

<url><https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/aug/8></url>

IN THE SECOND SESSION OF THE TWENTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, IN THE FIRST YEAR OF THE REIGN OF HIS MAJESTY KING EDWARD VII.

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 8th August, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

BELFAST AND NORTHERN COUNTIES RAILWAY BILL.

Order read for consideration of Lords' Amendments.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I object.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): May I point out that this is purely a verbal alteration which it is proposed to make. We only propose to omit the words "City and."

MR. T. M. HEALY: I want to have a guarantee from the Secretary to the Treasury that mixed trains shall not be run on this line to the detriment of the public service.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member would not be entitled to raise that question on the Lords' Amendment.

MR. T. M. HEALY: At any rate, I think it would be safer to put the Bill down for to-morrow.

Lords' Amendments to be considered to-morrow.

ALDEBURGH CORPORATION WATER BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

ILKESTON AND HEANOR WATER BOARD BILL.

Lords' Amendment considered, and agreed to.

STRATFORD-UPON-AVON, TOWCESTER, AND MIDLAND JUNCTION, EAST AND WEST JUNCTION AND EVESHAM, REDDITCH, AND STRATFORD-UPON-AVON JUNCTION RAILWAY COMPANIES BILL.

SWANSEA HARBOUR BILL.

WEST CUMBERLAND ELECTRIC TRAMWAYS BILL.

WOLVERHAMPTON AND CANNOCK CHASE RAILWAY BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

LEEDS CORPORATION (GENERAL POWERS) BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

LEEDS CORPORATION WATER BILL [Lords].

King's consent signified; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

SOUTH LANCASHIRE TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

STRATTON AND BUDE IMPROVEMENT BILL [Lords].

King's consent and Duke of Cornwall's consent signified; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

HARROGATE CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; an Amendment made; Bill to be read the third time.

RUGBY WATER AND IMPROVEMENT BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; Amendments made; Bill to be read the third time.

GREENOCK CORPORATION ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

[UNDER THE PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.]

Read the third time and passed.

TRAMWAYS ORDERS CONFIRMATION (No. 1) BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (LONDON) (RE-COMMITTED) BILL

[Lords].

Mr. Boland, Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, Mr. Emmott, Sir John Gorst, Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Arthur Morton, Mr. Platt-Higgins, and Sir Francis Powell nominated Members of the Select Committee on the Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That such of the Petitioners as pray to be heard by themselves, their Counsel, Agent, or Witnesses be heard.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That three be the quorum.";(Sir William Walrond.)

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): Having regard to the extreme urgency of this matter, will it be possible for the Committee to meet to-morrow morning?

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): Yes, Sir, it is proposed to meet to-morrow.

DR. MACNAMARA: Will its action be confined to the Stepney site?

SIR J. GORST: The reference is perfectly general. While I have no power to pledge the Committee in any way, I shall endeavour to confine the deliberations of the Committee to the question of site as raised by the Stepney Borough Council.

LLANELLY HARBOUR BILL [Lords].

Reported, without amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

Bill to be read the third time.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Edinburgh Corporation Order Confirmation Bill, Stirling Corporation Order Confirmation Bill, Kilmarnock Corporation Order Confirmation Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to, Amendment to Bethlem Hospital Bill [Lords].

That they have agreed to, Amendments to Easton and Church Hope Railway Bill [Lords]; Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [Lords]; South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways Bill [Lords]; Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [Lords]; Cardiff Railway Bill [Lords]; Cork, Blackrock, and Passage Railway Bill [Lords]: without amendment.

PETITION.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petition from Blaby, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Lancaster, from Blackpool to Garstang (Blackpool and Garstang Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the borough of Nelson, in the County Palatine of Lancaster (Nelson Light Railways Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the urban district of Barrowford, in the County Palatine of Lancaster (Barrowford Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the borough of Colne and the urban district of Trawden, in the County Palatine of Lancaster (Colne and Trawden Light Railways Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the county of Essex between Chipping Ongar Station on the Great Eastern Railway and Great Bardfield (Central Essex Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Lizard Light Railway Order, 1898 (Lizard Light Railway (Extension of Time) Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the West Riding of the county of York between Wales and Laughton-en-le-Morthen (Wales and Laughton Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the West Riding of the county of York and in the counties of Nottingham and Lincoln from Tickhill to Haxey (Tickhill Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Bridlington and North Frodingham Light Railway Order, 1898 (Bridlington and North Frodingham Light Railway (Extension of Time) Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Great Western Railway (Pewsey and Salisbury) Light Railway Order, 1898, and the Pewsey and Salisbury (Devizes Branch) Light Railway Order, 1898 (Pewsey and Salisbury Light Railway (Extension of Time) Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAYS (GENERAL REPORT).

Copy presented, of General Report to the Board of Trade on the Capital, Traffic, and Expenditure of the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (UNITED KINGDOM).

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1886 to 1900, Forty-eighth Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT (COLONIES).

Copy presented, of Statistical Abstract for the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom in each of the last fifteen years from 1886 to 1900, Thirty-eighth Number [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT, 1894 (VESSELS DETAINED).

Copy presented, of Return of all Ships ordered by the Board of Trade, or its Officers, to be provisionally detained as unsafe, together with Summaries, etc. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BOILER EXPLOSIONS ACTS, 1882 AND 1890.

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of the Board of Trade upon the working of the Boiler Explosions Acts, 1882 and 1890, with Appendices (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper [C. 302] [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRAMWAYS (STREET AND ROAD).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 8th July; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 314.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

Copy presented, of Thirtieth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1900–1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Supplement of the Thirtieth Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1900–1901, containing the Report of the Medical Officer for 1900–1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Reports and Papers on Bubonic Plague, by Dr. R. Bruce Low, with an Introduction by the Medical Officer of the Local Government Board [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL GALLERY (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Report of the Director of the National Gallery of Ireland to the Board of Governors and Guardians for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LAND REGISTRY.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 24th May; Mr. H. D. Greene]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 315.]

FORESHORES.

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 5th August, 1901, directing the application of moneys received by the Board of Trade in the year ended 31st March, 1901, in respect of the rights and interests of the Crown in the Foreshores of the United Kingdom [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the Prolongation of Hostilities in South Africa [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (COURTS-MARTIAL).

Copy presented, of Return of the number of Courts Martial held and Summary

Punishments inflicted during the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.
NAVY (HEALTH).

Copy presented, of Statistical Report of the Health of the Navy for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 316.]

NAVAL SAVINGS BANKS.

Account presented, of Deposits in Naval Savings Banks, and the payment thereof, and the interest thereon, etc., during the financial year 1899–1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table and to be printed. [No. 317.]

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

Account presented, showing the Receipt and Expenditure of Naval Prize, Bounty, Salvage, and other Moneys between the 1st April, 1900, and 31st March, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 318.]

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (IRELAND) ACT, 1877 (RULES).

Copy presented, of an Additional Rule and Schedule made by the Lord Chancellor and the Land Judge [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Copy presented, of State of the Volunteer Service Companies raised in 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Report from Brigadier-General Dixon on the Operations at Vlakfontein on 29th May, 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BRITISH SHIPS (DESSERTION OF SEAMEN ABROAD).

Return ordered, "showing the number of Desertions and Failures to Join in various parts of the World, compiled from Articles of Agreement which terminated in the years 1898, 1899, and 1900 respectively."; (Mr. Hain.)

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Return ordered, "of the names, objects, or business, places where business is or was conducted, date of registration, number of persons who signed the Memorandum of Association, total number of shares taken up by such subscribers, nominal capital, number of shares into which it is divided, number of shares taken up, amount of calls made on each share, and the total amount of calls received, of all Joint Stock Companies formed since the 1st day of January. 1900, to the 31st day of December, 1900, inclusive, distinguishing whether the Companies are limited or unlimited, and also the number of shareholders in each of the said Companies

at the date of the last Return, and whether still in operation or being wound up;

"Of the total number having their registered offices in the City of London, or within five miles of the General Post Office;

"And of the total number and the paid-up capital of all registered Companies which are believed to be carrying on business at the present time."; (Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE (DIVISIONS AND QUESTIONS).

Return ordered, "showing for the years 1888–1901 the total number of Days on which the House sat, with the date of the first and last sitting in each Session; the total number of hours during which the House sat after midnight in each Session; the total number of Divisions in each Session; and the total

number of Questions which appeared on the Notice Paper in each Session (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 0.131, of Session 1887).";(Mr. Loder.)
QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA;ARAB LABOUR FOR RHODESIA.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, as stated by the Administrator of Rhodesia at the opening of the Legislative Council at Salisbury, His Majesty's Government have given their sanction to the attempt now being made to obtain labour from Arabia; at what date such sanction was given, and by what stipulations on the part of the Government the sanction has been accompanied.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The authorities at Aden were asked on the 29th of June to afford proper facilities for engaging Arab labourers for Southern Rhodesia. His Majesty's Government have stipulated that the Administration of Southern Rhodesia shall accept responsibility for the engagement of the labourers and their transport to Southern Rhodesia, and shall secure the enactment of legislation for their protection which shall satisfy the requirements of His Majesty's Government.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Will these labourers be obtained within the Aden district or from Southern Arabia in Turkish Territory?

*LORD G. HAMILTON: We have no authority whatever over the population outside the British protectorate.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, as stated at the general meeting of the Buluwayo Chamber of Mines, an official of the British South Africa Company has been at Aden with a view to obtaining Arab labour at that place, and whether the Indian Government have made any of the stipulations with regard to the labour traffic from Aden such as they are in the habit of making with regard to labour traffic from India; whether Mr. Hole has already engaged 1,000 labourers under the sanction of the Imperial authorities.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The law governing emigration at Aden is the same as the law in India, but does not apply to Arabs from the interior, who are not British subjects. In the present case, therefore, I have satisfied myself that the Administration of Southern Rhodesia will introduce suitable legislation for the protection of Arab labourers, and I have authorised the Aden authorities to give such facilities to the company's official as may be proper. They will also see that the labourers fully understand the terms of their engagements, and are under no compulsion to accept them. I have not heard what number of labourers Mr. Hole has engaged. I am aware of the risks to which any experiment of this kind is liable, and the Aden authorities will watch it carefully.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Have the Government of India any representative in Rhodesia who will communicate with them, or will the Colonial Office represent them?

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The Indian Government has no representative in Rhodesia, but I believe it is well known that these Arabs will not work unless they are well treated; and, therefore, you have in that fact a guarantee for their good treatment which does not exist where weaker races are concerned.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): May I ask the noble Lord whether the

legislation in South Rhodesia of which he spoke will be enacted before these men arrive or after?

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The understanding is that the legislation shall be in force by the time they arrive.

REGULATION OF NATIVE AND IMMIGRANT LABOUR.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the introduction into Rhodesia of persons of colour as immigrants for the purpose of labour are protected by provisions similar to those contained in the Trinidad Ordinance laid upon the Table of this House relating to "Immigrants introduced at private expense" (Acts 37–57) which permit such introductions only on order by the Governor and making the contract of service dependent on the approval of protector and proof that the parties entered in the contract voluntarily and with full knowledge of its meaning; and also whether such immigrants have the protection secured to them equivalent to those provided in the same Ordinance in respect to labour and wages (Part VIII.); and whether he will lay upon the Table the Regulations in force in Rhodesia relating to labour, whether of natives or of immigrants.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Up to the present time there has been practically no introduction of coloured labour from over-sea, but with a view to providing for such introduction an Ordinance has been passed within the last month by the Southern Rhodesia Legislative Council. I understand that this Ordinance makes provision for the appointment of a Protector of Immigrants, and for securing in other ways the proper treatment of immigrants, but the actual text has not yet reached me. The labour of natives and immigrants in Southern Rhodesia has hitherto been regulated by the Cape law of master and servant, and I understand that an Ordinance codifying that law has been passed by the Legislative Council at their recent session. A copy will be laid on the Table when it is received.

JOHANNESBURG REFUGEES.

MR. MILD MAY (Devonshire, Totnes): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will consider the advisability of making provision that on the return of refugee owners of house property to Johannesburg they should not be liable for payments in respect of rent, rates, and consumption of water for the period of time during which, in their absence, their houses have been occupied by the Boers.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The position of refugee owners of house property in Johannesburg has been under the consideration of His Majesty's Government, and it is possible that further legislation may be necessary. I am, however, advised that lessees of houses who were driven out when the war broke out would under the Roman Dutch Common Law, and also under a proclamation issued at the beginning of the war by the late President, be exempted from the Payment of rent for the whole of the period during which they were deprived of the beneficial occupation of the property leased. Proclamations have been issued to facilitate the recovery of furniture, etc., which has been removed, and for the trial of actions for recovery of money paid for water rates. The question of rates is one on which I have not full information, and I will make further inquiry.

LAND SETTLEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the proposed expenditure of £500,000 on land settlement in South Africa will proceed on the lines laid down in the Report of the Land Settlement Commission;

if so, is it proposed to buy land and aid by Government funds men of small capital and little or no experience of farming to settle as farmers in South Africa.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: As I have already indicated, I am not prepared to make any further statement on the subject at present, but Lord Milner will report fully on the matter as soon as possible after his arrival.

MR. LAMBERT: Will the scheme come before the House before any money is expended?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir. A Vote has been taken.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR; GENERAL KRUITZINGER'S THREAT AGAINST THE NATIVES.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will lay upon the Table a copy of the instructions forwarded by the Government to Lord Kitchener for communication to General Kruitzinger.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The instructions to Lord Kitchener were contained in a telegram which ran as follows;

"Acts of the nature referred to in your telegrams of the 1st August which Kruitzinger threatened, and which have been committed as stated therein, are contrary to the usages of civilised warfare. All persons therefore authorising or committing them should, if captured, immediately be brought to trial, and the penalty of death should be inflicted on them if they are found guilty. This decision may be communicated by General French to the Boer leaders."

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: May I ask whether we can have the message from General Kruitzinger which brought forth this instruction?

LORD STANLEY: The only message we have is the one received from Lord Kitchener and published in Lord Kitchener's telegram, in which he gave the facts of the case.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: What I mean is the message from Kruitzinger himself.

LORD STANLEY: I will consider that.

FUTURE CONDUCT OF THE CAMPAIGN.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is intended in the future conduct of the campaign to discriminate between large and small bodies of the enemy, and whether the latter are to be denied belligerent rights.

LORD STANLEY: The future conduct of the campaign must be left to Lord Kitchener, who will no doubt be guided by whether the enemy act as belligerents or contrary to the usages of war, irrespective of the numbers that may be fighting against us at any one time or place.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Will the noble Lord, consistently with the statement he has just made, withdraw the telegram of instructions which has just been sent, controlling Lord Kitchener's action in this matter?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir; because I hold that what Kruitzinger threatened was

contrary to the usages of war.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Is it understood, then, that in this matter Lord Kitchener is acting under the direct orders of His Majesty's Government from home?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir; Lord Kitchener in his telegram mentions the whole facts of the case, and he would naturally rely to some extent on the advice he got from home, but he certainly would act entirely on his own initiative.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, W.): Has a date yet been fixed for Lord Kitchener's return?
[No answer was given.]

VLAKFONTEIN.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether General Dixon's despatch, giving an account of the battle of Vlakfontein, has yet been received; if so, whether he will lay it upon the Table, together with the full details which he is to communicate to the House in reference to that battle; whether he will also communicate to the House the sworn evidence as to killing of British wounded, promised in Lord Kitchener's despatch; and whether any reply has been received from General Delarey to the communication which Lord Kitchener addressed to him in reference to the alleged killing of British wounded at Vlakfontein.

LORD STANLEY: Yes, Sir. The despatch will be laid immediately. In answer to the second paragraph, we have not yet received the sworn evidence. The answer to the third paragraph is "No."

TRIAL OF REBELS;COETZEE'S CASE.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a man named Coetzee was, on the 24th of June last, tried at Dordrecht by a Military Court, composed of a Lieutenant-Colonel of the Royal Irish Regiment and a Colonial Major and Lieutenant, on a charge of murder and high treason; that the evidence disclosed that a Boer picket had been surprised by Colonel Scobell's column on the 6th of June, and that two men, of whom the prisoner was one, were found with rifles and ammunition in a neighbouring donga, from which the witness thought shots were being fired; and that on this evidence against Coetzee, and the evidence of another witness, he was certain the prisoners were the sons of a British subject, Coetzee was convicted and executed; and whether, in view of the feeling among our Dutch fellow-subjects caused by military executions of this kind, he will direct that captured Boer soldiers who are alleged to be British subjects shall be reserved for trial by the ordinary courts.

LORD STANLEY: I have no information concerning the first part of the question. In reply to the second part, it is impracticable to try men taken in arms against us by ordinary courts.

EXECUTION OF REBELS;COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE OF BURGHERS.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he has obtained information from South Africa, and if he can communicate to the House what were the exceptional circumstances connected with the compulsion of British colonists to witness the execution of their countrymen at Dordrecht; who gave the order for such compulsion; if it was sanctioned by the Commander-in-

Chief in South Africa, and, if not, whether the officer responsible for it has been punished; and whether these colonists were convicted criminals or prisoners; under what penalty did they attend, and what object was gained by such compulsion.

LORD STANLEY: The report has not yet arrived.

MR. PIRIE: Will the report arrive before the end of the session?

LORD STANLEY: It is quite impossible for me to say when it will arrive.

MR. PIRIE: On what date did you wire for the information?

LORD STANLEY: I cannot say.

MR. PIRIE rose to put a further question;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The question on the Paper has been fully answered.

*MR. LEAMY (Kildare, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has any official information to the effect that several of the leading inhabitants of Cradock have been deported for refusing to obey the order to attend the execution of Johannes Petrus Coetzee; and, if so, by whose order was the deportation carried out.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been called to the fact that all male adults in the township of Cradock were summoned by a public notice, headed by the title Martial Law, by Major C. C. Wiseman Clarke, Commandant Cradock District, to attend in the market square on the morning of Friday, 12th July, at a quarter to eleven, to witness the promulgation of the sentence of death on Johannes Petrus Coetzee for high treason, and that the notice enjoined all places of business to be closed from half-past ten till after the promulgation of the sentence, and whether this notice had the sanction, either previous or subsequent, of Lord Kitchener.

LORD STANLEY: In reply to these questions, I have no information on this subject.

*MR. LEAMY: Will the noble Lord ascertain if there is any truth in this serious allegation that a number of men have been deported for refusing to witness an execution?

LORD STANLEY: I understand we are to have a full report, and until that arrives it is impossible for me to say anything.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Is it not the fact that after the Dordrecht case orders were given that people should not be compelled to witness these executions?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the question on the Paper.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Will the report be received before the prorogation of Parliament?

[No answer was given.]

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: It is barbarous!

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Has the noble Lord any doubt that the proclamation was issued at Cradock? I have a copy of it here. It is a most atrocious thing, and yet the War Office have no information.

MR. PIRIE: May I ask whether, pending the information being given to this House,

this black practice will continue in South Africa?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Such a question would not be put on the Paper.

MR. PIRIE: Well, will the practice go on?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Would I be in order in handing a copy of the proclamation to the noble Lord?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member can do that privately.

MILITARY OPERATIONS AT WATERKLOOF.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the military authorities have found it necessary to clear Waterkloof of its inhabitants, and whether over forty families have been sent to safe farms; can he state what is meant by "safe farms"; whether they are prison camps, and how far they are from Waterkloof. I do not wish to be out of order, but I notice that portion of my question as to whether Waterkloof is in Cape Colony has been cut out.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is not usual to admit questions asking for information which could be obtained from any map. The matter, however, is not important, and I dare say had it been submitted to me I should have left it in the question.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I hope the clerks at the Table will note that.

LORD STANLEY: I have no official information to enable me to reply to the question.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: When is the noble Lord likely to have the information, if indeed he ever gets any at all?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: It's a case "where ignorance is bliss;"

COLENSO; SERGEANT-MAJOR BURNEY'S CLAIM.

MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been drawn to the case of Sergeant Major Burney, Prince of Wales's Light Horse, who claims that he was one of the men who tried to rescue Captain Robert at Colenso, and who states that he is owed £145 by the War Office, for which he has made repeated applications, but has not yet received a penny; and what action it is proposed to take in the matter.

LORD STANLEY: My attention has been drawn to this man's case, and I caused inquiries to be made by cable as to the truth of his statements. I have received the following reply;

"Burney enlisted Durban 30th January, 1901; was acting squadron sergeant-major, and reduced to ranks by district court-martial 1st March; was in hospital some time, and discharged the service 17th May; was arrested by civil power 18th May, and fined for drunkenness five shillings or five days; no pay due to him; he left power of attorney at Standard Bank of South Africa; officer commanding Prince of Wales's Light Horse knows nothing about him, as he never joined the corps in the field; no trace of his name in any Natal irregular corps; he has made no application for passage out of South Africa, consequently, as far as military is concerned, he is still in South Africa."

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS; REWARDS FOR WAR SERVICES.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that, though Roman Catholic chaplains have distinguished themselves during the war in South Africa by their conduct in attending to the

sick and wounded on the field of battle, no mention of this fact is made in the despatches from the seat of war, and if he can state the reason of this omission.

LORD STANLEY: One Roman Catholic chaplain has already been mentioned and rewarded, and further names have been received since the publication of the last honours and are under consideration.

MR. DALY: What was the nature of the reward given?

LORD STANLEY: I cannot say without notice, but probably it was promotion from one grade to another. I cannot say definitely, however.

MOUNTED INFANTRY VOLUNTEERS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if, having regard to the continuance of the war in South Africa, and the possibility of more mounted Volunteers being required, the Secretary of State will allow the mounted infantry companies formed by certain Volunteer corps at the instance of

the military authorities to remain until the expiration of their present engagement in 1904 upon the regulations as to capitation grant and allowances promulgated last September, bearing in mind that these companies do not compete with the new Imperial Yeomanry, being drawn for the most part from a different class.

LORD STANLEY: Will my hon. friend kindly refer to my reply to a question put on this subject by my hon. friend the Member for Kilmarnock Burghs on Tuesday last.†

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY; PAY AND FURLOUGH.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can announce the date on which the Fife and Forfar Yeomanry, who recently returned from South Africa, will receive the pay due to them and their formal discharges; and whether he can state what length of furlough will be given to the men who have served for over a year in South Africa; and whether he will consider the advisability of paying the men up to the day when they are actually discharged and able to resume civil employment.

LORD STANLEY: The men of this company were discharged seven days after arrival, having been granted the usual seven days furlough after disembarkation. They have been paid in accordance with general instructions an interim payment of four-fifths of the sum apparently due to them. They will receive all pay due to them as soon as ever the pay sheets are rendered.

MR. BROMLEY-DAVENPORT (Cheshire, Macclesfield): As the Financial Secretary to the War Office appears to throw responsibility for the payment or non-payment of the Imperial Yeomen on the officers commanding companies, may I ask him whether it is not almost impossible for officers to pay finally their men in this country until the pay sheets which are necessarily with the unit in South Africa, have been passed by the paymaster there?

† See preceding Volume, page 1408.

LORD STANLEY: My hon. friend is perfectly correct. The Yeomanry who have come back are time-expired men, and the unit to which they belong is still out in South Africa. The pay sheets, therefore, contain the names not only of the men

still out there, but of all the men who have come home, and until the pay sheets are properly checked in South Africa and sent back it is impossible for the officers commanding companies properly to render the pay sheets. We are expediting matters in every way possible, and meanwhile we are trying to alleviate matters by giving the men four-fifths of what is held to be due to them.

CURRAGH CONTRACTS.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the contract for beer, stout, and Irish whisky to supply the troops in the Curragh district has been given to the Burton Brewery Company; and, if so, can he say what opportunity has been given Irish firms to compete, and for what term the present contract has been taken.

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware that the contract has been so placed, but the matter is entirely one for the general officer commanding the district.

MR. DELANY: Will the noble Lord inquire?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir.

MILITARY EMPLOYMENT OF NATIVES.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he will cause inquiries to be made as to whether Kaffirs in South Africa have been armed by the British to such an extent that there is scarcely a camp in South Africa where a few natives with well-filled bandoliers may not be seen, and whether he will inquire whether most of the British columns are now accompanied by armed native scouts.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. I have no official information to this effect. It would be contrary to all orders issued on the subject if natives were armed for offensive purposes. At the same time I will communicate with Lord Kitchener on the subject.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Will the noble Lord also communicate the answer to the Colonial Secretary?

[No reply was made.]

COLOURED MEN WITH THE BRITISH ARMY.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state the number of coloured men employed in and about the British Army in the war in South Africa.

LORD STANLEY: I have no information to enable me to give the numbers. No such record could possibly be kept.

RESERVE OFFICERS' OUTFIT ALLOWANCES.

COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can explain why the outfit allowance for an officer of the Reserve recalled to service is the same as that for an officer promoted from the ranks in the infantry, but £50 less in the case of the cavalry, although a cavalry outfit is more expensive than an infantry one.

LORD STANLEY: I do not think I can add anything to my reply to a question put by my hon. and gallant friend on this subject on the 2nd instant.

RESERVE OFFICERS' SENIORITY RANK.

COLONEL LEGGE: I beg to ask the Secretary for State for War if he can explain

why officers joining a regiment or corps on exchange or from half-pay are allowed to retain their Army seniority, whereas officers recalled from the Reserve are deprived of theirs.

LORD STANLEY: A Reserve officer has no rank until he is recalled to duty. A regimental officer takes rank in his

† See preceding volume, page 1033.

regiment or corps from the date of appointment to it. If his Army rank bears a different date to his regimental rank, he carries his Army rank date, for purposes of precedence and command, only when serving together with officers of other corps.

RESERVE OFFICERS' PAY.

COLONEL LEGGE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can say why officers of the Reserve who have received a gratuity are granted full pay on recall to service, while officers in receipt of retired pay only get £;150 a year.

LORD STANLEY: After careful consideration it was decided that there should be no deductions from the full pay of those officers who had received a gratuity, as they represented that the money had been treated as capital, not income, and had not necessarily been invested in the purchase of an annuity.

ARMY REMOUNTS;PURCHASES IN AUSTRO-HUNGARY

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can say when he anticipates the inquiry which is being held at the War Office as to the purchase of horses in Austro-Hungary will be concluded; and whether he will promise that the whole of the evidence will be published for the information of members of Parliament.

LORD STANLEY: The inquiry is now concluded, but the Report and the evidence are not yet ready for submission to the Secretary of State for War. As some of the evidence was given on an honourable understanding that it should not be published, the Secretary of State for War cannot promise that the evidence will be published. He will doubtless publish the Report.

WAR OFFICE LABOURERS' WAGES AT NAVAL PORTS.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a decision has been arrived at with regard to conceding to the labourers employed by the War Department at the naval ports the same advance as that recently given to those under the Admiralty.

LORD STANLEY: The question is at present under consideration. I will notify the hon. Member when a decision is arrived at.

NAVAL COURTS-MARTIAL;REVISION OF FINDINGS.

MR. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in cases where a conviction by court-martial is submitted for confirmation to the Judge Advocate of the Fleet, the prisoner is required to undergo any part of the punishment awarded before the validity of the conviction has been adjudged by that legal officer; and whether he can state in any, and, if so, how many cases last year prisoners have undergone the whole or part of a sentence before the conviction on which it was based was quashed or reversed.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Although all

contested courts-martial are referred to the Judge Advocate, sentences awarded by naval courts-martial under the terms of the Naval Discipline Act come into operation at once. They are scrutinised by the local Commander-in-Chief, who would suspend the sentence in the event of any apparent illegality, pending reference to the Admiralty. It might happen that a sentence, subsequently found to have a legal flaw, had begun to take effect, but such instances are very rare. One only has occurred during the last twelve months, and in that case the imprisonment awarded had not been commenced when the finding was quashed.

GOVERNMENT DOCKYARDS; JOINERS' WAGES.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the rate of wages paid to joiners by private shipbuilding firms who receive contracts from the Admiralty are from 5s. to 10s. above the rate paid by the Admiralty to joiners in Government employ; whether he is aware that joiners have to undergo a long apprenticeship and to purchase an expensive kit of tools; and whether, under these circumstances, he will undertake that the rate of wages paid to joiners in Government employ shall be inquired into with a view to placing it on an increased and more fair standard.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Inquiries were recently made as to the rates of wages paid to joiners in private employment and joiners in the dockyards respectively, and it was ascertained that, taking into consideration the rates per hour, the rates of the latter compared favourably with those of the former. The rates of pay prevailing at the time of the inquiry referred to are substantially the same as those paid at the present day. All joiners, whether in the employment of the Government or not, must undergo a long apprenticeship, and must purchase tools for the prosecution of their trade. Under these circumstances it is not considered necessary to inquire further into the rates of pay of joiners in Government employment.

SUB-LETTING OF ADMIRALTY CONTRACTS.

MR. BROADHURST: I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether, seeing that the distribution of a contract by a principal contractor amongst other independent employers is a sub-contract, the Government requires to be informed of the conditions under which the work so distributed is done.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The Government cannot as a rule be informed of the conditions governing preparatory work which is not done on Admiralty premises. As I informed the hon. Member on Tuesday last, the terms of the Fair Wages Resolution of the House of Commons are embodied in all Admiralty contracts.

NAVAL VICTUALLING; ALLEGED BRIBERY.

MR. KEARLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any decision has been come to by the Admiralty as to the publication of the evidence given before the Departmental Committee on Naval Victualling, and whether, in view of the fact that many witnesses testified to a system of bribery prevailing in connection with canteen catering and contracting, any steps are being taken to free the Navy of such practices.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It is not proposed to publish the evidence given before the

Departmental Committee on Naval Victualling. The question with respect to the management of canteens, to which the hon. Member refers, and with respect to which evidence was given before the Committee, is receiving careful consideration at the Admiralty.

MR. KEARLEY: Is it not the fact that several witnesses made allegations of bribery in connection with this matter?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, I believe some of the witnesses did suggest it.

MR. KEARLEY: Then, under the circumstances, ought not the evidence to be published?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir. It is not usual to publish the evidence given on departmental inquiries. We had reason to believe that some of the witnesses would not come forward if they had anticipated that their testimony would be made public.

MR. KEARLEY: Are the Admiralty entitled to receive evidence of this nature?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Admiralty take the course which is most conducive to obtaining the truth. I should like it to be clearly understood, however, that no allegation of bribery is made against the Admiralty, or against any of its officers or officials in the performance of their duty.

MR. KEARLEY: I shall take the earliest opportunity of calling the attention of the House to this matter.

MR. FLAVIN: Can the hon. Member say in what branch of the service bribery does not take place?

NAVAL ORDNANCE CORPS.

MR. KEARLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any appointments of chief and warrant officers to positions in the Naval Ordnance Corps have yet been made in accordance with the undertaking repeatedly given that such appointments as opportunity offered should be secured to them.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The report of the Committee which recently considered the organisation of the Naval Ordnance Store Department made recommendations with respect to the employment of chief and warrant officers. These recommendations, together with others made by the Committee, are now under the consideration of the Admiralty, but no actual decision has yet been arrived at.

INSTRUCTION IN NAVAL GUNNERY.

MR. KEARLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in view of the results of shooting from ship's guns on board H.M.S. "Terrible," demonstrating that, where special attention is given by officers and men to gun, training and practice, the efficiency of a ship can be increased by at least 30 per cent., the Admiralty intend that Captain Scott's method of training men to shoot shall be adopted on every ship in His Majesty's Fleet.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Admiralty is fully alive to the necessity of training men to shoot, and all possible means are being employed to obtain the highest degree of efficiency. Captain Scott's method of training is being followed, and a large number of sets of his aiming apparatus have been ordered, in addition to those already supplied to ships in commission.

INDIA; INCOME TAX COLLECTION.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he

can state approximately the amount of income tax collected in India from incomes between Rs. 500 and Rs. 1,000; and whether he has considered the advisability of raising the limit of income liable to income tax to Rs. 1,000 as soon as the finances of India permit.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The amount of income tax collected in India from incomes between Rs. 500 and Rs. 1,000 is approximately 36 lacs out of a total of 193 lacs. As at present advised I am not disposed to raise the existing exemptions. Any changes in this or any other form of taxation must be governed by the future condition of Indian finance.

INDIAN BUDGET.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can fix the date for the introduction of the Indian Budget, and whether the Report of the Famine Commission will be printed and distributed previously to the discussion of the Budget.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The Budget will be taken on the day fixed for the Committee stage of the Appropriation Bill. The Report of the Famine Commission has, within the last few days, been received officially from India, together with the comments of the Indian Government and a statement of the action which they propose to take upon it. I cannot undertake to present these Papers to Parliament until I have had time to consider them in council, and as the questions raised are complex and most important, I shall not be able to come to a conclusion upon them for some little time.

INDIAN COTTON CULTIVATION.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if his attention has been called to the deterioration of the staple of Indian cotton and to the condition in which it is brought to market, and if the Government can do more than is now being done to bring about an improvement in this particular by methods similar to those which have been so successful in Egypt.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: I stated in answer to a question in this House on the 1st July 1902; that I was aware that the poor quality and condition of Indian cotton had been the subject of a good deal of attention in India, and that efforts

1902; See Debates, Fourth Series, Vol. xcvi., page 419.

were being made by the Indian Agricultural Departments to obtain selected seed, and to induce the cultivators to grow improved varieties. I am in communication with the Government of India on the subject.

FOX-HUNTING INCIDENT AT CAIRO.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that the officer commanding the 11th Hussars, with six other officers and one private of the 11th Hussars and other regiments of the British garrison at Cairo, while foxhunting at five o'clock on Sunday morning, the 21st July, in a walled-in garden, in the absence of the owner and without his leave, were assaulted and beaten with sticks by the owner's servants and the native guards in charge of the place; whether the officers were authorised by the general in command of the Cairo garrison to prosecute these servants for obeying their orders and defending the property;

whether he is aware that, while the officers have apologised to the owner, the servants and guards have been sentenced to long terms of imprisonment for obeying their orders, and whether the Government propose to use their influence with the Egyptian Government to obtain remission of these sentences; and whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence connected with this case.

The following question on the same subject also appeared on the Paper.;

MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe): To ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been drawn to the case in which certain servants in the employ of Mr. W. S. Blunt, upon his enclosed stud farm near Cairo, have recently been condemned to terms of imprisonment of six, four, and three months each for defending their employer's property from invasion and damage by certain officers in His Majesty's service; whether, in order to prevent the prejudice of native opinion against the administration of justice in Egypt, His Majesty's Government will take steps to secure these men's release.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): As this is a Foreign Office matter, perhaps I may be allowed to answer the question. The information which we have received is to the following effect. The officer commanding the 11th Hussars and others were out fox-hunting on the 21st July. A fox was found on the outskirts of Mr. Blunt's property, and was followed by the pack into an enclosure. The Master and whips galloped to a hole in the wall in order to get to the hounds and prevent any damage being done, when Mr. Blunt's stud manager shouted to them to stop, and struck at them with his stick. The other officers remained outside, but, hearing shouting inside, went back and entered the enclosure. Two of the officers who had first entered were surrounded by a number of the men of the place, mobbed, struck, their hats knocked off, and their horses beaten. The officer in command did his best to restore order, and called on the officers to fall back, and ordered them not to strike their assailants. The assailants were prosecuted for assault in the ordinary courts of law before the native courts, and the stud manager was sentenced to six months' imprisonment and two other defendants to four and three months respectively. It is understood that the defendants will appeal. The officers have expressed their regret to Mr. Blunt for the trespass, but it appears that practically no damage has been done to his property. There seems no reason to doubt that a serious assault has been committed, which no orders from the owner can justify; but the general officer commanding the British troops in Egypt will be requested to prevent the occurrence of incidents of this nature. The decision of any question as to the remission of sentences is for the Court of Appeal and the Egyptian authorities. Correspondence will be laid as soon as complete reports have been received.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: May I further ask the noble Lord whether the officers were in mufti; whether the servants who drove them out were unable to speak a word of English; whether the men had been employed by the owner of the property for the special purpose of keeping out marauders; whether, under these circumstances, the Government will use their influence with the Egyptian authorities to have the sentence revised; whether in Major Rycroft's official

report to headquarters in Cairo he does not say;

"We drew along the edge of the desert, and about 5 a.m., right outside the wall enclosing Mr. Blunt's property, the hounds jumped over the wall and immediately gob on the line of a fox";

and whether that is not inconsistent with the account which the noble Lord has given.

*SIR CHARLES CAYZER (Barrow-in-Furness): Is the noble Lord not aware that Major Rycroft possesses a perfect knowledge of the Arabic language, and owing to this and the great forbearance of himself and his officers prevented a serious occurrence?

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: As the hon. Member for Waterford is aware, it is not my decision that supplementary questions should not be answered, but the decision of the House. However, in deference to the position which the hon. Member occupies in the House, I do not object to say one word in answer to him. The officers were in mufti, and it is true that Major Rycroft has a thorough knowledge of Arabic, so it was not necessary that the natives should know English. But I do not think the hon. Member quoted my answer quite correctly. I said the fox was found in the outskirts of Mr. Blunt's property. With regard to the line the British Government should take, we shall, of course, await a full report of the circumstances before we go into the matter.

MR. TAYLOR: May I ask whether, pending an appeal, the men, if in prison, will be released?

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I must have notice of that question.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Do the military regulations allow officers of the British Army to go fox-hunting and poaching on Sunday?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Such a question is obviously out of order, and it has nothing to do with the question on the Paper.

PERSIA;CUSTOMS TARIFF.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any information has reached the foreign Office of a proposed modification in the Customs tariff of Persia; if so, whether due notice will be given to British merchants previous to the introduction of a radical change, and whether he would state the nature of the scheme.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The answer to the first question of my hon. friend is in the affirmative. The question of whether any notice is required or is practicable will receive consideration. I am not yet in a position to make any further statement on the subject.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state if any provision is made, or whether any reserve would be immediately available, if, owing to the reduction of interest or other causes, the withdrawals from the Post Office Savings Bank should exceed the new deposits.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The hon. Member asks me what would be done in the event of the falling off of Savings Bank deposits, which for a long time have been continually increasing. I see no reason to anticipate any such difficulty as he suggests.

COMMISSION ON COAL SUPPLY.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can now state the reference to, and the composition of, the Commission on Coal.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No, Sir; I am not yet able to do this.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: When is the right hon. Gentleman likely to be in a position to give the information?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Not in the course of the present session.

COAL DUTY REMISSIONS.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state approximately the sum accrued in the hands of the Customs at the end of July in respect of coal duty to be returned under the remission agreed to during the passage of the Finance Bill through the House of Commons; and, in view of the inconvenience and loss caused to exporters by the withdrawal of this capital from their business, will he expedite its repayment.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am afraid I have not sufficient data available to enable me to give the figures asked for. Every effort is being made to expedite the settlement of the numerous questions arising out of the contracts submitted, and directly each settlement is made steps are taken with a view to the return of the duty which has been remitted.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: Will the amount be less than a quarter of a million?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I cannot say.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): Will interest be paid on it?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I think not.

SS. "NUMIDIAN."

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has yet received a reply as to whether William Morrison, fireman on the steamship "Numidian," was arrested on 23rd May, in Montreal, for being absent without leave, and as to whether the master left him in prison and sailed for Liverpool without paying him off, in accordance with Sections 187 and 188 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894; and, if so, can he state what steps, if any, he has taken to see that this man is paid and compensated for his loss of time; and will he get a report of the case from the superintendent of the Mercantile Marine Office and magistrate's clerk at Montreal.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): No, Sir. A communication on the subject was addressed to the shipping master at Montreal on the 24th July, but no reply has yet been received.

MR. NANNETTI: When shall I repeat the question?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: As soon as I get a reply I will communicate with the hon. Member.

RAILWAY RATES.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that British and Irish railways carry foreign goods at from one-half to two-thirds less than the charge for home goods, and that their charges for coal are three times those of the German and Belgian railways; whether he will advise the

appointment of a Departmental Committee during the recess to inquire into and report upon those matters in connection with transport.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir. I am not aware that the facts are as stated by the hon. Member, and I do not propose to institute such a general inquiry as that suggested by the question. If any specific instance of undue preference is brought to my notice, I will inquire into it.

MR. FIELD: I have forwarded several specific complaints to the right hon. Gentleman already.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACT AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION BILL.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, having regard to the changes in the law made in the Grand Committee upon the Factory and Workshop Act Amendment and Consolidation Bill, he will consider the advisability of separating the consolidating from the amending clauses, or in some way showing the new proposals in the old law.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): A copy of the Consolidation Bill with notes to explain the Amendments, and also a Memorandum showing how each clause in the amending Bill was embodied in the consolidation Bill, were circulated to members of the Grand Committee; and copies of the Memorandum were deposited in the Vote Office for the use of members. I think this is all that can be done; it would be quite impossible to separate the clauses.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Is my right hon. friend aware that the new provisions reducing overtime are likely to seriously affect the wage-earning powers of workers in Sheffield?

*MR. RITCHIE: With regard to that, I have received from a very large number of bodies representations against the proposals embodied in the Bill. It is not possible for me to state what course the Government propose to take until the Bill comes on.

MR. NANNETTI: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in the opinion of trade unionists of all classes overtime is most injurious to, and not required by, the working classes?

*MR. RITCHIE: I do not know that I can quite go to that length, but still I have had representations from working men asking me to allow the matter to remain as it stands in the Bill.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that we work overtime here?

CRIMINAL LUNATICS; INEBRIATE REFORMATORIES.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether inmates of inebriate reformatories who become insane and are transferred to local asylums have their maintenance in such asylums paid for by the Government.

*MR. RITCHIE: Their maintenance is paid for by the Government so long as they remain criminal lunatics; if, however, an inmate of an inebriate reformatory who is removed to an asylum does not within a short period after the removal show such signs of recovery of sanity as render it probable that he can properly be returned to reformatory

treatment, he is usually discharged from the class of inebriates, and thereupon becomes and is treated as a pauper lunatic.

PENRHYN QUARRY DISPUTE; MILITARY AID TO THE CIVIL POWER; CONDUCT OF TROOPS, ET

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state who was the magistrate who signed the requisition asking that troops be sent to Bethesda, and, seeing that there has not been anything in the behaviour of the people at Bethesda during the past week to render necessary the presence of the soldiers, whether he intends to order their immediate recall.

*MR. RITCHIE: I understand that the magistrate who signed the requisition was the Chairman of the Standing Joint Committee for Carnarvonshire. I am glad to be able to say that I am informed that the state of things at Bethesda is such as will, in the opinion of the local authorities, justify the withdrawal of the bulk of the troops on the 10th instant, but I must remind the hon. Member that the responsibility for the preservation of order in the district rests with the local authorities, with whom I have no power or intention of interfering.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): Was the magistrate resident in the district? What is his name?

*MR. RITCHIE: I am afraid I cannot give that. Probably the hon. Member knows it better than I do.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: Have the local authorities held any inquiry?

*MR. RITCHIE: The responsibility rests with them, and I am informed that they felt justified in taking this step.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that on the evening of Saturday, 3rd August, some of the soldiers now stationed at Bethesda for the maintenance of the peace created alarm among the inhabitants of the place by shouting

and fighting in the public street opposite the Douglas Arms Hotel, and what action he proposes taking to punish the offenders.

LORD STANLEY: I have no information to the effect suggested.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the cost of catering the troops sent to Bangor in anticipation of disturbances at Bethesda is an Imperial or a local charge, and by whom were the rates for catering agreed upon with the local tradesman.

LORD STANLEY: The incidence of the cost in this and similar cases is under consideration.

*MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvon, Arfon): Can the noble Lord state the exact proportion of the Imperial and the local charge?

LORD STANLEY: The whole question is under consideration, and if I gave an answer now it might be misleading.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: Will regard be had to the decision in the Aberdare case?

LORD STANLEY: All the facts will be considered.

CARNARVONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL; CONSTITUTION OF SUBCOMMITTEE.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the sub-committee of the joint committee of the Carnarvonshire County Council, to whom the chief constable appealed for

endorsement of his request that soldiers should be sent to Bethesda, are composed of persons connected with the slate trade; and whether he proposes doing anything to amend the law so as to prevent in future interested parties from acting as magistrates in the calling out of the military during a labour dispute.

*MR. RITCHIE: I have no information on the point referred to in the first paragraph. I find no reason in the facts at present before me for thinking that any amendment of the law is required.

LIVERPOOL WATER MAINS;COMPENSATION CLAIMS.

COLONEL WALKER (Widnes): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the Liverpool Corporation refuse to entertain a claim for compensation for damage caused on a farm at Huyton by the bursting of a water main belonging to them on the ground that they are protected by their statutory powers from any liability in a case of the kind; and whether he will undertake to introduce legislation to provide for the recovery of compensation for damage caused in cases of this kind.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I understand that the corporation consider that they are not liable in the case referred to in the question, unless it can be shown that they have been guilty of negligence in the construction or use of the waterworks. Without admitting their liability, however, they have offered as compensation a sum of £15, at which amount the damage has been estimated. I could not undertake to introduce legislation as suggested by my hon. and gallant friend.

PTOMAIN POISONING.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will direct an inquiry into the circumstances attending the ptomaine poisoning of two ladies by decomposed cream; and whether he will take prompt steps to check the improper use of preservatives to enable articles of food to be disposed of to customers when in a state of decomposition dangerous to health.

MR. WALTER LONG: I have seen a newspaper paragraph as to the inquest in the case mentioned in the question, and I will endeavour to obtain a report from the medical officer of health of the borough on the subject I expect to receive in a few days the Report of the Departmental Committee on Food Preservatives, and I hope then to be in a better position to judge how dangerous decomposition in food may be satisfactorily prevented.

VACCINATION AT LEEDS;CASE OF EMILY MAUD CHILD.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will now lay upon the Table of the House the report made to his Board by the late Dr. Ballard, one of the inspectors of the Local Government Board, respecting the results of vaccination in the case of Emily Maud Child at Leeds, to which reference is made in the Report of the Royal Commission on Vaccination, in paragraph 4 (27) of that Report.

MR. WALTER LONG: It would be contrary to the practice of the Local Government Board to give publicity to the reports made by their inspectors in cases such as that referred to by the hon. Member. These reports are always regarded as

confidential. Full particulars of this case will be found in Appendix IX. to the Final Report of the Royal Commission on Vaccination, and in the evidence given before the Commission.

MR. CORRIE GRANT: Was not the Report made to the Royal Commission on Vaccination?

MR. WALTER LONG: No; I gather it was made to the Local Government Board.

COMMUNICABILITY OF TUBERCULOSIS.

MR. CAREW (Meath, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the statement of Professor Virchow, agreeing with Dr. Koch, that human and cattle tuberculosis are different, the Government will grant a sufficient amount to enable exhaustive scientific experiments to determine upon the communicability of tuberculosis from animals to man, and also appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon the subject.

MR. WALTER LONG: The making of experiments for the purpose referred to is a matter to be considered in connection with the question of the appointment of a Royal Commission. This question is receiving the attention of the Government, but, as I stated on Tuesday, they have not at present arrived at a decision with regard to it.

ORGANISATION OF SECONDARY EDUCATION.

MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the proposed organisation of secondary education will include the efficient control and regulation of pupil teacher centres by the new education authority; and whether he will state by what authority school boards are permitted by the Board of Education to provide secondary education for pupil teachers employed in their own schools, and more particularly for pupil teachers employed in schools conducted by other bodies.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I cannot pledge the Government to the contents of the Education Bill of next year. I understand the sections of the Education Act of 1870 relied on by school boards are 19 and 35.

SCIENCE AND ART EXPENDITURE.

MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, seeing that the total annual expenditure on science and art amounts to about 360,000, he can state what proportion the science and art grants for agriculture bear to the whole grants.

SIR J. GORST: There was paid for the year 1899–1900 in respect of attendances and results of the science examinations, under the heading "Principles of Agriculture," £407. But this does not at all represent the total grants for instruction bearing on agriculture, as it does not include grants for instruction in such subjects as botany, biology, and chemistry, nor the grants given on these and kindred subjects in evening schools and in day schools of science.

HOLYWELL SCHOOLS.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he can state what steps, if any, are being taken to re-open the Holywell schools; and whether it is

the intention of the Department to grant the request of the ratepayers to be allowed to establish a school board for the management of said schools.

SIR J. GORST: A school board for Holywell alone is about to be set up.
VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM.

MR. MASSEY-MAINWARING (Finsbury, Central): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he can state when the first contract for the foundations of the Victoria and Albert Museum runs out, what amount of money will have been spent under this contract, and what amount remains unspent, and when will the foundations be completed; has any contract been concluded for the basement of the Museum; have any tenders been invited for the main building; and, if not, what is the cause of delay in their issue; are the plans complete; have any modifications or alterations been made in them to diminish the extent of the Museum; and have delays been caused through certain special materials being ordered in not sufficient time for the building, the foundation stone of which was laid by Her late Gracious Majesty Queen Victoria more than two years ago.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): The foundations are completed, and the contract was for £33,410. A second contract has been made for building to the ground-floor level, and this work is now being proceeded with. As soon as this is finished tenders will at once be invited for the superstructure, the plans being now practically ready. No alterations that I am aware of have been made which would reduce the size of the museum, and no delays of importance have occurred, the work being completed within the allotted time. The contract for the foundations was not entered into until some time after the laying of the memorial stone, that ceremony having taken place in advance to suit Her late Majesty's arrangements.

WIDENING OF PICCADILLY.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he would consent to delay the widening of Piccadilly until the effect upon traffic of the proposed continuation of the Mall into Cockspur Street has been ascertained.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): May I suggest that the work should be suspended until next year, that the House may have an opportunity for considering the proposal?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I will consider that, but I may point out that the scheme was before the House last year. I do not think the alternative suggested by my hon. friend would have any appreciable effect, seeing that no heavy traffic or omnibuses can use the route; but the point shall be considered.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Was not the scheme very generally condemned last year?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I am not aware of that, and I venture to think that the scheme can be defended, and that if the public knew exactly what is intended objections would be easily answered.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the scheme is generally condemned in Ireland?

POSTMEN'S TUNICS.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing

the Postmaster General, if he is aware that certain postmasters interpret Rule 3 (section b) in the Town Postmen's Rate Book to mean that a postman should wear his coat buttoned from neck to waist (however hot the weather may be); and whether, seeing that Mr. Arnold Morley, when Postmaster General, held that the top button only was intended to be fastened, this interpretation will be acted upon by the Postmasters throughout Great Britain and Ireland.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.):

The Postmaster General is not aware that postmasters interpret the rule in question to mean that a postman must wear his coat buttoned from neck to waist. The men should, however, even in hot weather, have the top button of their coats buttoned, as they would otherwise present a slovenly appearance. No special instructions on the subject seem necessary.

MR. FLAVIN: How many members of this House keep their top button fastened?

EXAMINATIONS FOR MALE SORTERS

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, with reference to the examinations for male sorters held in London, can he state when the last examination was held, what number of candidates presented themselves, and how many of those came from Ireland, whether he is aware of the inconvenience and cost to Irish competitors at these examinations in having to travel in numerous cases over 500 miles, and whether, seeing that similar examinations were held at times at Inverness, Stornoway, and other places for the convenience of Scotch competitors, he will arrange that examinations will in future be held in Dublin.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The last examination for the situation of male sorters in London was held on the 30th May, 1901. On this occasion 257 candidates presented themselves, of whom 65 are believed to have come from Ireland. Eighty-five were successful, including 23 of the Irish candidates. Three of these competitions have been held each year during the past four years, and the average number of vacancies has been 172 per annum. They are held in London only, and Irish candidates who elect to compete for such appointments are under no disadvantage which is not shared by all others who do not reside in London; but having regard to the terms of service, and particularly to the early and late hours of attendance, the Civil Service Commissioners have not considered it advisable to give facilities which would tend to attract to these competitions persons whose homes are not in

London. No competitions for these or any other appointments are now held in Stornoway, and though important competitions for other posts have sometimes hitherto been held at Inverness, they are held also at Galway and Limerick.

IRISH LANGUAGE IN IRISH SCHOOLS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether fees are paid for Irish, when taught as an extra subject, on the average daily attendance of school or classes presented, or whether they are paid at a fixed rate per pupil on the number of children actually presented, and, if not, will he explain the principles which regulate payment, and the amounts which may be expected for such work.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): This question, I assume,

turns on the meaning of the expression bona fide, as applied to the attendance of pupils, in Rule 55. The Commissioners have decided that bona fide attendances mean that the child is a pupil of a national school, has made at least one hundred attendances in each annual period, and has attended the course of Irish, or other extra subject, for at least 75 per cent. of the meetings. The fee payable under these conditions for Irish is 10s. per pupil.

IRISH TEACHERS AND THE RESIDUAL GRANT.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state in how many instances national teachers have been paid their share of the balance of residual grant, whether he is aware that the teachers of Ireland have stated definitely that they have not got this money, and that Archbishop Walsh has stated that the money is due, and whether he will now institute an inquiry to ascertain what became of the money.

MR. WYNDHAM: The payment of the balance of the residual grant for the calendar year ended 31st December, 1900, to each teacher in the service on the 31st March, 1901, was made with

the consolidated income remitted in April. The payment of the equivalent of the residual grant accruing in the current year will be paid at the end of the present financial year. As already stated, I have called for a Return showing the expenditure of the school grant year by year since 1892–3, under the four clauses of the 4th Schedule to the Act of 1892 (including residual grant).

This Return, which will shortly be laid on the Table, will show whether the money has been allocated and paid away in the prescribed manner. I am not prepared to institute a further inquiry.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: When does the right hon. Gentleman expect to get the Return?

MR. WYNDHAM: In a day or two.

LONDONDERRY AND THE EDUCATION ACT.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Londonderry District Council No. 2 adopted the Compulsory Clauses of the Education Act, and the local authorities appointed their portion of the school attendance committee over four months ago, and, seeing that the Commissioners of National Education have not yet appointed their portion of this committee, can he state the cause of the delay, and will steps be taken to have the Act put into force in the district referred to.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Commissioners appointed five persons to act on the school attendance committee of this district on the 16th July, and the appointments were at once notified to all parties concerned. The enforcement of the Act rests with the local authority.

IRISH COMMISSION OF EDUCATION;COMPLAINT OF BOOKBINDERS' SOCIETY.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has yet received the report from the Commissioners of Education in Ireland as to the complaints sent by him to them from the Bookbinders' Society; and, if so, what steps he purposes to take to meet the claims of these men.

MR. WYNDHAM: The question of the application of the Fair Wages Resolution to the dealings of the Commissioners with the firm of Messrs. Blackie and Son was

considered by the Commissioners at their meeting on Tuesday last, when it was decided that the resolution did not, in their opinion, apply, there being no direct contract with that firm. The Commissioners add that they are assured by the firm that the charges brought against them by the Bookbinders' Society is not warranted by the facts.

MR. NANNETTI: Is it not recognised in all Government work that the Fair Wages Resolution must be acted upon? Seeing that these people are paid Government money, do they not come under the rule?

MR. WYNDHAM: That is just the point. The Commissioners say they maintain the resolution in direct contracts, but in this case they have no contract with, and consequently no control over, the firm concerned. The resolution does not, therefore, apply.

MR. NANNETTI: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that on several previous occasions the Commissioners have said that the firm did not pay fair wages?

MR. WYNDHAM: No; the Commissioners have accepted the statement of the firm that they do not break the Fair Wages Resolution.

MR. FLAVIN and Mr. NANNETTI both rose to put further questions.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The question on the Paper has been fully answered.

MR. FLAVIN: On the point of order, I have, Sir, a question arising directly out of the answer. Will you let me put it?

*MR. SPEAKER: No. Any further question must be given notice of in the ordinary way.

IRISH BOARD OF EDUCATION;BOOK DEPARTMENT.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with respect to the memorandum issued on 12th July by the Board of National Education, signed by eleven Commissioners, stating that the book department had now passed successfully through the crisis, and that the supplies were being sent regularly as ordered, and that there was now no arrear in that branch, will he state upon whose information the eleven Commissioners based their statement.

MR. WYNDHAM: In the memorandum referred to, the Commissioners embodied the substance of reports on the state of the book department supplied by their responsible officers. They have no reason to doubt the correctness of these reports, but, at the same time, they are quite prepared to investigate statements tending to impugn their accuracy if they are supplied with facts and figures enabling them to do so.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Archbishop Walsh absolutely contradicts the statement?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am quite aware that there is a contradiction, and the Commissioners have promised to investigate the matter if supplied with facts and figures.

SALLYBANK SCHOOL TEACHER'S SALARY.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the Return furnished of the salary of the principal teacher, Sally-bank, twelve months equivalent grant for results and Customs and Excise grant and one month's consolidated salary which included

another month's equivalent for these two items were returned as forming his income for the twelve months ended 31st March, 1901; whether, in view of the basis on which this teacher's salary was calculated, steps will be taken to compensate him for this loss by the recent alteration in the mode of payment; and whether the Return will be so amended as to give the amounts received for the residual grant and the balance of the residual grant separately for each of the four years dealt with.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have received and will forward to the hon. member a detailed Return showing the actual payments made to this teacher for each quarter in the four years mentioned, under the various heads. It appears that the total payments were slightly in excess of those shown in the previous Return. The average for the three years ended March, 1900, is not, however, affected. The teacher suffered no loss by the recent alteration in the mode of payment.

BOARD OF EDUCATION; ARCHBISHOP WALSH'S RESIGNATION.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether a second memorandum has been issued by the Board of National Education in Ireland in reference to the recent resignation of the most rev. Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin, and whether he will lay upon the Table a copy of this second memorandum, together with the copies of the minutes of all further proceedings of the Board with reference to this matter and the documents mentioned therein.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no knowledge of a second memorandum. In reply to a telegram which I despatched to the National Board embodying the terms of the hon. Member's question, I have received a reply to the effect that "the question cannot be answered till after the next ordinary meeting of the Board on the 13th instant." Perhaps the hon. Member will put down his question for Thursday, the 15th instant.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Of course I will put the question again, but I cannot understand why an answer could not be given. Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire if he can put on the Table copies of the recent Minutes dealing with this matter?

MR. WYNDHAM: I will see what can be done. I have no power myself to give the undertaking.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman communicate with the Board on the subject?

MR. WYNDHAM: As far as I am concerned I have no objection, but the meetings of the Board are confidential.

WHITE ESTATE, NEAR BANTRY.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.) I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether valuers have visited the White Estate, near Bantry, with a view to its sale to the tenants under the 40th Section of the Land Purchase Act, 1896; and whether he can state approximately when the sale is to take place.

MR. WYNDHAM: The request from the Land Judge was received by the Land Commission on 4th July. It is not possible to state, even approximately, when the Land Commissioners will make their report to the Land Judge. There will be no

unnecessary delay in reporting upon the estate, which is a large one.

LICENSING ACT PROSECUTION AT GALWAY.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the proceedings at the Galway Petty Sessions on 15th July last, when Mrs. Giblin, of Prospect Hill, Galway, was charged with a breach of the Licensing Acts, and when, on the case being called, Mr. J. C. Gardner left the bench and the chair was taken by Mr. F. Laurence O'Comyn; if he is aware that the husband of the publican, who is a Royal Irish Constabulary pensioner, swore that he placed a man named Comber to prevent any but bona fide travellers from entering, and that three of the men who were found on the premises swore that Comber invited them to go in, and that the magistrate dismissed the case against the publican, but fined the persons found on the premises; and that Mr. M. A. Lynch left the bench expressing his disapproval of the proceedings; and is he aware that Mr. Gardner, the resident magistrate, is a tenant of Mrs. Giblin, and can he explain why the superior officer of the Constabulary did not appear to prosecute in such a case but left it to a sergeant, and what action the Government intend to take in the case.

MR. WYNDHAM: This case was heard by five magistrates. The resident magistrate had previously left the bench, though for what reason I am unable to say, as he is at present on leave of absence. He is not, I am informed, a tenant of Mrs. Giblin. I have no power to interfere with the magistrates in the exercise of their judgment on questions of fact. Mr. Lynch left the bench after the decision was announced, but the police are not aware that he expressed disapproval of the proceedings. The case was not of sufficient importance to justify the attendance of the district inspector. The Government cannot take any further action in the matter.

*MR. MORRIS (Galway): Is it not a fact that on the day on which this publican was charged with a breach of the Licensing Acts there had been a very large excursion of visitors to Galway from all parts of Ireland, making it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for him to detect one or two local people amid the crowd of bona fide travellers whom he was bound by law to serve?

MR. WYNDHAM: I was not aware of that.

KILLCLOONEY ESTATE, GALWAY.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will make a further statement in reference to the sale to the Killclooney tenants.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have given all the facts in connection with this estate. The whole matter was considered yesterday at a meeting of the Congested Districts Board, and it was unanimously resolved to make certain representations to the Land Commission. The hon. member will, I feel sure, agree that it would be improper to make a further statement until the resolution has been received and considered by the body to whom it has been addressed.

PROPOSED PATHOLOGICAL LABORATORY IN DUBLIN.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to his reply to the deputation which waited on him in Dublin concerning a

proposal to establish a pathological laboratory devoted to research in connection with insanity for the asylums of the country, he will introduce a clause into the Local Government (Ireland) Amendment Bill empowering county councils to contribute towards the support of such a central laboratory for the study of mental pathology.

MR. WYNDHAM: Such a clause could not be inserted in the Local Government Act Amending Bill, but it would be germane to the Lunacy Bill now before the House. I earnestly hope to be able to introduce an Amendment of this character in the latter Bill.

SPEARSTOWN NATIONAL SCHOOL.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of the Spearstown National School, county Donegal, which was on the Commissioners' roll for thirty-two years, during which time it was under one teacher, who had a clean record; and, seeing that it has now been struck off the roll, can he state under what rule the Commissioners acted in doing so; is he aware that the motion to strike this school off the roll was carried by a majority of two votes only; that this school still has such an average attendance as to justify a claim for a grant from the National Board; and that the teacher would have been entitled to full pension in about eighteen months, but that the action of the commissioners has imperilled his whole pension, or at least will diminish his pension; whether the action of the Board is in accordance with the principles of the national system of education; and whether steps will be taken to rectify this state of matters.

MR. WYNDHAM: This school has, for many years, received grants from the National Board. The attendance, however, fell from forty-five in 1895 to thirteen in 1901. At their meeting on the 18th June, the Board decided unanimously to give aid to one only of the two schools in this locality. I do not, however, think it would be proper to give the voting of the Commissioners on the occasion when the grants were withdrawn from the Spearstown school. They have power under Rules 94 and 102 of the Code to discontinue aid to a national school. Schools with an average attendance of even less than thirteen are aided by the Board in exceptional circumstances, but the granting of such aid is discretionary with the Board. The pension of the teacher is not imperilled by the action of the Board; his retiring allowance will be somewhat less now than it would be if he did not retire until he reached the age of sixty-five. He is at present in his sixty-fourth year. The Government cannot take any action in the matter, as suggested.

MR. JORDAN: May I be permitted to say that the question has been practically re-written at the Table without consulting me, although I am constantly in the House.

*MR. SPEAKER: The question in its altered form has been on the Paper several days without objection.

FISH RATES BETWEEN DINGLE AND DUBLIN.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Great Southern and Western Railway charge

36s. 6d. per ton for salt mackerel and herrings from Dingle to Dublin, while they take the same merchandise from Dingle to Liverpool, viâ Dublin, for 12s. per ton; and that fishcurers in Dingle who want to sell in Dublin consign it to Liverpool, via Dublin, and thence back again to Dublin, for 15s. per ton; and having regard to the effect on the fish trade and the Irish consumer of the rates charged by the Great Southern and Western Railway to all those districts from which there are not competing modes of transit, whether he will cause an inquiry to be made into these rates with a view to uniformity and equality of incidence.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information in this matter beyond what is alleged in the question. If, however,

a statement is made to the Department of Agriculture by any person aggrieved by the rates, inquiry will be made.

OMAGH LABOURERS' COTTAGES;INCOME TAX DEMANDS.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a demand has been made on the Omagh Rural District Council for payment of income tax on the labourers' cottages situated within the area of its authority, while the council declines to pay the tax because the cottages are not self-supporting, causing outlay instead of bringing income; and, seeing that the object in providing labourers' cottages is charitable and not pecuniary, will he make representation to the proper quarter to have the demand for payment of income tax on labourers' cottages in Ireland withdrawn.

MR. WYNDHAM: I believe the fact to be as stated in the first paragraph. The question raised in the second paragraph is properly one that should be addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Perhaps I may refer to my right hon.

friend's reply to a similar question addressed to him on the 12th July of last year.†

MR. DALY: Is it not the fact that in many cases there is a loss of £;3 a year on these cottages to the ratepayers?

MR. WYNDHAM: The matter is one which must be dealt with by the surveyors of taxes.

FORESTRY IN IRELAND.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Cork County Council and other public boards in Ireland have adopted resolutions urging the necessity of tree-plantings and pointing out the desirability of empowering county and district councils to acquire waste lands for that purpose; and whether, inasmuch as Irish taxpayers contribute towards tree-planting in Great Britain, he will endeavour to
† See Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxv., page 1325.

obtain a grant from the Treasury in aid of the object in view.

MR. WYNDHAM: I replied to similar questions on the 14th and 21st June.† It is unnecessary to approach the Treasury in the matter, as the Department of Agriculture in Ireland is already supplied with funds for the purpose of promoting reafforestation.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Could not Irish Crown rents be utilised for this purpose

instead of being spent in England?

MR. WYNDHAM: That question should be addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

DUBLIN COUNTY POLLING DISTRICTS.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the desire of the general body of the electors of the Dalkey and Cabinteely polling districts of the county of Dublin that a revision court should be appointed to sit in that district; whether he is aware that at present persons from that district who have to attend revision sessions are obliged to travel several miles, oftentimes on several successive days, if they wish to secure the franchise; and whether there is any objection, seeing that the town hall is always available for the purpose of a court, to fix that place for the revision of the Dalkey voters' list.

MR. WYNDHAM: I must refer to the reply given on the 26th ultimo; to the similar question of the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division, to which I have nothing to add, except to repeat that any further representations that may be addressed to the Lord Lieutenant by those locally interested will, of course, be considered.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): What objection can there be to granting this request if the people want the change?

† See Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. xcv., pages 427 and 1072.

‡ See preceding Volume, page 237.

MR. WYNDHAM: That is a question for the Lord Lieutenant to decide.

MR. CLANCY: I will bring this matter under the notice of the House the first opportunity I get, in order to show that the object in refusing the request is to keep Nationalist voters off the Register.

POLICE AND PUBLIC, AT BALLYMOTE.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that on the 1st instant the police entered the house of John Gilmartin, Ballymote, county Sligo, arrested him in his house, brought him to the police barracks, and detained him there all night; can he state what their reason was for doing so, whether the police had any warrant, and what steps he proposes to take.

MR. WYNDHAM: The individual named in the question was arrested on the public street at midnight on the 11th instant for being drunk and disorderly. The police did not enter his house on the occasion; he was not arrested on a warrant, as none was necessary. The case will be magisterially investigated at petty sessions to-day. No action is called for on my part in the matter.

TARBERT AND KILRUSH STEAMER.

*MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the inhabitants in and around Glin, in the county of Limerick, are anxious that the subsidised steamer plying between Tarbert and Kilrush should call at their pier, a distance of about six miles from the former place, and that the entire cost for attendance on steamer at said pier (which is free of toll and has been certified safe by the county

surveyor) would not exceed £;1 a week, a guarantee to which effect would be given; and, having regard to the fact that there is no service at present either by rail or steamboat to Glin, and with a view to the development of the district by communications for tourists, will he take steps to have the subsidised boat call there.

MR. WYNDHAM: This matter has already engaged my personal consideration. I have nothing to add to the letter which I addressed on the 26th June to the hon. Member, except to say that the Government cannot subsidise an extension of the steamer service beyond the existing communication between Tarbert and Kilrush.

*MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Why cannot the Government do this, seeing that this is one of the most beautiful spots on the banks of the Shannon?

IRISH RATING GRIEVANCES.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the discontent caused and hardship felt by tenants of holdings and houses rated at £;4 per annum and under, owing to the operation of the Local Government Act, which compels them to pay the rates hitherto borne by the landlord, and having regard to the difficulty of efficient collection of rates from a poor class of occupiers, whether he will consider the advisability of introducing a short amending clause into the Local Government (Ireland) Bill now before this House, which would revert to the former practice and cast upon immediate lessors the duty of paying rates upon tenements and holdings rated at £;4 and under.

MR. WYNDHAM: The suggested Amendment would not be germane to the Bill now before the House. Apart from this, however, I would point out that the alteration in the law suggested would be opposed to the principle on which the Local Government Act of 1898 was based, namely, that the burden of the rates should fall on those to whom the electoral power is given.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN LIMERICK.

MR. LONDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the occasion of the inquiry lately held in the No. 1 District Council of Limerick in regard to the 7th Scheme for the erection of cottages under the Labourers Acts little consideration was given to the labourers' applications, on the grounds that some of the houses of these labourers had not been pronounced by the doctors as insanitary; and, seeing that this was caused by the fact that they had been temporarily living in the houses of farmers' herdsmen in which they had no permanent right of occupation, will he take action to have those applications reconsidered.

MR. WYNDHAM: The inspector's report of the inquiry, which was only held on the 11th July, has not yet been received. Consequently, I am not in a position to say what evidence was adduced, or to anticipate the recommendations of the inspector. But I will communicate with the hon. Member when the report is received.

COLONEL FRENCH'S COONAGH ESTATE.

MR. LONDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland

is he aware that some time ago preparations were made to sell to the tenants, under the 40th section of the Act of 1896, the property of Colonel French situate at Coonagh, in the north liberties of Limerick City; can he say how far arrangements were carried on, and will he recommend that sale to the tenants be carried out on a price to be fixed by the valuers of the Land Purchase Commissioners.

MR. WYNDHAM: The estate has been inspected, and the matter is at present under the consideration of two of the Land Commissioners with a view to the preparation of their report under Section 40. The price will be determined by the land judge.

FARRAR'S BALLYVARRA ESTATE.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that the estate of Mr. William Dent Farrar, at Ballyvarra, Lisnagry, Limerick, as far back as 1885 or 1886, was offered for sale by the authorities in the land judge's court to the tenants, Mr. F. A. B. Turner being then receiver; can he say how far proceedings for sale were carried and why they were discontinued; and whether a tenant named Patrick Wheland, evicted in May, 1900, and who offered a year's rent in discharge of arrears, has since been admitted back to his holding; and will he take steps to expedite the sale of the estate.

MR. WYNDHAM: The petition for sale of this estate was dismissed by the land judge in July of last year. The land judge has no knowledge of, or control over, any proceedings between the parties subsequent to that date, or of the alleged reinstatement of an evicted tenant.

TIPPERARY RENT APPEALS.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, during the month of July, he received from the No. 2 Tipperary District Council a resolution stating that on account of the way in which rents are fixed of the appeals by landlords to the Chief Commission who raise the rents they called on the Government to pass a Compulsory Land Purchase Bill; and whether he will use his influence early next session to give effect to the above resolution.

MR. WYNDHAM: This question has been repeatedly answered by me.

SANITATION AT BANBRIDGE.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Banbridge medical officer of health several times reported to the Banbridge Urban Council that 421 houses in the Western Ward and 134 houses in the Eastern Ward in Banbridge are without back doors, ash pits, water closets, or any sanitary accommodation; and will he state what action the Local Government Board has taken to compel the Banbridge Urban Council to carry out the provisions of the Public Health Act.

MR. WYNDHAM: The medical officer of health has reported that a large number of houses in the district are without back doors, and that some of these houses require to be dealt with in a radical manner. The Local Government Board has no power to intervene in the matter unless complaint of default is made under Section 15 of the Public Health Act, 1896.

IRISH LAND COURT VALUERS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether court land valuers in Ireland are required to pass any examination to test their fitness for valuing land; if not, can he say in what way, and by whom, are their qualifications tested.

MR. WYNDHAM: The fitness of county court valuers nominated by the Land Commissioners under Section 32 of the Land Act of 1887 is not tested by examinations; but the Commissioners have opportunities of judging the qualifications of all applicants for the position from hearing their evidence in cases that come before the Commissioners on appeal. A Return is now in preparation on the motion of the hon. Member for North Longford setting forth the names and qualifications of the valuers who were employed during the past three years.

LIFE SENTENCES;PREROGATIVE OF MERCY.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, having regard to the number of cases both in England and Ireland in recent years in which life sentences have been dealt with as if they were for a term of twenty years, and to the fact that convicts under life sentences have been released upon the expiration of fifteen years imprisonment, whether he will advise His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to treat with like clemency prisoners like Finigan and Muldowney, now confined in Mountjoy and Maryborough prisons, each of whom has been confined for about eighteen years.

MR. WYNDHAM: The exercise of the prerogative of mercy is vested in the Lord Lieutenant, and it would be entirely outside my province to advise him as suggested in the question. Any fresh representations, if they can be urged, in favour of a mitigation of the sentence on the two convicts named should be addressed in the usual way to the Lord Lieutenant.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the first part of my question.

MR. WYNDHAM: I fancy that in both countries the prerogative is only exercised by the constituted authority.

FERMANAGH BOUNDARIES;PROTESTANT AND ROMAN CATHOLIC REPRESENTATION ON LOCAL BODIES.

MR. JORDAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the numbers of Roman Catholics and Protestants respectively in the county Fermanagh at the last census; has his attention been called to a scheme, dated the 5th July, 1901, framed by the county council of Fermanagh, whereby the Roman Catholics, who, according to the former Census Returns, were in a majority of the population, are, by a rearrangement of local districts and a reduction of representatives, to be placed in a permanent minority in the county council and in the district councils. Will the inquiry into the scheme asked for by the county council be granted by the Local Government Board? If so, will it be conducted by a Roman Catholic or a Protestant inspector; and is there any precedent for such an inquiry under the Local Government Act, 1898.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Roman Catholic population of the county at the recent census was 36,066; the Protestant population was 29,168. The county council has

prepared a scheme proposing alterations in the boundaries of local areas with the object of removing inequalities in the electorate and representation, but there is nothing in the scheme to indicate that it would have the effect suggested. The council has been informed that no alterations, even if made, could take effect until January, 1903, and that the further consideration of the matter should be deferred until after the election of councillors in January of next year. I am unable to say whether an inquiry will ultimately be granted; or, if so, what inspector will hold it. Such an inquiry was lately held in Dublin.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this scheme was initiated by a Tory election agent at Belfast?

[No answer was returned.]

ENNISKILLEN BOUNDARIES; PROTESTANT AND ROMAN CATHOLIC REPRESENTATION ON LOCAL BODIES.

MR. JORDAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the numbers of Roman Catholics and Protestants respectively in the urban district of Enniskillen; has his attention been directed to a motion before the urban council to frame and submit to the county council a scheme of wards, and an alteration and enlargement of the urban district boundary, whereby Roman Catholics, notwithstanding their numbers, are to be placed in a permanent minority so far as representation to the urban council, the board of guardians, and the county council are concerned; and what action will the Local Government Board take under such circumstances.

MR. WYNDHAM: Until the detailed Census Returns for the county Fermanagh are published it cannot be stated what are the religious proportions of the population of electoral areas. I am aware it is proposed to alter the area of the urban district, and to divide it into wards, but I cannot say whether the proposal would have the effect alleged. The Local Government Board cannot take action at the present stage, the matter must first be dealt with by the urban and county councils.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman take care that no scheme of jerrymandering is started?

MR. WYNDHAM: No such scheme has come before the Board. If one does, and the allegation is made, the matter is certainly one which shall be considered.

CROWN QUIT RENTS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether any arrangement will be made to enable the quit rents which are the property of the Crown in Ireland to be available for Irish purposes.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I can add nothing to the several replies I have already given on this subject. I have done my best to explain to the hon. Member that it is impossible to meet his wishes in this matter.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the desirability of earmarking the rents for Irish purposes?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No, Sir.

BANTRY BAY FORESHORE.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether when Lord Ardilaun, as trustee to the Bantry estate, purchased the rights of the Crown to

portions of the foreshore of Bantry Bay for a sum of £;10, inquiries were made as to the value of said foreshore; and, if they were, will he say of whom; and whether competition was invited.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Trustees of the Bantry estate advanced a claim to certain parts of the foreshore of Bantry Bay, and, having regard to the difficulty of proving the Crown title, the Board of Trade were advised to accept an offer of £;10 for the rights of the Crown, subject to covenants for preserving the rights of the public. It is not usual in cases of this kind, where the title is disputed, to obtain a valuation, or to offer to sell to anyone other than the owner of the adjacent land.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Did not the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor give an undertaking that in future these sales should not take place without due public notice?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not aware of that.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Crown has assigned its right to the foreshore of Bantry Bay between Bluehill and the public road adjacent to the Abbey burial ground to the receiver on the White estate, and, if so, for what consideration.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, the Crown has not alienated any part of the foreshore referred to by the hon. Member to the receiver of the White estate. A portion of that foreshore was included in the sale to the trustees of the Bantry estates, but the larger portion still remains the property of the Crown.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Earl of Kenmare claims a right to the rocks, sand, and seaweed on the foreshore of Bantry Bay between Newtown and Gurteenroe, and can he state whether the Crown has transferred its right to the said foreshore to the Earl of Kenmare, and, if so, for what consideration.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, I am not aware that the Earl of Kenmare has made any claim with respect to the foreshore of Bantry Bay between Newtown and Gurteenroe. The Crown has not alienated its rights in the foreshore in question.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the fact that Lord Ardilaun and his co-trustees of the Bantry estate have sub-let the foreshore of Bantry Bay between Reenmeen East and Newtown, and that gravel is sold and carried off the foreshore, he will consider, in the public interest, the advisability of cancelling the arrangement entered into between the Board of Trade and the said trustees in 1898.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The act of selling and removing gravel from the foreshore would not entitle the Board of Trade to cancel the arrangement made by them with the trustees of the Bantry estate in 1898. The Board of Trade have power, however, to prohibit the removal of materials where necessary for the protection of the coast.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Is there no record of the pledge publicly given by the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor on the 18th August, 1894, on this subject?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not aware of it.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Ought not your subordinates to be aware of it?

MR. GILHOOLY: Can we see a copy of the agreement, so as to know what rights are

reserved?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir.

IRISH HARBOUR BOARD REVENUES.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received communications from a committee representing the Irish Harbour Board as to the inadequacy of the revenue derived under the existing system of registered tonnage with a certain class of vessels, and whether he will confer with this committee, or a deputation, to devise a remedy.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, I have received communications to the effect stated in the question, and I have replied that for reasons stated in the Board's letters I do not think any useful purpose would be served by my receiving a deputation on the subject at the present time.

MR. FIELD: When will the Minute be issued?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I hope the revised instructions will be out in a few days.

ATHLONE BARRACKS GASWORKS.

MR. SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the military gasworks in Athlone Barracks are used by a private contractor to supply gas to the Midland Great Western Railway Company, although the Athlone Urban Council supply gas for public and private lighting in the town, and have recently expended £4,500 on improvements in the gasworks and mains; whether, seeing that the military gasworks are handed over fully equipped to a contractor to thus compete against the town supply, the military authorities sanction this arrangement.

LORD STANLEY: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. In reply to the second paragraph, the contractor is liable for maintenance; the buildings, etc., have been handed over to him by the War Department, and this has been taken into account in fixing the terms of the contract. There have been arrangements of a somewhat similar character sanctioned in connection with the gas supply at other stations. The arrangement in question had been in force without complaint for many years before the Athlone gas supply was taken over by the district council.

IRISH POSTMASTERSHIPS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, seeing that five officers holding appointments in English post offices have been appointed to five Irish postmasterships since 1st January, 1900, an equal number of officers holding appointments in Irish offices will be appointed to vacant postmasterships in England or Scotland during the present year, so as to equalise promotion from Irish post offices; and can he state how many applications from Irish offices were received for the respective vacancies, and how many of the applicants were qualified to discharge the duties of postmaster.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Ninety-seven applications for the vacant postmasterships referred to were received from officers of the Department in Ireland. Of the persons applying, forty-six were recommended as competent to fill the vacant posts. Postmasterships are, however, filled by the appointment, irrespective of the locality in which the officer concerned may be serving, of the candidate

whose claims and qualifications are considered to render him the most eligible for the vacancy. And in these circumstances the Postmaster General is unable to give any such undertaking as that suggested.

IRISH MAILS.

MR. DOOGAN (Tyrone, E): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that the English night mail which is due in Cookstown at 9.55 did not arrive in that town till after twelve (noon) on 30th July, 31st July, 1st August, and also on one day in the preceding week; and whether, seeing that these frequent delays, which cause so much inconvenience to the inhabitants of the towns of Cookstown, Coolisland, and Stewartstown, result from the late arrival of the mail steamer at Kingstown, steps will be taken to provide that the English night mail will not in future be delayed in transit, and that the steamer will arrive at Kingstown in due time.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General regrets to find that the English mail was late in arrival at Cookstown on the occasions referred to by the hon. Member. In one case the delay was due to the mail packet from Holyhead having been delayed by fog in the Channel, while on the other occasions the delay was due to the amount of passenger traffic on the railways. The London and North-Western Railway Company found it necessary to run the Irish night mail train in two parts, and as the mail packet has to await the arrival at Holyhead of the second part, it could not be despatched until considerably after the appointed time. The London and North Western Company have been urged to take all possible measures for securing punctuality, and representations have also been addressed to the Great Northern of Ireland Railway Company, who were responsible for a considerable part of the delay on two of the occasions.

MR. CREAM (Cork, S.E.): Does not the ordinary express do the journey in less time than the mail?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot answer that without notice.

CLONMEL MAILS.

MR. CONDON (Tipperary, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that on five days during the past week the mails which should have reached Clonmel at 10.10 a.m. did not arrive until 2.10 p.m., and whether he will direct that the mails for Clonmel should in future be forwarded from Thurles by the Southern Railway direct, thereby ensuring the certainty of the mails reaching at 10 o'clock a.m.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is true that during the nine days from the 26th ultimo to the 3rd instant inclusive the English mails were on five occasions late in arrival at Clonmel, but an arrangement is now in operation for forwarding the mails for Clonmel direct from Thurles whenever the day mail train from Dublin is running too late to effect the ordinary connection at Limerick junction. The Postmaster General hopes that by this arrangement a regular arrival at Clonmel will be secured.

ROYAL DECLARATION BILL.

COLONEL LONG (Worcestershire, Evesham): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the character of the Royal Declaration Bill, and

that at this period of the session many members are paired against each other who would be agreed on this particular Bill, he will consider the advisability of not introducing it in the House of Commons this session.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): If I may judge from reports which I have seen of what passed in another place, from correspondence in the newspapers, and from indications I have observed in this House, the persons for whose relief this Bill is intended do not appear to be satisfied with it. I gather also from a different quarter that objection is taken to the Bill. In these circumstances it is evidently quite impossible for us to deal with this matter at the close of the session.

MR. T. M. HEALY: What course do the Government propose to take on the First Reading, which, as I understand, comes on mechanically?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand there will be no First Reading.

LORD RUSSELL'S TRIAL.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state the amount of fees paid to the law officers of the Crown in connection with the recent prosecution of Earl Russell, and also the whole expense of the trial.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not at present in a position to give the information asked for.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Will the right hon. Gentleman give an undertaking that the fees of the law officers of the Crown will be commensurate with the dignity of Parliament, having regard to the fact that these unfortunate gentlemen only divide about £20,000 between them annually.

BUSINESS OF TILE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: (Stirling Burghs): I beg to ask the Leader of the House if he has any information to communicate in regard to public business, and particularly what Votes will be taken to-morrow in the stage of Report of Supply.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think probably the most convenient course will be to put down the classes in their order. If the right hon. Gentleman desires anything to be raised, of course I shall be glad to consider it; but, as at present advised, I shall put down the classes in their order; Class 1, Class 2, and so on.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: If any objection reaches me I will communicate.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As regards Monday, I propose to take as the first Order the Second Reading of the Royal Titles Bill, which I think ought not to take any length of time, and then we shall proceed with the Report of the Factories Bill and of the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill. On Tuesday we shall take the next stage of the Royal Titles Bill and what remains of the Factories Bill and the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill. On Wednesday the main business will be the Naval and Military Works Bills. On Thursday, if we make reasonable progress with all these matters, I think it may be possible to take the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill. That is perhaps a sanguine estimate, but it is my hope.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will remember that there are on the Paper three or four Irish Bills; most of them of an uncontroversial

character. Still, they will require some discussion, and the Belfast Bating Bill will take some time.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I quite appreciate the fact that the hon. Member does not want these discussions to be taken late in the evening. I will put them down on Wednesday, and hope we may reach them fairly early.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman take a Saturday sitting in order to expedite public business?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There will, no doubt, be a Saturday sitting next week.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Would a meeting on Saturday next interfere with the Blenheim garden party?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Very much.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman fix a definite day for the Belfast Bill? I believe there are several deputations in London awaiting its coming on.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am anxious to bring it on as soon as I can, but I am hampered by not being able to tell how long will be required for the consideration of the Bills coming down from the Grand Committee.

MR. JOHN REDMOND asked if other business was to be taken after Supply was disposed of.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it may be convenient to take one or two small Bills, etc.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is that not in contravention of the rule which provides that on days allotted to Supply no other business shall be taken?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: And was not that rule enforced against us in the matter of the Catholic University Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: May I point out that on ordinary days of Supply no opposed business can be taken after twelve o'clock, and under such circumstances no doubt such a rule is desirable and convenient. But now we have reached a period of the session when the twelve o'clock rule is suspended, and we can go on until any hour.

SUPPLY [22ND ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

CLASS II

1. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £40,182, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board in Ireland."

SIR THOMAS ESMONDS (Wexford, N.) said he had on the Paper a notice of motion with regard to this Vote, but he did not intend to move it, because he thought it would be more convenient to the Committee and his colleagues to take that course, in order that they might have an opportunity of discussing various other matters under this head. It was now more than twelve months since they discussed the administration of the Local Government Act in Ireland, and since that time

they had had additional experience of the Act and its administration. One result of that experience had been to confirm the opinion which many of them held, that the Local Government Act was not the great blessing in disguise which it was supposed to be. They had also discovered that the drafting of the Act was not all that it ought to be, and it had proved to be a very complicated and obscure measure. They were now beginning to understand how the Act was to be worked, and they were now realising in how many directions the Act required to be amended. One of his complaints against the Local Government Act was that it entailed too many sacrifices and the spending of too much time on the part of those engaged in administering the Act. He would give the Committee an instance of how the work of the Local Government Act affected the council with which he happened to be connected; namely, the county council of Wexford. It was much better for them to come down to concrete cases, in order to make their views more thoroughly understood. The Local Government Act in the county of Wexford had made an extraordinary demand upon the leisure time of members of that council. Last year in Wexford they had sixteen county council meetings, nineteen finance committee meetings, and seventeen meetings of other committees. That made a total of fifty-two meetings in connection with the county council of Wexford. English members who were responsible for the passing of the Local Government Act for Ireland thought they had done all they ought to do when they had imposed the Act upon Ireland, and they did not think it any part of their business, as the governors of Ireland, to attend in their places now. English members would be astounded to be told that members of the county council had to attend meetings of the council and its committees on fifty-two occasions in the twelve months. He thought they had in this matter a strong grievance, because it was owing to the way in which the Local Government Act was drafted that the county councils were obliged to meet so many times. In future there was a possibility of an increase in the number of meetings of the various county councils and committees, because since last year they had the Technical Instruction Act, which meant the calling of constant meetings of a number of committees for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of that measure. It came to this, that those members of county councils who lived by their own labour and industry in Ireland, were supposed to give up practically half a year to the local administration of the country and they had to do that for nothing at all. In the old days it took the grand juries eight days in the year to carry out the administration, but now that they had this magnificent system of local government they had to attend fifty-two days in the year. After all, the county councils were merely doing the work the grand juries were supposed to do. Now the county councils must be constantly in session. Many members of the county councils were ex officio members who had other public duties to attend to. If they were justices of the peace they were bound to attend at the licensing sessions. Taking Ireland all round, the petty sessions met once a fortnight. Some of the county councillors were also district councillors or members of boards of guardians, and they had to attend the meetings of those bodies. The district councils or boards of guardians generally met once or twice a week, and the result was that, practically, gentlemen in

Ireland who interested themselves in the administration of the local affairs of the country had to give half a year to the carrying on of the local work. That was an undue demand to make on the time of men who were not rich, and he thought that something ought really to be done towards endeavouring to simplify the administration of local affairs so as to remove this evil, which in his opinion was very great.

He considered that to some extent the Local Government Board was responsible for a great deal of this waste of time. There was an enormous amount of ridiculous correspondence with the Local Government Board in Dublin, which entailed additional work and necessitated the employment of extra clerks. Some of the letters received from the Local Government Board were extremely amusing. A letter dated 15th April, 1901, to the secretary of the county council of Wexford was as follows;

"With reference to the entry contained in the minutes of proceedings of the Wexford County Council on the 11th ultimo relative to the payment of poundage fees to collectors, I am directed by the Local Government Board for Ireland to request that they may be furnished with a return as to the state of the collection for the half-year ended September, 1900, on the 22nd October, the 19th November, and the 4th December last."

There was no such entry in the minutes of the county council; in fact there was no such meeting of the county council held. There was no earthly object in writing that letter. On this point he would like the Chief Secretary to state whether the Local Government Board had the right to ask county councils to furnish copies of the minutes of their proceedings. There was no clause in the Local Government Act authorising the Board to make such a request. This was one of the ways in which the time of the county councils was wasted, and it was also a means of increasing the expense

of the local administration. The hon. Member quoted specimens of the correspondence received from the Local Government Board, in order to show that unnecessary demands were made on the time of county councillors. At a recent meeting of the Gorey Union the report of Dr. Flynn, medical inspector of the Local Government Board, was submitted. It contained the following with reference to the Coolgreany district;

"The medical officer, at the date of my inspection, had ordered medicines a fortnight previously: they had not then arrived. The contractors should execute orders with greater despatch, as inconvenience must arise in a dispensary district if medicines are not forwarded promptly when ordered."

What was the answer to this? The clerk of the union, who was a competent and experienced man, stated that since the Local Government Board circular of 25th February, 1901, against which the guardians protested at the time, the contractors for medicines treated the guardians' order with contempt, and told them that they had their instructions from the Local Government Board, and that they intended to follow these instructions. The result was that the Local Government Board came down upon the guardians for disregarding one of the circulars of the Board. The hon. Member quoted another passage from the medical inspector's report, which stated that;

"A scale of fees under Article 23 of the dispensary rules has not been adopted. The guardians should take this matter into their early consideration."

The answer of the guardians was that this scale of fees had been adopted and approved of by the Local Government Board by letter dated 3rd November, 1899. It was all very well to say that they had a grant-in-aid, and there was no necessity to be so uneasy about small increases of expenditure. They were also told that they ought not to grudge paying something for freedom. It was possible to pay for freedom or anything else a great deal more than it was necessary to pay. Local expenditure had been increased, and amongst the ratepayers from one end of the country to the other there was nothing but grumbling as to the way the public money was spent, and the small result derived from that expenditure. In Wexford the amount of the county expenditure within the standard year was £13,504. That sounded a small figure, but they were dealing with a country where shillings represented what sovereigns did on this side of the water. Last year the county charges amounted to more than £27,757. That was sufficient to show that the local administration had become very expensive. In the standard year the amount spent on asylums was £4,900, and last year it was £14,253. In the matter of asylum expenditure the Irish county councils had absolutely nothing to say except to pay the bill. They had had to pay out the money of the ratepayers like water.

He now came to the question of salaries. In his own county the salaries amounted to £3,678, or an increase over the standard of £1,200. Surely there must be something wrong there. Again, the standard cost of the preparation of the voters' list was £560; last year it was nearly double; £1,048. The standard law charges amounted to £92; last year they were £516. That might be said to be directly due to a circular sent down by the Local Government Board, under which nearly all the officials in the county who wanted to get increased remuneration or compensation went to law with the county council; from inspectors of explosives down to attendants on lunatics. The result was that the county council had to pay all sorts of legal costs. The auditing of asylum accounts by the Local Government Board auditors was much too expensive. One asylum had been charged £30 for auditing their accounts, and when the committee demurred to the Local Government Board they were served with a sealed order requiring the payment to be made forthwith. No Department deserved more serious attention than that of the auditors of the Local Government Board. They got all sorts of fees and travelling expenses, besides a subvention from the Imperial Treasury. He thought that, when these auditors were subsidised by the Imperial Government, the county councils and district councils and asylum committees ought not to be called upon to pay them fees. Another question of which they had to complain was an Order recently issued by the Local Government Board relative to the employment of nurses in workhouses. One of the rules of that Order was that temporary nurses in the workhouses should be paid such salaries as should be approved of by the Local Government Board. Surely that was a matter with which the guardians could themselves deal. Another rule was that the boards of guardians should appoint as many fully qualified nurses as the Local Government Board should direct. That rule was preposterous, although it might be

conceded that in the case of an epidemic some trained nurses should be appointed. Resolutions had been adopted against the Order, and he trusted they would have the full consideration of the Chief Secretary and the Irish Government. There was the strongest reason to complain under the existing circumstances of the regulations made by the Local Government Board in regard to the appointment of assistant surveyors. There was a great deal more in this than appeared on the surface. The Local Government Board had laid down a scale of qualifications for these assistant surveyors in Ireland which were preposterous considering the state of education in Ireland. For instance, that scale provided that every person applying for such a position must either possess a diploma or degree in engineering from a university or college of science, or a certificate from His Majesty's Civil Service Commissioners that he was qualified under the Civil Service Act; or should be an associate member of the Institute of Civil Engineers of London, or an associate member of the Institute of Civil Engineers of Ireland, or of the Incorporated Association of Municipal and County Engineers. If he was an assistant surveyor on 1st April he must satisfy the Local Government Board that he was fully qualified for the discharge of the duties of his office. Now what were these conditions of the Local Government Board? That he must have served with a county surveyor or architect for two years, or that he must have been in attendance at an engineering school or some university for not less than one year, during which he must have been practically engaged in civil engineering or in building construction. Or he must pass examinations in English composition, arithmetic, mensuration, building construction, construction of culverts and roads, and be an adept in chain surveying and levelling. In fact what was wanted was a trained civil engineer and surveyor, while the great majority of the people of Ireland who were likely to be candidates for the berth of assistant county surveyor would have no means of gaining these qualifications. It should be remembered that the salary of these assistant surveyors was only £80 a year, while their work was of the most elementary description; measuring, or removing stones on the road, seeing that the grass was not growing on the road, and that the water ran away from the roads. He contended that these regulations of the Local Government Board were an absolute absurdity.

He wished to call attention to the recent dispute between the Wexford County Council and the Local Government Board on the question of the salaries of the officials of the county council which had been ordered to be paid by the Local Government Board. There were debates in Parliament, and the result of the whole thing was that the Local Government Board reduced the salary of the county surveyor by £4. To anyone not accustomed to the condition of things in Ireland that would be simply astounding. Was it to be wondered at that the Irish people sympathised with all who rebelled against British administration, and could not quite realise and understand the intensity of feeling which existed among the masses of the people against British rule? He wished to draw the attention of the Committee to a passage in the judgment of Chief Baron Palles, who tried a case in the Court of Appeal, to which he thought sufficient attention had not

been given, and on which they ought, again and again, to ring the changes in order to show how British administration in Ireland was carried on. Chief Baron Palles said that the determination of the Local Government Board to fix the increased remuneration imposed a liability on the county council whether the amount was right or wrong, and that even if the Local Government Board had increased a salary by 50 per cent., whereas the work had only increased 20 per cent., the county council would be obliged to pay. Was it conceivable that a law of that kind should be permitted to continue, or that such an extraordinary perversion of justice should not be rectified at the earliest possible moment? If it were an English Act, a Bill would be immediately introduced to amend it, and yet, although one of the ablest judges in Ireland described the law as he had stated, no action was taken. That was a monstrous position and ought to be remedied. The question in dispute was with a mere Irish county council, and of course the Local Government Board would not give in. They were determined to ride rough-shod over the council and to carry out their determination at all hazards. No doubt the Chief Secretary would explain in the course of the debate that the county council ought to have given evidence. It was made a great point against the council that they had brought forward no evidence, but the reason was that, in the first place, they were not responsible for the inquiry and repudiated it; and, in the second place, they held that the Local Government Board, being an interested party, was incapable of holding the inquiry. Therefore the council would not recognise it in any shape or form, although they agreed to leave the question to the arbitration of any impartial person. He himself was present at the inquiry, and listened very carefully to what went on, and he was perfectly satisfied that there would have been no use in producing any evidence whatever. What had happened showed that the county council had considerable warrant for the way in which they acted. It would be presumed that the Local Government Board would have some knowledge of the domestic history of the county. For instance, it was stated that the work of the county and deputy surveyors under the Grand Jury was utterly impossible to fulfil. Why, therefore, when they were told that the work was a physical impossibility, should an increase of salary be given for it? Again it was well known that the county surveyor had a free pass over the Irish railways, and he could not therefore understand why travelling expenses should have been claimed. The Local Government Board reversed their original decision, and reduced one salary by £;4 and a few other salaries by £;5 each. When that extraordinary decision was made known the county council applied to the Local Government Board for the grounds on which it was arrived at, but the Local Government Board refused to give any reasons. Apparently they imagined that the matter did not affect the county council or the ratepayers, who had to pay the increased salary, and that the only persons interested were the Local Government Board themselves. The refusal of the Local Government Board to give the Wexford County Council any information was part of the whole system of the administration of the country, and was perfectly outrageous. The Irish Times, the leading paper supporting the Government in Ireland, referring to the refusal of the Local Government Board, said that there seemed to be no sufficient reason why the

report of the inspector who carried out the local inquiry should not have been produced, and it added that the manner in which the question would be decided would largely determine the relations which would exist in future not merely between the Wexford County Council and the Local Government Board, but also between other county councils and the Board. The aim of the Local Government Board, added the Irish Times, should be to bring conviction to the minds of the members of the county council by explaining first of all their decision and then the principle they followed in calculating the amount of the increase in each case. If the Local Government Board, continued the Irish Times, would do that, it would do much towards gaining for them the confidence of the Irish county councils; but, on the other hand, if the full facts were not furnished, not only would the Wexford County Council be dissatisfied, but other county councils would also be affected. He would invite the Chief Secretary to reconsider the matter. If it were to be brought to an issue in a peaceful manner there must be common sense on both sides; there must be some endeavour to meet the feelings of the people on the part of the Local Government Board; and some explanation must be forthcoming as to the reasons on which that Board acted in increasing the salaries. The main objection of the Wexford County Council to the increase in the salaries was not that they were too high; although they were too high; but that the action of the Local Government Board reduced the Local Government Act to a nullity by imposing liabilities on the taxpayers and treating the representatives of the people with absolute disregard. Had the Local Government Board really wished for a satisfactory conclusion, the matter could have been settled over and over again. It would have been settled when the predecessor of the right hon. Gentleman was in office if the Board had shown any common sense. He invited the Chief Secretary again to give the county council the reasons which led the Local Government Board to increase the salaries. He went further, and said that, if the grounds on which the Board acted were reasonable, he would do his best to induce the county council to take a reasonable view of the matter. He hoped the Chief Secretary would realise that the question was a very serious one. Even though the case was decided in the courts against the county council, it did not follow that the course pursued by the Board was desirable. For his part he was extremely anxious to find a solution of the difficulty, but the matter rested altogether with the Chief Secretary and the Local Government Board.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork County, Mid) said he had listened with the utmost attention to the eloquent and exhaustive speech of the hon. Baronet the Member for Wexford on the administration of the Local Government Act, with whose remarks he entirely concurred. He did not propose to follow on the same lines. There was another phase of the administration of the Local Government Board to which he would direct attention, especially as it affected the well-being, comfort, and better housing of a large portion of the Irish population. He referred to the manner in which the Labourers Acts were interpreted and administered, to the almost interminable delays which occurred, and to the generally unsatisfactory condition of their application. The duty was forced upon Irish members by their constituents every other day of bringing under the notice of this House

instances of hardships and of the vagaries and absurdities of Local Government Board inspectors in the rejection of applications for labourers' cottages. Any cause appeared to be good enough to deprive a poor labourer of his cottage.

In the case of the Cork Rural District Council they found the inspector advancing the luminous reason for throwing out whole batches of cottages that they were apparently not required. In other cases the equally solid and conclusive reason was advanced that the landlord objected, the tenant wanted the land for himself, and a host of other equally silly and absurd causes. It was a standing ground of complaint with the working men in Ireland that the Labourers Acts were not administered in a manner sympathetic to them, and as this was a question which seriously affected the material and moral progress of the country it was one which should engage the very best attention which the Government could bestow on it. He held if there was to be any respect for the administration of the Labourers Acts in Ireland, definite and conclusive reasons should be assigned in each case by the inspector, setting forth the points of evidence upon which he decided to reject cottages. This would be at least one step in the right direction, and he felt assured that if an Order to this effect were issued by the Local Government Board fewer cottages would be rejected, and the feeling of discontent which at present existed amongst the working men would be considerably lessened.

Schemes of cottages were often prepared with great difficulty and expense by rural district councils, they investigated every claim, and passed none which did not appear to them a just and reasonable one, and yet when these schemes were sent forward to the Local Government Board, when inquiries were held and the result sent down to the councils, after all the care and all the trouble that had been taken in communication with them, was it not a galling state of things that frequently more than one-half of the cottages originally applied for were rejected? Undoubtedly one of the great contributory causes to the depopulation of Ireland was the fact that the working classes were so badly housed. The Labourers Acts have been in operation for close upon twenty years, but it was a striking commentary upon the manner in which they had been administered

that thousands of labourers in Ireland still lived in wretched abodes, and that in no case, except perhaps in that of Macroom, in his own constituency, was the limit of taxation in respect to cottages; namely, 1s. in the £; reached. In this age of progress, and when the means of travelling to other countries were so moderate, people would not live in hovels in which the brute beasts would not be housed, and which were the fruitful breeding grounds of epidemics of the worst and most malevolent kind.

He now came to the question of delays; delays of the law and of the Local Government Board. Notwithstanding the replies of the Chief Secretary to questions of his on the subject, he contended that the Local Government Board were responsible for delays in the holding of inquiries into improvement schemes, and he had the admission of the right hon. Gentleman that three inspectors had to be appointed temporarily to cope with the work which the

Custom House authorities in their carelessness allowed to accumulate. This, to his mind, was sufficient refutation of the assertion of the Chief Secretary that no delays occurred. He held, and he knew it of his own knowledge to be a fact, and he was certain if the Chief Secretary took the trouble to inquire he would find it to be so, that even, after all the preliminaries had been complied with, and all the necessary documents sent to the Local Government Board, a year often elapses before an inquiry was held. Then, if there were any appeals from the decision of the Local Government Board, they must go before the Privy Council, and more time was wasted. And, finally, before the order would be made absolute, a Local Government arbitrator must assess the compensation to be awarded to the landlord and tenant. Hence it not infrequently happened that from the time a rural district council adopted a resolution to execute an improvement scheme until that scheme was finally sanctioned by the Local Government Board a period of three years elapsed, which, if the laws were properly framed and applied, should not take six months altogether. Such were the law's delays, and such the absurd red-tapeism of the well-known circumlocution office in Dublin. Not only did this meaningless procedure involve loss to the ratepayers, but it was also a great injustice to the labourers, who were kept for years waiting for cottages.

The next point in his criticism of the Local Government Board was the fact that the supervision exercised by their engineering inspectors over the erection of labourers' cottages was most inefficient and most unsatisfactory. Indeed, of their inspectors it might be said they came, they saw, and they reported. That appeared to be the beginning and the end of their work. The duty was cast upon them of seeing that the houses were properly built with the right materials, and the final instalment of the contract money could not be paid to the contractor until a certificate was given by the Local Government Board engineering inspector that the house was in every way built according to plan and specification. It was notorious that contracts had been frequently scamped, that the cottages had been jerry-built and put together anyhow, with the result that the occupants were in a constant state of revolt, rents were not paid, repairs had to be constantly made, the cottages were a disgrace, and the purpose and intention of the Labourers Acts were frustrated. Of course, it was not to be supposed that the engineers appointed by the rural district councils were to be absolved from all blame. He was free to admit that they were often incompetent, and selected without due reference to their qualifications, but, if this was so, why did the Local Government Board, which possessed a veto in the matter, sanction their appointment, and why did it not put down its foot and insist on the appointment of properly qualified engineers? Looked at from any point of view, he submitted that the Local Government Board was primarily responsible for the erection of badly-constructed houses, and that before the bar of public opinion they would be held guilty of gross neglect in this respect.

The most scandalous feature in connection with the administration of the Labourers Acts, the greatest defect in their provisions, was the manner in which they dealt with fishermen. He was not exaggerating when he said that there was no more deserving or industrious body of Irishmen than the fishermen off its

coasts. They reaped the harvest of the sea, they swept it with their nets, they braved its dangers, they had a most irksome and a most toilsome calling, yet would it be believed they did not come within the scope of the Labourers Acts; they could not become tenants of labourers' cottages unless they devoted a considerable portion of the year to agricultural work, and were paid for that work by actual wages. Could anything be more absurd or more unjust than this? He had before his mind at this moment the cases of a number of fishermen in the Skibbereen Union, who recently applied for labourers' cottages, but every one of whose applications were rejected because the Local Government Board inspector held that they did not spend a sufficient portion of the year at agricultural work, though they gave evidence that they worked occasionally for neighbouring farmers. All he could say of such conduct was that where Local Government Board inspectors thus interpreted the law, God help the poor fishermen.

He took occasion some months ago to visit a number of houses occupied by fishermen in south-west Cork, and he could not convey to this House by words the faintest idea of their wretchedness and squalidness. Many of them had only one compartment, which was kitchen, bedroom, and all; others had no proper division for the sexes, and young and old, male and female, lived and slept indiscriminately together, and this was doubtless a shocking picture, but it was painfully true, and what was more, it was a disgrace to the Government which did not seek to instantly remove it. He could honestly aver that in any single one of the fishermen's houses which he visited none of the gentlemen sitting on the opposite benches would even kennel a dog for which they entertained the slightest regard. That being so, he made an earnest appeal to the Chief Secretary to introduce legislation early in the next session which would bring fishermen by mere right of their avocation within the operations of the Labourers Acts; and not only did he make this appeal for fishermen, but extended it also for the rural tradesmen, and for every class of working men who were not at present

decently housed, and whose position and prospects would be improved, whose social status would be elevated were they provided with better dwellings and reasonable plots of land. The rural tradesman was a most important part of the economy of any district; he was necessary to the farming, fishing community, and he should be fixed and rooted on the soil. He hoped the Chief Secretary would not overlook their claims when an amendment of the Labourers Acts came to be considered.

He would now pass to the personnel of the inspectors. The Irish Government departments appeared to be repositories for all the half-pay officers of the Army, for Militia colonels; he believed they called them Saturday to Monday colonels in this country; and for at least one son of a well-known Orange member of Parliament for the north of Ireland, whom he did not see in his place at this moment. He maintained that it was ridiculous and absurd to expect that there could be proper administration of the Labourers Acts when gentlemen such as these were appointed as inspectors. What did they know about legal technicalities? Nothing whatever, and he was firmly convinced when any question of doubt arose their leanings were not on the side of the unfortunate labourer.

A juster selection, and one more in accord with the views and opinions of the people, should be made than that at present favoured by the Government. He wished in conclusion to say a few words on the question of appeals to the Privy Council. As the law at present stood, should any party feel dissatisfied with the result of the Local Government Board inquiry, they might appeal to the Privy Council, which would necessitate taking the whole union staff to Dublin, and would mean the addition of a considerable burden to the taxes borne by the ratepayers. A much simpler method in his opinion was, if there must be an appeal, let it be to the county court judge or the Land Sub-Commission, neither of which tribunals could be regarded as prejudiced on the labourers' side. He did not wish to occupy the time of the Committee further, but he expressed the hope that the Chief Secretary would seriously take into consideration the advisability of reforming, where such was found to be necessary, the administration of the Labourers Acts.

MR. MOORE (Antrim, N.) said he found himself in agreement with the hon. Member who had last spoken on this subject of the housing of the labouring classes, for it was a grievance which was felt in the north of Ireland as much as in the south. He thought, however, that a great deal depended upon the manner in which the rural sanitary authorities exercised their powers in respect to the houses inhabited by the working classes, some of which, for sanitary reasons alone, ought to be condemned. Whether they started under the Labourers Act or the Public Health Act, in order to begin at the root of the whole matter, they must first have the certificate of their sanitary officer. He thought sanitary officers might do a great deal more towards solving this problem. Who were those sanitary officers in Ireland? In almost every case they were the dispensary doctors. There were no more highly respectable men in Ireland than those doctors, for they knew the people well, and it was upon these men that they placed the duty of reporting insanitary property. They ought to remember that while this officer had to report instances of insanitary houses on the one hand, he was absolutely the servant of the rural council on the other hand. The rural council had to decide his pension, and they were his masters, and had the control of his superannuation. When a sanitary officer found himself in such a position in a small country district they all knew what influences were brought to bear. Until they took this duty off the shoulders of the dispensary doctors and appointed independent inspectors to deal with the housing of the working classes in Ireland, they would not be doing anything to get at the real difficulty in the administration of those Acts. Inquiries were held under the Labourers' Cottages Act in the various unions, but the present system of inquiry was very unsatisfactory. He had nothing whatever to say against the conduct of the Local Government Board inspectors at those inquiries.

Under the present system he did not think anything more could be done than was being done. What they ought to do was to appoint independent inspectors to report directly to the Local Government Board, and then have the matter brought before the rural council in the ordinary way. In that way they would get out of the difficulty by degrees. If they would insist on enforcing the sanitary provisions of the Public Health Act, they would also be doing a great deal for

the labourers, but until they took the burden off the shoulders of the dispensary doctors they would never get independent or impartial reports. He hoped that sooner or later they would have some inspectors appointed who would go through the country and find out for themselves what was really required.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) said he could not agree with the argument of the hon. Member for North Antrim in regard to the work of the dispensary doctors. In the first place, the labourers and their friends prepared their application, and all the dispensary doctors had to do was to certify whether the cottage was in a sanitary condition. Consequently it was not true that the doctor in certifying a house was placing himself at the mercy of the local authority. The estimate of three years given by the hon. Member for Mid Cork for the passage of a scheme was not at all equal to his own experience, for he had known a period of four years and nine months elapse in the case of one scheme. He had seen the Local Government Board led away upon the smallest nonsensical idea on the part of the land owners. The inspectors were not in sympathy with the labourers or the farmers, and when they went into poor districts, composed largely of Nationalists, they pitched out the applications by the score. The delay in investigating cases was most appalling. There was a very large sum down in the Vote for salaries for the inspectors, and large amounts were also allowed them for travelling expenses, and the district councils also had to contribute to the expenses incurred by them. The constitution of the Local Government Board was most objectionable to the Irish people. Parliament gave them a Local Government Act creating county and district councils, and then the harmonious working of the Act was hampered by the Local Government Board, which was out of sympathy altogether with the needs of the people of Ireland. They appointed a temporary Commissioner at a salary of £1,000 a year, and they made him the representative of the Grand Jury, which was hostile and antagonistic to every national sentiment in Ireland. In the year 1881 the Nationalists took over the control of the boards of guardians in Ireland. The Irish workhouses were then in a most wretched and miserable state; no ventilation, bad light, insufficient bed and bedding. The camps in South Africa could not be worse than the Irish workhouses were at that time. What had happened since? They set to work to improve that state of things. Now the workhouses were well ventilated, the light was good, and the inmates were getting proper food. And notwithstanding that all this had been done the Local Government Board were daily trying to force them to increase the accommodation and provision for the inmates simply in order to send up the rates. Take the years 1878 and 1898. In 1878 the population of Ireland was 5,282,246 whilst in 1898 the population was 4,576,181, or a decrease of 706,065. In the year 1878 the taxes amounted to £2,039,783, and in the year 1898 the total was £2,361,575, or an increase of £321,792. This result had taken place in face of the fact that a great decrease had taken place in the number of inmates in those institutions. In the year 1881 the population was 5,174,836, the Poor Law expenditure £965,128, while the number relieved was 589,849; in the year 1898 the population was 4,576,181, the Poor Law expenditure £981,333, and the number relieved fell to 525,104. So that in the year 1898, as compared with the year 1881, although the number of inmates relieved had been reduced by

64,745, the expenditure upon Poor Law institutions had increased by £16,205. That showed distinctly that it was not in relief to the poor that they were spending the money, but it was being spent in salaries and other expenses, which the Local Government Board were forcing upon the local boards of guardians. He knew of one case where an item was surcharged, although the expenditure had been ordered at the very instance of the Local Government Board. The Local Government Board, by every possible means they could devise, were making such conditions in the qualifications for officers and officials as would debar Nationalists from getting those appointments. The securities they were insisting upon for rate collectors were so high that this fact alone would deprive the poorer classes of the chance of ever getting such appointments, because they would not be able to give the security required. For years the Local Government Board in Ireland had been endeavouring to force additional officers upon the guardians, but he was glad to say that in most cases the boards of guardians had been equal to the occasion. It had been laid down that they must have specially trained nurses, and this seemed the thin end of the wedge which was aimed at a section of the community who had conferred the greatest benefit upon the people of Ireland; he alluded to the nuns. An attempt had been made to compel the guardians to disqualify those nurses unless they went through a course of training, but it would be a very unpleasant thing indeed to put any other nurses over the heads of those now in the institutions on account of this new faddist idea. They knew what class of nurses the Local Government Board would send down. He saw on the Paper that morning a question with regard to the high sheriff of some county having gone with a sledge hammer and broken into the office of the secretary of the county council. That was a matter which demanded explanation, and he hoped the Chief Secretary would give an assurance that such conduct would not be tolerated. He called attention to the fact that a new system of county council book-keeping had been introduced by the officials of the Local Government Board in Dublin. It appeared to him that the system was very complicated. One of the auditors when asked what should be put in a certain column could not tell. This new system would necessitate the employment of four or six times the present staff. Besides being unworkable and extravagant the system would cause terrible worry to the officials. There were five times the number of books now as compared with the old system. It was an extraordinary fact that the Local Government Board gentleman who devised this system of keeping the accounts had actually sent out a circular to the county and district councils recommending the books which were to be got from a certain printing firm in Dublin. Irishmen were not very suspicious in some things, but it looked very like as if there was a little bit of commission in a transaction of this kind.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said he would undertake to demonstrate to the Chief Secretary that the Order of the Local Government Board with regard to the examination of assistant surveyors as prescribed in a very elaborate code had now become ultra vires and illegal. Under the Act of 1837 an assistant county surveyor was to receive £70 a year, and it could not be raised by any means. In 1864 or 1865 an amending Act was passed raising the salary to £80 a year, and

that amount for all future appointments was to be the maximum. He quoted the Local Government Board Report of 1890 to show the construction which the Board had put upon the Local Government Act, and that it was upon the basis of their construction; a construction which had been nullified by the Court of Appeal in Ireland; that they had prescribed these examinations. The hon. Member pointed out that one of the paragraphs in the Report prescribed the qualifications for candidates who, on obtaining appointments, were to begin at a minimum of £120 a year, and who, according to his construction, might go up to a maximum of £250 a year. It might be a very reasonable thing that a man who might get a salary of £250 a year should know mensuration, trigonometry, French, German, and the classics, although he did not think such qualifications were required in connection with the mending of roads. But no salary in any future appointment could be more than the maximum prescribed by the Acts of 1837 and 1864, and therefore all this about scale and the men having a maximum and minimum salary, according to the size of their divisions, had been done away with. With regard to existing

officers, no examination could be prescribed because they were already in office, and therefore French, German, mensuration, and trigonometry did not apply to them. The examination code could only be applied to new men. Was it not an absurdity to say that some of these unfortunate men should be acquainted with the subjects mentioned in the code? Some of them, he knew, were decent, honest, respectable tradesmen. He knew one who was a carpenter, and a very good carpenter, but to suggest that that man should know mensuration and trigonometry was an absurdity. Therefore, if the Local Government Board had had any reasonable regard for the decision of the law courts, they would have withdrawn this absurd qualification examination as a necessary corollary of their defeat by the Wexford County Council.

A great deal of mischief had arisen in the working of the Local Government Act from the appointment of Mr. Bagnell, and he wished to ask the Government as to his retention in office. He strongly protested against Mr. Morris being retired. That gentleman offered an additional term of service of two or three years; in other words, they suggested that he should take the burden of seeing in motion this new system. He would thereby have got an addition of two or three years salary, and he would have got all the dirty work and none of the reasonable honour and glory after the Act had been started. The appointment of Mr. Bagnell was made to placate the House of Lords. The Act was passed by the House of Lords with a private understanding with the Irish landlords that some strong, offensive gentleman should be appointed, and accordingly they picked out the most offensive member of the Grand Jury who could be found. Mr. Bagnell had not been that success which they were led to believe. He began his career of office by declaring that the Local Government Act was the worst-drafted Act that had ever been passed. If the Government had had one spark of spunk in regard to the measure on which they spent their nights and days they would have kicked him out of office without any more ceremony than they would kick out a hall porter. He was

retained in office with the usual caution, because he had strong friends in the

Ministry, and, of course, his expulsion would only have given offence to that body. He understood Mr. Bagnell was only appointed for three years. [An HON. MEMBER: Five years.] Well, worse luck. If he had been appointed for five years they might expect some hundreds and thousands of pounds more on the Irish rates. The zeal of these people for the poor of Ireland synchronised exactly with the moment when the landlords were relieved. They had shown great zeal for lunatics. It was a mistake for any man to be sane in Ireland. So long as a man was a poor labourer in Ireland he was allowed to dwell in an insanitary house, and his family might have typhoid fever, but let him become insane and he was lodged in a palace at once. He got electric light and four meals a day, and port wine, and he had a magnificent garden to roam in, and 300 inspectors to come and feel his pulse. It was really not wonderful that lunacy was on the increase in Ireland. The same thing might be said of the whole system of administration. What he complained of strongly was that, in a little country of small people; the average valuation was something like £;10 or £;15; every penny was not scrutinised by the Local Government Board. When one heard these inspectors talk, it was "Only another 1d. or 2d. in the pound"; or "It will only cost you 2s. 6d. to bring this man in or send out that man." It was perfectly scandalous that the Local Government Board should insist on the appointment of a single extra man when their sole aim and object ought to be the relief of the people. He sympathised to some extent with some of the increases in this Vote, if it were the fact that the increase of inspectors was necessary for quickening up the administration of the Labourers Act. But he would like to ask what hope there was for a country the whole of the local administration of which was in the hands of people who were alien in sympathy with the people for whose wants they were supposed to provide? How could it be expected that Dives would sympathise with Lazarus? He did not do it 2,000 years ago, and would not do so to-day. If the Government took some of the people who were appointed as National schoolmasters and appointed them as Local Government officers; if they appointed a man in a frieze coat to the post of Local Government Inspector, they would find he would look more into things, and his services would be much appreciated by the Local Government Board. He admitted there was an enormous difficulty, but he had come to the conclusion that the whole system of audit, inspection, and centralised government was not worth paying for. It was too costly. It probably saved the rates 1s. and cost 2s. 6d. He demonstrated some years ago that the cost of lending £;1 to a farmer was £;3, and to-day he believed that with this huge army of inspectors and this system of quasi-foreigners going about and worrying the people for the sake of 21s. 4d. in the £; was too costly. It would be better to wink at a little jobbery; there is jobbery in every country, and would be to the end of the world; and he thought that, as a tradesman writes off a certain amount of bad debts every year, they might write off a little for jobbery, and as the administration cost 10 per cent., they would probably save 7¼.

The system of administration was top-heavy and unsuitable for a small country, and ought to be abolished. It would take Sir Isaac Newton or some other great mathematical mind to understand the books of the Local Government Board. Was it

any wonder that they were all copyright, and that the copyright was held by the Local Government Board Inspectors? In Cork there were sixty clerks to do the work of the office, which under the grand jury was done by two, and there were millions of entries where formerly there were half a dozen. He saw a statement from Armagh which said they would have to build new local offices, because they had no room for their clerks. How was it the grand jury were able to do their work with a secretary and assistant secretary? Having initiated this appalling system of administration, the Government make it a ground for increasing the salaries. At page ten of the Report it said;

"In estimating the amount of extra work imposed on existing officers transferred to the

county council it is necessary for us to examine each separate office, and ascertain the extent and the nature of the duties connected with it."

Could not they have left it alone and left the clerks to make their own calculations? In the case of secretaries, it is only necessary to have some knowledge of the complicated provisions of the Local Government Act." Why are they complicated? The Irish representatives protested against the complications, but their protests were ignored, and the cost was to be put on the taxpayers of Ireland. Then;

"Orders of Council made thereunder, and to understand the amount, variety, and intricacies of the new duties devolving on the officers."

What are the new duties? Suppose they took a road; it was the same old road, requiring the same amount of gravel and sand, and the rain of heaven descended upon it in the same way year after year. Then why was he to pay increased rates because the Local Government Board secretary kept his entries in five volumes when he previously made five entries, "and the work involved but increased meetings of the county council"? The Grand Juries met twice a year, and they were able to cope with all the work. Now the county councils must meet thirty times. Fancy a county surveyor in Ireland getting an increase of £200 a year on his salary for attending the meetings of the county council and listening to the oratory and the resolutions passed by that body. He was not to talk, only to listen. That was one sub-head. Another sub-head was increased correspondence. Why should there be an increase in the correspondence? There ought to be no correspondence. There was no correspondence between the grand juries and the Local Government Board, and why should the councils communicate with them? There was no reason under the sun that he could possibly imagine. "Increase of work in respect to finance." What increase was there, except the keeping of these copyright books which had been prescribed? All they wanted, and what the Government denied in regard to this Local Government Board, was an Act providing for an elective body, to take the place of the grand juries, and the handing over of the

powers of the grand juries to those elective bodies. What he complained of was that the extra sums they had to pay were not the result of local administration, but of a state of things imposed upon the country by the Local Government Board. The last question was as to the collection of the poor rate. That had to be collected in the past as it had now. And he could find no ground whatever for

the huge system of additions to salaries all along the line. One word with regard to what the hon. Baronet had said as to the action of the Local Government Board in evading the course of the law, as he understood the Court of Appeal in Ireland decided that this increase of £200 a year on the salary of this local agent was an illegal increase. That decision was made public, and he thought it was rather indecent of the Local Government Board to take off the sum of £4, and give no reason for their action. They fixed the salary at £196. The right hon. Gentleman was the head of local government in Ireland, but he did not know to what extent he was responsible, and it would be rather hard to hold him responsible for everything done by the Local Government Board. But he thought in regard to a case which has been made the subject of two Parliamentary Papers, to do a thing of this kind was an evasion of the law. The hon. Baronet had made a suggestion of a compromise, which the right hon. Gentleman had accepted with thankfulness in the case of Dr. Cullen, whom the Local Government Board insisted on dismissing for an offence he did not commit. After two years wrangling the right hon. Gentleman had said he would fine him a year's salary for the offence he did not commit and reinstate him. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on having arrived at a reasonable solution of that difficulty. Let him apply the same spirit of compromise to this question of salaries, which had engaged so much attention and aroused so much hostility. Everybody knew that these officials in Ireland were appointed by the landlords, and being friends and proteges of the landlords the salaries would be disposed to be fairly comfortable and reasonable. Why, then, should the Local Government Board increase them by £200, £300, and £400 all over the country? Those who had to pay these enormously increased salaries were people who were living on potatoes and salt, and who saw their sons and daughters exiled to England and America in order to earn small wages. Was it not enough to make the blood of the people boil? He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would turn his attention to bring some persuasion on the Local Government Board, of which, after all, he was chairman, to reform all these matters.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The hon. Baronet the Member for North Wexford and the hon. and learned Member who has just spoken have complained generally of the additional cost to the Irish ratepayers which has been incurred since the passing of the Local Government Act of 1898, and of the additional work which has been thrown on the local government bodies. One would have supposed that the similar Act passed for England had not also entailed a greater amount of work on the English county authorities, but I am sure that the chairmen of the quarter sessions and county councils in England could show that their work was a great deal harder now than before, and that the costs had also vastly increased. Then the hon. Member said that the correspondence had increased. Now, if the hon. Member only referred to the number of questions which I have had to answer in regard to labourers' cottages alone, he would be able to judge of the number of letters which reached the Local Government Board on the subject of Irish local government, and the number of replies that had to be made to them. The blame does not rest wholly on the Local Government Board, for if schemes have to be devised for three or four

years before a solution can be reached under the Act, there must be an enormous amount of correspondence. I have a great deal of sympathy with hon. members as to unnecessary inspections, but I do not know where a remedy is to be found. The hon. Member said that Ireland was over-inspected. That must strike everyone who has visited Ireland. I have heard of a gentleman who visited the congested districts; one of the poorest parts of Ireland; where he dined on successive evenings with the poor law inspector, then with the fisheries inspector, next with the public health inspector, and on yet another evening with the lunacy inspector; and then he left the digested district! Whose fault is it? [An IRISH MEMBER: Yours.] Anyone who listened to the debate this afternoon or to the questions asked must have seen that Member after Member asked for more inspectors. Now if those little tiny points are to be determined with regard to the absolute justice and equity of the case it can only be done by men of education and experience. An hon. Member said that they could get a man to do it at £;1 a week, and that he would give satisfaction to the people of Ireland. That is a very sanguine view. My experience is that nobody would give satisfaction to the people of Ireland, at the foot of the ranges of hills in the West, who have some grievance to investigate, who want more labourers' cottages, or that existing cottages are in the wrong place, except a man in whom they had confidence; and I maintain that they have confidence in gentlemen of good education, not connected with the locality, and who are not likely to be employed mainly by their neighbours. The hon. Gentleman abused some of the gentlemen who have been employed as inspectors; one especially, a major. I have, however, found that officers of the British Army have often furnished the most useful administrators in the State.

The hon. and learned Member for North Louth made a good deal of fun as to the distribution of patronage in Ireland. But the applications for posts are sufficiently amusing. The other week I had an application in the following terms;

"Sir,;As it was on the 2nd February our beloved Queen was interred, I venture to ask in her name a post for my husband."

The Committee must not suppose that a ready ear is lent to appeals of that character. The hon. Member made an unwarrantable attack on one of my colleagues on the Local Government Board, not, of course, on personal grounds, but because he was in sympathy with the old grand jury system, and that therefore he ought not to have been put on the new Local Government Board. But that gentleman had been deliberately put on the new Board because he had knowledge of the old system. He was on the Board not as an arbiter, but as an assessor; a man who had been distinguished for the great attention he had given to, and had ably expounded, the old grand jury system. The hon. Member seemed to think that it had been this gentleman who had urged what he called the extravagant expenditure insisted upon by the Local Government Board. But that is not so. As a matter of fact the old grand jury system was old-fashioned in its love for economy, and in some cases that love had pushed economy too far. As the representative of the old grand jury system the gentleman was a rigid economist, and it was not to him but to other gentlemen on the Local Government Board that

extravagance, if extravagance there has been, was to be attributed. But is it fair to take the expenditure of the year 1878 or 1879 and compare it with that of last year, under an entirely different system, and complain of extravagance? MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) asked if the right hon. Gentleman was aware that it was this same gentleman who had compelled the Kerry County Council to pay their officials £;400 a year more than under the old grand jury system.

MR. WYNDHAM: That was the result of the Act passed by this House. I cannot follow the hon. and learned Member for North Louth as to the sliding scale of salaries for the county surveyors; but I imagine he referred to the scale of salaries on the mileage system. From that he went to accuse the Local Government Board for prescribing an absurd system of examinations for new candidates for assistant surveyorships, and for existing officers. There is no relation between the two. But the Local Government Board has, according to the Act, to give its approval to any appointment made by the county council.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that his point was this. Was such a system of examination commensurate with such a small salary as £;80 which was attached to these offices?

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board are under the Act bound to approve of any such appointment, and they cannot give such approval without taking some steps to test the man's ability.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that the right hon. Gentleman forgot that one of his arguments was that when they fixed these examinations the salary was to range from £;120 to £;150 a year; but that it had now been decided the salary should be £;80 a year. Why should a man getting only £;80 a year be compelled to pass in mensuration and trigonometry?

MR. WYNDHAM: Of course it is desirable to get the best man for the money. I am ready to admit that, in my opinion, the sole responsibility for making these appointments must rest with the county councils, and not with the Local Government Board, subject, however, to the approval of the Local Government Board. It must be remembered that by law the county councils are prohibited from paying the assistant surveyors more than £;80 a year. I concede that I do not think that it is the duty of the Local Government Board in this respect to do the work of the county councils, and I believe that there would be no difficulty in regard to future appointments. As to the increase of the rates referred to by the hon. Baronet, the additional cost is not so great as the hon. Baronet had alleged. For the standard year the poor rate and county cess amounted to £;1,533,124 after deducting the agricultural grant; in 1900 the net rates were £;1,533,836; in 1901 the exact rates were £;1,627,003; and in 1902 the estimated total was £;1,587,598, so that the slight increase in 1901 was being wiped out, and they were going back to the standard figures. Some complaint had been made of the complication of accounts which had been imposed by the Local Government Act. I can assure hon. members that the Local Government Board have done their best to arrive at the simplest form of accounts by which they can carry out the objects of the Act; but if hon. members who are members of county councils can make any suggestion for a simpler form of accounts I shall be glad to consider it favourably.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE asked if the right hon. Gentleman would not appoint a small committee to investigate the matter, and suggest a simpler form of accounts.

MR. WYNDHAM: As the hon. Baronet is a capable member of a county council, I shall be very glad to accept any suggestion from him which will not end in a failure in carrying out the provisions of the Act; which ought, of course, to be carried out in the simplest and cheapest way. It had been said that the Local Government Board was increasing the expenses by sending round inspectors to urge the councils to employ more hands in getting out the rates. Some hon. members did not realise the work which necessarily had fallen on the county council, but which had been done before by a number of other bodies. The Local Government Board auditors reported on the progress of the accounts, and if they found that the work was not being done, and that the staff was insufficient, or not up to their work, that fact was reported to the Local Government Board, which informed the county council thereof, but never attempted to use compulsion as to employing more hands on the staff. Under the old system the preparation of the poor rates in a county containing, say, eight poor law unions, occupied four or five men in each union in order to get the rate ready in time. The county cess appointments perhaps necessitated some eight or ten more, so that some forty people were employed under the old system in striking the rates. Some of these councils complained that the Local Government Board inspector had advised them to employ, say, a dozen extra clerks in addition to the two assistants which the county council secretary had. Why, in the county of Mayo it had taken forty to fifty clerks three months of hard work to put its affairs in order. I do not complain that, when certain duties had been shifted from other bodies to the county council, there should have been mistakes, and it is only natural that some disappointment should have been created in regard to the cost of the administrative work of the county council. As to the sending of the minutes of the proceedings of the local bodies to the Local Government Board, it was quite natural that

that should be done, in order to avoid a great deal of correspondence; but there is no compulsion. It helps in many cases when disputes arise, and enables the local authorities to work harmoniously with the central body.

AN IRISH MEMBER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Local Government Board sent a severe reprimand to a county council for not having sent in a copy of the minutes?

MR. WYNDHAM: As I have said, there is no order or compulsion to do so, but it was for the convenience of both parties. The hon. Baronet made a complaint based upon the expense of auditing asylum accounts. Such complaints ought to be brought against the Acts passed by this House and not against the Local Government Board. The cost now falls on the local government bodies which was formerly paid by the Treasury, but that is part and parcel of the bargain made for local government, and forms part of the grant-in-aid. A great deal has been said about the increase of salaries to the officers of the county council. The county surveyors and assistant surveyors are, according to the Act, to be given an extra salary for any increase of work imposed upon them. It is a statutory obligation that the existing officers were to have continuous employment at

their old emoluments, but that if their duties are increased their emoluments are to be increased, and that the amount of that increase shall be determined by the Local Government Board, and by no one else; and that if these officers elect to retire there shall be pensions granted to them calculated at the Civil Service rates. The hon. Baronet approached this question in a very reasonable spirit, and seemed anxious to bring it to a conclusion; but he suggested no means by which the Local Government Board could divest themselves of the duties placed upon them by the Act. The Local Government Board are bound to give the increase if they believe that there is an increase of work. The hon. Baronet seemed to say that the Local Government Board should have taken into account the integrity of the officers in the discharge of their duty; but all that they can gather from the result of the appeal to the courts is that they are not to take that into account. The hon. Baronet was aware that a Provisional Order had already been passed which enabled the duties of these officers to be reduced;[An IRISH MEMBER: And increased also];and that instead of attending four meetings they need only attend two. Although my interpretation of an Act of Parliament has no authority, I should hold that if such a reduction took place it would then be competent to the Local Government Board to reduce the salary again, because the diminution of work would be "by and in pursuance of this Act." This only ought to be added, that if they reduce the amount of work which the officer executed below that which he had done before, then they would have to give him a lump sum in compensation for the amount of work which had been abolished. I do not think that there should be any great difficulty in arriving at a solution of the matter, and I believe that under the law as amended by the Provisional Order Bill substantial justice can be done to all the parties. No Act of the kind has ever been passed without the introduction of such a provision. The salaries of the old officials had to be safeguarded; it did not matter whether they worked hard or not, and the only means by which the old salaries could be kept safe was by the introduction of such a provision into the Act. But the Act still leaves room to pursue a more economical course. The hon. Baronet went on to deal with the nursing Order. I do not know whether the Committee is aware of it, but in some parts of Ireland, not from inhumanity, but from a want of a knowledge of recent developments in nursing, great hardship has been inflicted on the sick poor. The Local Government Board found themselves face to face with this position, that in some parts of Ireland the sick poor were really abominably treated. There were cases in which fractures of the thigh and bed sores remained undiscovered; there was another case in which forty-four persons, including thirty lunatics, were looked after by one woman, who was not a properly trained nurse. We are bound to give the sick poor proper attention. Who is responsible in Ireland for seeing that that is done? In the last resort, the Local Government Board. There is not a shadow of a doubt about it. Under Act of Parliament the Local Government Board are the direct successors of the old Poor Law Commissioners, and are vested with the duty of seeing that the sick poor are properly attended to. If a board of guardians failed to give proper attention in the matter, undoubtedly the Poor Law Commissioners had power to intervene, and

that power is now vested in the Local Government Board. It is not a sound policy to be always dissolving popularly-elected boards, and when a much less drastic course would meet the object in view, that less drastic course ought to be adopted. We endeavoured to adopt it in an Order issued on 4th February of this year. In that Order we asserted the right inherent in us under the Act of 1872, and earlier Acts, to declare that certain qualifications were needed in the persons appointed to look after the nursing of the sick poor; that the nurse should have served a certain time in a regular hospital, that there should be a qualified assistant to the nurse, and that the pauper inmates should not be used for nursing the aged and sick. These were all reasonable proposals which it was our duty to make and to enforce if need be. When that Order was brought out it was challenged, and I admit that it was too widely drawn. Whereas our whole purpose was confined to seeing that the sick poor were properly nursed, the Order was so drawn as to possibly indicate interference with other officers. But it was never so intended for one moment. Although we are so often criticised I was not surprised to find that that Order was hailed with a great deal of approval in many parts of Ireland; in many places where the Local Government Board rarely received any support. That Order was referred to the Privy Council and the Privy Council quashed it on the ground that it went too far, and it was enjoined on the Local Government Board to bring up another general Order which should be obviously and directly confined to nursing and nothing else. We were advised by all parties in Ireland to take that course. We took it, and issued another Order on 5th July, not at all in a peremptory or arrogant spirit, and on 26th July we followed it up with a circular, to which no exception could possibly be taken, explaining why it had been necessary to discipline to take that course. The circular concluded with the two following paragraphs;

"The object of the Board in issuing this Order is mainly for the purpose of enabling most desirable and necessary improvements to be made in the nursing staffs of workhouse infirmaries and hospitals, and the Local Government Board hope that each board of guardians will take this opportunity of very carefully considering, in consultation with their medical officer, the arrangements for the treatment, nursing, and attendance in the sick, lying-in, and infant wards of their workhouse. The Board suggests the guardians should ask their medical officer to furnish them with a report on the subject, and that they should thereafter fix a day for the consideration of his report. The Board would also be obliged if the guardians would cause them to be furnished with the information indicated in the accompanying form of Return and Report to be filled up by the medical officer, who would get any facts or figures he may require for the purpose from the clerk of the union or the master of the workhouse."

That circular was really conceived in a spirit which ought not to be criticised in the Committee. We had to issue the Order, and we accompanied it with the circular conceived in that tone, and I am surprised that the hon. Baronet should have taken exception to it. As the Irish Times has been quoted, perhaps I may quote an extract from the Freeman's Journal, which rarely supports the Government. The Freeman's Journal comment is as follows;

"The Local Government Board made an overwhelming case in favour of a drastic improvement in the treatment of the sick poor in several workhouses. A most painful impression was produced on the public mind by the revelations. Several of the hospitals described were not merely understaffed, but equipped in such a fashion as to make the treatment of the sick and the infirm poor in them a disgrace to those responsible."

Finally, the Freeman's Journal expresses the hope that no member of a Nationalist body will be found to discountenance the action of the Board.

MR. CULLINAN: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman to include in his quotation the fact that this reference was to the north of Ireland, and that the south of Ireland was not concerned at all?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot quite accept that view. There have been cases in the north of Ireland which filled me with very great regret, and the members from the north of Ireland have been most active in bringing the matter to my attention; the hon. Member for South Belfast has frequently asked questions in the House, and only yesterday or the day before asked me to take the most drastic measures possible to see that the Order was carried out, in order to bring a board of guardians to a sense of their duty. But surely in such a matter it is a pity to talk of questions of north and south; and since the Local Government Board are so fortunate as not to be seriously criticised in respect of this action, I think I might appeal to hon. members from all parts of Ireland to support the Board in its efforts to relieve the sick poor from danger, and from circumstances which are painful even to think of.

The hon. Member for Mid Cork dealt with the question of labourers' cottages in Ireland. He certainly treated the subject with great earnestness and sincerity of purpose, which must have been obvious to all who listened to him, but his criticism was not of the Local Government Board, but the Acts of Parliament that did not make sufficient provision for the housing of labourers in Ireland. He urged the Government to include fishermen and rural tradesmen. Those are arguments which might properly be brought forward if we were debating the question of the housing of the working classes, but on the Estimates all I can say is that the Local Government Board does its best to administer properly the Acts dealing with the matter passed by Parliament. Those Acts bind us down to supply cottages sufficient for the number of agricultural labourers who are needed in a particular district. Hon. members from Ireland seem to think that those Acts authorise the housing of all people who live in a district, and who are not rich enough to provide cottages for themselves. Some of the arguments used led me to think that that must be the view of hon. members. That is not the case. The Local Government Board can only pass a scheme if it is proved that the labourers who are to be housed are needed in the locality, and that there is a demand for the amount of labour which they can supply; but many of the schemes submitted embraced proposals

to house numbers of persons who are not agricultural labourers, and more than are needed in the locality, ignoring the rights of other persons whose rights the Local Government Board are bound to protect. We cannot plant a house down wherever we please in Ireland, or in any other place. If we attempted a short

cut in that direction it is evident there would be a long correspondence with the Department which had the charge of seeing that the Act was properly carried out. The blame in this matter does not rest with the Local Government Board. I can assure hon. members that schemes come before the Board which are put forward in all good faith by the rural council, but are not put forward in good faith by all ratepayers who supply that council with evidence, and the evidence in regard to them is oftentimes very unsatisfactory. I can truly say that the Government have always taken an interest in all questions relating to the housing of the working classes whether in Ireland or England, and if the time comes for dealing with the question again in Ireland, I think it very probable that some further consideration will be given to some of the classes who cannot be accurately described as agricultural labourers. It may be the case, and I think it is so in Ireland, that the small tradesman has as good a claim to the consideration of Parliament in regard to housing as the artisan in London. But that can only be dealt with by legislation, and cannot be done, and ought not to be done, by a public Department, straining the existing Acts. The hon. Member for North Antrim suggested the appointment of inspectors for labourers' cottages, but that would add to the cost of administration, and already the expenses are heavy enough. I think we ought to make the best of the machine as it is, without adding any more wheels to it. The hon. Member for South Tipperary's points have been answered in the replies which I have made to other members, but I think he will gather from me that I draw an absolute distinction between existing officers and officers to be appointed in the future. In that case a great part of the responsibility must lie, as I have said, with the local bodies, and not with the Local Government Board.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) said he did not think anyone could find fault with the remarks of the Chief Secretary, who had replied to the discussion in a spirit which had not always been evinced by gentlemen holding his office. His speech alone, to say nothing of the other speeches which had been delivered, showed what a calamity it would have been if the Vote had been closed without an opportunity of discussing it. A number of important questions had been raised, and the right hon. Gentleman had dealt with them not only in a considerate spirit, but as important subjects deserving of public debate. He desired now to refer to a matter relating to county Dublin; not so much because he represented that county as that it represented a tendency and habit on the part of the Local Government Board which it was the duty of the Chief Secretary to repress. Under Section 71 of the Local Government Act it was provided that the financial relations between urban districts and the rest of the county in which they were situated might be revised every fifteen years after the passing of the Act of 1898, or of the Local Act under which these suburban districts were created. The section also provided that this revision was to be commenced and undertaken only when any of the councils concerned applied for it to be undertaken. It was a very curious thing that in the case of county Dublin, which contained nine of these townships, the initiative in the matter seemed to have been taken by the Local Government Board themselves. Not only that, but they had actually proceeded, in the face of the Act of Parliament, to make up their minds

upon a question which had to be judicially determined, and which, according to the Act of Parliament, ought not to be determined without a previous inquiry. In November last, without any previous notice, without any inquiry having been made, without any application so far as the county council was concerned or aware, the following letter was sprung upon the Dublin County Council;

"Local Government Board, Dublin,

"28th November, 1900.

"Sir,;I am directed by the Local Government Board for Ireland to forward, for the information

of the county council, the accompanying list of county-at-large charges from contributions to which the Board consider urban districts should be exempted, subject to variations defined in Local Acts; and I am to state that the Board propose to issue orders giving effect to these exemptions.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) "H M. SWAINE, Secretary."

He really did not think the Chief Secretary would defend a proceeding of that kind. The Act of Parliament prescribed what should be done and the course to be followed. In this case the townships of Rathmines and Pembroke;for he had not the least hesitation in putting his finger on those two townships;were probably up to some nasty trick, and he had no doubt they went to the Local Government Board in a hole-and-corner way, and induced them, in defiance of the Act of Parliament, to issue this disgraceful letter. It was true no steps had been taken in pursuance of that letter, but the right hon. Gentleman had put into the new Local Government Bill a clause which would enable him to proceed. The action of the Local Government Board in this matter should be viewed with great suspicion, and the Chief Secretary ought to support the county council as against the suburban authorities, which sought in almost every instance to make little of the county body in which they could no longer have any controlling power. The township of Rathmines, especially, was a Tory district, the only completely Tory district in county Dublin, and because it could not have a majority in the county council it wanted to set up for itself as an independent body. It was able to go behind the back of the county council to get the Local Government Board to write that letter. If any large proportion of the 3,000 letters which the Chief Secretary had recently said the Board had to write every week were anything like the one to which he had referred, they might very well be dispensed with. He gave the right hon. Gentleman warning that, as far as he was concerned, he would oppose to the utmost the retention in the Local Government Bill of the clause of which he had spoken, the only object of which was to perpetrate an injustice and to anticipate the time at which the House had agreed this revision should be made on the passing of the Local Government Act; and he should endeavour to persuade the House to stick to the bargain deliberately made when the townships were made and the Local Government Act passed in its present shape. With regard to the debate which had taken place, he agreed with the right hon. Gentleman that the Orders in Council and the Orders of the Board were responsible largely for the increased expenditure. He would point out, however, that those orders were the right hon. Gentleman's

own handiwork, or of the Government to which he belonged. No doubt many of the processes which cost so much money were necessary under the Orders, but the Orders might have been so drawn that many of the processes would be unnecessary and the expense saved. As to the general question of labourers' cottages, he admitted that as the law at present stood great delay was necessarily occasioned. In 1896 a few Irish members endeavoured to get the law so amended that those delays would be completely avoided. The right hon. Gentleman had forgotten that some of the delay was owing to the Local Government Board itself. Most unaccountable delays had taken place in holding inspections and giving the results of inquiries to the public. He commended to the notice of the Chief Secretary the action of one of his predecessors, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Manchester. That right hon. gentleman wanted to open a light railway and to set the people to work on it in Connaught. If he had waited to comply with the law, the whole winter would have passed without a single penny being expended for the purpose of keeping the people alive by giving them employment. What did he do? He said to the Local Government Board, "Go in and take possession of the land; put in your labourers; and make the railway; no matter what the law says." That was a case of emergency.

MR. WYNDHAM: Hear, hear.

MR. CLANCY: Certainly. But surely there were cases of emergency under the Labourers Act, and the right hon. Gentleman ought to have no hesitation in such cases in following the precedent set up by his predecessor. With regard to court-houses, it was most unfortunate

that an Amendment proposed by the Nationalist members to put the control of these buildings in the hands of the popular bodies about to be set up was not adopted. No injustice or danger to the administration of the law would have been involved, whereas now there were perpetual rows all over Ireland as to the use of the court-houses. He sincerely hoped for the sake of the county that the Chief Secretary would take heart of grace in these matters, and make up his mind to settle these questions, which could be settled in a reasonable manner to the satisfaction of everybody.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.) referred to the circumstances connected with two inquiries held at Shillelagh some time ago by Dr. Flynn, a Local Government Board inspector. The local medical officer of health, Dr. Bolster, made charges of negligence against the local nurse, named Joyce, and it was also alleged that she had taken a fee from a patient. The matter was thoroughly investigated by the guardians, who decided that the charges of negligence were not proved; while, in regard to the charge of taking a fee, it appeared that nurse Joyce had simply received three shillings for car hire. By some means or other Dr. Bolster induced the Local Government Board to order a new inquiry.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): Called attention to the fact that there were not forty members present.

*THE CHAIRMAN: No motion for a count can be made on the last day of Supply.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (continuing) said that in response to a request from the guardians, nurse Joyce sent in a list of her witnesses, thirty-four in number, and Dr. Bolster sent in the names of sixteen persons to give evidence on his

side. When the inquiry opened, on 5th September, counsel appearing for nurse Joyce objected to proceeding, because none of her witnesses had been summoned. The objection was allowed, and it was agreed that the inquiry should be resumed at Tinahely, the district in which both the doctor and the nurse resided. Notwithstanding the fact that permission had been obtained for the use of the Town Hall at Tinahely, the Local Government Board inspector on 20th December, without giving any explanation, resumed the inquiry at Shillelagh. Again none of nurse Joyce's witnesses had been summoned, the excuse being that the doctor had privately examined them, and found they had no material evidence to give. It was very strange that a medical man should be permitted to give a legal opinion of that sort. On 11th March, in reply to a question, the Chief Secretary stated that eight witnesses were summoned on behalf of the nurse, seven of whom were examined, while nine were summoned, and six examined on behalf of the doctor. Immediately on the publication of that statement he received a communication from the Shillelagh guardians saying the right hon. Gentleman's information was absolutely incorrect. He therefore asked another question of the Chief Secretary, to which the reply was that eight witnesses were summoned on behalf of nurse Joyce, that four were examined, and that four either did not appear or left the court before they were examined. That was a very vague assertion to come from a responsible Minister. From whom did he get the information, on 11th March, which he contradicted in his statement of 18th March? What was the effect with regard to the four witnesses who were examined? He asked the Chief Secretary how many witnesses were examined on behalf of the nurse, and he said eight. That led him to infer that they were favourable witnesses. He had since discovered that not a solitary one of those four witnesses was on the nurse's side. Three of those witnesses were not summoned witnesses, and had no knowledge of the facts of the statement in dispute, and they only gave evidence as to character. Why did Dr. Flynn not summon this woman's witnesses? After the inquiry the Local Government Board came to the conclusion that nurse Joyce had been guilty of negligence, and they called upon the guardians to request her to sign in her resignation. As it was considered to be a one-sided and a partial trial, the guardians declined to call upon the nurse to resign. Then the Local Government Board sent down an order compelling the Board to discharge this nurse. Naturally there was a great deal of irritation on the board in consequence of the way Dr. Flynn had conducted this case, and they could not understand, in view of all the details of the case, why the Local Government Board should accept Dr. Flynn's version, and order the resignation of this poor woman. It might be asked what motive Dr. Flynn had for trumping up the charges against Mrs. Joyce. Not a word had been uttered against her skill as a nurse, in one case Dr. Flynn attributed the calling in of another doctor to one of his patients to Mrs. Joyce, and therefore he was her enemy. This doctor once stated that if the board elected this woman to his district she would not be there very long. He got Dr. Flynn to take his part, and they got her out of her employment. Dr. Flynn in one inquiry got the Local Government Board into a very awkward position.

The next case was that in regard to Dr. Bolster, and the guardians, after investigating the charges made, came to the conclusion that Dr. Bolster had been negligent. Dr. Flynn came down again, and the Local Government Board reversed the decision of the board of guardians. He would only refer to one charge, and that was with regard to Michael Doyle, who was apprenticed to Mr. Murphy. The doctor attended this boy at seven o'clock in the evening and gave him a gargle. Mr. Murphy stated that the boy was dangerously ill, and Dr. Bolster took the boy's temperature, but he made no note of it, and simply said that the boy was suffering from a skin eruption which was not contagious. At 10 o'clock at night this boy's employer packed him off to his own home, seven Irish miles away, and he was put to bed there along with another boy. Dr. King, who was called in to attend the boy, immediately declared the case to be one of scarlatina of a moderately severe type. In the infirmary the boy was examined by another doctor, who also declared that the boy was suffering from scarlatina. It might be asked why this boy was sent away at all. The reason was that Mr. Murphy was Dr. Bolster's patient, and it was stated that the doctor favoured his case by sending the boy away.

He held that the charges made against Dr. Bolster were not borne out by the evidence, and the board of guardians were naturally irritated that the Local Government Board should fly in the face of the local authority. There was a general feeling that the Local Government Board were hostile to the local bodies. Dr. Bolster was offensive and insulting to the guardians, and they had not been able to do anything with him since the Local Government Board came into existence. The unfortunate nurse whose case had been referred to lost her employment on account of the personal hostility of the doctor. He urged that one impartial inquiry should be held by a Local Government Board inspector who had not the unhappy knack of Dr. Flynn of getting the Board into hot water wherever he made an inquiry.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said he recognised the sympathetic tone of the speech of the Chief Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman was the representative in this House of the Local Government Board, and it was his duty to bring that Board into close relations with the local authorities. He asked the right hon. Gentleman and his legal adviser the Attorney General how it was that in Ireland there was so much friction between the Local Government Board and the local authorities, while in England there was hardly any friction. He did not wish to go into any small points which would detain the House, but he could mention many cases to illustrate the nature of the friction to which he referred. He would, however, take the broad basis of the working of the Local Government Act as his theme. Why was it that the two institutions, which were supposed to be similar, worked in such different directions in England and Ireland? He would tell the right hon. Gentleman the reason. In Ireland, unfortunately, they were not governed in a constitutional manner. They were supposed to be under a constitutional regime, but in practice constitutionalism was absent. In England the heads of Government departments conferred with men who were recognised as being in sympathy with popular feeling in regard to matters of administration, but that

was not done in Ireland, where the Local Government Board had constituted themselves an Irish Parliament. They had done it in the case of Wexford with regard to salaries, and they had done it in the matters to which the hon. Member for North Dublin had called attention that evening. The result was that they had nothing but friction, annoyance, difference of opinion, dissension, and obstruction between the Local Government Board officials and the county councils and the district councils of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman was not responsible for this state of things, but the permanent officials; he did not care whether they were under a Tory or a Liberal Government. If they in Ireland were trusted with local government, they ought to be competent to fulfil the functions with which they had been endowed. He quite agreed with the opinion that until the people were accustomed to the discharge of the duties with which they had been entrusted there would be a certain amount of friction between the local bodies and the Local Government Board. But the Local Government Board consisted of two or three highly-paid officials, not elected, and out of sympathy with the people. Some hon. Gentlemen opposite seemed to think that the people of Ireland ought to obey the behests of the Local Government Board without murmur. If the hon. Gentleman would only convey to the members of the Local Government Board that when there was a difference of opinion between the county, urban, or district councils and these officials of the Local Government Board, a conference should be held of both sides, a mutual agreement might be arrived at without involving friction and litigation. The Local Government Board and the governing bodies ought not to be constantly in collision, but acting in co-operation with each other. [Laughter.] He was quite serious in this matter. He had had many interviews with Sir Henry Robinson in regard to many questions, and he found him a most cultured, patient, and efficient official. He had frequently managed to change that gentleman's opinion, and that was the reason why he made the suggestion. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] Would anyone say that in matters of public business he should not go to a public official and ask for a favour if he thought it was just and right? Would anyone say that they ought to cultivate friction instead of co-operation, if the interests of the people were to be served? [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] If he thought that he was offending against the canons of the Irish party he would not make that declaration, and therefore he had made his suggestion quite seriously. At any rate, he thought that a great deal of friction had been unnecessarily created by the fact that certain officials of the Local Government Board appeared to think that they had only to make a suggestion, and that suggestion should therefore be carried out. The idea was taking root amongst a great section of the people of Ireland that the design of the Local Government Board in that country was to increase taxation, and to take out of the hands of the local governing bodies the function of legislation which properly belonged to them. He maintained that no more dangerous course could be taken by the right hon. Gentleman and other responsible authorities in Ireland than to bring themselves into conflict and friction with the duly elected representatives of the people. [Cries of "Oh, oh!"] They who represented constitutionalism; [Laughter from the Ministerial Benches.] Hon. Gentlemen

opposite might laugh. There were a large number of people on the opposite side of the House who did not seem to believe in constitutionalism, and the attitude of these gentlemen showed that when the Irish members discussed these questions in moderate language they received no encouragement. What was the use of passing admittedly good laws in the British House of Commons and handing them over to be administered by a select clique of permanent officials in Ireland? They all knew that bad laws well administered were frequently better for a country than good laws badly administered. What they wanted was good laws well administered. A certain small section on the Local Government Board appeared to have made up their minds that they were altogether irresponsible to the Irish people, that they could do what they liked, and that when the Chief Secretary came over to Ireland they could persuade him that what they did was for the good of Ireland. The consequence was, that these large schemes, passed for the good of Ireland, had been practically nullified. He was a member of the Dublin County Council and the Blackrock District Council, and he spoke from personal knowledge of the subject which he had brought before the Committee.

MR. RENTOUL (Down, E.) said he had had experience in connection with the Local Government Board in Ireland, and he thought that any intelligent foreigner who had been listening to the debate must have come to the conclusion that it was the most perfect of all boards in the world, because in all the speeches that had been delivered not one point of any sort had been made against the Board. The hon. Member who had just sat down had told the Committee that he was a member of the Dublin County Council and of the Blackrock District Council, and that he could say a great deal against the Local Government Board, but he had not given a single instance of complaint substantiated by details.

MR. FIELD said that the complaint generally was on the other side. He had any number of instances, and if the hon. Member and the Committee liked he could keep them for another two hours speaking about them.

MR. RENTOUL said he had enjoyed the speech of the hon. Member, because of the absence of details and otherwise because of its pungency. Very serious complaints had been made against the Local Government Board, but they were really attacks on the law. The law might be all wrong; but it was not for a Committee of this House to correct the law, but for the House itself to pass an Act to amend it. The statement had been made that the Local Government Board was hostile to the newly-created local bodies; but as these bodies had been created by the Unionist Government, it was not likely that a board presided over by the present Chief Secretary would desire to upset these bodies in their work. Of course, at the beginning of their work some interference had been made with the county councils in every part of Ireland, and that had created some friction. He himself had to bring two complaints against the Local Government Board about their unnecessary interference with the county council of county Down, but when the facts had all been gone into it was found that they did not warrant the charge of undue interference. Now that the work of local government administration was becoming known the interference of the Local Government Board was becoming less and less necessary, and they all said that the less interference the better. Reference had been made to the control which the high

sheriff exercised over the court-houses maintained by the county councils. Undoubtedly that was likely to create friction, as the sheriff was changed from year to year; and though many sheriff's got on splendidly with the county councils, the evil action of one sheriff might wipe out the kindly treatment of a dozen different sheriffs. The sheriff represented largely the old grand jury system which had passed away, and consequently it was natural that the representatives of a new system should look upon him with a little jealousy, and vice versa. That, however, was not confined to Ireland, for he remembered the jealousy between the London County Council and the members of the old Metropolitan Board of Works. There was nothing of that friction in county Down, because it so happened, fortunately for them there, that the sheriff was also chairman of the county council, and everything worked smoothly. He admitted that the Labourers Acts had fallen dead in many parts of Ireland, and undoubtedly some change would have to be made; but that was a matter, not for the Local Government Board, but for direct legislation by this House.

*MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.) said he regretted that he had time only to refer to two points. The hon. and learned Gentleman who had just sat down had essayed to whitewash the Local Government Board, but in doing so he had tried an impossible task. Everybody who knew anything about the Local Government Board must be convinced that not only were they extravagant and arrogant, but they were totally ignorant of the affairs of the Irish people. No doubt the hon. Member looked forward

with hope to a seat on some such board as compensation for the loss of his seat in the House, which fact accounted for his readiness to speak as he had just done. The conduct of Dr. Flynn, while he was vice-guardian at Killarney, was illustrative of the whole conduct of the officers of the Local Government Board. Dr. Flynn, while he was in Killarney, had occasion to appoint a clerk to the union, and out of the whole of the candidates who applied for that position it was an astonishing fact that the one who was successful in getting the appointment was a gentleman who was able to obtain the influence of Professor Butcher, the cousin of the President of the Board of Trade, who was then Chief Secretary for Ireland. Dr. Flynn had since been promoted by the Local Government Board, though he had also, while vice-guardian, promoted to the mastership of one of the largest workhouses in Ireland a man who for thirty years had been engaged in the police force, who was utterly unqualified for the position, and who had to resign owing to incompetency and drunkenness within two years. There was also a rate collector who during the time that Dr. Flynn was in Killarney was using the guardians' money for his own private purposes. A sum of £1,400 had been collected by this rate collector, and not accounted for; and Dr. Flynn, although it had been brought to his own personal knowledge, had never called public attention to it, for the reason that he wanted to conceal the fact that it had taken place while he was there acting as vice-guardian. He submitted that Dr. Flynn's conduct in the past utterly unfitted him for occupying any position under the Local Government Board, and that instead of being promoted he ought to have been dismissed. Colonel Kirkwood was another officer of the Board whose duty was to inquire into the schemes for the erection of labourers'

cottages, amongst other things. He knew nothing whatever of the duties appertaining to the office. He probably got a military title on account of talking of guns and drums and wounds in a militia mess-room, and not because he ever effected a "masterly retreat,"

evacuated a Spion Kop, or hoisted a white flag. Those two officials were a sample of all the officials of the Local Government Board, and for these reasons and others he objected to the personnel of the Board, because his experience of it was that it was quite unsuited for the government of the Irish people. It was arrogant, unrepresentative, and uninformed. In Kerry they had personal experience of a county council, the members of which had as great ability to discharge their duties as any hon. Member of this House had to discharge his. That council had to consider on one occasion the increase of the salary of its secretary. This man was only entitled to £500, but so artfully had he piled up the various sums that he had to receive that the Local Government Board fixed his salary at £1,000. That man had since resigned, and was now in receipt of a pension of a considerable sum, and was not prevented from acting as a land agent, and the county council had been able to find a successor who was infinitely more capable at a salary of £400 a year. For these reasons and many others which time did not allow him to state he objected to the Vote,

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Joyce, Michael

Ambrose, Robert

Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan

Kearley, Hudson E.

Asher, Alexander

Delany, William

Kennedy, Patrick James

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Dillon, John

Lambert, George

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Doogan, P. C.

Layland-Barratt, Francis

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Duffy, William J.

Leamy, Edmund

Bell, Richard

Elibank, Master of

Leigh, Sir Joseph

Boland, John

Emmott, Alfred

Levy, Maurice

Bolton, Thomas Dolling

Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst'ne

Lough, Thomas
Boyle, James
Fenwick, Charles
Lundon, W.
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Field, William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Brigg, John
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Broadhurst, Henry
Flavin, Michael Joseph
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Burke, E. Haviland-
Flynn, James Christopher
M'Dermott, Patrick
Burns, John
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
M'Fadden, Edward
Burt, Thomas
Gilhooly, James
M'Govern, T.
Caine, William Sproston
Grant, Corrie
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Caldwell, James
Griffith, Ellis J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarth'n
Cameron, Robert
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hammond, John
Moss, Samuel
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Harwood, George
Murnaghan, George
Cawley, Frederick
Hayden, John Patrick
Murphy, John
Channing, Francis Allston
Hayne, Rt Hon. Charles Seale-
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Nolan, J. (Louth, South)

Cogan, Denis J.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Norman, Henry
Colville, John
Holland, William Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Crean, Eugene
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Crombie, John William
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Cullinan, J.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Daly, James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)
Dalziel, James Henry
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

and as the guillotine was about to fall he begged to move a reduction of £;100.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;40,082, be granted for the said Service."; (Mr. Murphy.)

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.) said with regard to the question of the erection of labourers' cottages there were three courses which would considerably facilitate the erection of labourers' cottages. One was that in the case of an appeal against the representation the appellant should pay the costs. He knew a great many landlords and agents in Ireland who would never appeal but for the fact that they knew that they would not have to pay the costs, but that they would come out of the pockets of the ratepayers.

It being Ten of the clock, the CHAIRMAN, in pursuance of the Order of the House of the 7th of August, proceeded to put the Questions necessary to dispose of the Vote under consideration.

Question put.

The Committee divided; Ayes, 141; Noes, 237. (Division List No. 420)

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Wallace, Robert
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Roche, John
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
O'Dowd, John

Roe, Sir Thomas
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Samuel S. M. (Whitechapel)
Weir, James Galloway
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
O'Malley, William
Shipman, Dr. John G.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
O'Mara, James
Soares, Ernest J.
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
O'Shee, James John
Sullivan, Donald
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Partington, Oswald
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Paulton, James Mellor
Tennant, Harold John
Woodehouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Power, Patrick Joseph
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Reddy, M.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
TELLERS FOR AYES; Sir Thomas Esmond and Captain Donelan.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N
Redmond, William (Clare)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Rickett, J. Compton
Tomkinson, James
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Ure, Alexander
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Cranborne, Viscount
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Crossley, Sir Savile
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Davenport, William Bromley-
Henderson, Alexander
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Arnold Forster, Hugh O.
Denny, Colonel
Hogg, Lindsay
Arrol, Sir William
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Hoult, Joseph
Balcarres, Lord
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Houston, Robert Paterson
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Duke, Henry Edward
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Banbury, Frederick George
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Man'cr
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Finch, George H.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Bignold, Arthur

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Kimber, Henry
Bigwood, James
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Bill, Charles
Fisher, William Hayes
Law, Andrew Bonar
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Fison, Frederick William
Lawson, John Grant
Bond, Edward
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Bousfield, William Robert
Flower, Ernest
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Forster, Henry William
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Brassey, Albert
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Fowler, Right Hn. Sir Henry
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Bull, William James
Gardner, Ernest
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Garfit, William
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Lowe, Francis William
Butcher, John George
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Carlile, William Walter
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'mlets

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Gordon Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Sip
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Macdona, John Cumming
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Maconochie, A. W.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Chapman, Edward
Gretton, John
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Charrington, Spencer
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Majendie, James A. H.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Groves, James Grimble
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hain, Edward
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hall, Edward Marshall
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hambro, Charles Eric
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Collings, Rt. Hn. Jesse
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morgan, David J. (W'lthamstow
Morrell, George Herbert
Rentoul, James Alexander
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Renwick George
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Mount, William Arthur
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Muntz, Philip A.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Thornton, Percy M.
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Tollemache, Henry James
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Myers, William Henry
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Round, James
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Valentia, Viscount
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Rutherford, John
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Walker, Col. William Hall
Penn, John
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Webb, Colonel William George
Pierpoint, Robert
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Seton-Karr, Henry
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Plummer, Walter R.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell- (Birm.)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks., E. R.)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Purvis, Robert
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Pym, C. Guy
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Randles, John S.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Rankin, Sir James
Spear, John Ward
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Renshaw, Charles Bine
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Original Question put.
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Fison, Frederick William
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Chapman, Edward
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Charrington, Spencer
Flower, Ernest
Arrol, Sir William
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Forster, Henry William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Foster, Phillip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Balcarres, Lord
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Gardner, Ernest
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Garfit, William
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Banbury, Frederick George
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Gordon, Maj Evans- (TrH'mlets

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Cranborne, Viscount
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Bignold, Arthur
Davenport, William Bromley-
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Bigwood, James
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Bill, Charles
Denny, Colonel
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Dickson, Charles Scott
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Bond, Edward
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Gretton, John
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Bousfield, William Robert
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Groves, James Grimble
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Hain, Edward
Brassey, Albert
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Hall, Edward Marshall
Brown, Alexander H. (Shrop.)
Duke, Henry Edward
Hambro, Charles Eric
Bull, William James
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Bullard, Sir Harry
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Burdett-Coutts, W.

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Butcher, John George
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Carlile, William Walter
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Finch, George H.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Heath, J. (Staffords. N. W.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Fisher, William Hayes
Henderson, Alexander
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 246; Noes, 136. (Division List No. 421).
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Hogg, Lindsay
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheff., Brightside)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Morrell, George Herbert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Hoult, Joseph
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Mount, William Arthur
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Hozier, Hon. James H. Cecil
Muntz, Philip A.
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tynisde
Hudson, George Bickersteth

Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Jackson, Rt. Hon. W. Lawies
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Myers, William Henry
Spear, John Ward
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Spencer, E. (W. Bromwich)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
O'Neill, Hon Robert Torrens
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk)
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset).
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)
Paulton, James Mellor
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Kimber, Henry
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Pemberton, John S. G.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Law, Andrew Bonar
Penn, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Lawson, John Grant
Pierpoint, Robert
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Lee, A. H. (Hants, Fareham)
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Leigh-Bennett, H. Currie
Plummer, Walter R.
Thornton, Percy M.
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Tollemache, Henry James
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine
Pretymann, Ernest George

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Purvis, Robert
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pym, C. Guy
Valentia, Viscount
Lowe, Francis William
Randles, John S.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Shef'eld
Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. (Kent)
Rankin, Sir James
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Walker, Col. William Hall
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Webb, Colonel William George
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Remnant, James Farquharson
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und. Lyne
Macdona, John Cumming
Rentoul, James Alexander
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Renwick, George
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Maconochie, A. W.
Rickett, J. Compton
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Wills, Sir Frederick
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)

Majendie, James A. H.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Wilson-Todd, Wm H. (Yorks.)
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Massey Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Round, James
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Royds, Clement Molyneux
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Rutherford, John
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Flynn, James Christopher
Ambrose, Robert
Clancy, John Joseph
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Asher, Alexander
Cogan, Denis J.
Gilhooly, James
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Colville, John
Grant, Corrie
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Griffith, Ellis J.
Bell, Richard
Crean, Eugene
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Boland, John
Crombie, John William
Hammond, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Cullinan, J.

Harwood, George
Boyle, James
Daly, James
Hayden, John Patrick
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Dalziel, James Henry
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Brigg, John
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Broadhurst, Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Healy, Timothy Michael
Burke, E. Haviland-
Delany, William
Holland, William Henry
Burns, John
Dillon, John
Horniman, Frederick John
Burt, Thomas
Doogan, P. C.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Caine, William Sproston
Elibank, Master of
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Caldwell, James
Emmott, Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Cameron, Robert
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Fenwick, Charles
Joyce, Michael
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Field, William
Kearley, Hudson E.
Cawley, Frederick
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Kennedy, Patrick James
Lambert, George
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Soares, Ernest J.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (Northants)

Leamy, Edmund
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Sullivan, Donal
Leigh, Sir Joseph
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Levy, Maurice
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Tennant, Harold John
Lloyd-George, David
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Lough, Thomas
O'Dowd, John
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N
London, W.
O'Keily, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Tomkinson, James
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
O'Malley, William
Ure, Alexander
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
O'Mara, James
Wallace, Robert
M'Dermott, Patrick
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
M'Fadden, Edward
O'Shee, James John
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
M'Govern, T.
Partington, Oswald
Weir, James Galloway
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Pirie, Duncan V.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Power, Patrick Joseph
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Reddy, M.
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Moss, Samuel.

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Murnaghan, George
Redmond, William (Clare)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Murphy, John
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Vilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Robson, William Snowdon
Woodhouse, Sir J. T (Huddersf'd
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Roche, John
Norman, Henry
Roe, Sir Thomas
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, M.
Shipman, Dr. John G.

The CHAIRMAN thereupon, in pursuance of the same Order, put severally the Questions, That the total amount of the Votes outstanding in each Class of the Civil Service Estimates, and the total amount of the Votes outstanding in the Estimates for the Navy, the Army, and the Revenue Departments, be granted for the Services defined in those Classes and Estimates.

CLASS I.

2. Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,233,715, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for Expenditure on the following Services included in Class I. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:

£;

1.

Royal Palaces and Marlborough House

84,600

2.

Royal Parks and Pleasure Gardens

71,500

3A.

Gladstone Monument

1,100

4.

Miscellaneous Legal Buildings, Great Britain

32,000

5.
Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain
22,000

6.
Diplomatic and Consular Buildings
25,000

7.
Revenue Buildings
197,000

8.
Public Buildings, Great Britain
209,500

9.
Surveys of the United Kingdom
130,159

10.
Harbours under the Board of Trade
3,478

11.
Peterhead Harbour
17,000

12.
Rates on Government Property
264,223

£;
13.
Public Works and Buildings, Ireland
132,667

14.
Railways, Ireland
43,478
£;1,223,715

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E): I rise to a point of order. I want to ask you whether, by the words of the rule, you are not required when putting the Question to define the services for which we are asked to grant the money. The words are; "The total amounts of the Votes outstanding in that class to be granted for services as defined in the class."

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Member will refer to the Estimates circulated, he will find those services defined.

MR. DILLON: My point is this: that it is not the custom when a Question is put to refer us to a printed Paper which has been placed in our hands. The custom is to put the Question fully from the Chair.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is so in the ordinary case, but this is an exceptional procedure.

MR. DILLON: That is not stated in the rule.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 244; Noes, 142. (Division List No. 422).

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Fisher, William Hayes
Macdona, John Cumming
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Fison, Frederick William
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Maconochie, A. W.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
FitzRoy, Hn. Edward Algernon
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Arrol, Sir William
Flower, Ernest
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Asher, Alexander
Forster, Henry William
Majendie, James A. H.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon. W. F.
Balcarres, Lord
Gardner, Ernest
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Garfit, William
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Banbury, Frederick George
Gordon, Maj Evans- (TrH'mlets
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Gore, Hn. G. R. C Ormsby- (Salop
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Morrell, George Herbert
Bignold, Arthur
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Bigwood, James
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Bill, Charles
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Mount, William Arthur
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Muntz, Philip A.
Bond, Edward
Gretton, John
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Bousfield, William Robert
Groves, James Grimble
Myers, William Henry
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Hain, Edward
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Brassey, Albert
Hall, Edward Marshall
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Bull, William James
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Pemberton, John S. G.
Burdett-Coutts, W.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Penn, John
Butcher, John George
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Pierpoint, Robert
Carlile, William Walter
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Plummer, Walter R.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Heaton, John Henniker
Pretymann, Ernest George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Henderson, Alexander
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Purvis, Robert
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Hogg, Lindsay
Pym, C. Guy
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Randles, John S.
Chapman, Edward
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Rankin, Sir James
Charrington, Spencer
Hoult, Joseph
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Houston, Robert Paterson
Reid, James (Greenock)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Remnant, James Farquharson
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.

Renshaw, Charles Bine
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Rentoul, James Alexander
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Jackson, Rt. Hn. Wm. Lawies
Renwick, George
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Cranborne, Viscount
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Kimber, Henry
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Round, James
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Denny, Colonel
Lawson, John Grant
Rutherford, John
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.

Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Duke, Henry Edward
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Lowe, Francis William
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Lowther, Rt. Hon. Jas. (Kent)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tyn'sde
Finch, George H.
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmo'th
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Spear, John Ward
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Williams, Rt. Hn. J. P. (Birm.)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Wills, Sir Frederick
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Valentia, Viscount
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sh'ffld
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Stone, Sir Benjamin

Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Webb, Col. William George
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Thornton, Percy M.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-Lyne)
Tollemache, Henry James
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
NOES
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Hammond, John
O'Dowd, John
Ambrose, Robert
Harwood, George
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
O'Malley, William
Bell, Richard
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Mara, James
Boland, John
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Holland, William Henry
O'Shee, James John
Boyle, James
Horniman, Frederick John
Partington, Oswald
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Paulton, James Mellor
Brigg, John
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Pirie, Duncan V.

Broadhurst, Henry
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jordan, Jeremiah
Reddy, M.
Burns, John
Joyce, Michael
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Burt, Thomas
Kearley, Hudson E.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Caine, William Sproston
Kennedy, Patrick James
Rickett, J. Compton
Caldwell, James
Lambert, George
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Cameron, Robert
Layland-Barrett, Francis
Robson, William Snowdon
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edward
Roche, John
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Roe, Sir Thomas
Cawley, Frederick
Levy, Maurice
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Channing, Francis Allston
Lloyd-George, David
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Clancy, John Joseph
Lough, Thomas
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Soares, Ernest J.
Colville, John
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Sullivan, Donal
Crean, Eugene

MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Crombie, John William
M'Dermott, Patrick
Tennant, Harold John
Cullinan, J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Daly, James
M'Govern, T.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Kenna, Reginald
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Tomkinson, James
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Ure, Alexander
Delany, William
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport
Wallace, Robert
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Moss, Samuel
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Dillon, John
Murnaghan, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Doogan, P. C.
Murphy, John
Weir, James Galloway
Duffy, William J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Elibank, Master of
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Emmott, Alfred
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Norman, Henry
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Fenwick, Charles
Nussey, Thomas Willans

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
 Field, William
 O'Brien, James F. X. (Cerk)
 Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
 Flavin, Michael Joseph
 O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
 Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
 Flynn, James Christopher
 O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
 Woodhouse, Sir J T (Hudd'rsfi'd)
 Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
 O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
 Gilhooly, James
 O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
 Grant, Corrie
 O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
 Griffith, Ellis J.
 O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
 Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
 O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
 CLASS II.

3. Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £;928,342, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included in Class II. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:;

£;

1.

House of Lords, Offices

4,761

2.

House of Commons, Offices

13,100

£;

5.

Foreign Office

47,076

7A.

Privy Seal Office

1,920

8.

Board of Trade

132,328

9.

Mercantile Marine Services

65,769

10.

Bankruptcy Department of the Board of Trade

5

11.

Board of Agriculture

26,094

13.

Civil Service Commission

26,625

14.

Exchequer and Audit Department

38,656

23.

Stationery and Printing

368,037

24.

Office of Woods, etc.

14,014

26.

Secret Service

25,000

Scotland.

27.

Office of Secretary for Scotland

7,954

28.

Fishery Board

10,545

29.

Lunacy Commission

3,604

30.

Registrar General's Office

5,473

31.

Local Government Board

8,778

Ireland.

32.

Lord Lieutenant's Household

2,813

33.

Chief Secretary's Offices, etc.

9,676

34.

Department of Agriculture

70,806

35.

Charitable Donations and Bequests Office

963

37.

Public Record Office

3,242

38.

Public Works Offices

19,940

39.

Registrar General's Office

10,278

40.

Valuation and Boundary Survey

10,885

£;928,342

MR. DILLON said that there was nothing in the new rule directing the Chairman to put the question in a different form from that which had been adopted in the past. The practice had been to name the services for which the money was required, and he contended that the Chairman was bound to continue to do so. He had asked for all the services contained in Class II., whereas Votes 3 and 4 had been fully voted.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I fail to see how I have contravened the rule in any way. The rule directs that I must put the question

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Bigwood, James

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Bill, Charles

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm)

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bond, Edward

Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Chapman, Edward

Arrol, Sir William

Bousfield, William Robert

Charrington, Spencer

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Brassey, Albert
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Balcarres, Lord
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Bull, William James
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Butcher, John George
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Banbury, Frederick George
Carlile, William Walter
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Beach, Rt. Hn Sir Michael Hicks-
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Bignold, Arthur
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cranborne, Viscount

with regard to the total amount of the Votes outstanding in each class.

MR. DILLON said the rule referred to the granting of Votes "for the services defined in the class."

*THE CHAIRMAN: The services are defined in the class. Then the outstanding Votes in that class are those which have not already been voted. The hon. Member has said that Votes 3 and 4 of Class II. have already been voted. They are not included in the sum proposed to be now voted, because they are not outstanding Votes.

MR. DILLON said there was nothing in the wording of the new rule to authorise an alteration in the method of putting the question.

*THE CHAIRMAN: This procedure is quite new. I fail to see how I am contravening

the rule in any way. If I were to read out each separate Vote, it seems to me I would be contravening the rule. What I have to put is the total Vote.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I understood you to say what was your interpretation of the rule. Is it for the Chairman to interpret the rule?

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is what he is here for.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 250; Noes, 144. (Division List No. 423.)

Crossley, Sir Savile

Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick

Randles, John S.

Davenport, W. Bromley-

Johnston, William (Belfast)

Rankin, Sir James

Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Denny, Colonel

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

Reid, James (Greenock)

Dickson, Charles Scott

Keswick, William

Remnant, James Farquharson

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Kimber, Henry

Renshaw, Charles Bine

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.

Rentoul, James Alexander

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Law, Andrew Bonar

Renwick, George

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Lawson, John Grant

Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)

Duke, Henry Edward

Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J (Manc'r

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Round, James
Finch, George H.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Rutherford, John
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Lowe, Francis William
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Fisher, William Hayes
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Fison, Frederick William
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Lyttelton, Hn. Alfred
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Flower, Ernest
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Seton-Karr, Henry
Forster, Henry William
Macdona, John Cumming
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.)
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Maconochie, A. W.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Gardner, Ernest
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)

Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Garfit, William
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Spear, John Ward
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'mlets
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Gore, Hn. G. R. C Ormsby- (Salop
Middlemore, John T.
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Gretton, John
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Thornton, Percy M.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Morrell, George Herbert
Tollemache, Henry James
Groves, James Grimble.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

Hain, Edward
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Hall, Edward Marshall
Mount, William Arthur
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Hambro, Charles Eric
Muntz, Philip A.
Valentia, Viscount
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Murray, Charles, J. (Coventry)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Hanbury, Rt Hon. Robert Wm.
Myers, William Henry
Walker, Col. William Hall
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Webb, Col. William George
Haslett, Sir James Horner
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Parker, Gilbert
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Paulton, James Mellor
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Heaton, John Henniker
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm.
Henderson, Alexander
Pemberton, John S. G.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Penn, John
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Pierpoint, Robert
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside

Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Hoult, Joseph
Plummer, Walter R.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Houston, Robert Paterson
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Pretymann, Ernest George
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Purvis, Robert
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Pym, C. Guy
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Bell, Richard
Ambrose, Robert
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Boland John
Asher, Alexander
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Boyle, James
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Brigg, John
Holland, William Henry
O'Malley, William
Broadhurst, Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Mara, James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Burns, John
Jameson, Major J. Eustace

O'Shee, James John
Burt, Thomas
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Partington, Oswald
Caldwell, James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Pirie, Duncan V.
Cameron, Robert
Jordan, Jeremiah
Power, Patrick Joseph
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Joyce, Michael
Reddy, M.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Kearley, Hudson E.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cawley, Frederick
Kennedy, Patrick James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Channing, Francis Alston
Lambert, George
Rickett, J. Compton
Clancy, John Joseph
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Leamy, Edmund
Robson, William Snowdon
Colville, John
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Roche, John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Roe, Sir Thomas
Crean, Eugene
Lloyd-George, David
Samuel, S. M. (Whitchapel)
Crombie, John William
Lough, Thomas
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Cullinan, J.
Lundon, W.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Daly, James
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Soares, Ernest J.

Dalziel, James Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
MacNeil, John Cordon Swift
Sullivan, Donal
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
M'Dermott, Patrick
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Delany, William
M'Fadden, Edward
Tennant, Harold John
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
M'Govern, T.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Dillon, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Donelan, Captain A.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Doogan, P. C.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Tomkinson, James
Duffy, William J.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport
Ure, Alexander
Elibank, Master of
Moss, Samuel
Wallace, Robert
Emmott, Alfred
Murnaghan, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Murphy, John
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Weir, James Galloway
Fenwick, Charles
Nolan, Col. John P (Galway, N.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Field, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Flavin, Michael Joseph

Norman, Henry
 Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
 Flynn, James Christopher
 Nussey, Thomas Willans
 Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
 Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
 O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
 Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
 Gilhooly, James
 O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
 Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
 Grant, Corrie
 O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
 Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
 Griffith, Ellis J.
 O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
 Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
 O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Came and Sir James Woodhouse.
 Hammond, John
 O'Connor, T. P. Liverpool
 Harwood, George
 O'Donnell, John (Mayo S.)
 Hayden, John Patrick
 O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
 Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
 O'Dowd, John
 CLASS III.

4. Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £1,976,094, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included in Class III, of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:;

£;

3.

Supreme Court of Judicature
 182,287

4.

Land Registry
 24,193

5.

County Courts
 26,906

6.

Police, England and Wales
 31,595

7.
Prisons, England and the Colonies
391,713

8.
Reformatory and Industrial Schools, Great Britain
121,809

9.
Broadmoor Criminal Lunatic Asylum
26,175

Scotland.
£;

10.
Law Charges and Courts of Law
54,273

11.
Register House, Edinburgh
27,827

12.
Crofters' Commission
2,990

Ireland.

18.
Land Commission
83,542

17.
County Court Officers, etc.
64,390

18.
Dublin Metropolitan Police
54,204

19.
Royal Irish Constabulary
755,621

20.
Prisons
70,973

21.
Reformatory and Industrial Schools
54,705

22.
Dundrum Criminal Lunatic Asylum
2,891

£;1,976,094

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 247; Noes, 138. (Division List No. 424.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Fisher, William Hayes
Macdona, John Cumming
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Fison, Frederick William
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Maconochie, A. W.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Arrol, Sir William
Flower, Ernest
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire),
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Forster, Henry William
Majendie, James A. H.
Bagot, Capt. J. Fitzroy
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Balcarres, Lord
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Gardner, Ernest
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Garfit, William
Middlemore, John T.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Banbury, Frederick George
Gordon, J. Londonderry, South
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Bathurst, Hon. A. Benjamin
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'mlets
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. Hicks
Core, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Bell, Richard
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Bignold, Arthur
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Morrell, George Herbert
Bigwood, James
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Bill, Charles
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Mount, William Arthur
Bond, Edward
Gretton, John
Muntz, Philip A.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Grahm (Bute
Bousfield, William Robert
Groves, James Gribble
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Hain, Edward
Myers, William Henry
Brassey, Albert
Hall, Edward Marshall
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Bull, William James
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nderry
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Parker, Gilbert
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley

Butcher, John George
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Pemberton, John S. G.
Carlile, William Walter
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Penn, John
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Pierpoint, Robert
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Heaton, John Henniker
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Henderson, Alexander
Plummer, Walter R.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Hogg, Lindsay
Pretymann, Ernest George
Chapman, Edward
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Purvis, Robert
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hoult, Joseph
Pym, C. Guy
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Houston, Robert Paterson
Randles, John S.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Rankin, Sir James
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Reid, James (Greenock)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Remnant, James Farquharson
Colomb, Sir John C. Ready
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Renwick, George
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Kenyon, Hon Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Cranborne, Viscount
Keswick, William
Ritchie, Bt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Law, Andrew Bonar
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham)
Lawson, John Grant
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Denny, Colonel
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareh'm
Round, James
Dickson, Charles Scott
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Rutherford, John
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)

Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Duke, Henry Edward
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Lowe, Francis William
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Finch, George H.
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Smith, H C (N'rth'umb. Tyn'side
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Tollemache, Henry James
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm.
Spear, John Ward
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Wills, Sir Frederick
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Valentia, Viscount
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Webb, Colonel Wm. George
Strut, Hon. Charles Hedley
Weir, James Galloway
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Welby, Sir Charles G. E (Notts.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Thornton, Percy M.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Grant, Corrie
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Ambrose, Robert
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Asher, Alexander
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ashton, Thos. Gair
Hammond, John
O'Dowd, John
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Harwood, George
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.
Boland, John
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Malley, William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Mara, James
Boyle, James
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.

Holland, William Henry
O'Shee, James John
Brigg, John
Horniman, Frederick John
Partington, Oswald
Broadhurst, Henry
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Power, Patrick Joseph
Burns, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Reddy, M.
Burt, Thomas
Jordon, Jeremiah
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Caine, William Sproston
Joyce, Michael
Redmond, William (Clare)
Caldwell, James
Kearley, Hudson E.
Rickett, J. Compton
Cameron, Robert
Kennedy, Patrick James
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lambert, George
Robson, William Snowdon
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Roche, John
Cawley, Frederick
Leamy, Edmund
Roe, Sir Thomas
Channing, Francis Allston
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Clancy, John Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Cogan, Denis J.
Lloyd-George, David
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Colville, John
Lough, Thomas

Soares, Ernest J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lundon, W.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Crean, Eugene
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Sullivan, Donal
Crombie, John William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Cullinan, J.
MacNeill, John Cordon Swift
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Daly, James
M'Dermott, Patrick
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Fadden, Edward
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Govern, T.
Tomkinson, James
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Ure, Alexander
Delany, William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Wallace, Robert
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Dillon, John
Moss, Samuel
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Doogan, P. C.
Murnaghan, George
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Duffy, William J.
Murphy, John
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Elibank, Master of
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Emmott, Alfred
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

Fenwick, Charles

Norman, Henry

Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)

Field, William

Nussey, Thomas Willans

Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)

Flavin, Michael Joseph

O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid)

Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Hudd'rsfi'd

Flynn, James Christopher

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)

Gilhooly, James

O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)

CLASS IV.

5. Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £;208,675, be

granted to His Majesty, to defray

the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the

31st day of March, 1902, for Expenditure in respect of the following

Services included in Class IV. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.::

£;

2.

British Museum

86,580

3.

National Gallery

7,903

4.

National Portrait Gallery

2,644

5.

Wallace Collection

3,788

6.

Scientific Investigation, etc.

28,154

7.

Universities and Colleges, Great Britain, and Intermediate Education, Wales

75,700

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Dickson, Charles Scott
Houston, Robert Paterson
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Arrol, Sir William
Duke, Henry Edward
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Balcarres, Lord
Emmott, Alfred
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Keswick, William
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Kimber, Henry
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Finch, George H.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Banbury, Frederick George
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Lawson, John Grant
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Fisher, William Hayes

Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Fison, Frederick William
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Bignold, Arthur
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Bigwood, James
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Bill, Charles
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Flower, Ernest
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Bond, Edward
Forster, Henry William
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Bousfield, William Robert
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Lowe, Francis William
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Gardner, Ernest
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Brassey, Albert
Garfit, William
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Bull, William James
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Bullard, Sir Harry
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Lyttelton, Hn. Alfred
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'mlets
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Butcher, John George
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Macdona, John Cumming

Carlile, William Walter
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Maconochie, A. W.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Goulding, Edward Alfred
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingsh.)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Majendie, James A. H.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Gretton, John
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Chamberlain, J. Austen) Worc'r
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Chapman, Edward
Groves, James Grimble
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Charrington, Spencer
Hain, Edward
Middlemore, John T.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Hall, Edward Marshall
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt William
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Harris, Frederick Leverton
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morrell, George Herbert
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbr'dge
Heaton, John Henniker
Mount, William Arthur
Cranborne, Viscount
Henderson, Alexander
Muntz, Philip A.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Davenport, William Bromley-
Hogg, Lindsay
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Myers, William Henry
Denny, Colonel
Hoult, Joseph
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Ireland.

£;

11.

Endowed Schools Commissioners

520

12.

National Gallery

1,086

13.

Queen's Colleges

2,300

£;208,675

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 247; Noes, 139. (Division List No. 425.)

O'Neill, Hn. Robert Torrens

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Thornton, Percy M.

Parker, Gilbert

Round, James

Tollemache, Henry James

Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray

Pemberton, John S. G.

Rutherford, John

Tritton, Charles Ernest

Pierpoint, Robert

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward

Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Valentia, Viscount

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert

Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Shef'ld

Plummer, Walter R.

Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.

Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)

Powell, Sir Francis Sharpe

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)

Walker, Col. William Hall

Pretymann, Ernest George

Seton-Karr, Henry

Webb, Col. William George

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts)

Purvis, Robert

Sinclair, Louis (Romford)

Whiteley, H. (Ashton-un-Lyne

Pym, C. Guy

Skewes-Cox, Thomas

Whitmore, Charles Algernon

Randles, John S.

Smith, A. H. (Hertford, East)

Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Rankin, Sir James
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tyn'sd
Williams, Rt. Hn. J. Powell (Birm
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Smith, J. P. (Lanarks.)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Reid, James (Greenock)
Spear, John Ward
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Spencer, E. (W. Bromwich)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Stanley, E. Jas. (Somerset)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Renwick, George
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Ambrose, Robert
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Asher, Alexander
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Gilhooly, James
Norman, Henry
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Grant, Corrie

Nussey, Thomas Willans
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Bell, Richard
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Boland, John
Hammond, John
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Harwood, George
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Boyle, James
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Brigg, John
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Broadhurst, Henry
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Dowd, John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Holland, William Henry
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Burns, John
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Burt, Thomas
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Malley, William
Caine, William Sproston
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Mara, James
Caldwell, James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Cameron, Robert
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Shee, James John
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Joyce, Michael
Partington, Oswald

Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Kearley, Hudson E.
Pirie, Duncan V.
Cawley, Frederick
Kennedy, Patrick James
Power, Patrick Joseph
Channing, Francis Allston
Lambert, George
Reddy, M.
Clancy, John Joseph
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cogan, Denis J.
Leamy, Edmund
Redmond, William (Clare)
Colville, John
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Rickett, J. Compton
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Crean, Eugene
Lloyd-George, David
Roche, John
Crombie, John William
Lough, Thomas
Roe, Sir Thomas
Cullinan, J.
Lundon, W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Daly, James
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Dalziel, James Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Soares, Ernest J.
Delany, William
M'Dermott, Patrick
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
M'Fadden, Edward
Sullivan, Donal
Dillon, John

M'Govern, T.
 Taylor, Theodore Cooke
 Donelan, Captain A.
 M'Kenna, Reginald
 Tennant, Harold John
 Doogan, P. C.
 Mansfield, Horace Rendall
 Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
 Duffy, William J.
 Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
 Thompson, Dr. E. C. (M'n'gh'n, N
 Elibank, Master of
 Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
 Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
 Esmonde, Sir Thomas
 Moss, Samuel
 Tomkinson, James
 Fenwick, Charles
 Murnaghan, George
 Ure, Alexander
 Field, William
 Murphy, John
 Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
 Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
 Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
 Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
 Weir, James Galloway
 Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
 Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
 White, Luke (York, E. R.)
 Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES.;Mr. Robson and Mr. Wallace.
 White, Patrick (Meath, North)
 Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
 CLASS V.

6. Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £;926,905, be granted to His Majesty to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included in Class V. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.:;

£;

2.

Uganda, Central and East Africa Protectorates, etc.
 210,049

3.

Colonial Services

308,006

4.

Cyprus, Grant in Aid

1,000

5.

Subsidies to Telegraph Companies

27,850

7.

Treasury Chest Fund

305,000

8.

Loan to Wuchang Viceroy

75,000

£;926,905

MR. DILLON rose to a point of order. He drew attention to the fact that in this Vote were included two Votes that were not rightly included under the new rule, a Supplementary Vote by way of loan to the Viceroy of Wu-chang and also the Treasury Chest Fund, Votes of a character in respect to which the First Lord of the Treasury gave a pledge two years ago that they should not be included in the general closure.

*THE CHAIRMAN: A pledge given by a Minister does not in any way bind me. I do not think the hon. Member has raised his point of order on a sure foundation.

The rule is;

"Provided always that any additional Estimate for any new service or matter not included in the original Estimate of the year shall be submitted for consideration two clear days before the Committee is closed."

I would like not to give an opinion with regard to the Treasury Chest Fund, but the loan to the Wu-chang Viceroy is an additional Estimate not included in the original Estimate, and then arose the question in my mind, Has it been submitted for consideration in Committee of Supply? I confess for some time I had considerable doubt, but I may say I have consulted the Speaker on the matter, and he and I are now agreed that the Vote was submitted for consideration when it was put down as the second Vote on the Paper. "Submitted for consideration" does not mean "proposed from the Chair." That is the view of the Speaker, and that view I entirely share. "Proposed from the Chair" is, of course, a well-known expression, which has been frequently used in the Standing Orders and Rules of this House, but "submitted for consideration" the Speaker holds, and I hold, is a condition that has been fulfilled by the matter being made an effective Supply Vote on a particular day more than two days before the Committee closed.

MR. DILLON appealed to the First Lord of the Treasury to say whether that was an observance of the pledge which he had given to the House upon a former occasion.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is entitled to address me on a point of order, but no debate is permitted. I say that both last year and the year before there are precedents in this matter. Last year there was a Vote for Local Taxation (Ireland), a new Vote, and an additional Estimate for a new matter not in the

original Estimate. It was put down for consideration in Supply two days before the closure day, but it was not discussed. The year before; 1899; exactly the same thing occurred with a Vote for the Paris Exhibition. These are two precedents on all fours with the present Votes as to which the hon. Member has raised the point of order. In the face of these two precedents, I hold that the condition has been complied with in this case.

MR. DILLON submitted that this point was never raised before, and if that was so, he contended that the cases which the Chairman had quoted had no bearing on the point of order. He respectfully submitted to the Chairman that it was not in accordance with either the letter or the spirit of the rule that a Vote which had never been submitted to the Committee and which the Committee of Supply had had no opportunity whatever of discussing should be included under the closure rule in the face of the proviso he had quoted. He intended to take an early opportunity of reminding the First Lord of the Treasury of his pledge.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.), upon a point of order, contended that "submitted for consideration" did not mean that a certain motion had been simply put upon the Notice Paper, for that could have no practical bearing on the point. [Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh!"] He was not speaking to hon. Gentlemen opposite, who were not intelligent enough to understand him, but he was addressing the Chairman upon a point of order. He wished to remind the Chairman of what ought to be within the knowledge of every hon. member of the House who was acquainted with Parliamentary procedure, that this rule with regard to notice papers and the printing of notices was a very modern innovation indeed. It would be utterly impossible to suggest;

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I must ask the hon. Member to limit his remarks simply to his point of order, for he is not entitled to make a speech.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Burdett-Coutts, W.

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Butcher, John George

Duke, Henry Edward

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Carlile, William Walter

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.

Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward

Arrol, Sir William

Cayzer, Sir Charles William

Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Finch, George H.
Balcarres, Lord
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Chapman, Edward
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Charrington, Spencer
Fisher, William Hayes
Balfour, Rt. Hon. Gerald W. (Leeds)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Fison, Frederick William
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Fitroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Banbury, Frederick George
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Flower, Ernest
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Forster, Henry William
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir Michael Hicks
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Bignold, Arthur
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Gardner, Ernest
Bigwood, James
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Garfit, William
Bill, Charles
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Gordon, Hon. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Bond, Edward

Cranborne, Viscount
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Crossley, Sir Savile
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'mlets
Bousfield, William Robert
Davenport, William Bromley-
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Denny, Colonel
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Brassey, Albert
Dickson, Charles Scott
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Bull, William James
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL said he would endeavour to do so if the Chairman would restrain the interruptions of hon. Gentlemen opposite. He wished to point out that these printed notices were modern innovations.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is not relevant to the point of order. May I be allowed to point out that if the hon. Member were in my position he might give a different ruling, but it devolves upon me to decide what these words mean. I have given my decision after consulting the highest authority in the House, and I do not really think that there is anything more to discuss upon this question.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL, who was greeted with loud Ministerial cries of "Order, order!" said he again submitted that it was utterly impossible for any order or for any judgment to be based upon the Orders of the Day, because the Orders of the Day were mere matters of convenience, and were not pertinent to the legislation of this House. They were merely a modern innovation simply for the convenience of the House.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 242; Noes, 139. (Division List No. 426.)

Gretton, John
Maconochie, A. W.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Groves, James Grimble
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Hain, Edward
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Round, James
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Majendie, James A. H.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Hall, Edward Marshall
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Rutherford, John
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G. (Mid.)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. E.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Heaton, John Henniker
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Henderson, Alexander
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Morrell, George Herbert
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside

Hogg, Lindsay
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Hope, J. E. (Sheffield Brightside)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Mount, William Arthur
Spear, John Ward
Hoult, Joseph
Muntz, Philip A.
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich
Houston, Robert Paterson
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Myers, William Henry
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Jackson, Rt. Hn. Wm. Lawies
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Parker, Gilbert
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Paulton, James Mellor
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Thornton, Percy M.
Keswick, William
Pemberton, John S. G.
Tollemache, Henry James
Kimber, Henry
Penn, John
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.

Pierpoint, Robert
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Law, Andrew Bonar
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Lawrence, Wm. L. (Liverpool)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Valentia, Viscount
Lawson, John Grant
Plummer, Walter R.
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Walker, Col. William Hall
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pretymann, Ernest George
Webb, Colonel William George
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Leveson-Cower, Fredk. N. S.
Purvis, Robert
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-un.-Lyne)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Pym, C. Guy
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Randles, John S.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Rankin, Sir James
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Wills, Sir Frederick
Lowe, Francis William
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks., E. R.)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Rentoul, James Alexander

Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Renwick, George
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES.; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Macdonald, John Cumming
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Ambrose, Robert
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Doogan, P. C.
Asher, Alexander
Cawley, Frederick
Duffy, William J.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Channing, Francis Allston
Elibank, Master of
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Emmott, Alfred
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Cogan, Denis J.
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Bell, Richard
Colville, John
Fenwick, Charles
Boland, John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Field, William
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Crean, Eugene
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Boyle, James
Crombie, John William
Flynn, James Christopher
Brigg, John
Cullinan, J.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Broadhurst, Henry

Daly, James
Gilhooly, James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Dalziel, James Henry
Grant, Corrie
Burns, John
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Burt, Thomas
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Caine, William Sproston
Delany, William
Hammond, John
Caldwell, James
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Hayden, John Patrick
Cameron, Robert
Dillon, John
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Moss, Samuel
Robson, William Snowdon)
Healy, Timothy Michael
Murnaghan, George
Roche, John
Holland, William Henry
Murphy, John
Roe, Sir Thomas
Horniman, Frederick John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Norman, Henry
Soares, Ernest J.
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)

Sullivan, Donald
Joyce, Michael
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Kearley, Hudson E.
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Tennant, Harold John
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Lambert, George
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Ure, Alexander
Leamy, Edmund
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Wallace, Robert
Leigh, Sir Joseph
O'Dowd, John
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Levy, Maurice
O' Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Lloyd-George, David
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Weir, James Galloway
Lough, Thomas
O'Malley, William
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Lundon, W.
O'Mara, James
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
O'Shee, James John
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Partington, Oswald
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
M'Dermott, Patrick
Pirie, Duncan V.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)

M'Fadden, Edward
Power, Patrick Joseph
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
M'Govern, T.
Reddy, M.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Mr. D. A. Thomas and Mr. Whitley.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Redmond, William (Clare)
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Rickett, J. Compton
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.
CLASS VI.

7. Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £;307,968, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Brassey, Albert
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Cranborne, Viscount
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bull, William James
Crossley, Sir Savile
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bullard, Sir Harry
Davenport, William Bromley-
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Arrol, Sir William
Butcher, John George
Denny, Colonel
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Carlile, William Walter
Dickson, Charles Scott
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Balcarres, Lord
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Doxford, Sir William T.
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Duke, Henry Edward
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Banbury, Frederick George
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Chapman, Edward
Emmott, Alfred
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Charrington, Spencer
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Bignold, Arthur
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Bigwood, James
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Bill, Charles
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Finch, George H.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Bond, Edward
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Fisher, William Hayes
Bousfield, William Robert
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Fison, Frederick William

Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
in Class VI. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.;;
£;

1.
Superannuation and Retired Allowances
305,637

2.
Merchant Seamen's Fund Pensions
1,200

3.
Miscellaneous Charitable and other Allowances
696

4.
Hospitals and Charities, Ireland
435

£;307,968

The Committee divided;;Ayes, 243; Noes, 136. (Division List No. 427.)

Flower, Ernest

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Reid, James (Greenock)

Forster, Henry William

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine

Remnant, James Farquharson

Foster, Sir Mich. (Lond. Univ.)

Long, Col Charles W. (Evesham)

Renshaw, Charle Bine

Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S W

Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)

Rentoul, James Alexander

Gardner, Ernest

Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Renwick, George

Garfit, William

Lowe, Francis William

Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)

Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.

Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)

Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Gordon, Maj. Evans- (T'r-Hmlts
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Rolleston, Sir John E. L.
Gore, Hn. G. R. COrmsby- (Salop
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby (Linc.)
Macdona, John Cumming
Round, James
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Goschen, Hon. George J.
Maconochie, A. W.
Rutherford, John
Goulding, Edward Alfred
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Gretton, John
Majendie, James A. H.
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Greville, Hn. Ronald
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Groves, James Grimble
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F-
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Hain, Edward
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Middlemore, John T.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Hall, Edward Marshall
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Spear, John Ward
Harris, Frederick Leverton
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morrell, George Herbert
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Stirling Maxwell, Sir John M.
Heaton, John Henniker
Mount, William Arthur
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Henderson, Alexander
Muntz, Philip A.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Hogg, Lindsay
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hope, J. E. (Sheffield, Brightside
Myers, William Henry
Thornton, Percy M.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tollemache, Henry James
Hoult, Joseph
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Houston, Robert Paterson
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Tritton, Charles Ernest
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Parker, Gilbert
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Paulton, James Mellor
Valentia, Viscount
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Pemberton, John S. G.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Penn, John
Webb, Col. William George
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pierpoint, Robert
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-un.-Lyne)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Keswick, William
Plummer, Walter R.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Kimber, Henry
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wills, Sir Frederick
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Purvis, Robert
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)
Lawson, John Grant
Pym, C. Guy
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham)
Randles, John S.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Rankin, Sir James
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Broadhurst, Henry
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Ambrose, Robert
Burns, John
Crean, Eugene
Asher, Alexander
Burt, Thomas
Crombie, John William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Caine, William Sproston
Cullinan, J.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Caldwell, James
Daly, James
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Dalziel, James Henry
Bell, Richard
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Boland, John
Cawley, Frederick
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Channing, Francis Allston
Delany, William
Boyle, James
Clancy, John Joseph
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Cogan, Denis J.
Dillon, John
Brigg, John
Colville, John
Donelan, Captain A.
Doogan, P. C.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Duffy, William J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift

Redmond, William (Clare)
Elibank, Master of
M'Dermott, Patrick
Rickett, J. Compton
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
M'Fadden, Edward
Roberts, H. (Denbighs.)
Fenwick, Charles
M'Govern, T.
Robson, William Snowdon
Field, William
M'Kenna, Reginald
Roche, John
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Mansfield, Horace Kendall
Roe, Sir Thomas
Flynn, James Christopher
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Gilhooly, James
Moss, Samuel
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Grant, Corrie
Murnaghan, George
Soares, Ernest J.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Murphy, John
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (Northants
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sullivan, Donal
Hammond, John
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Hayden, John Patrick
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Tennant, Harold John
Hayne, Rt. Hn. C. Scale-
Norman, Henry
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N

Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Holland, William Henry
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Ure, Alexander
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Wallace, Robert
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Weir, James Galloway
Jones, W. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Dowd, John
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Kearley, Hudson E.
O'Malley, William
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Mara, James
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Loamy, Edmund
O'Shee, James John
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Partington, Oswald
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Levy, Maurice
Pirie, Duncan V.
Lundon, W.
Power, Patrick Joseph

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Mr. Nussey and Mr. Lambert.

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

Reddy, M.

CLASS VII.

8. Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £42,172, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Colomb, Sir John Chas. Read

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Brassey, Albert

Compton, Lord Alwyne

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bull, William James

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Bullard, Sir Harry

Cox, Irwin Edward B.

Arrol, Sir William

Burdett-Coutts, W.

Cranborne, Viscount

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Butcher, John George

Crossley, Sir Savile

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Carlile, William Walter

Davenport, Wm. Bromley-

Balcarres, Lord

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.

Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)

Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)

Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)

Denny, Col.

Balfour, Capt, C. B. (Hornsey)

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)

Dickson, Charles Scott

Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds

Cayzer, Sir Charles Wm.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Banbury, Frederick George
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Doxford, Sir William T.
Beach, Rt Hn Sir Michael Hicks
Chapman, Edward
Duke, Henry Edward
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Charrington, Spencer
Durning-Lawrence, Sir E.
Bignold, Arthur
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Bigwood, James
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Bill, Charles
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn E.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Bond, Edward
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
in Class VII. of the Estimates for Civil Services, viz.;;
£;

1.

Temporary Commissions
10,149

2.

Miscellaneous Expenses
17,773

3.

Repayments to the Civil Contingencies Fund
14,250
£;42,172

The Committee divided::Ayes, 237; Noes, 135. (Division List No. 428.)

Finch, George H.

Lawson, John Grant

Rasch, Maj. Frederic Carne

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Reid, James (Geenock)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Remnant, James Farquharson
Fisher, William Hayes
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Fison, Frederick William
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Renwick, George
Flower, Ernest
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (St'lybridge
Forster, Henry William
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Foster, Sir M. (Lond. Univ.)
Lowe, Francis William
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Robertson, Herbt. (Hackney)
Gardner, Ernest
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Garfit, William
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Ropner, Col. Robert
Godson, Sir Augustus F.
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Round, James
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Macdona, John Cumming
Rutherford, John
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'ml'ts
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Gore, Hn G. K. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Maconochie, A. W.

Sadler, Col. Samuel A.
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thomas M.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Goschen, Hon. George J.
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Majendie, James A. H.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Greene, Hy. D. (Shrewsbury)
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Gretton, John
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Middlemore, John T.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Groves, James Grimble
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Smith, H C (Nrth'mb. Tyneside)
Hain, Edward
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Hall, Edward Marshall
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Spear, John Ward
Hambro, Charles Eric
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Middx)
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk)
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.
Morrell, George Herbert
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Morris, Hon. Martin Hy. F.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Mount, William Arthur
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Muntz, Philip A.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N. W.)
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Heaton, John Henniker
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Thornton, Percy M.
Henderson, Alexander
Myers, William Henry
Tollemache, Henry James
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Hogg, Lindsay
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Parker, Gilbert
Valentia, Viscount
Hoult, Joseph
Peel, Hon. W. R. Wellesley
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Pemberton, John S. G.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Perm, John
Webb, Col. Wm. George
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil

Pierpoint, Robert
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne
Jackson, Rt. Hn. Wm. Lawies
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Plummer, Walter R.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Keswick, William
Purvis, Robert
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Pym, C. Guy
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Randles, John S.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Rankin, Sir James
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Burns, John
Crombie, John William
Ambrose, Robert
Burt, Thomas
Cullinan, J.
Asher, Alexander
Caine, William Sproston
Daly, James
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Caldwell, James
Dalziel, James Henry
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Bayley, T. (Derbyshire)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Bell, Richard
Cawley, Frederick
Delany, William
Boland, John
Channing, Francis Allston
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Boyle, James
Clancy, John Joseph
Dillon, John
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Cogan, Denis J.
Doogan, P. C.
Brigg, John
Colville, John
Duffy, William J.
Broadhurst, Henry
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Elibank, Master of
Burke, E. Haviland-
Crean, Eugene
Emmott, Alfred
Fenwick, Charles
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Field, William
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
M'Kenna, Reginald
Rickett, J. Compton
Flynn, James Christopher
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Robson, William Snowdon
Gilhooly, James
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Griffith, Ellis J.
Moss, Samuel
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Murnaghan, George
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Hammond, John
Murphy, John
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Soares, Ernest J.
Hayden, John Patrick
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Narthants
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Sullivan, Donal
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Norman, Henry
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Healy, Timothy Michael
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Tennant, Harold John
Holland, William Henry
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Thompson, Dr E (Monaghan, N.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.
Ure, Alexander
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Wallace, Robert
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Doherty, John (Mayo, S.)
Walton, John (Barnsley)
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Joyce, Michael
O'Dowd, John
Weir, James Galloway
Kearley, Hudson E.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Lambert, George
O'Malley, William
Whiteley, G. (York, W. R.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Mara, James
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Leigh, Sir Joseph
O'Shee, James John
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Levy, Maurice
Partington, Oswald
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Lundon, W.
Paulton, James Mellor
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Pirie, Duncan V.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
MacNeill, John Cordon Swift
Power, Patrick Joseph
M'Dermott, Patrick
Reddy, M.

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

9. Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £;14,209,300, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for Expenditure on the following Navy Services, viz.::

£;

Vote 2.

Victualling and Clothing

1,892,300

Vote 7.

Royal Naval Reserves

292,100

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Brand, Hon. Arthur G.

Clare, Octavius Leigh

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Brassey, Albert
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Brigg, John
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Bull, William James
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Arrol, Sir William
Bullard, Sir Harry
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Colville, John
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Butcher, John George
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Balcarres, Lord
Caldwell, James
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Carlile, William Walter
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cranborne, Viscount
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Crombie, John William
Banbury, Frederick George
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Crossley, Sir Savile
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Dalziel, James Henry
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Davenport, William Bromley-
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Bignold, Arthur
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r.
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Bigwood, James
Channing, Francis Allston
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Bill, Charles
Chapman, Edward
Dickson, Charles Scott
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Charrington, Spencer
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
£;

Vote 8.

Shipbuildings, Repairs, Maintenance, etc. Section III. Contract Work
6,685,500

Vote 9.

Naval Armaments
3,919,700

Vote 12.

Admiralty Office
279,600

Vote 14.

Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, etc.
1,140,100

£;14,209,300

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 270; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 429.)

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Rentoul, James Alexander
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Renwick, George
Duke, Henry Edward
Keswick, William
Rickett, J. Compton
Durning Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)

Elibank, Master of
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Ritchle, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Emmott, Alfred
Lawson, John Grant
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Legge, Col. Hon Heneage
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manch'r
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Ropner, Col. Robert
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Round, James
Finch, George H.
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Finlay, Sir Rbt. Bannatyne
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Rutherford, John
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Fisher, William Hayes
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Fison, Frederick William
Lowe, Francis William
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Flower, Ernest
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Forster, Henry William
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond Univ.
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)

Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Macdona, John Cumming
Sharpe, Wm. Edward T.
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Gardner, Ernest
Maconochie, A. W.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Garfit, William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Smith, H. C. (N'rthmb. Tyneside)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Cordon, Maj. Evans (T'rH'mlets)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon. W. F.
Soares, Ernest J.
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Spear, John Ward
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Line)
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.

Greville, Hon. Ronald
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Groves, James Grimble
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Strutt, Hn. Chas Hedley
Morrell, George Herbert
Sturt, Hn. Humphry Napier
Hain, Edward
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hall, Edward Marshall
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Tennant, Harold John
Hambro, Charles Eric
Mount, William Arthur
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Muntz, Philip A.
Thornton, Percy M.
Hamilton, Marq. of (Londnderry
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Tollemache, Henry James
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Myers, William Henry
Tritton, Chas. Ernest
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Norman, Henry
Ure, Alexander
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Valentia, Viscount
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
O'Neill, Hon. Robt. Torrens
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Heaton, John Henniker

Henderson, Alexander
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Parker, Gilbert
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Hogg, Lindsay
Partington, Oswald
Webb, Col. William George
Holland, William Henry
Paulton, James Mellor
Weir, James Galloway
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Pemberton, John S. G.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und-Lyne
Horniman, Frederick John
Penn, John
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Hoult, Joseph
Pierpoint, Robert
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Wills, Sir Frederick
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Plummer, Walter R.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestershire N.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Purvis, Robert
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
Jackson, Rt. Hn. Wm. Lawies
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Randles, John S.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Johnston, William (Belfast)

Rankin, Sir James
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Jones, David Brynm'r (Swansea)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Remnant, James Farquharson
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Hammond, John
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Ambrose, Robert
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Asher, Alexander
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Dowd, John
Bell, Richard
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Boland, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.)
Boyle, James
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William
Broadhurst, Henry
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Mara, James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Lambert, George
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Burns, John
Leamy, Edmund
O'Shee, James John
Caine, William Sproston
Levy, Maurice
Pirie, Duncan V.
Campbell, John (Amagh, S.)
Lundon, W.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Carvill, Patrick Geo Hamilton
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Reddy, M.

Clancy, John Joseph
 MacNeill, John Cordon Swift
 Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
 Cogan, Dennis J.
 M'Dermott, Patrick
 Redmond, William (Clare)
 Condon, Thomas Joseph
 M'Fadden, Edward
 Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
 Crean, Eugene
 M'Govern, T.
 Sullivan, Donal
 Cullinan, J.
 Mansfield, Horace Rendall
 Taylor, Theodore Cooke
 Daly, James
 Moss, Samuel
 Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
 Delany, William
 Murnaghan, George
 White, Luke (York, E. R.)
 Dillon, John
 Murphy, John
 White, Patrick (Meath, North)
 Doogan, P. C.
 Nannetti, Joseph P.
 Whiteley, George (Yorks, W. R.)
 Duffy, William J.
 Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
 Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
 Field, William
 Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
 Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
 Flavin, Michael Joseph
 O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
 Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks, W. R.)
 Flynn, James Christopher
 O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmond and Captain Donelan.
 Gilhooly, James
 O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
 Griffith, Ellis J.
 O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
 ARMY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.
 10. Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £44,988,600, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of

payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for Expenditure in respect of the following Army Services, viz.:

£;

Vote 2.

Medical Establishment, Pay, etc.

1,088,600

Vote 3.

Militia: Pay, Bounty, etc.

2,662,000

Vote 4.

Yeomanry Cavalry, Pay and Allowances

375,000

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. E.

Brand, Hon. Arthur G.

Coghill, Douglas Harry

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Brassey, Albert

Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Brigg, John

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Brown, Alex. H. (Shropsh.)

Colville, John

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Bull, William James

Compton, Lord Alwyne

Arrol, Sir William

Bullard, Sir Harry

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Burdett-Coutts, W.

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Butcher, John George

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge

Balcarres, Lord

Caldwell, James

Cranborne, Viscount

Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J (Manch'r

Carlile, William Walter

Crombie, John William

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.

Crossley, Sir Savile

Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds.)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Dalziel, James Henry
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Banbury, Frederick George
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J (Birm.
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worcr
Dickson, Charles Scott
Bignold, Arthur
Chapman, Edward
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Bigwood James
Charrington, Spencer
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Bill, Charles
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Blundell, Col. Henry
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Duke, Henry Edward
£;

Vote 5.

Volunteer Corps, Pay and Allowances
1,230,000

Vote 7.

Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies
18,782,000

Vote 8.

Clothing Establishments and Services
4,825,000

Vote 9.

Warlike and other Stores: Supply and Repair
13,450,000

Vote 13.

War Office: Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges

305,000

Vote 14.

Non-Effective Charges for Offices, etc.

2,271,000

£;44,988,600

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 264; Noes, 81. (Division List No. 430.)

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Lawrence, Wm. E. (Liverpool)

Rickett, J. Compton

Elibank, Master of

Lawson, John Grant

Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge

Emmott, Alfred

Layland-Barratt, Francis

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green

Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone

Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareham

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas Thomson

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward

Leigh, Sir Joseph

Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)

Forgusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Roe, Sir Thomas

Finch, George H.

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Firbank, Joseph Thomas

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.

Round, James

Fisher, William Hayes

Lowe, Francis William

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Fison, Frederick William

Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)

Rutherford, John

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

Lloyd, Archie Kirkman

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Flower, Ernest
Lucas Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Forster, Henry William
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Macdona, John Cumming
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Gardner, Ernest
Maconochie, A. W.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Garfit, William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Majendie, James A. H.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Gordon, Maj. Evans- (T'rH'ml'ts
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Gore, Hn. G. R C Ormsby- (Salop)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby (Linc.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Smith, Hon. W. E. D. (Strand)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Soares, Ernest J.

Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Spear, John Ward
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Groves, James Grimble
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Stanley, Edward Jas (Somerset)
Hain, Edward
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Morrell, George Herbert
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hambro, Charles Eric
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Hamilton, Marq of (L'ndonderry
Mount, William Arthur
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Muntz, Philip A.
Tennant, Harold John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks, W. R.)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Thornton, Percy M.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Myers, William Henry
Tollemache, Henry James
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.

Norman, Henry
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Heath, Arthur Howard Hanley
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Ure, Alexander
Heaton, John Henniker
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Valentia, Viscount
Henderson, Alexander
Parker, Gilbert
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Partington, Oswald
Walker, Col. William Hall
Hogg, Lindsay
Paulton, James Mellor
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Holland, William Henry
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Webb, Colonel William George
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside
Pemberton, John S. G.
Weir, James Golloway
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Penn, John
Welby, Sir Charles G. E (Notts.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Pierpoint, Robert
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Hoult, Joseph
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Houston, Robert Paterson
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Hummer, Walter R.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Hozier, Hn. Jas. Henry Cecil
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Wilson, J. W. (Worcestershire, N
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Purvis, Robert
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Randles, John S.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersfi'd
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Rankin, Sir James
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Rasch, Major Frederick Carne
Jones, David Brynm'r (Swansea
Reid, James (Greenock)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Remnant, James Farquharson
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Keswick, William
Rentoul, James Alexander
Law, Andrew Bonar
Renwick, George
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.
Boyle, James
Ambrose, Robert
Bell, Richard
Broadhurst, Henry
Asher, Alexander
Boland, John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Burns, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Dowd, John
Caine, William Sproston
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leamy, Edmund
O'Malley, William
Channing, Francis Allston

Levy, Maurice
O'Mara, James
Clancy, John Joseph
London, W.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Shee, James John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Pirie, Duncan V.
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cullinan, J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Reddy, M.
Daly, James
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Delany, William
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Redmond, William (Clare)
Dillon, John
Moss, Samuel
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Doogan, P. C.
Murnaghan, George
Sullivan, Donal
Duffy, William J.
Murphy, John
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Field, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
Whiteley, George (Yorks, W. R.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Hammond, John
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks, W. R.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

11. Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £2,884,880, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for Expenditure in respect of the following Services included

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Fisher, William Hayes
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Fison, Frederick William
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Chamberlain, Austen (Worc'r
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Chapman, Edward
Flower, Ernest
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Charrington, Spencer
Forster, Henry William
Arrol, Sir William
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Foster, Sir M. (Lond. Univ.)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Gardner, Ernest
Balcarres, Lord
Coghill, Douglas Harry

Garfit, William
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'm'ts
Banbury, Frederick George
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cox, Irwin Edward B.
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael H.
Cranborne, Viscount
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Bignold, Arthur
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Greene, Hy. D. (Shrewsbury)
Bigwood, James
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Dickson, Charles Scott
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Brassey, Albert
Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. P.
Groves, James Grimble
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Hain, Edward
Bull, William James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Bullard, Sir Harry
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Hall, Edward Marshall

Burdett-Coutts, W.
Duke, Henry Edward
Hambro, Charles Eric
Butcher, John George
Durning-Lawrence, Sir E.
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Ld. G. (Mdx.
Carlile, William Walter
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Hamilton, Marq of (L'dond'rry)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Fielden, Edwd. Brocklehurst
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Finch, George H.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Cayzer, Sir Charles W.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Heath, Arthur Howard (H'nley
in the Estimates for Revenue Departments, viz.::

£;

1.

Customs

528,300

5.

Post Office Telegraphs

2,356,580

£;2,884,880

The Committee divided::Ayes, 223; Noes, 116. (Division List No. 431.)

Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N. W.

Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Heaton, John Henniker

Moon, Edward Robert Pacy

Sadler, Col. Samuel A.

Henderson, Alexander

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)

Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles

Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter

More, Robert J. (Shropshire)

Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert

Hogg, Lindsay
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside)
Morrell, George Herbert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Morris, Hon. Martin Hy. F.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Hoult, Joseph
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Houston, Robt. Paterson
Mount, William Arthur
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Muntz, Philip A.
Smith, H C (N'rth'mb., T'neside)
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Jeffreys, Arthur Fredk.
Myers, William Henry
Spear, John Ward
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Keswick, William
Parker, Gilbert
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Peel, Hon. Wm. R. Wellesley
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Lawson, John Grant

Penn, John
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pierpoint, Robert
Sturt, Hon. Humphrey Napier
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester
Leveson-Gower, Fred N. S.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Thornton, Percy M.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Plummer, Walter R.
Tollemache, Henry James
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Long, Rt Hon Walter (Bristol, S.)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Lowe, Francis William
Purvis, Robert
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Randles, John S.
Valentia, Viscount
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Rankin, Sir James
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Rasch, Maj. Frederic Carne
Walker, Col. William Hall
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Reid, James (Greenock)
Webb, Colonel William George
Macartney, Rt Hon W. G. Ellison
Remnant, James Farquharson
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts)
Macdonald, John Cumming
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Maconochie, A. W.
Renwick, George

Wills, Sir Frederick
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Wilson, Arthur S. (York, E. R.)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Majendie, James A. H.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Rolleston, Sir J. F. L.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Ropner, Col. Robert
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Round, James
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Rutherford, John
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Delany, William
Kennedy, Patrick James
Ambrose, Robert
Dillon, John
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Asher, Alexander
Donelan, Capt. A.
Leamy, Edmund
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Doogan, P. C.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Bell, Richard
Duffy, William J.
Levy, Maurice
Boland, John
Elibank, Master of
Lundon, W.
Boyle, James
Emmott, Alfred
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

Brigg, John
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Broadhurst, Henry
Field, William
M'Dermott, Patrick
Burke, E. Haviland-
Flavin, Michael Joseph
M'Fadden, Edward
Burns, John
Flynn, James Christopher
M'Govern, T.
Caine, William Sproston
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Caldwell, James
Gilhooly, James
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Moss, Samuel
Carvill, Patrick George H.
Hammond, John
Murnaghan, George
Cawley, Frederick
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Murphy, John
Channing, Francis Allston
Hayden, John Patrick
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Clancy, John Joseph
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Colville, John
Healy, Timothy Michael
Norman, Henry
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Holland, William Henry
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Crean, Eugene
Horniman, Frederick
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
Crombie, John William

Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Cullinan, J.
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Daly, James
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Dalziel, James Henry
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Joyce, Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
O'Dowd, John
Rickett, J. Compton
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Roberts, John II. (Denbighs.)
White, Luke (Yorks., E. R.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N)
Roe, Sir Thomas
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
O'Malley, William
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Whiteley, J. H. (Halifax)
O'Mara, James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
O'Shee, James John
Soares, Ernest J.
Wilson, Henry J (Yorks., W. R.)
Partington, Oswald
Sullivan, Donal
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Hudd'rsfi'd)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Thomas, David Alfred (M'rthyr)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Thomas Bayley and Mr. Taylor.

Reddy, M.

Thomson, F. W. (Yorks., W R.)

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Ure, Alexander

Question put, "That the Chairman do report these Resolutions to the House."

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Dickson, Charles Scott

Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Hudson, George Bickersteth

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Johnston, William (Belfast)

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Arrol, Sir William

Duke, Henry Edward

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

Asher, Alexander

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Keswick, William

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Followes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward

Law, Andrew Bonar

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manch'r

Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)

Balcarres, Lord

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Lawson, John Grant

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r

Finch, George H.

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds

Firbank, Joseph Thomas

Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.

Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.

Fisher, William Hayes
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Banbury, Frederick George
Fison, Frederick William
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Flower, Ernest
Lowe, Francis William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Forster, Henry William
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Bignold, Arthur
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Bigwood, James
Gardner, Ernest
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Garfit, William
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Brassey, Albert
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Macdona, John Cumming
Bull, William James
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South)
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'mlets)
Maconochie, A. W.
Lurdett-Coutts, W.
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Butcher, John George
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Carlile, William Walter
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Goulding, Edward Alfred

Majendie, James A. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Groves, James Grimble
Middlemore, John T.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hain, Edward
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Hall, Edward Marshall
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Chapman, Edward
Hambro, Charles Eric
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Charrington, Spencer
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Morrell, George Herbert
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Mount, William Arthur
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Muntz, Philip A.

Corville, John
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Heaton, John Henniker
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Henderson, Alexander
Myers, William Henry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Cranborne, Viscount
Hogg, Lindsay
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Crossley, Sir Savile
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Parker, Gilbert
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Hoult, Joseph
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Pemberton, John S. G.
The Committee divided::;Ayes, 224; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 432.)
Perm, John
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Pierpoint, Robert
Round, James
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Pirie, Duncan V.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Thornton, Percy M.
Plummer, Walter R.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Tollemache, Henry James

Pretyman, Ernest George
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Purvis, Robert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Valentia, Viscount
Randles, John S.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Walker, Col. William Hall
Rankin, Sir James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Webb, Col. William George
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Rentoul, James Alexander
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Renwick, George
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Smith, Hon. W. F. (Strand)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Spear, John Ward
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur) Ormskirk)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Ambrose, Robert
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Bell, Richard
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Dowd, John
Boland, John
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Boyle, James
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Brigg, John
Hutton, Alfred F. (Morley)
O'Malley, William
Broadhrst, Henry
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Mara, James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Burns, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Shee, James John
Caine, William Sproston
Joyce, Michael
Partington, Oswald
Caldwell, James
Kennedy, Patrick James
Power, Patrick Joseph
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Reddy, M.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leamy, Edmund
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Cawley, Frederick

Leigh, Sir Joseph
Redmond, William (Clare)
Channing, Francis Allston
Levy, Maurice
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Soares, Ernest J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Sullivan, Donal
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Cullinan, J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Daly, James
M'Govern, T.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Dalziel, James Henry
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks., W. R.)
Delany, William
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Ure, Alexander
Dillon, John
Moss, Samuel
White, Luke (Yorks., E. R.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Murnaghan, George
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Doogan, P. C.
Murphy, John
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Duffy, William J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Elibank, Master of
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Emmott, Alfred
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks., W. R.
Field, William
Norman, Henry
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Hudd'rsfi'd
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Courtenay Warner.
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Hammond, John
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Resolutions to be reported to-morrow.
NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1899–1900.
Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, and the statement appended thereto, as follows, viz.;;
(a) That the gross expenditure for certain Navy Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £;1,151,718 11s. 2d., as shown in Column No. 1 of the Schedule hereto appended; while the gross expenditure for other Navy Services fell short of the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £;1,749,812 15s. 2d., as shown in Column No. 2 of the said appended Schedule, so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Navy Services fell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £;598,094 4s.;

(b) That the total actual receipts in aid of the Grants for Navy Services exceeded the total estimated receipts by the sum of £;205,185 6s. (id., as shown in Column No. 4 of the said appended Schedule;

(c) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.;;

£;

s.

d.

Total Surpluses

1,793,043

11

2

Total Deficits

929,764

0

8

Net Surplus

£803,279

10

6

And whereas the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge on Exchequer Grants for certain Navy Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the estimated Appropriations-in-Aid, in respect of the same Services; and have also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services."

Motion made, and Question Proposed, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned.";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) moved to report progress. He said the Committee had been engaged during the night in the performance of a work which it had never in the whole course of its long history been called upon to perform before. Without one word of comment or discussion the Committee had voted sixty-seven millions of public money, and he thought that the scandal would be still further increased if the First Lord of the Treasury forced other business on the Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report progress; and ask leave to sit again.";(Mr. John Redmond.)

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I hope the hon. Gentleman will not persist in his motion. The subject which the Committee is now asked to deal with is of a purely formal character, and as far as I know has never been discussed before. It is absolutely necessary to pass this resolution in order that we may get on with our financial business before we proceed to enjoy our well-earned holiday. I hope the hon. Gentleman will not persist in his motion.

MR. DILLON said he hoped his hon. friend would persist in his motion. The honourable understanding on which the Supply rule rested was that no other business should be taken on an allotted day, and he would respectfully urge on the right hon. Gentleman that to submit the resolution under the circumstances was a breach of that understanding. If the whole of an allotted day were not devoted to Supply, and if other business were taken, then it ceased to be an allotted day. That had been recognised by the right hon. Gentleman himself, for on one occasion when a Bill was taken after Supply on an allotted day the right hon. Gentleman stated that it was taken through an oversight when he was not present, and that it would not be allowed to occur again. The understanding, which affected the convenience of many hon. members, was that an allotted day should be devoted to Supply and to Supply alone, and to take other business at that hour of the morning was a complete breach of that understanding. It might be urged that that understanding ceased when the 12 o'clock rule was suspended, but it could not be contended that on an ordinary allotted day the right hon. Gentleman would be entitled to move to report progress at 11 p.m. in order to consider other business. Was there an alteration when the 12 o'clock rule was suspended? He said not, because when the 12 o'clock rule was suspended it did

not alter the spirit of the application of the Supply rule, and if the Committee sat until 5 a.m. it would still be one sitting, and on all fours with an ordinary sitting concluding at 12 o'clock. Therefore, the consideration of other business on an allotted day was a distinct breach of the understanding on which the Supply rule was based. That was a strong and unanswerable argument against taking any further business that night, but even if it did not exist, surely the argument of his hon. friend the Member for Waterford was one of great force. Hon. members had been travelling through the division lobbies for several hours, mainly in a silly procession. It was said that that was the fault of the Irish members, but it was not. It was the fault of the Government, who acted in a most preposterous manner in lumping together Supply without any logical arrangement.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is now discussing the resolution passed yesterday. He cannot go back to that.

MR. DILLON said he would not proceed in that argument further, but he would urge that the proceedings of the last three and a quarter hours were the fault of the Government, and that, therefore, they were entitled to demand from the Government after such a performance that business should be now interrupted, and that hon. members should be allowed to retire to their beds. He thought that claim was increased by the fact that the whole proceedings of the House of Commons had been turned into ridicule in order to allow hon. members to be at Blenheim on Saturday. If that were a sufficient excuse for turning the House of Commons into a laughing stock, and revolutionising the principles on which its business had been conducted for 200 years, surely hon. members who were not going to Blenheim were entitled to some consideration. It was most irrational for the Government to ask the Committee to consider further business that night. The First Lord of the Treasury made the astounding statement that the resolution was purely formal. If the right hon. Gentleman persisted he hoped to be able to convince him in the course of a somewhat prolonged discussion that that statement was not accurate. An amount of laxity in framing the Estimates had been shown, and could not be permitted to pass without discussion. The right hon. Gentleman also said that the resolution had never been discussed before, but he remembered discussing it himself, and if it were persisted in he would have to discuss it again. Hon. members were now in a far more fit state of mind to go home and rest than to enter upon a complicated discussion of the Estimates.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs) said he thought the reasons given by his hon. friends for reporting progress were unanswerable. There was another reason, and that was that the First Lord of the Treasury stated that no important business would be taken after Supply. The right hon. Gentleman stated that the resolution was formal, but he differed from the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It has been treated as formal for generations.

MR. DALZIEL said that respect had not been shown for what had been done for generations in other and more important matters. In his experience never had a resolution been proposed which showed such laxity in the preparation of the Estimates. Over a million sterling more than was anticipated had been expended;

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is now discussing the resolution.

MR. DALZIEL said he was merely indicating how necessary it was to report progress in order that the resolution might be fully considered on another occasion. How long did the right hon. Gentleman intend to ask the Committee to sit? Hon. members were all anxious not to interfere with the general understanding as to the date of the adjournment, but after walking through the division lobbies for several hours he thought they were entitled to a rest. If that resolution were passed, would the right hon. Gentleman proceed to other business? Was there any other department which had spent a million too much in one direction and a million too little in another? Certainly on previous occasions when Supply was discussed no other business was taken. The procedure now proposed was entirely new, and he would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman as to whether there was not some respect due to the Opposition and to the House of Commons. The right hon. Gentleman had done very well, and would not lose anything by falling in with the suggestion of his hon. friend.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said that if it were necessary to pass the resolution in order to be able to introduce the Appropriation Bill, that it would be perfectly easy to do so by having a Saturday sitting. He had been in the House for sixteen years, and had seen Saturday sittings again and again towards the end of the session for exactly this purpose, and there was no reason why they should not have one that week, except the reason referred to by the hon. Member for East Mayo. Hon. members had been deprived of their rest, and the House had been driven in a most despotic manner, in order to give the right hon. Gentleman and his friends a pleasant holiday on Saturday. Ordinary parliamentary procedure had been put aside, and the most serious interference made with their constitutional rights by a complete changed procedure for no real reason except this, and it was discreditable and an outrage on the House of Commons that its rights and privileges should thus be ignored, and that it should thus be driven as it was, with a lash.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said that although the resolution in previous years had been formal, that year it was not quite so formal. In past years the Treasury always protected the interests of Parliament by not allowing anything which was not in accordance with constitutional practice, but this year the Public Accounts Committee had reported that, while acknowledging the payments were necessary under existing circumstances, they considered that in future they should have parliamentary sanction, and that provision should be made for that purpose. For that and other reasons the resolution was now more important than ever it had been before, and therefore required more discussion. Accordingly its consideration should be postponed.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said that the suggestion that the resolution should be postponed was a reasonable one. They had been told by the First Lord of the Treasury that the business for that night would be the voting of Supply. Supply had been voted after thirteen divisions had been taken, and surely under the circumstances the right hon. Gentleman ought to agree to adjourn. He would suggest very respectfully to the right hon. Gentleman that if the resolution

could not be taken on Friday they should have a Saturday sitting for the purpose of passing it. It was most inconvenient not to have a Saturday sitting, which would obviate hon. members being kept up to any hour every night. Could the right hon. Gentleman give any valid or reasonable explanation why at this period of the session the House should not be called upon to sit next Saturday and the following Saturday? It would be much more convenient to have a Saturday sitting than to have prolonged sittings night after night. He submitted that hon. members should abandon their week-end trips, and have a Saturday sitting to transact the business which it was sought to take that night. Why should there not be a Saturday sitting? He had heard it suggested, but he could hardly believe it, that most of the Cabinet Ministers had arranged to go down to Oxford on Saturday to be entertained by a certain nobleman in the neighbourhood of that town. He was, however, sure that that entertainment would not be permitted by such a businesslike Government to stand between the House of Commons and the transaction of business at that late period of the session. He did not believe that an engagement of that kind would prevent the First Lord of the Treasury, who attended so constantly to his business, having a Saturday sitting to complete the work of the session. He had heard a story; he did not know what credence should be given to it; with reference to the proposed alternative of a Saturday sitting. It was to the effect that there had been a division in the Cabinet on the question, and that the First Lord of the Treasury said he was quite prepared to have a Saturday sitting, and to forego the pleasure of being entertained at Blenheim, but that the Colonial Secretary declared that he would not allow anything to stand between him and the opportunity of being entertained by a real live duke, which the First Lord of the Treasury might have been used to all his life, but which he was not. He most earnestly protested against hon. members who were prepared to do their duty and to transact business being kept up all night and refused a Saturday sitting in order that the Colonial Secretary might be enabled to hob-nob with a duke.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
 Gardner, Ernest
 More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
 Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
 Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
 Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow)
 Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
 Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
 Morrell, George Herbert
 Arkwright, John Stanhope
 Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
 Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
 Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
 Gordon, Maj Evans (Troms)
 Mount, William Arthur

Arrol, Sir William
Gore, Hn. G. R. C Ormsby- (Salop
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Groves, James Grimble
Pemberton, John S. G.
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Pierpoint, Robert
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Plummer, Walter R.
Bignold, Arthur
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Pretymann, Ernest George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Brassey, Albert
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Purvis, Robert
Bull, William James
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Randles, John S.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Heaton, John Henniker
Rankin, Sir James
Burdett-Coutts, W.

Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Reid, James (Greenock)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Remnant, James Farquharson
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightsd.)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Renwick, George
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hoult, Joseph
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wor'cr)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Chapman, Edward
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Charrington, Spencer
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Keswick, William
Round, James
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Law, Andrew Bonar
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Lawrence, Wm, F. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Cranborne, Viscount
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Crossley, Sir Savile
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Davenport, William Bromley-
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Dickson, Charles Scott
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Duke, Henry Edward
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Macdona, John Cumming
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Maconochie, A. W.
Spear, John Ward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk-
Finch, George H.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Majendie, James A. H.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.

Fisher, William Hayes
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Fison, Frederick William
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Flower, Ernest
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Thornton, Percy M.
Forster, Henry William
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Tollemache, Henry James
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
MR. FLYNN rose to speak, when.
MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."
Question put, "That the Question be now put."
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 180; Noes, 92. (Division List No. 433.)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Valentia, Viscount
Wills, Sir Frederick
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Webb, Colonel William George
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Hammond, John
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Ambrose, Robert
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Asher, Alexander
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Dowd, John

Boland, John
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Boyle, James
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Brigg, John
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Malley, William
Broadhurst, Henry
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
O'Mara, James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Burns, John
Joyce, Michael
O'Shee, James John
Caldwell, James
Kennedy, Patrick James
Partington, Oswald
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edmund
Power, Patrick Joseph
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Reddy, M.
Channing, Francis Allston
Levy, Maurice
Redmond, John E (Waterford
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Colville, John
Mac Neill, John Gordon Swift
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sullivan, Donal
Crean, Eugene
M'Fadden, Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Cullinan, J.

M'Govern, T.
Thomas David Alfred (Merthyr)
Daly, James
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Thompson, Dr. E. C (Mon'ghn, N
Dalziel, James Henry
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Moss, Samuel
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Delany, William
Murnaghan, George
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Dillon, John
Murphy, John
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Doogan, P. C.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Williams, Osmond) Merioneth)
Field, William
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES.; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W)
Question put accordingly. "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave
to sit again."
AYES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Murphy, John
Ambrose, Robert
Flynn, James Christopher
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Asher, Alexander
Gilhooly, James

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Griffith, Ellis, J.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Boland, John
Hammond, John
O' Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Boyle, James
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, P. (Kilkenny)
Brigg, John
Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale-
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Broadhurst, Henry
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.).
Burke, E. Haviland-
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Burns, John
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Caldwell, James
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jones, W. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Dowd, John
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Clancy, John Joseph
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Malley, William
Cogan, Denis J.
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Colville, John
Leigh, Sir Joseph
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Levy, Maurice
O'Shee, James John

Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
Partington, Oswald
Cullinan, J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Daly, James
M'Neill, John Gordon Swift
Reddy, M.
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Dermott, Patrick
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, William (Clare)
Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Dillon, John
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Doogan, P. C.
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Duffy, William J.
Moss, Samuel
Sullivan, Donal
Field, William
Murnaghan, George
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 93; Noes, 176. (Division List No. 434.)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson, Henry J. (York's., W. R.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
White, Luke (Yorks., E. R.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex F.
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Palmer, Waiter (Salisbury)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Pemberton, John S. G.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Pierpoint, Robert
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Arrol, Sir William
Groves, James Grimble
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Hambro, Charles Eric
Plummer, Walter R.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Pretymann, Ernest George
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Bryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Purvis, Robert
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Randles, John S.
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Rankin, Sir James
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Reid, James (Greenock)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Bignold, Arthur
Heaton, John Henniker
Rentoul, James Alexander
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Renwick, George
Brassey, Albert
Hogg, Lindsay

Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Bull, William James
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Hoult, Joseph
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Round, James
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Sackville, Col. S. G Stopford-
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Keswick, William
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Chapman, Edward
Law, Andrew Bonar
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Charrington, Spencer
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Lawson, John Grant
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Seaton-Karr, Henry
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Cranborne, Viscount
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Smith, H. C. (North'mb Tyneside
Crossley, Sir Savile
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Davenport, William Bromley-
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Spear, John Ward
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Macdona, John Cumming
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Maconochie, A. W.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Duke, Henry Edward
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Majendie, James A. H.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Thornton, Percy M.
Finch, George H.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Tomlinson, Wm. Ed. Murray
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Melville, Beresford Valentine
 Tufnell, Lieut-Col. Edward
 Firbank, Joseph Thomas
 Mildmay, Francis Bingham
 Valentia, Viscount
 Fisher, William Hayes
 Molesworth, Sir Lewis
 Walker, Col. William Hall
 Fison, Frederick William
 Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
 Webb, Colonel William George
 Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
 Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
 Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
 Flower, Ernest
 More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
 Wills, Sir Frederick
 Forster, Henry William
 Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow)
 Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
 Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)
 Morrell, George Herbert
 Wilson, J. W. (Worcestershire N)
 Gardner, Ernest
 Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
 Mount, William Arthur
 Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
 Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute)
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
 Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
 Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
 Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'mlets)
 Nicol, Donald Ninian

Original Question again proposed.

MR. DALZIEL said this was a very important matter, which required some explanation. He hoped the Secretary to the Treasury would be able to explain. It seemed to him that they had got to a state of things when it was almost useless having any Estimates prepared at all. He hoped they would get an assurance that greater care would be taken in future.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, N.) said the First Lord of the Treasury had stated that the resolution was purely formal. The First Lord with his big battalions could carry any resolution he might introduce, but that was the only reason he could adduce to prove that this was purely formal. He had a number of objections to the resolution. The whole of the schedule to which the resolution alluded showed

the gross carelessness with which the Estimates had been prepared, He could not understand how, under Sub-section 3 relating to contract work, there had been a miscalculation amounting to £;1,489,405. The resolution now before the Committee proposed that certain amounts of money should be deviated to purposes other than those for which they were originally voted, and the First Lord said this was a purely formal matter. As an example of what was going on, he quoted a passage from the Report of the Public Accounts Committee with regard to the taking over of the Nelson Monument at Portsmouth by the Admiralty from the War Office. The contract for re-building the monument amounted to £;1,091, but the contractors proved that the actual cost was £;1,411, and the Admiralty applied to the Treasury for leave to pay the excess. The Treasury acceded to the application on the ground that the work was exceptional, and that it was impossible to make an accurate estimate before the work was commenced. That one small matter ought to be enough to awaken suspicion with regard to the larger matters with which this resolution dealt. The Public Accounts Committee stated in their Report that they were of opinion that such deviations should only be allowed by the Treasury when the circumstances were very exceptional, and that this case must in no way be taken as a precedent. He submitted that the resolution now before the Committee was simply an Act of Indemnity for Ministers who had allowed money to be applied to purposes for which it was not voted. If money which was voted for one service could be applied to others, it showed that the House was consistently and continuously presented with Estimates which were false. They could easily be made more accurate if trouble was taken. On martial law over £;2,600 had been spent

beyond what was estimated, and the manner in which various other items had been expended certainly required some explanation. With reference to contracts, he desired to know how much had been spent in Government shipyards. Of course the Committee knew very well that contractors could turn out ships quite as good, if not better, than the ships turned out in the Royal shipyards, and certainly much cheaper. The Committee would like to know why £;809,951 had been diverted by the permanent officials into yards controlled by themselves instead of being expended on contracts in the ordinary way. Last year the amount diverted was £;749,000, and the year before £;1,084,000. The Department could have enforced penalties for the non-execution of work, but they only imposed £;350 altogether, and he believed that that amount had been afterwards returned. The Committee was dealing with enormous sums of money, over which the House of Commons had no control, and it was giving enormous power to the Treasury to have absolute control of over three millions of money. The First Lord of the Treasury had suggested that that was a formal matter, but at any rate he felt very keenly about it. The House of Commons was losing its control over money matters, and whenever a similar resolution was brought forward he would not hesitate to discuss it. He proposed to omit the following words;

"That the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge on Exchequer Grants for certain Navy Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the estimated Appropriations-in-Aid, in respect of the same Services; and have also

temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services."

*THE CHAIRMAN: The only question I have to put is, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned." What the hon. Member proposes to omit is merely a recital.

MR. O'MARA said he would move, instead, that £100,000 be substituted for the net surplus. It was ridiculous that, having spent twenty-two days in discussing Supply last session, the views of the officials should now be brought forward for the acceptance of hon. members.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) said that the hon. Member who first spoke complained that the figures before the Committee showed great inaccuracies in the Estimates made by the Admiralty some two years ago. He would ask the Committee to remember that both the Admiralty and the War Office had to forecast the needs of a particular year long in advance of the year itself. Several of the Estimates were dependent on requirements which had to be learned from foreign stations, and they had to be drawn up a long time in advance. When hon. members considered that the Estimates were framed three and sometimes six months before the commencement of the financial year, it was not unnatural that there should be a divergence between what was estimated and what was required. Although the divergencies were large, were they improperly large having regard to the total of Votes, which amounted to twenty-seven and a half millions? The excess of actual over gross expenditure amounted to something under 4 per cent., which was not very high considering the difficulties under which the Estimates were framed.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: They are nearly all in one item.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That was mainly due to the failure of the contractors to carry out the estimates framed, he thought by themselves, as to the amount of work they could turn out within a year, and also because the Admiralty were unable to put out certain orders as early as they expected, because the designs of the ships were not ready. The Admiralty found that they could make greater progress in their own yards, and they accordingly asked the Treasury to sanction the authorisation of some of the money which could not be spent for the purpose for which it was voted. They heard a great deal of dealing in affairs in a businesslike way, and the manner in which those matters were treated was nothing but businesslike. The hon. Member for South Kilkenny asked for details of the items, but he did not think he would be justified in occupying the time of the Committee

in giving them. The hon. member founded his request partly on the allegation that the action of the Treasury was illegal. That was a misapprehension.

Parliament had decided with regard to the Navy and the Army, if there was a surplus on certain Votes and a deficit on others, that the Treasury should have power to sanction the authorisation of the surplus for the purpose of meeting the deficit, always provided that the total sum voted by the House was not exceeded. Parliament had given the Treasury the right to exercise its discretion in connection with expenditure in the Navy and the Army, and if the hon. member wished to learn how that discretion had been exercised, he would find it set out

in full in the Appropriation Accounts which were annually laid before Parliament. Those accounts had been examined with very great care by the Public Accounts Committee, and he thought it would not be reasonable to ask the Committee to go into details in a resolution of that kind, which it had been customary for a long time to regard as non-contentious.

MR. DILLON said he had no intention of going into the details which had been already dealt with by his hon. friend the member for South Kilkenny, but he wished again to protest against the position taken up by the First Lord of the Treasury. He was perfectly well aware that it was competent for the Treasury in connection with Votes for the Army and Navy to sanction the application of money voted for one purpose to another purpose, but the very fact that it was necessary to pass that resolution showed that it was not a formal matter. If it were a formal matter the action of the Treasury would be left unchecked, and there would be no need for the resolution at all. He was also aware that there was a very full explanation in the Appropriation Accounts with reference to the matter, but it did not follow that because Parliament gave the Treasury certain power that the Treasury should be at liberty to play fast and loose with the Army and Navy Votes. That would be an absolute absurdity. The sums which had been overspent and underspent were enormous, and the manner in which the Treasury had acted was calculated to set at nought the decisions of Parliament. There were two other points on which he grounded his claim to discuss the resolution. First of all, the miscalculation of the Admiralty in matters not connected with foreign stations had been enormous. It was preposterous that there should be an excess of £;245,366 for victualling and clothing for the Navy. The number of men and boys in the Navy was well known, and not a man or boy more than the number voted could be borne. Why, then, should there have been such an enormous excess? He thought that some better explanation than that offered by the Secretary to the Treasury should be given. He observed that there was growing up a most objectionable and vicious practice of grabbing money voted for one purpose and transferring it to another purpose, instead of bringing up a Supplementary Estimate in the ordinary way. That was entirely indefensible. The First Lord of the Treasury had bottled up hon. members. Nearly 100 Votes had been passed without their being allowed to open their mouths, but, as long as human nature remained what it was, discussion would burst out in

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers

Hope, J. E. (Shef'd, Brightside

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Hornby, Sir William Henry

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Duke, Henry Edward

Hoult, Joseph

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Arrol, Sir William
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Finch, George H.
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Keswick, William
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Fisher, William Hayes
Lawson, John Grant
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Fison, Frederick William
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Bentinck, Lord Henry
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Bignold, Arthur
Flower, Ernest
Leveson-Gower, F. N. S.
Blundell, Colonel Henry C.
Forster, Henry William
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine
Brassey, Albert
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Gardner, Ernest
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Godson, Sir A. Frederick
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn

Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Gordon, Maj. Evans- (T'rH'mts
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Macdona, John Cumming
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Goschen, Hon. G. Joachim
Maconochie, A. W.
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Chapman, Edward
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Charrington, Spencer
Greville, Hon. Ronald
M'Killop, J. (Stirlingshire)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Groves, James Grimble
Majendie, James A. H.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hambro, Charles Eric
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. Wm.
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Corbett, T. L. (Down, N.)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Cranborne, Viscount
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Crossley, Sir Savile
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Davenport, William Bromley-
Heath, J. (Staffords., N. W.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire

Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Heaton, John Henniker
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter
Morrell, George Herbert

another direction. If they were not to be allowed to discuss Supply in an ordinary and proper manner, they would be forced to discuss it whenever opportunity offered. Hon. members would devise novel methods for discussion if their ordinary opportunities were cut off. There was only one way to put an end to discussion on those matters, and that was to do what was done in Germany, namely, to vote three or four years Supply and adjourn Parliament for that period. So long as the House of Commons was called together for the purpose of criticising the Government, so long would some means of discussion be discovered by ingenious members, and no rules could prevent that. Those were the grounds on which he objected to the resolution being taken.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 163; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 435.)

Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Mount, William Arthur
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thompson
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Round, James
Thornton, Percy M.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Pemberton, John S. G.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Tufnell, Lieut.-Colonel Edward
Pierpoint, Robert
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Valentia, Viscount
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Walker, Col. William Hall
Plummer, Walter R.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Webb, Colonel William George
Pretymann, Ernest George
Seton-Karr, Henry
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks. E. R).
Purvis, Robert
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N).
Randles, John S.
Smith, H. C. (N'rth'mb. Tyneside
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Rankin, Sir James
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Spear, John Ward
Renwick, George
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ambrose, Robert
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Dowd, John
Asher, Alexander
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Boland, John
Jordon, Jeremiah
O'Malley, William

Boyle, James
Joyce, Michael
O'Mara, James
Burns, John
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Caldwell, James
Leamy, Edmund
O'Shee, James John
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Power, Patrick Joseph
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Levy, Maurice
Reddy, M.
Channing, Francis Allston
Lundon, W.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Clancy, John Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Fadden, Edward
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Crean, Eugene
M'Govern, T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Cullinan, J.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Sullivan, Donal
Daly, James
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Dalziel, James Henry
Moss, Samuel
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Murnaghan, George
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N
Delany, William
Murphy, John
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Dillon, John

Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Duffy, William J.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks, W. R.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Hammond, John
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Original Question put accordingly, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

MR. O'MARA said that he had moved an Amendment to substitute £;100,000.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member stated he was going to move that Amendment, AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch).
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Bignold, Arthur
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Arrol, Sir William
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Chapman, Edward

Asher, Alexander
Brassey, Albert
Charrington, Spencer
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bullard, Sir Harry
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
but he did not conclude his speech by moving it. Even if he had, I would not
have accepted it, because he did not indicate what items amounting to £;100,000
should be sanctioned.
The Committee divided;:Ayes, 167; Noes, 80. (Division List No. 436.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Purvis, Robert
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Randles, John S.
Cranborne, Viscount
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Rankin, Sir James
Crossley, Sir Savile
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Davenport, William Bromley-
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Remnant, James Farquharson
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Keswick, William
Renwick, George
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Ridley, Hn M. W. (Stalybridge)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lawson, John Grant
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Legge, Colonel Hon. Heneage
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas Thomson
Duke, Henry Edward
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Robertson, Herbt. (Hackney)

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Ropner, Col. Robert
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Round, James
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Finch, George H.
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Fisher, William Hayes
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Fison, Frederick William
Macdona, John Cumming
Seton-Karr, Henry
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
Maconochie, A. W.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Flower, Ernest
M'Arthur, Charles J (Liverpool)
Smith, A. H. (Hertford, East)
Forster, Henry William
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Smith, H C (N'th'mb., Tyneside)
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Gardner, Ernest
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Spear, John Ward
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn

Melville, Beresford Valentine
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Gordon, Maj. E.- (Tow'rH'ml'ts
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Gore, Hn G R C. Ormsby- (Salop.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Goschen, George Joachim
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Goulding, Edward Alfred
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Morrell, George Herbert
Thornton, Percy M.
Groves, James Grimble
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Hambro, Charles Eric
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Hamilton, Rt Hon Lord G (M'd'x
Mount, William Arthur
Valentia, Viscount
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Walker, Col. Wm. Hall
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Webb, Colonel William George
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Pemberton, John S. G.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Pierpoint, Robert
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Hermon-Hodge, Rbt. Trotter
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Hope, J. F. (Sheffi'ld, Brightside
Plummer, Walter R.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Pretymann, Ernest George
Hoult, Joseph
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Ambrose, Robert
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Boland, John
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Boyle, James
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Burns, John
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Caldwell, James
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Dowd, John
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Kennedy, Patrick James

O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
O'Malley, William
Cogan, Denis J.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
O'Mara, James
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Levy, Maurice
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
O'Shee, James John
Cullinan, J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Daly, James
M'Dermott, Patrick
Reddy, M.
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Delany, William
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Roberts, John H. (Denbighsh.
Dillon, John
Moss, Samuel
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Doogan, P. C.
Murnaghan, George
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Duffy, William J
Murphy, John
Sullivan, Donal
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Gilhooly, James
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.

White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)

Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)

White, Patrick (Meath, North

Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks, W. R.)

1. Resolved, That the application of such sums be sanctioned.

SCHEDULE.

Number of Vote.

Navy Services, 1899–1900. Votes.

Gross Expenditure.

Appropriations in Aid.

Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure.

Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure.

Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

1.

2.

3.

4.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

1

…

Wages, etc., of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines

;

29,559

17

0

;

5,078

14

0

2

…

Victualling and Clothing for the Navy

245,366

4

10

;

;

94,407

5

11

3

…

Medical Establishments and Services

;

29

16

11

;

1,745

7

6

4

…

Martial Law

2,601

17

8

;

;

;

40

17

2

5

…

Educational Services

;

5,001

12

6

;

395

7

3

6

…

Scientific Services

;

1,148

15
2
;
5,159
13
10
7
…
Royal Naval Reserves
42,243
13
1
;
95
3
3
8
…
Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.:
Sec. 1
…
Personnel
64,419
0
2
;
;
;
240
9
11
Sec. 2
…
Matériel
809,951
11
11
;
;
;
126,088
17
4
Sec. 3
…
Contract Work
;
1,489,405

13
5
;
315
3
3
9
…
Naval Armaments
;
124,970
1
9
;
19,413
14
9
10
…
Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and A broad
;
40,256
2
7
;
10,865
15
8
11
…
Miscellaneous Effective Services
27,140
8
7
;
;
;
1,135
0
2
12
…
Admiralty Office
;
4,499
8
8

;
10

7
13

…
Half-pay, Reserved and Retired Pay

;
808

7
5

;
17

3
6

14
…
Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances

;
10,130

5
1

;
118

17
10

15
…
Civil Pensions and Gratuities

;
1,759

1
7

;
25

4
7

16
…
Additional Naval Force for Service in Australasian Waters

42
16

0
;

;
42

0

0
 Amount written off as irrecoverable
 2,196
 12
 0
 ;
 ;
 ;
 ;
 1,151,718
 11
 2
 1,749,812
 15
 2
 ;
 265,185
 6
 6
 Net Surplus,
 £;598,094
 4
 0
 Surplus,
 £;265,185
 6
 6
 Surplus surrendered to the Exchequer
 £;863,279
 10
 6

[Mr. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) took the Chair.]

Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, and the statement appended thereto, as follows, viz.:

(a) That the gross expenditure for certain Army Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £;950,384 16s. 6d., as shown in Column No. 1 of the Schedule hereto appended; while the gross expenditure for other Army Services fell short of the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £;1,634,061 5s. 2d., as shown in Column No. 2 of the said appended Schedule; so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Army Services fell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £;683,676 8s. 8d.;

(b) That the receipts in aid of certain Army Services fell short of the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £;262,092 2s. 3d., as shown in Column No. 3 of the said appended Schedule; while the receipts in aid of other Army Services exceeded the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £;130,217 16s. 10d., as shown in Column No. 4 of the said appended Schedule; so that the total actual receipts in aid of the Grants for Army Services fell short of the total

estimated receipts by the net sum of £;131,874 5s. 5d.;

(c) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.:

£;

s.

d.

Total Surpluses

1,437,483

17

3

Total Deficits

885,681

14

0

Net Surplus

£;551,802

3

3

And whereas the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge on Exchequer Grants for certain Army Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the estimated Appropriations-in-Aid, in respect of the same Services; and have also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned.";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

MR. DILLON said the largest item in this schedule was £;491,877 for provisions, forage, and other supplies. He called attention to certain scandals in connection with the contracts for meat supplied for the Army in South Africa. He had seen a statement in the public press that the Premier of Queensland had recently returned to Brisbane after a tour in Cape Colony, and that he had stated that at the Cape the troops were paying 11d. per lb. for mutton, which could be landed on the quay at Cape Town at 3d. per lb. In these circumstances the hon. Member did not wonder at this surreptitious and backdoor method of smuggling through the contract, because it was very natural that the Government should be desirous of keeping the whole thing in the dark, and treating this resolution as a purely formal matter. The transaction took place in the year 1899, and yet in his last Report the Comptroller and Auditor General stated that he had written a letter to the War Office asking whether a refund of 2d. per lb. was sufficient, and that no reply had yet been received. What was the true inwardness of the whole of this transaction? Had the Government investigated this question in the way they investigated the question of the Hungarian horses? Fortunately they got an opportunity of raising the question of the corruption and swindling that had been going on in Hungary. Was it a fact that Australian frozen mutton was landed at Cape Town at 3d. per lb., and that the contractors

sold it to the British Government at 11d.? If that was a fact, it was monstrous, and if it was not a fact there ought to be a full explanation given why the Comptroller and Auditor General had not been able to get an answer from the War Office on this matter. The hon. Member also called attention to what was said by the Comptroller and Auditor General in regard to the saddles bought for the Rhodesian force. It appeared that saddles which cost from £;8 to £;11 were afterwards sold at 30s. a piece. That might or might not be true, but if it was true it was a scandal. The average price paid for saddles supplied to the Rhodesian force was £;4 a piece higher than the price paid by the War Office for saddles bought at the same time. He found that £;4,338 had been paid with the sanction of the Treasury for the maintenance of troops called in to aid the civil power during the South Wales coal strike. It was a monstrous thing that this sum should be smuggled through the House of Commons. A question so grave ought to have been brought forward for discussion in Committee of Supply. In regard to the War Office scandals, to which attention had been called, so long as this House had to pay somebody ought to be held responsible for the jobbery and corruption which had taken place. He protested against the doctrine that a resolution of the kind now before the Committee, which was practically a Bill of Indemnity, was to be treated as a matter of course.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the hon. Gentleman who raised a question arising out of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General seemed to have forgotten that the Report was the subject of careful investigation by the public Accounts Committee, who had made a report to the House on the various matters brought before it. The hon. Gentleman asked whether any inquiry had been made by the Government into the statements contained in the Comptroller and Auditor General's Report, and the inferences he was pleased to draw from that Report. The Report was before the Public Accounts Committee, and the examination of the Army Estimates required no small portion of the time of the Committee during the present session. He would take in turn the items which the hon. Member had mentioned. There were two connected with the Imperial Yeomanry; one regarding purchase of saddlery, and the other the engagement of a ship. When the Imperial Yeomanry was formed in the first instance the War Office, as everybody knew, was working under enormous pressure, and in the early stages the Yeomanry Committee carried out all the arrangements of the Imperial Yeomanry. In the matter of saddlery he doubted whether they could have made a much better bargain than they did. At the time the whole saddlery trade of the country was working under enormous pressure. The Government factories and private factories were at their busiest, and when additional orders had to be placed for the Yeomanry it was natural, and indeed inevitable, that they should be placed at a high price. In regard to the "Louisiana," the Yeomanry Committee undertook on behalf of the War Office the transport of the force, and that ship was chartered for the purpose. Later on it was felt to be desirable that the transport of the Yeomanry and all the other troops by sea should be in the hands of the Admiralty. That department had more experience of transport, and they did not shrink from the responsibility of sending out the Yeomanry by another

vessel, the Yeomanry Committee having from inexperience made a mistake in the matter. In regard to the payment for troops sent to South Wales to aid the civil power, the hon. Member was not aware of the circumstances. An attempt was made to recover the cost from the county rates, but the decision of the High Court was that they were not liable, and the expense had to be met by the Government. A more serious case mentioned by the hon. Gentleman had reference to the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General in regard to the contract made in South Africa just at the outbreak of the war. When he read the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General he took as serious a view as the hon. Gentleman, but he should not have ventured without further information to scatter round so freely gross charges of corruption against officers of His Majesty's Army. This matter was carefully considered by the Public Accounts Committee, and they had information before them which the Comptroller and Auditor General had not at the time he was obliged to present his Report to Parliament. The hon. Gentleman stated that the Comptroller and Auditor General had been obliged to complain to Parliament that he had been refused information by the War Office. What he said at the time he made his Report was that he had not received a reply to his letter,

but by the time he came before the Public Accounts Committee he was in possession of full information on the subject. The Committee heard the Comptroller and Auditor General and also the Accountant General of the War Office, and then at the desire of the Committee the chairman summoned the officer who made the contract, and who had in the interval returned home to England. Colonel Richardson appeared before the Committee, and they therefore had full information on the subject. What was the story? What were the facts? At the outbreak of the war they were called upon to provide supplies for very large bodies of troops in the field. It was most urgently indispensable that those supplies should be provided, and the officer's duty was not to let anything interfere with the proper supply of food for the troops. He made a contract for either fresh meat or frozen meat. Frozen meat was cheaper than fresh meat, but it could not be supplied except when the troops were close to the railway, where the refrigerating cars could be kept. If the contractors were obliged to supply not frozen meat but live meat, they would also have to supply drivers and butchers to accompany the Army in the field, and they would have to take the risk of loss, not from capture, but from the cattle being driven about with troops on the march. Owing to the long delay which took place in the advance of the troops beyond the Modder River, it was possible for the contractors to supply refrigerated meat for a long time, and in a much greater proportion than anybody had conceived possible at the time when the contract was made, and the refrigerated meat being cheaper the contractors made a much bigger profit than they expected. He would say at that point that it was not merely in the interests of the contractors to supply refrigerated meat, but also in the interests of the Army. The evidence was that the soldiers preferred it, that it was on the whole better meat, and that by supplying refrigerated instead of fresh meat the difficulty and danger of having slaughter houses in the camps and having offal to deal with in a hot climate were avoided. Therefore the supply of

refrigerated meat was in the interests of the soldiers as well as of the contractors, who, by reason of the long delay on the Modder River, were able to make profits which were not believed to be possible. The contract was air in itself, and was well understood by all concerned in South Africa.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: asked if Colonel Richardson understood that the contract included frozen meat.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that the Report of the Committee stated that Colonel Richardson, who made the contract, distinctly stated that it was fully understood on both sides to include frozen meat.

MR. O'MARA: asked if the hon. Member would read paragraph four of the Report.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he would read it in good time. The hon. Member who raised the question made a most serious charge and presented his case in a most serious aspect. He accused the Government of hiding facts from the knowledge of the House, and under the circumstances he would put the story before the Committee, and he thought it was not too much to ask that he should be allowed to tell it in his own way. It was perfectly well understood in South Africa by both sides that refrigerated meat might be supplied if it could be supplied in good condition, but that was not understood when the Papers came to the War Office, although it was proved to their satisfaction afterwards, and to the satisfaction of the Public Accounts Committee. Having regard to that misconception on the part of the War Office, and still more to the fact that they had been able to supply much larger quantities of refrigerated meat than they expected, the contractors made much larger profits than they anticipated and they offered to return 2d. per pound. The hon. Member who raised the question said that had not yet been repaid. That was a mistake. The whole of the amount had been repaid. The hon. Member was misled; he admitted several people had been misled; by the report of the Controller and Auditor-General, written admittedly at a time when he had imperfect information, and when he had not all the facts before him. The hon. Member suggested that that 2d. per pound was nothing more than the duty on imported meat, which the Cape Government had suspended owing to the outbreak of hostilities. That was not so. Owing to the scarcity of food in South Africa, the duty on meat was taken off, but the duty was never charged on Government stores, and therefore the Government had the full benefit of the 2d. per pound in addition to the remission of the duty which was common to all stores imported into South Africa for His Majesty's services. He had dealt with all the points raised by the hon. Member except the fact to which he called attention, that at the time this contract was made for meat for the troops at 11d. per pound the Navy and the troops were obtaining refrigerated meat at the Cape at 5d. per pound. That was perfectly true. But that meat was obtained in the first place under a contract made months before war was imminent, and before there was any appearance of war. Hon. members would understand that the appearance of war naturally brought about a great change in the market for those commodities; so great a change that the scarcity of foodstuffs obliged the Cape Government to remove the duty. In the second place the meat was supplied to the Navy at Simonstown, and to the troops in the Cape Town district, while the contract at

11d. per pound was for meat to be supplied to the troops wherever the troops might be. That included the cost of carrying it up country, and also the cost of drivers and purveyors marching with the troops. The price of meat supplied up country could not be expected to be the same as that of meat supplied close to the seaboard under a contract made long before war broke out. The Public Accounts Committee; and he would be borne out in what he was about to state by the right hon. Gentleman the Chairman of that Committee; gave very close attention to the matter. The Committee came to the case with suspicion, and they felt it was a case for inquiry. The Report stated that the Committee were of opinion that Colonel Richardson was justified in making the contract, but that he should have contracted at different prices for frozen meat and fresh meat, and that the conditions of the contract should have been made more clear to the War Office. Looking at what had occurred with the wisdom which came from looking backwards instead of forwards, the Committee said that under the particular circumstances of the campaign Colonel Richardson would have made a better bargain if he had taken separate prices for the two classes of meat, instead of taking a common price. But if the troops had moved as quickly as was at first expected, and if they had moved earlier away from the railway, the bargain which Colonel Richardson made would have been a very good one for the country. It was only because the troops delayed for a long time astride the railway that the contract turned out less favourable than it would have done had the two classes of meat been contracted for at different prices. In justification of Colonel Richardson's action, he might add that a contract for refrigerated meat for the troops had never been made before. It worked extremely well, and gave great satisfaction; and on the whole, acting under extremely difficult circumstances and very great responsibility, Colonel Richardson discharged the task which devolved upon him with great ability and great skill, and the troops in South Africa in the early part of the war owed much to his care and attention.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said he wished to point out that the Vote was of a more serious character than in previous years, and that the Admiralty and the War Office had dealt with much larger sums than formerly. There was one large item of £5,000, regarding which the Public Accounts Committee stated;

"While acknowledging that the payments were necessary under existing circumstances it is considered that they should not be made in future without parliamentary sanction.

There was another case in which the War Office went off in a hurry and bought seventy German guns, which turned out not to be very good. They did not come into the Estimates, but were bought out of the Transport Vote. There were likely to be more cases of a similar character in the future, and he hoped that the Treasury would be more careful.

MR. DILLON said that the Secretary to the Treasury did him an injustice in reference to the nature of the contract. The Comptroller and Auditor General stated that the contract did not mention frozen meat, that it was understood at the War Office to be for live meat, and that 3,000,000 lbs. of frozen meat had been supplied under it.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he thought the hon. Gentleman was misled by taking the statement of the Comptroller and Auditor General before he had all the facts before him. The Comptroller and Auditor General gave very full evidence before the Public Accounts Committee, and in that evidence he qualified a great deal of what he said in his statement. It was made perfectly clear to the Committee that refrigerated meat was included in the contract. The conditions of the War Office in reference to contracts for live meat only were added at the end of the contract, and that might have misled the Comptroller and Auditor General.

MR. DILLON said that the hon. Gentleman did not refer at all to what drew his attention to the matter first, namely, the statement of the Premier of Queensland, who had returned from a visit to South Africa. He said that the contractors got refrigerated meat from Australia at 3d. a lb.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he had not seen the Premier's statement. He would point out, however, that the price of meat at Cape Town was only a small proportion of the price up country, especially if the meat had to be supplied not merely at fixed places but to wherever the troops moved.

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER resumed the Chair.]

MR. O'MARA said he had the strongest objection to the resolution, as it conveyed a very false impression. There had been no saving of £551,000 as was suggested, and it was a gross abuse to submit such a resolution without any explanation. As a matter of fact, there was not any surplus at all, and he based his statement on the third report of the Public Accounts Committee. It struck him since he came into this House that the accounts were presented in a way which would disgrace any big trading company in the country. They reminded

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Brassey, Albert
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Balfour, Rt. Hon. Gerald W. (Leeds
Bullard, Sir Harry
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Arrol, Sir William
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bignold, Arthur
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich.

him of what the lamented Barney Barnato did when he floated his bank. There was a good deal of trying to hide from members of the House all unpleasant details, and it was only by delving into the accounts that they could bring to light any of the ugly facts which would bear very little comment. Faithful soldiers of the Army for whom money had been voted had not been expended. There was at the Treasury at the credit of the Paymaster General of the Army £1,000,000, and there were unfortunate soldiers who had come home and who were now starving in the streets of London. It was a matter of common knowledge that soldiers who were entitled to medals would not go to be presented with them by the King until they received their arrears of pay. Questions on the subject had been asked in the House, and it was admitted to be a fact. He heard the Financial Secretary say that these soldiers could only be paid a quarter of the amount due, and that this would be done as a special concession. These soldiers and their families were starving because, as the Financial Secretary said, the money could not be paid until the pay sheets came from South Africa, Referring to the allowances of £1,000 of secret service money to the generals in South Africa, the hon. Member said he had no doubt this would be used for corrupting and seducing from their allegiance as many Boers as the money would corrupt. This was the only way in which the secret service money could possibly be used. He would content himself by moving the following Amendment, "to leave out after 'question.'"

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.) moved that the Question be now put.

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided: Ayes, 148; Noes, 72. (Division List No. 437.)

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)

Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter

Pretymann, Ernest George

Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc's)

Hope, J. F. (Sheff'd, Brightside)

Purvis, Robert

Chapman, Edward

Hornby, Sir William Henry

Randles, John S.

Charrington, Spencer

Hoult, Joseph

Rankin, Sir James

Churchill, Winston Spencer

Hudson, George Bickersteth

Reid, James (Greenock)

Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Johnston, William (Belfast)

Remnant, James Farquharson

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge)

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Keswick, William
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Cranborne, Viscount
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lawson, John Grant
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Davenport, William Bromley-
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Round, James
Dickson, Charles Scott
Leveson-Gower, F. N. S.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Smith, H C (N'rthumb Tyn'side
Finch, George H.
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. E.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Madona, John Cumming
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Maconochie, A. W.

Spear, John Ward
Fisher, William Hayes
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Fitzroy, Hon. E. Algernon
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Flower, Ernest
M' Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Forster, Henry William
Majendie, James A. H.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W. F.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Gardner, Ernest
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Godson, Sir Augustus F.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Valentia, Viscount
Goschen, Hon. G. Joachim
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Walker, Col. William Hall
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Morgan, David J (W'lthamstow
Webb, Col. William George
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Morrell, George Herbert
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Groves, James Grimble
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Wilson, A Stanley (Yorks, E. R.)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Mount, William Arthur
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (Midd'x
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. Wm.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Nicol, Donald Ninian
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Heath, J. (Staffords., N. W.)
Pierpoint, Robert
Heaton, John Henniker
Plummer, Walter R.
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Ambrose, Robert
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Boland, John
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boyle, James
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Dowd, John
Burns, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Caldwell, James
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Malley, William
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Clancy, John Joseph
Levy, Maurice
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.

O'Shee, James John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Reddy, M.
Cullinan, J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Daly, James
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Delany, William
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Dillon, John
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Sullivan, Donal
Doogan, P. C.
Moss, Samuel
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Duffy, William J.
Murnaghan, George
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Murphy, John
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Flynn, James Christopher
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Gilhooly, James
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson, Henry J (Yorks, W. R.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
TELLERS FOR THE NOES.; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Hammond, John
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Question put accordingly, "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."
The Committee divided.; Ayes, 153; Noes, 67. (Division List No. 438.)
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Goschen, Hon. George J.
Mount, William Arthur
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Groves, James Grimble
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Arrol, Sir William
Hambro, Charles Eric
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Mid'x)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Pierpoint, Robert
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Plummer, Walter R.
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Pretymann, Ernest George
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col, Edward
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Purvis, Robert
Bignold, Arthur
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N. W.)
Randles, John S.
Blundell, Col. Henry
Heaton, John Henniker
Rankin, Sir James
Brassey, Albert
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Reid, James (Greenock)

Bullard; Sir Harry
Hope, J. F. (Sh'ffi'ld, Brightside)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Cavendish, V C W. (Derbyshire
Horniman, Frederick John
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hoult, Joseph
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Johnstone, H. (Sussex)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Chapman, Edward
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh
Round, James
Charrington, Spencer
Keswick, William
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Lawson, John Grant
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Cranborne, Viscount
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Smith, H C (N'rth'mb, Tyneside
Crossley, Sir Savile

Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Spear, John Ward
Dickson, Charles Scott
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Macdona, John Cumming
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Maconochie, A. W.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Finch, George H.
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Majendie, James A. H.
Valentia, Viscount
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Fisher William Hayes
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Webb, Col. William George
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Flower, Ernest
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy

Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.
Forster, Henry William
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.
More, Robt. J. (Shropshire)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Gardner, Ernest
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.
Morrell, George Herbert
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Morris, Hon. Martin H. F.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Doogan, P. C.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Ambrose, Robert
Duffy, William J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
M'Govern, T.
Boland, John
Flynn, James Christopher
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Boyle, James
Gilhooby, James
Moss, Samuel
Burns, John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Murnaghan, George
Caldwell, James
Hammond, John
Murphy, John
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hayden, John Patrick
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Healy, Timothy Michael
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Clancy, John Joseph
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
Cogan, Denis J.

Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Joyce, Michael
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Crean, Eugene
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Cullinan, J.
Leamy, Edmund
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Daly, James
Levy, Maurice
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Delany, William
Lundon, W.
O'Dowd, John
Dillon, John
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
O'Malley, William
Redmond, William (Clare)
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks, W. R.)
O'Mara, James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Sullivan, Donal
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
O'Shee, James John
Thomas, David Alf. (Merthyr)
Power, Patrick Joseph
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Reddy, M.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
2. Resolved, That the application of such sums be sanctioned.
SCHEDULE.
No. of Vote.
Army Services, 1899–1900. Votes.
Gross Expenditure.
Appropriations in Aid.
Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure.
Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure.
Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

1.

2.

3.

4.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

1

Pay, etc., of Army (General Staff, Regiments, Reserve, and Departments)

;

1,086,432

15

4

129,050

6

7

;

2

Medical Establishments: Pay, etc.

29,480

6

5

;

;

;

425

0

10

3

Militia: Pay, Bounty, etc.

;

250,294

11

1

;

2,916

8

5

4

Yeomanry Cavalry: Pay and Allowances

;

4,661

5

5

3

0

0

;

5

Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances

;

10,664

15

2

;

736

15

8

6

Transport and Remounts

110,470

9

5

;

;

;

38,237

8

3

7

Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies

491,877

10

11

;

;

;

58,983

5

11

8

Clothing Establishments and Services

88,006

0

11

;
58,404

3

6

;

9

Warlike and other Stores: Supply and Repair

201,370

16

4

;

;

770

3

2

10

Works, Buildings, and Repairs: Cost, including Staff for Engineer Services

;

224,270

4

7

51,015

13

1

;

11

Establishments for Military Education

1,411

12

3

;

;

;

3,729

11

7

12

Miscellaneous Effective Services

23,058

8

5

;

;

24,197

15

10

13

War Office: Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges

3,308

10

9

;

;

;

130

1

0

14

Non-effective Charges for Officers, etc.

;

54,553

3

6

20,962

4

6

;

15

Non-effective Charges for Men, etc.

;

3,184

10

1

2,656

14

7

;

16

Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances

643

2

8

;

;

;

91

6

2

Balances irrecoverable

751

18

5

;

;

;

;

950,384

16

6

1,634,06

5

2

262,092

2

3

130,217

16

10

Net Surplus,

£;683,676

8

8

Net Deficit,

£;131,874

5

5

Surplus surrendered to the Exchequer

£;551,802

3

3

Question put, "That the Chairman do report these Resolutions to the House."

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn

Murray, Gluts. J. (Coventry)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.

O'Neill, Hon. Robt. Torrens

Arrol, Sir William

Groves, James Grimble

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Hambro, Charles Eric

Pierpoint, Robert

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r

Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Hummer, Walter R.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm
Pretymann, Ernest George
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Purvis, Robert
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.)
Randles, John S.
Bignold, Arthur
Heaton, John Henniker
Rankin, Sir James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Reid, James (Greenock)
Brassey, Albert
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Remnant, James Farquharson
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Hoult, Joseph
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Round, James
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Royds, Clement Molyneux

(Chapman, Edward
Keswick, William
Charrington, Spencer
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Lawson, John Grant
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tyn'sd.
Cranborne, Viscount
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristo S.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Spear, John Ward
Davenport, William Bromley-
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Dasraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Macdona, John Cumming
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Maconochie, A. W.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
 Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
 Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
 M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
 Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
 Majendie, James A. H.
 Valentia, Viscount
 Finch, George H.
 Massey Mainwaring, Hn. W. F
 Walker, Col. William Hall
 Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
 Melville, Beresford Valentine
 Webb, Col. William George
 Firbank, Joseph Thomas
 Molesworth, Sir Lewis
 Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
 Fisher, William Hayes
 Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
 Wilson, A Stanley (Yorks, E. R.)
 Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
 Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
 Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
 Flower, Ernest
 More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Forster, Henry William
 Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
 Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S W
 Morrell, George Herbert
 TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
 Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
 Gardner, Ernest
 Mount, William Arthur
 Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
 Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
 NOES.
 Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
 Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
 Boyle, James
 Ambrose, Robert
 Boland, John
 Burns, John
 The Committee divided::Ayes, 147; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 439.)
 Caldwell, James
 Jones, William (Carnarvons.)
 O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Joyce, Michael
O Dowd, John
Clancy, John Joseph
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N
Condon, Thomas Joseph
O'Malley, William
Crean, Eugene
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Cullinan, J.
Levy, Maurice
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Lundon, W.
O'Shee, James John
Daly, James
Delany, William
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Dillon, John
M'Dermott, Patrick
Doogan, P. C.
M'Fadden, Edward
Reddy, M.
Duffy, William J.
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Redmond, William (Clare)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Flynn, James Christopher
Moss, Samuel
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Murnaghan, George
Sullivan, Donal
Gilhooly, James
Murphy, John
Griffith, Ellis J.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)

Nannetti, Joseph P.
Hammond, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Hayden, John Patrick
Nussey, Thomas Willans
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Resolutions to be reported to-morrow.
WAYS AND MEANS.
Considered in Committee.
(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the Service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, the sum of £86,756,285 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND moved to report progress. He appealed to the First Lord of the Treasury not to proceed with further business at that hour in the morning (4.45). It was not reasonable to ask the Committee to assent to a Vote of £86,000,000 at that hour, when there was not a fair opportunity for reasonable discussion. He appealed to the First Lord of the Treasury even if he had no consideration for the views of the Irish members, if he believed that he was completely right and that they were completely wrong, for the credit of his own party and the House of Commons, not to perpetrate what was little short of a scandal. The right hon.

Gentleman had succeeded in doing what no Minister had ever succeeded in doing in the history of Parliament; he had not only stifled discussion but had prevented hon. members voting against Estimates to which they objected. He therefore appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to accept his motion to report progress. After all, a Minister who had the courage to outrage all the proceedings of Parliament ought to be strong enough not to allow himself to be intimidated by the cries of hon. Gentlemen behind him. If the right hon. Gentleman would not agree to adjourn he hoped his hon. friends would resist the attempt which was being made to intimidate them. If they were forced to fight they were quite prepared for it, in the absolute consciousness and belief that they were in no way responsible for what had occurred. They were not responsible for the new rule, or for voting sixty-seven millions of the taxpayers' money without

discussion. He hoped that he would live to see another Government in power who would put into force to the fullest extent, when hon. Gentlemen opposite were in Opposition, the scandalous and outrageous rules which were now degrading Parliament. He begged to move to report progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again.";(Mr. William Redmond.)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There have been many interchanges between hon. Gentlemen opposite and ourselves with regard to transactions for the last six hours, but there can be no difference with regard to the motion now before the Committee. The hon. Gentleman appeals to parliamentary practice and precedent, and I can assure him that Parliamentary practice and precedent are unbroken, and that the resolution now put from the Chair has always been put and agreed to without discussion, it being a necessary preliminary to the introduction of the Appropriation Bill at the end of the session. This is not a Vote for money, as the hon. Gentleman seems to suppose. It has that appearance, but it is not, and so far as I know, no question of controversy is raised or can be raised by this formal stage of the Appropriation Bill. Under these circumstances I hope the hon. Gentleman will not persist in his motion.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he had a very good response when the right hon. Gentleman spoke to him of parliamentary practice and precedent.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman spoke to me about it,

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said that the right hon. Gentleman answered him by saying that the motion was in strict accordance with parliamentary precedent. That was not so, because the right hon. Gentleman could not point to a single year in the whole history of Parliament where proceedings such as had taken place that night had occurred. There was never an occasion in which Supply had been rushed through as it was that night. It was, therefore, no use appealing to parliamentary precedent, as parliamentary precedent had been outraged by what had occurred.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Bathurst, Hon. A. Benjamin

Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Bentinck, Lord Henry

Chapman, Edward

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bignold, Arthur

Charrington, Spencer

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Blundell, Colonel Henry C.

Churchill, Winston Spencer

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Brassey, Albert

Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Arrol, Sir William

Bullard, Sir Harry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Cecil, Evelyn (Ast5n Manor)
Cranborne, Viscount
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Balfour, K. R. (Christchurch)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Davenport, W. Bromley

MR. DILLON said there was no justification for taking the motion that night.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no intention of taking any Bills to-night, but this is a formal resolution.

MR. DILLON said that there was no object to be gained by pressing the resolution. It would not expedite business, and it would not make any difference whether the resolution were passed that night or the next night. There might be circumstances under which it might make a day's difference in the length of the session, but they did not exist at present. The First Lord of the Treasury himself confessed that he had abandoned all hope of being able to prorogue Parliament on Saturday week, and, therefore, there was no object in taking the resolution that night. As he understood it, the motion for the Appropriation Bill had never been introduced until the Supply for the year had been voted.

[Mr. T. M. HEALY: That was the old practice.] That was the old practice. If the right hon. Gentleman could state that by taking the resolution to-night he could adjourn on Saturday week, he could understand it, but he had abandoned that notion, and there was therefore no hurry for the Appropriation Bill, as far as the convenience of the House was concerned. The system which was now being adopted did not facilitate business or tend towards preserving the dignity of debate, and never would.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 140; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 440.)

Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Purvis, Robert
Dickson, Charles Scott
Keswick, William
Randles, John S.

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lawson, John Grant
Ranklin, Sir James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Reid, James (Greenock)
Doxford, Sir W. Theodore
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Remnant, James Farquharson
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Fellowes, Hon. A. Edward
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Ridley, S Forde (Bethnal Green)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Finch, George H.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Finlay, Sir Robert Banuatyne
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Fisher, William Hayes
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Macdona, John Cumming
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Flower, Ernest
Maconochie, A. W.
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick S W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marlebone, W.)
Gardner, Ernest
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Smith, Abel, H. (Hertford, East
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
M'Killop, James (Stirlingsh.
Smith H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn

Majendie, James H. H.
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Massey Mainwairing, Hn. W F.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Spear, John Ward
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Groves, James Grimble
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hambro, Charles Eric
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hamilton, Rt Hn L'rd G (Mi'dl'x
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Morrell, George Herbert
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Morris, Hon Martin Henry F.
Valentia, Viscount
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Mount, William Arthur
Walker, Col. William Hall
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Webb, Col. William George
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Heaton, John Henniker
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Pierpoint, Robert
Hoult, Joseph
Plummer, Walter R.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pretymann, Ernest George
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Ambrose, Robert
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boland, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
O'Dowd, John
Boyle, James
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Burns, John
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Caldwell, James
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Malley, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Levy, Maurice
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
O'Shee, James John
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Dermott, Patrick

Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cullinan, J.
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Daly, James
Mansfield, Horace Rendell
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Delany, William
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Sullivan, Donald
Dillon, John
Moss, Samuel
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Doogan, P. C.
Murnaghan, George
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Duffy, Willam J.
Murphy, John
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Gilhooly, James
Nussey, Thomas Willans
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Question put accordingly, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave
to sit again."
AYES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E
Boland, John
Caldwell, James
Ambrose, Robert
Boyle, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Burns, John
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 70; Noes, 140. (Division List No. 441.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Dowd, John
Cogan, Denis J.
Leamy, Edmund
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Levy, Maurice
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
O'Malley, William
Cullinan, J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Mara, James
Daly, James
M'Dermott, Patrick
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Delany, William
M'Fadden, Edward
O'Shee, James John
Dillon, John
M'Govern, T.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Doogan, P. C.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Reddy, M.
Duffy, William J.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Moss, Samuel
Redmond, William (Clare)
Flynn, James Christopher
Murnaghan, George
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Gilhooly, James
Murphy, J.
Sullivan, Donal
Griffith, Ellis J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Hammond, John

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Hayden, John Patrick
Nussey, Thomas Willans
White, Patrick (Meath North
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow W.
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Joyce, Michael
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex F.
Gardner, Ernest
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederi'k
Mount, William Arthur
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Gordon, J. (Londonderry South
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Arrol, Sir William
Goulding, Edward Alfred
O'Neill, Hon. R. Torrens
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Greene, W Raymond- (Cambs.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Groves, James Grimble
Pierpoint, Robert
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Hambro, Charles Eric

Plummer, Walter R.
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Pretymann, Ernest George
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edw.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Purvis, Robert
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Randles, John S.
Bignold, Arthur
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Ranken, Sir James
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Reid, James (Greenock
Brassey, Albert
Heaton, John Henniker
Remnant, J. Farquharson
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hermon Hodge, Robert Trotter
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Hornby, Sir Wm. Henry
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hoult, Joseph
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Chamberlain, J. Austin (Worc'r
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Sackville, Col. S. G Stopford-
Chapman, Edward
Keswick, William
Sadler, Col. S. Alexander

Charrington, Spencer
Lawson, John Grant
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Smith, A. H. (Hertford, East)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N S.
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tynsd.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Loder, Gerald W. (Erskine)
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks.)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesh'm
Smith, Hon. W. F D. (Strand
Cranborne, Viscount
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.
Spear, John Ward
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Spencer, E. (W. Bromwich)
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Loyd, Archie, Kirkman
Stanley, Hn. A. (Ormskirk)
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Macartney, Rt Hn. W. G Ellison
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Macdona, John Cumming
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
M'aconochie, A. W.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. M.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim E.
Valentia, Viscount
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Walker, Col. William Hall
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward

Majendie, James A. H.
Webb, Col. William George
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W F.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Finch, George H.
Molville, Beresford Valentine
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Wilson, J. W. (Worc'tersh. N.
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Fisher, William Hayes
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
FitzRoy, Hn. Edward Algernon
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Flower, Ernest
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick S. W
Morrell, George Herbert

MR. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Original Question be now put."

MR. JOHN REDMOND asked whether, as the question had not been discussed at all, the Chairman could put the closure.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think it is unfair to put it under the circumstances.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The question has not been discussed.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not know what discussion is possible.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Gardner, Ernest
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Mount, William Arthur
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute
Arnold-Forster, H. O.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Arrol, Sir William

Goulding, Edward Alfred
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Groves, James Grimble
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Hamilton, Rt. Hn L'rd G (Midd'x
Pierpoint, Robert
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Plummer, Walter R.
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Pretymann, Ernest George
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Bignold, Arthur
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Purvis, Robert
Blundell, Col. Henry
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Randles, John S.
Brassey, Albert
Heaton, John Henniker
Rankin, Sir James
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Reid, James (Greenock)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Remnant, James Farquharson
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hoult, Joseph
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hudson, George Bickersteth

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Kenyon, Hon Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
(Chapman, Edward
Keswick, William
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Charrington, Spencer
Lawson, John Grant
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Leveson-Gower, Fr'derick N. S.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Cranborne, Viscount
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lowther, C. (Climb., Eskdale)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Davenport, William Bromley-
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Spear, John Ward
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. Ellison
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Macdona, John Cumming
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Maconochie, A. W.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Durning Lawrence, Sir Edwin
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Valentia, Viscount
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Majendie, James A. H.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W. F.
Webb, Colonel William George
Finch, George H.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Wilson, A. Stanley (York E. R.)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Fisher, William Hayes
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Flower, Ernest
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Morrell, George Herbert
NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E)
Boland, John
Caldwell, James
Ambrose, Robert
Boyle, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Burns, John
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton

MR. T. M. HEALY: On a point of order, I wish to ask you, Sir, whether there is any precedent for closing the Appropriation Bill at any stage?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Precedents do not matter!

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I cannot answer that now.

Original Question put.

The Committee divided::Ayes, 141; Noes, 68. (Division List No. 442.)

Clancy, John Joseph

Joyce, Michael

O'Dowd, John

Cogan, Denis J.

Kennedy, Patrick James

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Loamy, Edmund

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N

Crean, Eugene

Levy, Maurice

O'Malley, William

Cullinan, J.

Lundon, W.

O'Mara, James

Daly, James

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Delany, William

M'Dermott, Patrick

O'Shee, James John

Dillon, John

M'Fadden, Edward

Power, Patrick Joseph

Doogan, P. C.

M'Govern, T.

Reddy, M.

Daffy, William J.

Mansfield, Horace Rendall

Redmond, John E. (Waterford

Flavin, Michael Joseph

Moss, Samuel

Redmond, William (Clare)

Flynn, James Christopher

Murnaghan, George

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

Gilhooly, James

Murphy, John

Sullivan, Donal

Griffith, Ellis J.

Nannetti, Joseph P.

Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)

Hammond, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, Luke (York, E. K.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Hayne, Ht. Hn. Charles Seale-
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.
Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the Service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, the sum of £86,756,285 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report the resolution to the House."

MR. T. M. HEALY said he understood that the Chairman was about to put the question that the resolution be reported to the House. The closure motion clearly did not cover that.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The motion is a purely formal one, and it would be quite contrary to all practice and precedent to discuss it, although the House might divide upon it.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that the motion to report progress had been discussed on a hundred occasions. He submitted he was entitled to assert his right to speak on any question put from the Chair. A question having been put from the Chair, it was a great innovation to suggest that hon. members were not entitled to discuss it. They had sat through the night in great good humour on both sides, but it was unfair that they who had borne the heat and burden of the day should now be denied audience. The First Lord of the Treasury had inaugurated a procedure which if the

gas had not been turned off he would have called the Cecilian vespers;

*THE CHAIRMAN: I did not interrupt the hon. Gentleman because he stated that he knew of a hundred occasions on which similar debates had taken place; but it is perfectly clear that the debate must be strictly relevant to the question that I report the resolution to the House. The hon. Member cannot go back on the resolution.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he agreed. If he had imagined for a moment that the right of a man to speak on the motion would have been challenged he would have been prepared to quote precedents from Hansard. The impatience of the Treasury Bench

was most unusual. They had got all the money they wanted, and they would have a garden party on Saturday. The steps which had been taken by the right hon.

Gentleman to closure the debate;

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is not entitled to go back on the closure of the debate. That was the action of the Committee. I must invite the hon.

Gentleman to confine himself strictly to the question as to whether or not I report the resolution to the House.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he did not desire to infringe the rules of debate. He would merely state that he would oppose the motion on the ground of the application of the closure to the formal stage of a Bill, which, no matter what business had been before the House, had always been treated as a free and open motion, in the discussion of which every hon. Member was entitled to participate.

MR. DILLON said he opposed the motion because the resolution had not been debated. He was rather astonished to hear the opinion from the Chair that because a discussion was unprecedented therefore it should not be taken; but they had been doing unprecedented things throughout the night. Why should the Question be put from the Chair at all unless it could be discussed. It was an extraordinary position to assume that members should be denied the right to discuss a motion put from the Chair; but apparently they were not to be given any opportunities for discussion, except such as fitted in with the motions of the First Lord of the Treasury.

MR. LEAMY (Kildare, N.) said that it appeared to him if a question were put from the Chair, and if hon. members were denied the right to discuss it, that was treating the House of Commons with contempt.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is now discussing the point of order. I have given way on that, and I must invite the hon. Gentleman to confine himself strictly to the Question that I report this resolution to the House.

MR. LEAMY said he had no desire to intrude on the time of the Committee, but if recent procedure had not been

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt, Sir A. F.

Bullard, Sir Harry

Davenport, William Bromley

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)

Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)

Dickson, Charles Scott

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers

Arrol, Sir William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Doxford, Sir W. Theodore
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r.)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Chapman, Edward
Fellowes, Hon. A. Edward
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Charrington, Spencer
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Balfour, Rt. Ha. G. W. (Leeds
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Finch, George H.
Balfour, K. R. (Christchurch)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Finlay, Sir R. Bannatyne
Bathurst, Hon. A. Benjamin
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Fisher, William Hayes
Bignold, Arthur
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Fitzroy, Hon. E. Algernon
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Cranborne, Viscount
Flower, Ernest
Brassey, Albert
Crossley, Sir Savile
Foster, Philip, S. (Warwick. S W

adopted it was quite possible that all those questions would have been settled hours ago. He would point out that the House was not in a position at that hour of the morning to discuss such a grave and serious resolution. There had been no discussion in Committee, and it was not fair to ask the House to discuss the question at six o'clock in the morning. Everything seemed to be rushed through at motor-car speed, and what was it all for? The whole object was to enable right hon. Gentlemen to get down to Blenheim on Saturday.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon Gentleman is not really confining himself to the motion. MR. LEAMY said it was stated and not contradicted that that was the reason for the expedition of business.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is not relevant.

MR. LEAMY said he accepted the ruling of the Chair. They would be able to deal with the matter again. Considering the amount of business which had been

transacted during the sitting, he thought it very unfair to report the resolution without discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put"

The Committee divided: Ayes, 140; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 443.)

Gardner, Ernest

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge

Godson, Sir Augustus F.

Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. Ellison

Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)

Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn

Macdonald, John Cumming

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Maconochie, A. W.

Robertson, Herbt. (Hackney)

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim

Martham, Charles (Liverpool)

Ropner, Col. Robert

Goulding, Edward Alfred

M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.

M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Groves, James Grimble

Majendie, James A. H.

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alex.

Hambro, Charles Eric

Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.

Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert

Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x.

Melville, Beresford Valentine

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.

Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Smith, A. H. (Hertford, East)

Harris, Frederick Leverton

Moon, Edward Robert Pacy

Smith, H C (N'rth'mb., Tneside

Haslett, Sir James Horner

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)

Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)

Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley

More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Smith, Hon. W. E. D. (Strand)
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Spear, John Ward
Heaton, John Henniker
Morrell, George Herbert
Spencer, E. (W. Bromwich)
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Morris, Hon. Martin Hy. F.
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Mount, William Arthur
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hoult, Joseph
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Nichol, Donald Ninian
Valentia, Viscount
Johnston, William (Belfast)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert T.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Webb, Col. William George
Keswick, William
Pierpoint, Robert
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Lawson, John Grant
Plummer, Walter R.
Wilson, A. S. (Yorks, E. R.)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Purvis, Robert
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Randles, John S.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Rankin, Sir James
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Remnant, James Farquharson
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Ambrose, Robert
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boland, John
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Dowd, John
Boyle, James
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Burns, John
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Caldwell, James
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Malley, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Levy, Maurice
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
O'Shee, James John
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Dermott, Patrick
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Cullinan, J.
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Daly, James
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Delany, William
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Sullivan, Donal
Dillon, John
Moss, Samuel
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Doogan, P. C.
Murnaghan, George
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Duffy, William J.
Murphy, John
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Gilhooly, James
Nussey, Thomas Willans
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'rary Mid
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Question put accordingly, "That the Chairman do report the Resolution to the House."
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Arrol, Sir William
Bignold, Arthur
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Blundell, Col. Henry
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Brassey, Albert
Chapman, Edward
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 139; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 444.)
Charrington, Spencer
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Pierpoint, Robert
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Plummer, Walter R.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Pretymann, Ernest George
Collings, Rt. Hn. Jesse
Hoult, Joseph
Pryce Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Purvis, Robert
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Randles, John S.
Cranborne, Viscount
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Rankin, Sir James
Crossley, Sir Savile
Keswick, William
Reid, James (Greenock)
Davenport, William Bromley-
Lawson, John Grant
Remnant, James Farquharson
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Ridley, Hon-M. W (Stalybridge
Dickson, Charles Scott
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas Thomson
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Finch, George H.
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. Ellison
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Macdona, John Cumming
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Maconochie, A. W.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, Hast
Fisher, William Hayes
M'Arthnr, Charles (Liverpool)
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Flower, Ernest
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.
Majendie, James A. H.
Spear, John Ward
Gardner, Ernest
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk

Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Goulding, Edward Alfred
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Valentia, Viscount
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Walker, Col, William Hall
Groves, James Grimble
Morrell, George Herbert
Webb, Colonel William Hall
Hambro, Charles Eric
Morriss, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn L'rd G (Midd'x
Morrison, James Archibald
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Mount, William Arthur
Wilson, J. W (Worcestersh. N.)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Nicol, Donald Ninian
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Heaton, John Henniker
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Ambrose, Robert
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boland, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
O'Dowd, John
Boyle, James
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Burns, John
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, James Roscommon, N.
Caldwell, James
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Malley, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Levy, Maurice
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
O'Shee, James John
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Dermott, Patrick
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cullinan, J.
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Daly, James
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Delany, William
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Sullivan, Donal
Dillon, John
Moss, Samuel
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Doogan, P. C.

Murnaghan, George
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Duffy, William J.
Murphy, John
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Gilhooly, James
Nussey, Thomas Willans
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tippera'y Mid
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Resolution to be reported to-morrow.
In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 22nd day of July last,
Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.
Adjourned at Six of the clock, a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 9th August, 1901.

DEATH OF HER IMPERIAL MAJESTY THE EMPRESS FREDERICK OF GERMANY.

The Comptroller of the Household reported His Majesty's Answer to the Address of the 7th day of this instant August, as followeth::

"I return you My most sincere chunks for your Loyal and Dutiful Address, expressing sympathy with Me in the great loss which I have sustained by the death of My beloved Sister, the Dowager Empress and Queen Frederick of Germany and Prussia, Princess Royal of Great Britain and Ireland.

"It affords Me great comfort and gratification to receive this expression of your cordial feelings towards Myself and the Royal Family, and to be reminded of the warm interest you take in all that concerns Them.

"I shall not fail to communicate to His Imperial Majesty the German Emperor your Message of condolence with Him and the Imperial and Royal Family.

ROYAL ASSENT.

COMMISSION.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and, being returned,

Mr. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to a number of Bills [see page 249].

NEW WRIT.

New Writ for the County of Hants (Western or Andover Division), in the room of the right hon. William Wither Bramston Beach, deceased.; (Sir William, Walrond.)

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

BELFAST AND NORTHERN COUNTIES RAILWAY BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Lords' Amendments considered.

Lords' Amendment;

"In page 4, line 2, of Clause 5, to leave out the words 'City and.'"

Read a second time.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said that by the Local Government Act of 1898 for the first time the city of Londonderry was separated from the county of Londonderry, and there was no such thing under the section as the County Council of the City and County of Londonderry. The Act of 1875, which was incorporated, placed a charge for twenty-three years of £45,000 on the capital of £220,000, and it placed that charge not upon the entire county of Londonderry, but upon certain baronies of Londonderry. In these circumstances what did the promoters do? He submitted that the Amendments inserted by the Lords were a gross breach of the privileges of this House.

*MR. SPEAKER: There is only this one Amendment, and of course the hon. and learned Member must confine himself to the effect of this Amendment. I think it would be more convenient if the hon. and learned Member made his criticism upon the question that the House do agree with the Lords' Amendment.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he was submitting that the Amendment of the House of Lords was a breach of the privileges of this House, and he submitted that upon the question now before the House his arguments were pertinent. The Amendment made by the House of Lords in this Act was unconstitutional in itself, and it was a breach of the privileges of this House, for it affected a large body of ratepayers who never had any notice that this charge was to be placed upon them at all. That was his argument. He had demonstrated by the section of the Act of 1875 that the Act placed this charge upon four areas out of the entire county of Londonderry. This was a most serious inroad upon the privileges of the ratepayers, but how did it stand with regard to the House? The whole county of Londonderry was now rated for the purposes of this charge. Notices of this ought to have been given to every ratepayer in the county of Londonderry by the original notices drawn up in October and November of every year. They had the right to petition. He would not have complained of this extraordinary step so much if it had been for the purpose of continuing the existing charge for the benefit of the local ratepayers, but the proposal now was that a large number of persons in certain baronies who had never paid this charge before would now have to contribute. The Standing Orders of the House provided that problems of this kind should not be dealt with without notice, and insisted upon the privileges of the House with regard to any clauses inserted in private Bills or provisional Orders sent down by the House of Lords being observed, more especially in regard to local charges being placed on local authorities for local purposes. The charge in the original Act was solely upon certain baronies;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! What the hon. and learned Member is now going into cannot be raised upon a point of order, and it would be better if he would raise his objection upon the general question.

MR. T. M. HEALY said the ratepayers of Ireland would be placed in a grave position if they were denied the protection of the privileges of this House in

regard to a matter of this kind. The procedure in regard to private Bills was sufficiently difficult and cumbrous, but the Standing Order rigidly insisted, under a joint Order of both Houses, that no Bill should even be introduced to create a public charge unless notice had been given to every man in the locality, and unless the public bodies had notice and given their approval of the charge. What became of this Standing Order in the case of the Lords' Amendment to this Bill? The unfortunate shareholders were to be robbed of all their money and property for the benefit of a Treasury arrangement with a monopolist company.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is hardly a point of order.

MR. T. M. HEALY said his point was that there was no such body as the County Council of the City and County of Londonderry.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is going wide of the question. He is discussing the merits of the Bill, and he cannot do that upon a point of order.

MR. T. M. HEALY said his submission was that it was contrary to the Standing Orders that the House of Lords should make this Amendment, which deprived the public of the protection of the Standing Order which required that all new charges laid upon the ratepayers should first have the approval of the local bodies.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): On a point of order, may I submit to the House that this clause containing the operating charges was not inserted by the House of Lords but by this House, and all that the House of Lords has done is to exonerate the city of Londonderry, which was included in error in the clause inserted in this House. Therefore the action of the House of Lords has not been to cast a burden upon any ratepayers or taxpayers, but simply to remove from the city of Londonderry a burden placed upon it by mistake in this House.

*MR. SPEAKER: Is there such a body as the County Council of the City and County of Londonderry?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No.

*MR. SPEAKER: It certainly appears to me to be a mere case of error of description. It is a question whether the Lords have not merely corrected an error which the Commons had fallen into.

MR. T. M. HEALY contended that the House of Commons had fallen into no error. Because of an objection addressed to the House of Lords by some private interested parties the Lords had put in a clause which operated the whole county of Londonderry.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not understand that to be the case. As far as I can understand the position, there is no such body as the County Council of the City and County of Londonderry.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): Under the Local Government Act of 1898 there was no grand jury of the city of Londonderry at all, but there was one grand jury which covered both the city and the county. Under the Act of 1875 the seven baronies of the county of Londonderry were charged under the guarantee with the payment of interest on the sum which has

been stated at 5 per cent. In the clause as it left the House of Commons a non-existent body was named, and the House of Lords had simply corrected the clause by substituting for that nonexistent body the body that is obviously intended.

What the House of Lords has done is simply to strike out those words relating to the non-existent body and make the clause describe an existent body, namely, the County Council of the County of Londonderry, upon whom the burden is thrown.

*MR. SPEAKER: It seems to me that all this Amendment does is to describe correctly a body which had been incorrectly described. Apparently there has been no new burden imposed upon the ratepayers by the House of Lords.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he was of course bound by this ruling, and he would address himself to the merits of the question.

*MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest that some hon. Member should first move that the House do agree with the Lords in this Amendment, and then the hon. and learned Member can move to disagree.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."; (Mr. O'Neill.)

MR. T. M. HEALY said he could well understand why the learned Attorney General was anxious that this clause should pass, because he happened to represent North Derry.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is not the result of this Amendment. The only point is whether this Amendment should be inserted, and it appears to me to be simply a correction. Therefore the hon. and learned Member cannot go into the question of the effect of the whole clause.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he was dealing with what was his own impression as to the effect of this clause as a matter of argument and not of law. As the clause left this House, it could not be denied that it laid a charge upon no man. It was idle to contend that this was simply a correction. The public of Ireland were entitled in an onerating Bill to be heard and to say whether this Amendment created an onerating charge. That was only common logic. Slips often occurred in Acts of Parliament of which prisoners got the benefit of the doubt. The real construction was that the mind of Parliament was expressed by the words of the Act, and as those words left this House, slip or no slip, they laid no charge upon anybody in the county or city of Londonderry, and the result would have been that they would have escaped by the terms of the Act as it left this House. Those hon. members who were familiar with the Local Government Act of 1898 noticed the slip, and they blessed the name of those who drew up this section. This would have passed the House of Lords without alteration so far as the county council of Londonderry was concerned, and the other local bodies, had it not been for the interested action of a number of private shareholders who, in their own interests, set themselves the task of getting this alleged ship corrected. He challenged contradiction upon the point that this Bill as it left this House relieved the people of the county of Londonderry from all obligations in regard to this charge. The result of the Lords' Amendment must be considered in relation to the existing statutes. He submitted that the effect would be that those persons living in the southern baronies and areas of this county would for

the first time be operated with this charge.

*MR. JOHN GORDON (Londonderry, S.) said that the hon. and learned Member for North Louth was under a very great misapprehension in regard to this question no doubt. The Local Government

Act of 1898 had put an end to baronies as taxable areas for general purposes under the Act, but it had at the same time provided that charges for railways, tramways, and the like could still be levied off the areas which had originally been made liable for such charges, and he understood that these charges had actually been levied and paid in this way since the passing of that Act. When the section left that House its intention was to preserve to the shareholders the rights which they possessed under previous Acts. There was no intention to impose a liability upon ratepayers not previously liable.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is now going into the general merits of the Bill, and he is not in order in doing so.

*MR. JOHN GORDON said it seemed to him that the intention of the section of the Act of Parliament alluded to when it left the House was to preserve to the shareholders any rights which they already had. If there was any slip in the language used or any mistake, was it not a reasonable and right thing to correct it? If the clause would extend a liability not before incurred, he should have supported the hon. Member in resisting the change. He would not touch the merits of the case; but content himself with saying that he did not think the House would impose any liability on the ratepayers to which they were not previously liable.

MR. MOORE (Antrim, N.) said his action would be largely guided by the
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Caldwell, James

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Anstruther, H. T.

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Cayzer, Sir Charles William

Duke, Henry Edward

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Arrol, Sir William

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart

Asher, Alexander

Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edwd.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Chapman, Edward

Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Balcarres, Lord
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Fisher, William Hayes
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Banbury, Frederick George
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Garfit, William
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn)
Bignold, Arthur
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry. S.)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Cranborne, Viscount
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Davies Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Butcher, John George
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Goulding, Edward Alfred

answer which the Attorney General for Ireland gave them as to whether in the original Act the baronies were liable to these charges. Would the right hon. Gentleman tell them whether as the Bill came down to them the baronies were;
*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That matter cannot be raised on this Amendment.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Nothing else arises. That is the whole point.

MR. ATKINSON said he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that so far as the liability of the ratepayers in the particular baronies mentioned in the Act of 1875, they remained exactly as they were before. There was no federation of the baronies. The Provisional Order simply provided that the county districts should be used instead of the baronies. It neither circumscribed nor extended the area on which any particular charges were made.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Read the section.

MR. ATKINSON said that was his interpretation. So far as that Amendment was concerned, it was obvious that it did not charge any district; but what the Amendment intended, he presumed, was to indicate the bodies that should henceforth pay the charge.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 137; Noes, 91. (Division List No. 445.)

Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)

Macdona, John Cumming

Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye

Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)

MacIver, David (Liverpool)

Ropner, Col. Robert

Groves, James Grimble

Maconochie, A. W.

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Hain, Edward

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Rutherford, John

Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x

M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Harris, Frederick Leverton

Majendie, James A. H.

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Haslett, Sir James Horner

Maple, Sir John Blundell

Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert

Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.

Mitchell, William

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Heaton, John Henniker

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Skewes-Cox, Thomas

Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)

Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)

Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead

Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.

Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.

Hornby, Sir William Henry

Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)

Spear, John Ward

Horner, Frederick William

Murray, Rt Hn. A. Graham (Bute

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Hoult, Joseph

Myers, William Henry
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Paulton, James Mellor
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Valentia, Viscount
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Plummer, Walter R.
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Lawson, John Grant
Pretymann, Ernest George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham)
Purvis, Robert
Webb, Col. William George
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Randles, John S.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Rankin, Sir James
Wilsod-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Rentoul, James Alexander
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Mr. O'Neill and Colonel J.
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
M'Calmont.

NOES.

Abraham, W. (Cork, N. E.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hammond, John
O'Dowd, John
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Bell, Richard
Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale-
O'Malley, William
Boland, John
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Shee, James John
Boyle, James
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Partington, Oswald
Brigg, John
Jones, W. (Carnarvonshire)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Broadhurst, Henry
Jordan, Jeremiah
Reddy, M.
Burns, John
Joyce, Michael
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Burt, Thomas
Kennedy, Patrick James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Cameron, Robert
Lambert, George
Rickett, J. Compton
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edmund
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Roche, John
Channing Francis Allston
Lough, Thomas
Roe, Sir Thomas
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

Cogan, Denis J.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Colville, John
M'Fadden, Edward
Soares, Ernest J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Govern, T.
Sullivan, Donal
Crean, Eugene
M'Kenna, Reginald
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Crombie, John William
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Tennant, Harold John
Cullinan, J.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Thompson Dr. E. C. (MonaghnN
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Murnaghan, George
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Delany, William
Murphy, John
Tomkinson, James
Donelan, Captain A.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Ure, Alexander
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Duffy, William J.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Elibank, Master of
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Emmott, Alfred
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Mr.
Field, William
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
T. M. Healy and Mr. Daly.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
O'Doherty, William

Flavin, Michael Joseph

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Subsequent Lords' Amendment agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Amendments to Dover Corporation Bill [Lords];
Smethwick Corporation Bill [Lords]; Lowestoft Corporation Bill [Lords]; Ripon
Corporation Bill [Lords]; Southport Water (Transfer Bill) [Lords]; Harpenden
District Gas Bill [Lords]: without amendment.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) (RE-COMMITTED) BILL
[Lords].

Ordered, That the parties interested have leave to be heard by themselves, their
counsel, agents, or witnesses, before the Committee on the Education Board
Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords].;(Sir J. Gorst.)

LONDON UNITED TRAMWAYS BILL.

WALLASEY IMPROVEMENT BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

BRISTOL CORPORATION (DOCKS AND RAILWAYS, ETC.) BILL [Lords].

King's consent signified; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

MANCHESTER AND LIVERPOOL ELECTRIC EXPRESS RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

King's consent signified; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

PORTMADOC, BEDDGELERT, AND SOUTH SNOWDON RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

King's consent signified; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

WESTON-SUPER-MARE GAS BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 4).

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the General
Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Berehaven, ordered to be brought in by
Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 4) BILL.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order made by the Board of Trade under the General
Pier and Harbour Act, 1861, relating to Berehaven," presented accordingly.

Ordered, That Standing Order 193A, which provides that "no Bill, originating
in this House, for confirming a Provisional Order or Provisional Certificate,
shall be read the first time after the first day of June," be suspended as
regards a Bill entitled the Pier and Harbours Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill,
and that the Bill be read the first time.:(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

Bill read accordingly the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for
Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 289.]

Ordered, That in the case of the Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4)
Bill, Standing Order 73 be suspended, and that the Examiners have leave to sit
and proceed forthwith.:(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) (RE-COMMITTED) BILL
[Lords].

Reported, without further Amendment from the Select Committee, with Special
Report and Minutes of Evidence [Provisional Order confirmed].

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 327.]

Minutes of Proceedings, to be printed. [No. 327.]

Bill, as amended, to be considered upon Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

Resolved, That this House, at its rising this day, do adjourn till Monday next.;(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

PETITIONS.

AGRICULTURAL RATES ACT (1896), ETC., CONTINUANCE BILL.

Petition from Morayshire, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

CANADIAN CATTLE (IMPORTATION).

Petition from Berwickshire, for the abolition of restrictions; to lie upon the Table.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE TO CROPS, ETC., BILL.

Petition from Morayshire, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th June; Sir Henry Fowler]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 319.]

TRAMWAY AND GAS AND WATER ORDERS.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade of their proceedings under the Tramways Act, 1870, and the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, during the session of 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GAS UNDERTAKINGS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 2nd April; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 320.]

GAS UNDERTAKINGS (LOCAL AUTHORITIES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 2nd April; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 321.]

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 8th August; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 322.]

BANKRUPTCY.

Copy presented, of Eighteenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade under the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 323.]

COMPANIES (WINDING UP).

Copy presented, of Tenth General Annual Report by the Board of Trade [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 324.]

RAILWAY SERVANTS (HOURS OF LABOUR).

Copy presented of Report by the Board of Trade of their Proceedings under the Railway Regulation Act, 1893, during the year ended 27th July, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade on their Proceedings and Business under the Weights and Measures Acts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 326.]

PITCAIRN ISLAND.

Copy presented, of further Correspondence relating to the condition of the Pitcairn Islanders [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2687 to 2690 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series No. 563 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AFRICA (No. 8, 1901).

Copy presented of Report by the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway Committee on the progress of the works, 1900–1901 (with a map) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

INQUIRY INTO CHARITIES (COUNTY OF WILTS).

Return ordered, "comprising (1) the Reports made to the Charity Commissioners in the result of an inquiry held in every parish wholly or partly within the county of Wilts into Endowments, subject to the provisions of the Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853 to 1894, and appropriated in whole or in part for the benefit of that county, or of any part thereof, together with the Reports on those Endowments of the Commissioners for inquiring concerning Charities, 1818 to 1837; (2) a Digest showing, in the case of each such parish, whether any, and, if any, what, such Endowments are recorded in the books of the Charity Commissioners in the parish; and (3) an Index, alphabetically arranged, of names and places mentioned in the Reports.";(Mr. Griffith Boscawen.)

COLONIAL IMPORT DUTIES, 1901.

Return ordered, "relating to the rates of import Duties levied upon the principal and other articles imported into the Colonies and other possessions of the United Kingdom.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

ENGLISH, SCOTCH, AND IRISH LOANS WRITTEN OFF.

Return ordered, "showing the sums written off the Assets of the Local Loans Fund by the Public Works Loans Acts, 1896–1900, in respect of English, Scotch, and Irish Loans.";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;LORD KITCHENER'S PROCLAMATION.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Colonies whether the proclamation of Lord Kitchener, issued to-day, was drawn up on any suggestion of Lord Kitchener or after consulting Lord Kitchener.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Of course. Sir, it was drawn up with the full approval of Lord Kitchener.

MR. CHANNING Was the approval given before?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir.

NATIVE COMPOUNDS;ENFORCEMENT OF NATIVE LABOUR CONTRACTS.

MR. CHANNING: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has, through Lord Milner or otherwise, taken steps, since the shooting down by British soldiers of natives attempting to escape from the compound at the Wesselton Mine at Kimberley, in October last, to lay down regulations or otherwise to prevent the use of British soldiers for the enforcement of

contracts, or for any other purposes than those which come within the law and the Army Regulations.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No. The employment of military forces in districts under martial law must be left to the discretion of the military authorities, who are responsible for the manner in which they employ such forces.

MR. CHANNING: I understand this question has no reference to martial law, but has reference to the enforcement of contracts in the compound at Kimberley, and I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that he will inquire into the matter. I now ask him whether the employment of British soldiers to enforce contracts is within the law and the regulations.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I never made any promise to inquire into the matter, because under no possible circumstances could it concern my department. Either it is an act of a self-governing colony, with which I cannot interfere, or it is an act of the military authorities at a time when martial law prevailed. If so, the question should be addressed to the War Office.

MR. CHANNING: As the right hon. Gentleman is laying down conditions dealing with the employment of natives I would ask whether he contemplates, in connection with this matter, the employment of British troops to enforce contracts either in Kimberley or the Transvaal.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member appears to be unaware of the fact that Kimberley is not under the Imperial Parliament. It is under the control of the Government of the Cape, which is a self-governing colony, with which I do not wish to interfere.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Is not the Governor of Cape Colony, as representing the King, bound to obey the orders of the right hon. Gentleman?

[No answer was returned.]

SHOOTING OF A NATIVE; CASE OF CAPTAIN COX.

MR. CHANNING: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Lord Milner or Sir Holy Hutchinson have, on their own authority or under direction of the Colonial Office, taken any steps by requiring the Attorney General of Cape Colony to act or otherwise to secure the bringing to trial of Captain Cox for ordering a Cape policeman named Smith to shoot a native named Dolley, which order was accepted by the court in October last as sufficient evidence to acquit Smith on the charge of murdering Dolley.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir; the matter is one entirely within the discretion of the Cape Attorney General, who accepts full responsibility towards the Cape Parliament for his decision after careful consideration not to prosecute Captain Cox.

MR. CHANNING: DO I understand that it is not within the power and jurisdiction of the Secretary of State for the Colonies and Lord Milner to make any suggestion or recommendation to the Cape Colony Government on a matter of this kind?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have the right to make any courteous communication to the Government of any colony, but I do not propose to interfere with the discretion of the Cape Colony in this matter.

LAND SETTLEMENT.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the exact sum proposed to be allocated to the scheme of land settlement in South Africa; whether, when such scheme has been prepared, will it be submitted to the House; and whether, before any Imperial money is used, will the Imperial Parliament have an opportunity of expressing an opinion upon the details of its disposal.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir. I have nothing to add to my reply of yesterday.

BOER PRISONERS AT ST. HELENA; SHOOTING OF GODEFROY.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the case of the killing of

See page 26.

Godefroy at St. Helena, an investigation before a coroner was demanded by the Boer prisoners, which demand was refused; and, if so, can he state why it was refused; whether at the military inquiry which did take place the friends of Godefroy were represented; and whether his representatives were allowed to cross-examine the military witnesses; whether the committee of Boer prisoners who communicated with the Governor in reference to this incident have sent in any statement; and, if so, whether such statement was considered by the court which conducted the inquiry; and whether he will allow the Member for East Mayo to have access to any correspondence which has passed between the camp committee, the Governor, and the president of the court in reference to the shooting of Godefroy, and to the official record of the proceeding of the court.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The report called for has not yet arrived. I am not therefore in a position to answer the question.

MR. DILLON: Seeing that this occurred in the month of February last, and as there are means of telegraphic communication, cannot the noble Lord get the information?

LORD STANLEY: I can only say I have asked for the report and it has not yet arrived.

MR. DILLON: I shall repeat this question.

EXECUTION OF REBELS; COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE OF BURGHERS.

MR. CHANNING: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether orders have now been sent or will forthwith be sent by telegram to South Africa directing the authorities, in the case of any further executions, to discontinue the practice of compelling the Dutch inhabitants to witness these executions.

LORD STANLEY: There is no such practice as the hon. Member supposes. The single instance to which he refers was due to the necessity which, in the opinion of the military authorities, existed for showing that the sentences inflicted by court-martial were really carried out. It will not have to be repeated.

MR. CHANNING: I should like to ask the noble Lord whether I am to understand from his answer that His Majesty's Government have sent directions to South Africa to prevent any such occurrence again.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. In the opinion of the General Officer Commanding in South Africa this will not have to be repeated.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, S.): Has the noble Lord received any fresh communication on the subject since yesterday, when he was questioned in regard to it.

LORD STANLEY: I believe a communication was received this morning.

BRITISH MOBILE FORCES.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether, having regard to the recent military successes of the Boers will he state what measures are in contemplation and are being taken by the Government to enable Lord Kitchener to conduct the war with more vigour by fresh mobile troops.

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware of any recent events which would justify the supposition that further fresh mobile forces are necessary.

COURTS-MARTIAL;HEAVY SENTENCES ON MUNSTER FUSILIERS.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of twenty-eight men of the 1st Battalion Munster Fusiliers, who have been sentenced to seven years penal servitude after landing at Southampton from Africa; and can he state what was the offence committed by those men to call for such a sentence.

LORD STANLEY: No information has reached the War Office of any such court-martial sentence.

COURTS-MARTIAL;REVISION OF SENTENCES.

MR. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in cases of such convictions by courts-martial as must be submitted to a judge advocate general for confirmation or consideration, the accused person is required to undergo the inflicted sentence, whether of imprisonment or other punishment, before the validity of the conviction has been determined by that officer; if so, whether this procedure can be so altered as to secure that punishment shall not be undergone until the conviction has been adjudged to be valid by the proper legal authority.

LORD STANLEY: General courts-martial only must be submitted to the judge advocate general for confirmation by the Sovereign. Other courts-martial are only referred to him before confirmation when the confirming officer is in doubt on some legal point. All general, district, and field general courts-martial are sent to him for review and custody, and if total illegality is discovered the proceedings are quashed, but in 1900 only one in 400 was quashed. The sentence takes effect from the date of the signature of the president of the court. It would not be practicable to allow a prisoner to be at large after trial, and the delay involved by the suggestion would render discipline quite impossible.

MEAT CONTRACTS.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he is aware that a quantity of foreign beef is being supplied the troops,, whereas the contract is for beef from native cattle; and if he will take steps to prevent this in the future.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg also to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that in some cases contractors are supplying

foreign beef obtained in Deptford, Birkenhead, and elsewhere as native home-fed meat; whether he will inquire into the matter and enforce the terms of contract.

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware that any foreign beef is being supplied to the troops contrary to the terms of existing contracts. General officers commanding districts are well aware of the conditions of supply, and may be trusted to enforce compliance with the terms.

MR. FIELD: Will the noble Lord make inquiry into facts which I have had laid before him as to the supply of foreign instead of native meat?

LORD STANLEY: It is a very large question, but if the hon. Member will bring any specific cases under the notice of the general officer commanding I am sure they will be fully inquired into.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY OFFICERS.

MR. PEEL (Manchester, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the Militia and Yeomanry Bill of this session extends the provisions of the Militia Act of 1882 to the Imperial Yeomanry, he will consider the advisability of placing officers of the Imperial Yeomanry on an equality with officers of the Militia as regards precedence.

LORD STANLEY: Yes, Sir; this point will be considered.

In reply to Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield);

LORD STANLEY said the whole question of promotion was under consideration, but it would not do for him to make any statement at present.

RETURN OF TROOPS FROM SOUTH AFRICA.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the expected return of a number of troops from South Africa at the end of September, he will consider the claims of those soldiers to be sent home who have served the longest time in the field, especially those who, like men in the Derbyshire regiment, served in the Tirah campaign before going to South Africa, and have been wounded in this campaign.

LORD STANLEY: I am not at present in a position to make any statement in the direction suggested by the question.

MILITIA PAY.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a militiaman, after disembodiment or discharge in South Africa, is entitled to receive seven days pay, ration, and messing allowance for each month of embodied service after twelve months, in addition to the forty-two days laid down in paragraphs 27 and 32 of the Instructions relating to the Embodied Militia, issued with Army Orders of May, 1901.

LORD STANLEY: The embodied militiaman whose whole service is given in South Africa gets a gratuity of pay for forty-two days for the first six months, forty-two days for the second six months, forty-two days for the third six months or any shorter period, and seven days for each month after the eighteenth month. He also gets a gratuity of 30s. for the first year, and if his service extends beyond twelve months of £3.

MR. COCHRANE: Does it date from the embodiment or from the day of going out to South Africa?

LORD STANLEY: I do not know.

ARMY REMOUNTS.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he can state when the Report of the Commission to inquire into the question of Army remounts will be published; and if he can say how many witnesses were examined from Ireland, and from what portions of that country did the witnesses come.

LORD STANLEY: This is a Committee appointed by the Secretary of State to advise him as to the best method in the future of obtaining remounts, and is not a Commission as suggested by the hon. Member; and it will be for the Secretary of State to decide whether all or any of the proceedings shall be made public.

Meanwhile the proceedings are confidential.

MR. DALY: Cannot the noble Lord say how many witnesses have been examined from Ireland? There should

be no secrecy as to what part of Ireland they come from.

LORD STANLEY: The Report is being drawn up; all the proceedings were confidential.

RIFLE RANGES; LICHFIELD RANGES.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he can state what progress has been made in providing new rifle ranges this year, what new rifle ranges have been opened, and how soon the range near Lichfield will be completed.

LORD STANLEY: Over £58,000 has been spent on rifle ranges between 1st January and 31st March, 1901. The figures for the subsequent months are not yet to hand. Five ranges have been completed since 1st January. Thirty-six ranges for the Volunteers have been approved, and are in course of construction. The purchase of land at Lichfield is not yet completed.

ARMY MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether he can state when the Report of the Commission on the Army Medical Department will be ready, and if it will be published.

LORD STANLEY: I am not able to say when the Report of this departmental Committee will be ready. The question of its publication does not therefore arise at present.

SOLDIERS' FIELD GLASSES.

MR. GOULDING (Wiltshire, Devizes): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Sergeants Stephens and Brind and Private Carmichael, 18th Hussars, were captured by the enemy, and consequently lost the field glasses with which they had voluntarily provided themselves for the public service; that the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa has recommended that the claims made by the men for the field glasses should be paid, as they had shown considerable zeal in providing them-

selves with field glasses at their own expense, and had been exonerated by a court of inquiry from all blame as to their capture, and that the War Office has declined to sanction their indemnification; whether, taking into consideration the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief, and the resistance to which he alludes, the claims of these men will be reconsidered.

LORD STANLEY: Field glasses are not required by regulation, and have not therefore hitherto been considered matter for indemnification. The question is receiving further consideration.

RECRUITING STATISTICS.

MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he can state the total number of recruits raised for the Regular Army and for the Militia respectively since 1st January, 1901, specifying in each case the numbers obtained for the infantry arm and the number of specials.

LORD STANLEY: The total recruits for the Regular Army up to the 27th July amounted to 25,700, of whom 12,390 were for infantry and 8,668 were specials. For the Militia there were 22,369 recruits, of whom 18,579 were for infantry.

ARMY ANNUAL RETURN.

MR. H. D. GREENE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can say when the last Annual Return of the British Army was published, and when the next will be issued.

LORD STANLEY: The last Return was for 1898. As the House has been already informed, it will not be possible to collate the necessary information for another Return until the war is over.

INDIAN FINANCE.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state whether it is intended to give effect to the proposals referred to in paragraph 69 of the unanimous Report on Indian Expenditure, to the effect that the Indian financial year should end on 31st December, in order that the Indian Accounts may be laid before Parliament at an earlier date than is now practicable, and with a view to the discussion on Indian Finance taking place earlier in the session.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I stated, in reply to a similar question on the 2nd of April last, that a proposal to make the Indian financial year end on the 31st December had been considered, in 1873, by a Select Committee of this House, who reported against it; and that I had communicated the suggestion of the recent Royal Commission to the Government of India, but did not believe it would be found practicable to adopt it. To this I can add nothing at present.

INDIAN FISCAL SYSTEM; DEATH DUTIES.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the present character of the Indian Revenue, he will consider the desirability of extending the principle of the Finance Act of 1894 to the Indian fiscal system.

LORD G. HAMILTON: My hon. friend's question is a suggestion that it would be desirable to raise revenue in India by means of Death Duties. The question has often been considered, but in the opinion of nearly all who have discussed it, the habits and usages of the people of that country are such as to make this form of taxation unsuitable, if not impracticable.

TRINIDAD; GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS.

*MR. COMPTON RICKETT (Scarborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the

Colonies whether a further report from the Governor of Trinidad, relating to the closing of Government schools, and their transfer to denominational management, has come to hand; whether he has received a petition from the inhabitants of Trinidad objecting to the threatened closing of these Government schools, and asking for an inquiry into the state of education in that island; and also a petition for permission to erect a new building for the Royal College, and for sanction to add to its teaching staff; whether he has reached any decision in regard to these matters, and whether the correspondence relating thereto will be produced.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have received the further report referred to in the question and a petition against the closing of the schools. I have not received a petition for a new building for Queen's Royal College. I have sanctioned an addition to its teaching staff. I have not yet come to any final decision on the subject of the Trinidad schools.

CAIRO FOX-HUNTING INCIDENT.

MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the prisoners in the Egyptian tame foxhunting case who have appealed against their sentence are still confined to gaol; and, if still in gaol, will His Majesty's Government take steps for their release pending appeal.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): His Majesty's Government have no information which would enable me to answer the first question of the hon. Gentleman. With regard to the second, the hon. Gentleman is evidently unaware that the Egyptian courts are as independent as the courts of the United Kingdom, and it would be highly improper for His Majesty's Government to interfere with their discretion.

SCOTTISH STEAM TRAWLERS.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the mischief resulting from the incompetency of masters of steam trawlers in Scotland in navigation; and, if legislation is necessary to effect a remedy, whether he will be prepared to legislate on the subject next session.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The expediency of requiring masters of trawlers in Scotland to take out certificates will be considered when any opportunity arises of amending the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, but I cannot make any definite promise of legislation.

POST OFFICE LEGISLATION.

COLONEL STOPFORD-SACKVILLE (Northamptonshire, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the general ignorance prevailing among parish councils as to their powers under the Post Office Amendment Act, 1895, and the Post Office (Guarantee) Act, 1898, he will be willing to issue to them a circular conveying to them anew in plain language the explanation of these Acts, as was attempted to be done in the circular letter of 3rd September, 1898.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I

will give consideration to the suggestion of my hon. and gallant friend.

ENCROACHMENT ON HINKSFORD HIGHWAY.

COLONEL WEBB (Staffordshire, Kingswinford): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the action of the Seisdon Rural District Council in permitting an encroachment on the highway at Hinksford, in the parish of Swindon, in their district; whether he is aware that the district council have approved plans for buildings which do not comply with their own bye-laws; whether it is with the sanction of the Local Government Board that the person who advises the rural district council as to the acceptability of plans is an architect who prepares plans for buildings in the district; and whether he can take any steps to secure the proper performance by the district council of their duties in regard to these matters.

*MR. WALTER LONG: I have applied to the rural district council for information with regard to the matters referred to in the question, and am awaiting a reply from them on the subject. No sanction on the part of the Local Government Board is required to the appointment of the person who advises a district council as to the acceptance of plans.

ABERYSTWITH;THE "QUEEN BEE" FATALITY.

MR. GEORGE KENYON (Denbigh): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received any official intimation of the fatal accident to the "Queen Bee" at Aberystwith, and if he will give the latest information to the House, whether he can say when this boat was last officially inspected, and whether, having reference to the accidents occurring to pleasure boats at this season, he can suggest any better system of inspection and registration than that which is now in force.

*MR. WALTER LONG: My right hon. friend has asked me to reply to this question. I have not received any official information as to the accident referred to, but I am in communication with the local authority on the subject. I have under consideration proposals for the amendment of the law relating to the registration and licensing of pleasure boats.

WELSH ORDNANCE SURVEY.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he will state what progress has been made by the Ordnance Survey Department with the revision of the ordnance maps for the counties of Wales, and what counties are now in course of revision; whether he has given instructions for the commencement of the revision of the maps for the county of Carmarthen; if not, whether he will do so, having regard to the fact that the revision of the adjoining county of Glamorgan has been completed.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): The counties of Anglesey, Carnarvon, Denbigh, Flint, Merioneth, and Glamorgan have already been revised. The revision of the county of Montgomery is in progress.

Carmarthenshire was revised only thirteen years ago, and as revision is to take place every twenty years its revision is not yet due, but it will be completed well within the twenty-year limit. The original survey of Glamorganshire was completed twenty-three years ago.

RABIES IN CARMARTHENSHIRE.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he can give the date when the last known case of rabies was discovered in the county of Carmarthen, and whether he is in a position to state when the muzzling order now in force in that county is likely to be withdrawn.

*MR. HANBURY: The last known case occurred in March last, but some suspicious cases have occurred at later dates. Having regard to the long period that may elapse before the disease is developed in an infected dog, it would be undesirable to withdraw the Order at present.

NATIONAL COMPETITION OF SCHOOLS OF ART.

MR. PEEL: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the exhibition of the works of students in the National Competition of Schools of Art is held at the dead season of the year; between 26th July and 31st August; and in a temporary iron building at the end of a lane; and whether, in view of the public interest in the competition, he could make arrangements to have the works exhibited in a more suitable place and at a more convenient time.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The exhibition is held at the time most convenient to art masters and teachers and art students, by whom it is very largely visited. The present structure, in which the exhibition has been held for the last ten years, is temporary; and ample accommodation will be provided in the buildings now being erected.

SCHOOL EXEMPTIONS AT WALSALL.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that the Walsall School Board, at its meeting in July, granted a number of complete and partial exemptions illegal in character; and whether the Education Department propose to hold any inquiry or to take any steps to prevent this body from breaking its own bye-laws.

SIR J. GORST: This question is still under investigation.

PUBLIC REVENUE IN THE ISLE OF MAN.

MR. H. D. GREENE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state what was the amount of net income, arising from the Crown lands and properties and from the working of the Post Office in the Isle of Man, received in the financial year ending in 1901, to what accounts these sums have been carried, or to what purpose applied; and whether there is any, and, if so, what, agreement or arrangement between the Government and the Isle of Man, and of what date, relating to the application of these funds respectively.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The net income arising from Crown lands in the Isle of Man in the year 1900–1 was £3,935. I am unable to state the amount of net income derived from the working of the Post Office in that island. There is no special agreement or arrangement between the Government and the Isle of Man respecting the application of these receipts. They form part of the general public revenue of the British Isles, and are dealt with under the provisions of the Acts of Parliament relating to the Crown lands and the Post Office, which Acts extend to the Isle of Man.

BRITISH POSTAL ORDERS IN TURKEY.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that British postal orders are only obtainable at the British post office; at Constantinople, and are neither issued nor payable at the British post offices at Salonica, Smyrna, or Damascus, and can he say what is the cause of the delay in carrying out the reform.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: At present the British post office at Constantinople is the only British post office in the Levant at which postal orders are obtainable. As the hon. Member has already been informed in this House, the question of extending the postal-order system to the British post office at Salonica, has been under consideration; and the Postmaster General hopes shortly to give postal-order facilities not only to Salonica but to Smyrna. There is no British post office at Damascus, but there is one at Beyrout, and when there is any sign of a demand for postal orders at Beyrout; which at present there is not; the question of supplying them to that office also shall be considered.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the French post offices in Turkey issue money orders and bons de poste or postal orders payable at any post office in France at the same rate as in France, and seeing that, at the British post offices at Constantinople, Salonica, and Smyrna, 6d. commission is charged on a £;1 money order to the United Kingdom, whilst the French post offices at Constantinople, Salonica, and Smyrna charge only twenty-five centimes or 2½d. on a £;1 money order to the United Kingdom, will he take into consideration the reduction of the charges at these British post offices.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is the fact that the French post office charges its inland rates of commission on money orders and bons de poste issued at its post offices in the Levant, and the commission on a French money order for 25 francs is 25 centimes. The commission on a £;1 money order at British post offices in the Levant is 6d.; but £;1 can be remitted from the British post office at Constantinople by postal order for a commission of 2d., and the same facilities will exist at Salonica and Smyrna so soon as the extension referred to in my answer to the last question is carried out. In these circumstances it is not proposed to interfere with the present money-order rates.

BRITISH PARCELS POST IN TURKEY.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, having regard to the fact that the Austrian post offices in Turkey accept parcels of 11 lbs, or five kilogrammes for Great Britain at a charge of 2s., while the British post offices in Turkey charge 3s. for an exactly similar parcel to the same destination, whether he will state what steps he proposes to take.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has no information concerning the amount of the postage charged on parcels for the United Kingdom at an Austrian post office in Turkey except that of Constantinople. At that office the postage is 12 piastres; equivalent to 2s.; on parcels of any weight up to the maximum of eleven pounds. The British post office offers a rate which is identical for the

parcel of maximum weight, to which the hon. Member particularly refers, while on a seven pound parcel it is sixpence less, and on a three pound parcel only half the Austrian postage. It also offers a more expensive rate, but this is for a quicker service.

BRITISH AND GERMAN MONEY ORDER SYSTEM.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that, in the case of money orders drawn in England in favour of persons in Germany, it is unnecessary to write to the persons to whom they are addressed, because the German postal authorities take the money direct to the houses of the addressees and receive receipts; and whether he will introduce this practice in England if the German postal authorities supply evidence that the system works well both as regards telegraph and postal money orders.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is aware of the arrangement referred to by the hon. Member. The question of introducing it into the United Kingdom has already been fully considered in all its details, with the assistance of the German post office; and the Postmaster General is convinced that from the point of view of the public as well as of the Post Office the arrangement would be much less satisfactory than that which already obtains here.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON asked whether the Postmaster General would give the system a trial.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I understand that in the opinion of the advisers of the Postmaster General the difficulty of identification would be greater in this country than in Germany, where more is known about individuals, and money orders would miscarry and fail to reach the persons for whom they are intended.

LONDON TELEPHONE SERVICE.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether any arrangement has been come to between the Government and the National Telephone Company for equal charges for telephones and telephone services in London; and whether the Government or the Postmaster General has now abandoned the intention to enter into competition with the National Telephone Company, as indicated in the speech of the late Secretary to the Treasury.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Negotiations are in progress between the Post Office and the National Telephone Company with a view to secure the greatest possible facilities for telephone users in the London district, and in particular free intercommunication between all subscribers on either system within that area. These negotiations are not yet completed; and it is not possible for me to make any further statement upon them at present.

NEW POSTAGE STAMPS.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he has inspected the red colour penny stamps of the various colonies of the British Empire, most of which were manufactured by Messrs. De La Rue and Company; and can he say when a definite reply will be given to the petition of 200 Members of the House of Commons for

the abolition of the present penny stamp, and the introduction of a royal scarlet or red colour penny stamp in this country.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The question of the colour of the new penny stamp is still under consideration, and it is not likely that a decision can be arrived at immediately.

GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS AND FREE POSTAGE.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, in view of the fact that while all inspection notes, invoices, and letters addressed to the Army Clothing Department by contractors are post free, exactly similar documents to the Naval Store, Deptford, require to be post paid, whether he will take steps to remedy this difference.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The question of including the Naval Store, Deptford, in the list of Government departments entitled to receive correspondence free of postage is one for the Lords of the Admiralty, in conjunction with the Postmaster General, and no communication has been received on the subject.

TELEGRAPH OFFICE GUARANTEES.

COLONEL STOPFORD-SACKVILLE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state on what basis the calculations are founded which operate to prevent the extension of telegraph offices except under guarantee; when were the Treasury regulations last revised, and can he give the number of telegraph guarantees now existing in England and Wales, distinguishing between those by private individuals and those by district and parish councils or meetings.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In the case of villages where it is estimated that the revenue to be derived from telegrams will cover the expenses there is generally speaking nothing to prevent the extension of the telegraphs. It is only where the estimated revenue is not sufficient that a guarantee is required. The amount of the guarantee is made up of a charge for interest on the cost of constructing the line, the annual cost for maintenance, and the payments to the sub-postmaster. The regulations were last revised in 1897, on the occasion of Her late Majesty's Diamond Jubilee, and the State then undertook for the first time to bear half the risk of every guarantee.

DISMISSALS OF DISHONEST POSTMEN.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state what is the number of established and unestablished postmen who were dismissed for dishonesty or on suspicion in the years 1897, 1898, 1899, and 1900.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The number of postmen dismissed on the charge of dishonesty during the years in question is as follows:;In 1897, 53 established and 46 unestablished postmen; in 1898, 52 established and 46 unestablished postmen; in 1899, 54 established and 45 unestablished postmen; in 1900, 72 established and 72 unestablished postmen.

LAURENCEKIRK POSTMASTERSHIP

MR. CROMBIE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will make an early appointment to the postmastership at Laurencekirk, which has been vacant since June, in view of the

inconvenience caused to the public by having a post office employing eighteen subordinate officials without a head.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN The vacancy for a postmaster at Laurencekirk has been advertised in the weekly "Post Office Circular," and an appointment will be made as soon as all the applications from candidates have been received and their claims and qualifications have been considered.

INCOME TAX ABATEMENTS.

MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware of the inconvenience caused to persons of small fixed incomes in having to make out each year in detail a statement of income before receiving the abatements of income tax to which they are entitled by law, and seeing that many persons, such as ladies and others unaccustomed to business, forfeit the abatements to which they are entitled sooner than face the annual ordeal of filling income tax forms, he will provide that in those cases wherein the right to abatement is once established, particularly under Schedules A and B, a simple declaration that the previous income has not increased be accepted by the Revenue authorities in proof of any further claims for abatements from the same person.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In strictness the income tax laws require that a person whose income falls within the statutory limits of abatement should establish his claim to abatement year by year. But, as a matter of practice, when a title to abatement has once been established, the officers of the Board of Inland Revenue do, whenever practicable, dispense with a fresh formal claim from the same person during the next few years.

EASTERN AND SOUTH AFRICA TELEGRAPH COMPANY.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he would state the reasons which necessitated the conclusion of a fresh agreement with the Eastern and South Africa Telegraph Company for a prolonged period, based upon certain stipulations and subsidies, without waiting for the Report of the Cable Committee appointed for the special purpose of examining and reporting upon these very terms and conditions; also whether the omission of an expropriation clause on fair terms was intentional.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The completion of this arrangement has been delayed by protracted negotiations on points of detail, but its principle was accepted by His Majesty's Government and the Cape Government nearly a year before the Cable Committee was appointed.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON put a question which was inaudible.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: On that point we are waiting for the opinion of the Cable Committee, which specially directed its attention to this point. I can express no opinion until we have their Report.

LOCAL TAXATION IN SCOTLAND.

MR. NICOL (Argyllshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he can state when the Royal Commission on Local Taxation will issue their Report for Scotland.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): A definite date cannot be fixed, but it is hoped that the Report in question may be issued in the course

of the autumn of this year.

STORNOWAY ALLOTMENTS.

MR. WEIR (ROSS and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether he is aware that a Return recently published shows that 117 applications have been made to the Stornoway parish council for allotments since 15th May, 1895, under Section 20 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1891; and, seeing that the whole of these applications have been refused, will he explain the cause.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed by the clerk to the parish council of Stornoway that the applications for allotments referred to by the hon. Member were refused on account of the proprietors not consenting to grant the land for that purpose. I also understand that the parish council made no application to the county council for compulsory powers.

ALLOTMENTS IN ROSS-SHIRE.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, seeing that an application made by the parish council of Kincardine, Ross-shire, under the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, Section 26, authorising land to be taken on lease compulsorily for allotments, was refused by the county council for Ross and Cromarty on 4th May, 1899, will he state the cause of the refusal.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am informed by the Local Government Board that the refusal of the county council of Ross and Cromarty to grant an order authorising the parish council of Kincardine to take land on lease compulsorily for allotments was the subject of an appeal to them in terms of Section 25 (5) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894. The Board made careful inquiry into the case, and induced the county council to reconsider their decision, but at this stage the circumstances had so altered as to convince the county council that they ought not to issue the order craved. The parish council of Kincardine, in view of the altered circumstances, intimated to the Board that they did not desire to press their appeal.

TYRONE COUNTY COUNCIL OFFICIALS.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Tyrone County Council, shortly after its entrance to office, considered the claims of its assistant surveyors for increase of salaries, and decided on giving an increase of 25 per cent., that this action of the council received the sanction of the Local Government Board in September, 1899, and that at the bidding of the assistant surveyors and against the wish of the council the Local Government Board sent an inspector to Omagh last month to hold an inquiry into a matter settled and sanctioned in September, 1899; is he aware that the county council at the annual meeting in June last passed a resolution requesting the Local Government Board to allow it to hold half-yearly instead of quarterly meetings in future, and that in case the request is granted the duties of surveyors will be reduced to what they were under the old grand jury system, and will he direct the Board to deal with the resolution in respect to half-yearly meetings before deciding the claims of assistant surveyors for still further increase.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): In August, 1899, the county council passed a resolution increasing the salaries of the assistant surveyors from £80 to £100 a year. These officers made no protest at the time, and the Local Government Board expressed its concurrence in the arrangements made, on the assumption that an agreement had been arrived at between the council and the assistant surveyors. The latter subsequently protested against the salary proposed, and as it was clear that no agreement had been, or was likely to be, arrived at, the Board was under a statutory obligation to determine the matter. The local inquiry has been held, but the inspector's report has not yet been received. In reply to the second paragraph, the Board has no power to reduce the statutory meetings of the council from four to two in each year. Under the Amended Procedure Order a council may arrange to make half-yearly payments to contractors, but under the Local Government (Application of Enactments) Order four quarterly meetings must be held in each year.

MR. MURNAGHAN: Did the Local Government Board sanction the arrangement without examining it?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have given a full account of the matter. No protest was entered, and the Local Government Board understood that the assistant surveyors had entered into a reasonable arrangement.

IRISH BOARD OF EDUCATION; BOOK DEPARTMENT.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received resolutions from associations of teachers in which they state that the charges made against the management of the book store by Archbishop Walsh were correct, and the defence set forth in the memorandum incorrect; whether he is aware that several teachers not only have their

supplies delayed for months, but have forfeited the money and supplies, and whether, in view of these charges made against a public department, he will cause an inquiry to be held in order to ascertain what has become of this money.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have received a number of resolutions to the effect stated in the first paragraph. The Commissioners, as I have already stated, have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the reports which have been made to them in this matter by their responsible officers on the condition of the book department. The Commissioners are quite prepared to investigate statements tending to impugn the correctness of these reports if they are supplied with facts and figures enabling them to do so.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: If I send the right hon. Gentleman specific cases, will he give an undertaking that they shall be investigated by the Commissioners and not merely by officials?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Gentleman cannot make me a court of appeal for the Board. They have stated they are prepared to consider any cases, and I should advise him to send them to the Board.

MONAGHAN ASSISTANT COUNTY SURVEYORS.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, at a special meeting of the county council of Monaghan, it was resolved that deputies should be appointed to the assistant

county surveyors, by which the duties of the assistant county surveyors would not be increased from the time of the grand jury, whether he can state if the county council of Monaghan appoint deputies to the assistant county surveyors, the Local Government Board will allow the salaries to remain at £80 per annum, as was paid to the assistant county surveyors during the time of the grand jury.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has sent me a copy of a resolution to the effect stated in the first paragraph. The question whether the county council is legally empowered to appoint deputies to assistant surveyors, otherwise than in cases of illness, is one upon which I am not prepared to express an opinion without a fuller opportunity of examining the authorities. Perhaps the hon. Member will postpone the question until Thursday next. There are words in the Act which might be held to support the hon. Member's contention.

CLAIMS FOR MALICIOUS INJURY AT OMAGH.

MR. MURNAGHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware the number of claims for malicious injuries in the Omagh rural district is on the increase, and in excess of former years, and that the police, before the passage of the Local Government Act, used to inquire into the circumstances of each claim, and give evidence at presentment sessions and before the grand jury as to the result of the investigation; is this still a part of the duty of the Royal Irish Constabulary; and, if not, will he ask the police in Omagh to afford the same assistance as formerly in the investigation of claims for malicious injuries.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of claims for compensation for malicious injuries at the last Omagh quarter sessions was in excess of the number heard at the corresponding sessions of 1900, but there has been no increase in the amount of compensation awarded. In many of these cases the police were witnesses. They investigate every case, and give evidence when summoned as witnesses, either on behalf of county councils or applicants for compensation. The passage of the Local Government Act has made no alteration in their duty in this respect.

MOUNTJOY CONVICT PRISON STAFF.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that discontent exists in Mount-joy Convict Prison, Dublin, among the officers and men employed there since the recent appointment of the present Principal Warder Murray; that this official has treated both officers and prisoners with harshness; that, owing to the manner in which he acts, there has been an increase in the number of alleged breaches of the prison rules; and that, consequently, the governor's time is taken up in investigating complaints; whether he is aware that a warder named Barber, an officer of over eleven years service, has resigned owing to his treatment by Principal Warder Murray; and whether, seeing that this officer was appointed over the heads of more experienced and older officers in the service, if he will not cease to act in the manner complained of, he will be removed to some other prison.

MR. WYNDHAM: No complaints have been made to the Prisons Board of the character mentioned in the first paragraph. There has been an increase in the number of breaches of prison rules, but this is not due to any action on the part of the

principal warder. Very little of the governor's time is taken up in investigating these breaches. Barber's resignation was not due to the cause alleged. He resigned because he was aware that the Prisons Board would be obliged before long to recommend his discharge from the service. The principal warder has given satisfaction to the Board, who do not propose to remove him from Mountjoy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that since this question was put down there have been very few complaints as to this warder? Will he see that this state of affairs continues?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information.

HOUSING OF IRISH FISHERMEN.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is prepared to give consideration to representations and to cause inquiries to be made regarding the housing of the fishermen of the south and west coast of Ireland, and whether the character of the houses in which these men live has been brought under his notice; and, seeing that the applications of fishermen for labourers' cottages have been uniformly rejected by the Local Government Board, even when evidence has been adduced that they have devoted a portion of the year to agricultural work, he will state what steps it is proposed to take, either by amendment of the present Acts or the introduction of fresh legislation, to secure better dwellings for fishermen and for rural tradesmen and factory hands at present outside the scope of every enactment for the better housing of the working classes.

MR. WYNDHAM: Under the existing Labourers Acts "fishermen "and" hand-loom weavers" who do agricultural work at any season of the year are included in the term "agricultural labourers," for whom cottages may be provided. It is not, I am informed, correct to say that applications of fishermen for cottages have been uniformly rejected by the Local Government Board. The question of the extension of the Housing of the Working Classes Act (which at present extends only to urban districts and towns under the jurisdiction of town commissioners) so as to include the cases of artisans and others living in towns and villages too small to support town commissioners is one that deserves, and is receiving, consideration. At present, however, I cannot make any more definite statement.

LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEME AT MACROOM.

MR. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, in the recent improvement scheme under the Labourers Acts promoted by the Mac-room Rural District Council, a labourer sent in a properly filled representation paper for a cottage on the lands of Mrs. Ellen Manning, Droumdrive, in the electoral division of Macloneah; that, though his present abode was pronounced unfit for human habitation, and that no objection was made to his claim for a cottage, his representation paper was never considered at the Local Government Board inquiry; and will he state whether his representation paper was mislaid in the offices of the Local Government Board, or what are the reasons why it was not considered in the ordinary course.

MR. WYNDHAM: The scheme promoted by the district council contained no proposal to erect a cottage for this man, consequently his case was not considered at the

inquiry.

DAWRA COURT HOUSE.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that the caretaker of Dawra court house, in the county of Cavan, refused to allow the members of the Enniskillen Rural District Council No. 2 to hold its last quarterly meeting in the petty sessions room, although the county council of the county of Cavan pays a rent of £10 a year for this house; and can he state whether the county council of a county or a district council is entitled to use the court house or petty sessions rooms for the transaction of their business when not required for the administration of justice.

MR. WYNDHAM: Section 72, Sub-section 3, of the Local Government Act, 1898, provides that;

"except so far as the sheriff, or the justices' may require for the administration of justice' or the discharge of his or their duties, the use of any court house, sessions house, or other county building under his or their custody or control, the county council may use the same for the purpose of the execution of their duties."

The county council is thus entitled to the use of the court house or sessions house for the execution of its duties when the same can in the judgment of the sheriff or justices be done without interference with the administration of justice. The district councils have no right to the use of any court house or sessions house.

TRIM UNION FINANCE.

MR. KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the debit and credit balances found to exist by the adjusting auditor under the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, between the several divisions of the Trim Union, were the growth of many years, seeing that one division had a credit balance of 2s. and another a debit balance of 1s.

10s. 6d., while the poor rate

in the standard year was only 1s. 6d., and having regard to the fact that the Local Government Board Auditor was bound in each half-yearly audit to see that each poor law division contributed its due proportion of union expenditure, will he state whether this was done, and, if not, whether he will inquire who is responsible for a system of accounts which has caused hardship to ratepayers who were obliged to bear the whole of those debit balances, half of which the landlords would have been obliged to allow the tenant if levied when due by the several divisions previous to the passing of the said Act.

MR. WYNDHAM: Considerable research would be needed to determine whether the balances were the growth of years. It was the auditor's duty to see that the proper proportion of receipts and expenditure was charged in each half-year to each electoral division in accordance with statutory requirements. That duty was properly discharged. The auditor was under no responsibility to see that each electoral division contributed its due proportion towards the general expenditure of the union. This lies entirely within the competence of the guardians for decision by them when preparing the estimate of rates to be

levied. It seems that, in the case of the Trim Union, the former board of guardians failed to assess their proper contribution on certain electoral divisions, while they appear to have placed an unduly high assessment on others.

ISLAND MORE.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the ratepayers of Island More, in Lough Derg, appeared before the Borrisakane Board of Guardians, on the passing of the Local Government Act into law, requesting that they might be incorporated in the Borrisakane Union; and that the application was considered by the Local Government Board, who decided on leaving the question to the decision of the North Tipperary and Clare County Councils; whether any steps have since been taken to bring the matter under the notice of these bodies; and, seeing that the people on this island have recently been made responsible for a loan in connection with the Scariff water work's scheme, whether he will make provision in the amending Local Government Act to remedy their alleged grievance.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts appear to be as stated in the first paragraph. The Board is not aware that any action has since been taken in the matter by either of the councils mentioned. It is open to the ratepayers on the island to renew their application, and the provisions of the existing law are sufficient to enable the question of the transfer of the island to the Borrisakane Union to be dealt with, without recourse to further legislation.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.) put a question which was inaudible; and Mr. WYNDHAM said that if the islanders made another application the whole subject would be inquired into.

SPEARSTOWN NATIONAL SCHOOL.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, as the Spearstown National School, county Donegal, was on the Roll of the Commissioners of Education for thirty-two years, and as there have been exceptional cases in which the Commissioners have made grants to schools having an average of thirteen or less, and seeing that the motion to strike this school off the roll was carried by only a majority of two, will he consider this case, and recommend the Commissioners to make an exceptional grant; and whether, seeing that the teacher had a clean record for thirty-two years, and that in a few months he would have been entitled to his full pension, will he, considering all the circumstances of the case, recommend the Commissioners to grant him his full pension.

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot undertake to intervene in the allocation of grants to schools by the National Board. I have referred the question of according a full pension to that body for its observations.

CAVAN COURT HOUSE.

MR. M'GOVERN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that the agent to the Earl of Clanricarde, who is high sheriff for the county of Cavan, on 1st July, without notice, broke open the door of the room in the court house which has been used by the finance committee of the county council for its meetings and by the secretary of the county council for

his private office, removed the papers therein, and put a lock of his own on it; and, on same date, took possession of a room which the Cavan Urban Council has used as an office and for its meetings since 1854; did the late secretary of the Cavan grand jury always use the room in which the finance committee transacted its business as a private office; and as neither of those rooms was required for the use of the judges or bar in discharge of their duties, do the Government intend to take any notice of this gentleman's conduct or make any change in the law, so that county councils in Ireland shall have full control over the court houses which have been built and maintained at the expense of the ratepayers, except when required at assizes or quarter sessions.

MR. WYNDHAM: This question has been referred to the high sheriff for his observations, but, so far, they have not been received. I am unable, therefore, to reply to the several queries in reference to the matters of fact put to me in the question. The custody of assize and quarter sessions courts is vested in the sheriff, and prima facie he has a right to determine when they may be used for purposes other than the administration of justice. In the absence of the information referred to it would be premature to say whether or not he exercised that right wisely in the present instance. For the reasons given in the discussion in Committee on Clause 72 of the Local Government Act, 1898, the Government do not consider it expedient to alter the existing law.

MR. M'GOVERN: Does the right hon. Gentleman expect to get the information I have asked for?

MR. WYNDHAM: I hope so.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): What right has a high sheriff to seize any chamber in which a county council keeps its books and papers?

MR. WYNDHAM: These buildings are vested in the high sheriff, and it is for him to determine to what extent they are needed for the conduct of public business by the county council or any other body. It is a matter for his discretion, and if the county council are not satisfied they must appeal to the Lord Lieutenant.

MR. FLAVIN: Does the right hon. Gentleman say the high sheriff has absolute power of taking possession?

IRISH ORDNANCE SURVEY.

MR. MOORE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he can state the amount received by the Ordnance Survey Department in Ireland in respect of lands surveyed by them for the purposes of proceedings in the Land Judge's Court during the year ending 1900–1901, how many estates were so surveyed in the same period, in how many cases did they act for the vendors of lands being sold through the Land Commission, are the staff employed in survey work in receipt of their ordinary Royal Engineers pay, and to what credit is the amount received by them for survey work carried; and, as this survey is carried out by the officials of one State department under the control of a second to meet the requirements of a third, will he consider if the services can be rendered at their actual cost to the State.

*MR. HANBURY: The amount received for work in connection with the Land Judge's Court was £3,555; the number of estates surveyed as mentioned was seventy-two; the number of estates surveyed for the Purchase Department of the Land

Commission was nineteen (at a cost of £832). These sums are credited to the Appropriation-in-Aid. No Royal Engineers are employed on these surveys. The work is charged for at cost price.

RABIES IN IRELAND.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, in view of the few cases of rabies which occurred in Ireland lately, he will remove the restrictions existing which prevent dogs from passing between England and Ireland and vice versa.

*MR. HANBURY: A case occurred in Westmeath so recently as last April, and until Ireland has been free from any detected case of rabies for a much longer period than four months I cannot undertake to remove the existing restrictions.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the injustice done last season to a considerable number of greyhound owners, particularly in the north of Ireland? Cannot the right hon. Gentleman remove the restrictions for the coming season?

*MR. HANBURY: I cannot undertake to remove any restrictions at the risk of reintroducing the disease.

MR. LOUGH: Are not sporting dogs exempt from the restrictions?

*MR. HANBURY: No, not generally.

MR. FIELD: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware there have been no outbreaks of the disease for several months past?

*MR. HANBURY: There have been two already this year.

CORK AND FERMOY RAILWAY.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the cause of the delay in publishing the correspondence between the Fishguard and Rosslare Railway Company and the Treasury upon the proposed withdrawal of the company's pledge to construct the Cork and Fermoy Railway.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not aware that there was any delay. The last letter in the correspondence is dated the 26th July; the Papers were moved for on the same day, and issued on the 3rd of this month.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Is it not the fact that the letters, which were asked for a considerable time beforehand, were not issued until a fortnight or three weeks after the debate?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Member will refer to what took place he will find that is hardly a correct account of what took place. I did not actually promise the Papers, but I said I would consider whether anything could be done, but it was desirable that when correspondence was laid on the Table it should be complete.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Have there been any other communications since the publication?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have had a simple acknowledgment from the railway company of the receipt of the last letter included in the batch.

ROYAL CANAL, IRELAND.

MR. KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will lay upon the Table a copy of the Report to the Irish Board of Works recently made on the condition of the Royal Canal by an inspector of that Board.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The report in question was a confidential report to the

Board by one of the Board's inspectors, and it would be contrary to the usual practice in such cases to lay it upon the Table. The Board of Works has directed the Midland and Great Western Company's attention to the defects which exist, and has called upon them to take immediate steps to carry out the necessary works of maintenance and repair.

MR. KENNEDY: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the Report of 1894 was published?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not aware of that, and I do not think it is desirable to publish it.

MR. KENNEDY: Will the hon. Gentleman show me a copy of the Report?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I will look at it first.

PROMOTION IN ARMAGH POST OFFICE.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can state what is the principle of preferment which obtains at the Armagh post office; whether he is aware that a member of the staff, withdrawn over two years ago for special duty, was recently brought back and given the supervisorship with an extra weekly allowance, and again withdrawn, so that he is now in receipt of two sets of allowances, while his work at Armagh is performed by another man who receives nothing, and whether he will state what amount has been expended in this case by way of special allowances; whether he is aware that at the Armagh post office no Roman Catholic has ever got a single step beyond the initial grade; and whether he will see that the disabilities in the matter of promotion under which Roman Catholic servants of the post office labour will be abolished.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In all cases of promotion the officer who is considered to be best qualified for the vacant position is chosen. It is a fact that a member of the Armagh staff was temporarily withdrawn from that office in December, 1898, for special duty in a surveyor's office, and that when the supervisorship at Armagh became vacant he was chosen to fill it as being the officer best qualified for the post. He took up the appointment at Armagh in July, 1900, but in April last his services were again temporarily required in the surveyor's office, where a great pressure of work existed. According to rule, his substitute cannot be paid a supervising allowance until he has been acting for his superior officer for more than nine months. The supervising allowance is 4s. a week, and an allowance of 3s. 6d. a day for subsistence is paid to the officer who is absent from his head-quarters. The religion of post office servants at Armagh or elsewhere is not a matter with which the Postmaster General is concerned, or which is allowed to enter into questions of promotion.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: Will the hon. Gentleman be good enough to answer the latter part of the question. How much has been expended in the way of special allowances?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There was a supervising allowance of 4s. a week, and a subsistence allowance of 3s. 6d. per day when the officer was away from headquarters.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: Has a single Roman Catholic ever been preferred?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General declines to inquire as to the religion of any member of the postal staff.

BELFAST POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS;SUNDAY DELIVERIES.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will permit one delivery of letters in Belfast on Sundays, as is the case in other Irish cities, having regard to the fact that the practice of giving letters at the office to those who call for them at times leads to fraud and compels the clerks to be present, and that the postmen would prefer to deliver letters on Sundays so as to lessen their burden for the following day.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): Has the Belfast Corporation suggested any change?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In accordance with the general practice of the Post Office in such matters, the Postmaster General would not be prepared to alter the existing arrangements at Belfast on Sundays unless application for a change were made or supported by the city authorities, as representing the wish of the majority of resident inhabitants. No intimation has reached him from the Belfast Corporation of any desire on their part for an alteration, and he does not propose therefore to take any steps in the matter.

NAVAN POST OFFICE.

MR. KENNEDY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that suitable premises can now be obtained for a post office at Navan, county Meath; and whether he will expedite the steps necessary to acquire the same before the opportunity is lost by those premises passing into other hands.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Negotiations are in progress for the purchase of a site for a new post office at Navan, but if the owner of the premises to which the hon. Member calls attention is prepared to give the Postmaster General reasonable time for inquiry, it may be practicable to acquire them.

IRISH PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION.

MR. COCHRANE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the latest Census Returns, which show that the population of Scotland is slightly in excess of that of Ireland, and that, whereas Scotland is represented in this House by seventy-two members, the number of members returned by constituencies in Ireland is 103; and whether the Government will appoint a Select Committee during next session to inquire into the whole of the circumstances, and report what steps should be taken to remove this inequality.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): It is a fact, as my hon. friend states, that the population of Scotland is now slightly in excess of the population of Ireland, but, curiously enough, I find that the male population of Ireland is slightly in excess of the male population in Scotland. I do not know whether my hon. friend would regard that as an argument for female suffrage. The anomalies in our electoral system are grave and undoubted, but whether a Select Committee would be the proper method, or machinery, for finding a remedy is very doubtful. I cannot give my hon. friend any promise as to that part of the question.

IRISH STATE MSS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if

he will consider the question of the appointment of an Irish Record Commission and an Irish Historical Manuscripts Commission, with a view to the publication of Irish State papers and Irish historical manuscripts in similar proportion to the publication of similar documents in England.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR was understood to reply that this was a matter on which the English Commission had better be consulted.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: Who is the Irish representative on the Commission?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I must ask for notice of that. I will try and answer on Monday.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman direct the Chief Secretary to give an opportunity of examining the historical papers which are not to be published?

[No answer was returned.]

TEACHERS' TENURE BILL.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will put down the Teachers' Tenure Bill as an early Order on Monday or Tuesday, with the view to ascertain whether or not it can be passed into law this session by common agreement.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot give this Bill an early place on Monday or Tuesday. So far as my inquiries into the matter have gone, they lead me to the conclusion that it is a Bill which will excite a great deal more controversy than it is possible to deal with in the course of the present session.

TELEGRAPH VOTE; PACIFIC CABLE.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in view of the fact that the Estimates for the telegraph and telephone services of this country for the current year have not yet been submitted to the House for discussion, and a loss of over half a million a year is now incurred in the telegraph service, whether he can see his way to provide for a discussion regarding this loss, and also on the telephone service, on the Appropriation Bill.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: Will the right hon. Gentleman be good enough to name a day for the discussion of the policy of the Government on the Pacific Cable question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to both questions I have to say I am afraid I cannot give any special facilities for the discussions asked for. May I add, I have never yet known a discussion in Supply with regard to the telegraph service end in a diminution of the public charge in respect of that service.

THE COMMISSION ON COAL.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state when the results of the investigation by the Geological Survey at South Kensington will be made known, and whether the delay in the appointment of the Commission on Coal is attributable to the intention of the Government to await the result of that investigation before deciding that any public object is to be gained by an inquiry.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I must ask that this question be addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who has taken charge of this matter. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman will put it down for Monday.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. LOUGH: I wish to put a question with regard to the Orders of the Day. I do not know whether the First Lord intends to take them in the order in which they are printed, because I may point out that the first is the Local Government Board (Ireland) Vote, which was discussed the other night, and if the debate on that is to be resumed it will shut out discussion on other Reports of Supply which have not yet been dealt with. Cannot the right hon. Gentleman under the circumstances postpone the first Order?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no particular objection if it can be unanimously done, but I do not think it would be worth while debating a motion to do that. With regard to other business, I think it desirable to put down as the second Order on Monday, after the Royal Titles Bill, the Pacific Cable Bill, and to postpone, until its passage, the further consideration of the Factory and Workshops Bill.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.) asked the First Lord of the Treasury when the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill would be taken.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It stands next after the Factories Bill on Monday.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can make any statement about affording facilities for the passing of certain non-contentious private Bills in which substantial progress has already been made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Perhaps the noble Lord will ask me this question on Monday or Tuesday.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Militia and Yeomanry Bill, with Amendments.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this session of Parliament relating to the Revenues of India be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the Whole House.

Resolved, That this House will, upon Tuesday next, resolve itself into the said Committee.;(Secretary Lord George Hamilton.)

NEW BILLS.

CLUBS REGISTRATION (SCOTLAND).

Bill for the registration and regulation of clubs in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Law, and Mr. John Wilson (Glasgow).

CLUBS REGISTRATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"For the registration and regulation of clubs in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 290.]

SUNDAY TRADING (SCOTLAND).

Bill for the regulation and control of Sunday Trading in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Cameron Corbett, Mr. Law, Mr. John Wilson (Glasgow), and Mr. Hunter Craig.

SUNDAY TRADING (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"For the regulation and control of Sunday Trading in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 291.]

SUPPLY [8TH AUGUST];REPORT.
[23RD ALLOTTED DAY.]

Resolutions reported;

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

Class II.

1. "That a sum, not exceeding £40,182, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Local Government Board in Ireland."

First resolution read a second time.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he understood there was a general agreement that the first Order should be postponed and other Reports of Supply dealt with. He would move accordingly.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Is the motion to adjourn the first Report of the 8th August until the second Order has been disposed of? That is what I understood.

*MR. SPEAKER: The suggestion is that the first Order of the day be postponed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Probably it is my fault, but I do not perfectly apprehend what the hon. Gentleman wants.

MR. LOUGH: What we want is to discuss the salary of the right hon. the Colonial Secretary.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As I have stated to the House, I propose to take the Votes in Classes 1 and 2 in their natural order.

MR. LOUGH: The right hon. Gentleman said that if there was any expression of opinion on the part of the House as to the order in which the Reports might be taken, it would be agreeable to him.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I believe that was the understanding.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the House wishes to proceed with the second Report, that can be done by agreeing with the first Report.

MR. LOUGH: I do not think so. We have to go through all the Orders on the Paper.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am afraid that it would be impossible to agree to all the items accepted yesterday.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I want the Report on the Votes for Ireland to be taken.

Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.) said it seemed a scandal that the county councils, which supplied the money for the upkeep of the court houses in Ireland should not have a word to say in regard to their management. In the county of Armagh Lord Clanricarde was a candidate for the county council, and was defeated, but he managed to be elected high sheriff, and with his defeat at a popular election ranking in his mind he did his best to cause inconvenience to the county council during his year's tenure of office. He hoped that some arrangement would be come to by which the friction existing at present would be avoided. The county councils were just as anxious as the high sheriffs to accommodate the judges who came on assize. He complained that when the Local Government Act was passed, in 1898, the standard year selected was 1896, in which the smallest poor

rate and county cess had been struck for the previous ten years. It was suggested that hon. members who came from Ireland talked rubbish, that their opinions were not to be considered, that the right hon. Gentleman had to take all his instructions from the Castle. The right hon. Gentleman was in this House for six months in the year, and it was not to be expected that he would understand all the difficult questions with regard to the management of Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman was doing his best, but he had to receive from his officials in Dublin their reports, and inasmuch as those officials had generally been indicted in this House it was not surprising that in their reports they should endeavour to put the best face upon these matters. He thought with regard to the matter of court houses there might be some give and take, and that the right hon. Gentleman might be able to find some way by which the wretched feud which was going on at the present time between the high sheriffs and the county councils should be brought to an end. The county councils and the district councils of Ireland were doing their business splendidly; a fact which spoke to the good character of the men who composed them, having regard to the fact that they had never occupied such a position before; but they had not been encouraged in their work by the Local Government Board.

It was really an extraordinary thing that the Local Government Board, who could know nothing of the wants of any district, except through information supplied from the reports of county surveyors, invariably threw over the recommendations of the local bodies of those districts. In the case of the county council of Tyrone, which was a Unionist county council, that county council considered 25 per cent. was a sufficient increase in the salary of the county surveyor, but their action had not in any way been supported by the Local Government Board. From the moment that the Local Government Act was passed, the milk of human kindness began to flow in the breast of the Local Government Board, with a corresponding enormous increase in the rates. There had to be assistant nurses in the workhouses, and holidays given to the doctors, and everything that could be thought of in order to increase the rates upon the people. What was the reason? Simply that the increase in the rates should be such that the people would say, "We have now local government and our own people at the head of affairs, but the rates were far less heavy when we had the old Tories over us." That was the idea of the Local Government Board. None of these things were ever thought of when the gentry and the landlords ruled these matters, and paid their share, but directly these popular bodies came into existence the Local Government Board at once found it necessary to employ assistant trained nurses and improve the dietary of the unions. It was all very well to say that the cost was two-fifths of a penny increase for the salaries, but what was the cost of the dietary? The cost of dietary in the workhouses under the old rule was 3s. 10d., but since the local bodies had come into being, through the instrumentality of the Local Government Board it had risen to 5s., so that, although the increase in the salaries of the officers was only two-fifths of a penny, in regard to the dietary it was 25 or 30 per cent.

It was not only the increase of salaries which made the increase of rates, but

the general conduct of the Local Government Board in interfering in every department with the management of the public bodies in Ireland. The action of the Local Government Board was to endeavour to make local government in Ireland as difficult as possible. In the debate of the previous evening it had been stated that the dispensary doctors were not independent enough or quick enough in reporting upon insanitary areas. There was no foundation for such a statement, because it had been conclusively proved that the delay in these matters occurred after they had passed the local guardians. It was the Local Government Board inspectors who were entirely responsible for this delay; there was not the slightest reason for saying that the medical officer neglected his duty, because it had been conclusively proved that the delay took place after his report was made. The delay in deciding whether labourers' cottages should be erected in a certain locality was certainly not the result of the action of the medical officers.

With regard to the suggestion made by the right hon. Gentleman that the county councils should come together, and come to an easier working arrangement, he would certainly, as soon as he got back to Ireland, see what could be done in that regard. He would see if it were not possible to make the books easier, and submit to the Local Government Board a scheme for an easier form of making out the accounts, which would not be antagonistic to the Local Government Board, but would be submitted merely for the purpose of making the Act work more smoothly, and simplifying a great many matters where friction occurred at times between the Local Government Board and county councils. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the local bodies had been dilatory in coming to arrangements, but he pointed out that after the Local Government Act was passed the county councils were called together three times a week to consider the most trifling and frivolous questions raised by the Local Government Board. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman, considering the views of hon. members in connection with these matters, would give them his attention. With regard to the labourers' cottages, the less delay and expense there was in erecting labourers' cottages the better for the labourers and the rates, and if the Local Government Board could see their way to get these schemes through it would enable the labourers to have cheap and sanitary houses. With regard to appeals which had been lodged against any scheme for the erection of cottages, he had never known a case where the costs had been given against the appellant; but they were always against the rates, and he contended that if, when appeals were lost, the appellant had to pay the costs, it would go a long way to prevent many frivolous appeals being brought. He also was of opinion that if county council officials were made the tribunals before whom these arbitrations were brought, instead of the Local Government Board inspectors, a great deal of the present delay would disappear, and the result would be beneficial to all concerned.

MR. MACARTNEY congratulated the right hon. Gentleman upon the policy he had inaugurated with regard to improved nursing and dietary in the work-houses of Ireland. There was no doubt that in many places in Ireland too scant a regard had been paid by the guardians to the paupers under their care, and he was surprised to hear the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down use his position

in this House to turn the right hon. Gentleman from the course which he had adopted.

MR. DALY disclaimed any such intention, and explained that the point which he endeavoured to make was that the Local Government Board did not see the necessity for these things until the landlords of Ireland ceased to bear half the cost. He had no objection to improved nursing.

MR. MACARTNEY said it was more than twenty years since the landlords of Ireland exercised any control over these matters, but he accepted the explanation of the hon. Gentleman, and withdrew the charge he had made against him, that he advocated a less generous treatment of the poor so far as professional skilled nursing was concerned. The right hon. Gentleman had met, he believed, a grievance which existed in the administration of the poor law system by the most reasonable means, and all classes in Ireland had given their support to its being properly carried out, not only with regard to nursing but in the general administration of the poor law, and if it was not properly carried out there would be reason for much regret.

The matter he desired to call attention to had been much dwelt upon in the discussion on the previous evening; the administration of the Labourers Acts. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the delays which had occurred had not been the result of the action of the Local Government Board. He was afraid that that was not so. He quite agreed that representations coming from the country required most careful scrutiny, and the amount of objection made to any particular representation entailed a great deal of correspondence and occupied a great deal of time at the central office, but he did not refer to districts from which representations had been sent embracing a large number of cottages. He referred to cases where the number of cottages rarely exceeded six. There was a case in the area of the Antrim District Council where the representation was made in 1900; the Local Government Board inspector looked into the matter in January, 1901, and it was not until July this year that hon. Gentlemen were able to see the Report made six months after the holding of the inquiry. He could not understand why such a delay should have occurred in a case; where not more than six houses were required. That was one instance of several cases of delay to which his attention had been called, and he invited his right hon. friend to say whether he would look into those matters in the recess, and see for himself whether there had or had not been rather longer time occupied by the Local Government Board inspectors in making out their reports and the authorities in Dublin coming to a decision upon those reports. It had the effect of making the people of Ireland distrust the legislation which this House provided for the benefit of the labourer, and also of raising a hostile feeling in certain classes of the population which he did not think was to the benefit of Ireland, and which should not be allowed to continue. He thought that some of the boards of guardians had been distinctly short-sighted in the way in which they had dealt with these representations, which, however, had been extremely moderate in their character. After all, it was only in order that the labourers should be kept upon the farms, and it was obvious that if a labourer in the country was not well housed he would go to the towns, where he could be better housed and

get better wages. It was in the interest of the ratepayers and the farmers themselves that where representations were moderate and where there was reasonable ground they should deal with those representations in a generous and just manner. He desired also to call attention to the action of the Balmeny District Council which it appeared to him could not be justified under the Act, although no doubt their only desire was to economise. This year there was a representation made to the district council which they declined to entertain, and the person making the representation appealed to the Local Government Board and asked them to inquire into the conduct of the board of guardians. The only reply to that

appeal was a reply acknowledging the letter and enclosing a minute stating that it was not thought desirable to build one house in a certain locality, and that the consideration of the representation had been deferred until other representations were made. The point he desired to make was that the representation was based on one of three grounds; either that the existing house accommodation was insufficient, or that the house was unsafe, or that it was unfit for human habitation through being in a bad state of repair. Boards of guardians were not entitled, even from motives of economy, to hang up indefinitely representations of this character. It was contrary to the whole spirit of the Act. Nor was the action of the Local Government Board in the matter at all satisfactory. The man was told he had a right of appeal, but all the satisfaction he obtained from the Local Government Board was a blue printed form telling that which he already knew, namely, the decision of the board of guardians. To the labourers in the district it would appear that the benefits Parliament had designed in their interests were by the action of the boards of guardians and the Local Government Board rendered absolutely nugatory. Another point to which the Chief Secretary might direct his attention was the number of printed forms which had to be filled up by the district councils in connection with these Acts. Many of the forms were really unnecessary, and if they were abolished some economy; he did not say it would amount to very much; would be effected. In connection with this question of labourers' cottages, he was glad to say that district councils were beginning to move with a certain amount of reasonable rapidity, but he hoped the Chief Secretary would look into the case to which he had referred, because unless a district council was able to satisfy the Local Government Board that it had reason to anticipate additional representations in the immediate future, and even the representation of a single man, if well founded, should be dealt with by the Local Government Board and the guardians.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) expressed his pleasure that the Irish members were taking such a keen interest in all the details of local government. They were bringing all their grievances forward for discussion in the House of Commons in order that they might obtain a fuller and more complete control over their own affairs. The people of Ireland were in a very different position from the inhabitants of England in this matter. In England the Local Government Board, which controlled the county councils and other local bodies, had direct representation in the House of Commons in the persons of two

Ministers responsible for the administration of that particular Department. In regard to Ireland, however, there was only one Minister responsible for the whole of the government of that country, and who, consequently, could not have that intimate detailed knowledge of local government possessed by the President of the Local Government Board in England.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I am President of the Local Government Board in Ireland.

SIR WALTER FOSTER pointed out that the President of the Irish Local Government Board was also Chief Secretary, and responsible for all departments, whereas the President of the English Board was responsible only for that one department. The consequence was that in Ireland the greater part of the central control had to be left to permanent officials. Such a system was bound to break down, not because the permanent officials were not competent, but because, as local authorities developed, it could not be expected that large representative bodies would submit to have their decision over-ruled and controlled by permanent paid officials at Dublin Castle. The men had not yet been created who, as permanent officials, could, with success, rule large representative bodies. Sooner or later such a system must produce friction. These bodies would resent, and, he thought, properly resent, such control. It was not possible for a system of local government, based on the broadest representation, as was the case in Ireland, to continue to be controlled by a small body of permanent officials. Up to the present those permanent

officials had, he thought, done their work very well, but in doing that work they were bound to have recourse to the almost innumerable forms of which complaint had been made. Printed forms were necessary to lessen correspondence. Unless some means were devised by which some central and representative body in Ireland was given control over the local bodies which had been created, the time of the House would be more and more occupied with the details of Irish self-government. All through the session question after question had been asked with regard to details which, apparently trivial in themselves, were of great interest to the localities affected, and those questions wore bound to go on increasing as the people of Ireland took more interest in local government. By the Act of 1898 an enormous burden of work had been created for the House of Commons, which, sooner or later, must inevitably lead to some change in the system, and to an extension of representative control over local affairs in Ireland, which, he believed, was the only key to successful management of local government. If all these details were to be repeated session after session the House of Commons was bound to break down under the burden, and some system of devolution would have to be found by which questions could be settled in the country in which they arose. The local government system tended to bring that about, and at the same time it was developing men capable of carrying on the local government of Ireland. One of the great merits of county councils was that they were training a body of men in local government to take a higher and wider sphere. He believed that sooner or later it would dawn on the minds even of those who were most opposed to what used to be called Home Rule that the best system that could be devised was to extend the principle of devolution, and give

to the Irish people a larger control than they now possessed over their own local affairs.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid) thought the county council of Tyrone had reason to complain of the system of the Local Government Board in fixing the salaries of officials. Three months

after the county council took office the question of salaries was considered, and it was decided to increase the salaries of the assistant surveyors by 25 per cent., from £;80 to £;100. The next month a communication was received from the Local Government Board sanctioning the increased salaries, without the slightest suggestion being made that the sums were too small. Things went on for about a year, and the Local Government Board then came to the conclusion that they would arrange a scale of salaries for assistant surveyors for the whole country, the amount ranging from £;120 to £;150 or £;160. It was not until that scale was formulated that the county council of Tyrone had any intimation that the assistant surveyors refused to accept the amount fixed the year before. The Local Government Board made a mistake in sanctioning the salaries in the first place without ascertaining whether they were the result of an arrangement agreed to by both parties; but, having sanctioned them, they should not have gone back on their decision. The whole tendency of the central body was to create friction between the officials and the local bodies. The Board set themselves up as the friends of the officers, and naturally the officers looked to the central body for assistance, and did not exhibit proper respect for the bodies by whom they were appointed and paid. The county council endeavoured to do the thing fairly, having regard both to the interests of the ratepayers and to the increase of the work. But even now the assistant surveyors had time to act as private engineers or architects, and they had actually put out their signs asking for private practice. Why should these men, who were paid good salaries, interfere with the legitimate work of gentlemen in private practice? He also hoped the Chief Secretary would give full consideration to the resolution of the county council in respect to half-yearly instead of quarterly meetings, before deciding the claims of assistant surveyors for further increases. The effect of having half-yearly meetings would be to put things as they were before the passing of the Act, and would take away from the assistant surveyors any claim for increases at all. He was pleased to see the interest taken in these matters by the Unionist representatives,

but Ulster members need not put forward the statement that dispensary doctors were indifferent on the question of labourers' cottages because they feared to incur the displeasure of members of the district council. Ratepayers in Antrim would not be liable to any increase of rate on account of labourers' cottages being built for the next twenty or fifty years, because there was a surplus to the credit of that county sufficient to build at least 200 cottages free of all cost to the ratepayers. The same might be said of any county in Ulster. With regard to additional inspectors, the great curse of Ireland was "over-officialism." The country was bled to death by officials, who sucked up everything that was good, leaving only the bad. If the Chief Secretary did anything at all, it would be well if he deported the inspectors from Ireland

altogether. The officials found fault simply to justify their existence. As an illustration the hon. Member instanced the case of the Omagh Board of Guardians, in connection with which the relieving officer was surcharged 8s. in respect of outdoor relief, because the chairman of the board had not initialled the grant. Many other instances of the manner in which the inspectors did their work might be given. He himself offered to the Omagh board a site for six cottages, as there was a difficulty in securing convenient land, but the Local Government Board inspector actually refused the site without ever going on the land. Surely the Chief Secretary did not think that was a proper way in which to administer the Act? He regretted having taken up so much time, but, as these matters came under his own observation, he thought he was only doing his duty in bringing them forward.

*DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.) said one or two matters of importance had arisen during the debate which he desired to bring before the House. One of them was the nursing question. He quite agreed with what had been said on this question by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ilkeston, that it was a subject of the greatest importance. He thought that the nursing order of the Local Government Board had done a great deal of damage to some of the smaller hospitals which, before it was issued, were engaged in training nurses. There was one small hospital in the north of Ireland with which he was connected which had been engaged in training nurses for the last twenty years; he referred to the Tyrone Hospital. The Local Government Board had recently brought forward a rule which disqualified this hospital for the training of nurses because it had not got a resident medical superintendent, two visiting medical officers, a qualified lady superintendent, did not possess 140 beds, and was not recognised clinical hospital. Nurses had been trained at this hospital very efficiently, and they had afterwards gone to take up good positions in America, Scotland, England, and various parts of Ireland. Nurses had been trained at this hospital and sent to the workhouse hospitals all over the north of Ireland as temporary nurses at a high weekly wage, and yet, forsooth, because this institution did not exactly comply with the Local Government Board regulations in some details, any of the nurses who had been trained at this hospital were disqualified from making applications for positions as head nurses in Irish district hospitals. The Tyrone County Hospital was chiefly used for training the daughters of farmers as nurses, and this enabled them to get large salaries, out of which they sent considerable sums of money to their parents and friends, and the result of this order had been to prevent this training being continued.

It was well known that nurses could be trained more effectively in small hospitals than in large ones. In small hospitals like the Tyrone hospital the nurses had to do work which was done by the students in the large hospitals. And yet the Local Government Board laid down rules which prevented these thoroughly trained nurses taking up appointments in the hospitals in their own country as superintendent nurses of Irish workhouse hospitals; in other words these nurses were considered good enough to nurse the better class of patients in Irish county infirmaries, and in the homes of private families, yet were not

sufficiently trained to nurse the paupers in a district hospital. No more absurd position was ever taken up by a responsible governing authority, and it should not be tolerated by the Chief Secretary, and I am sure will not be when he inquires into the facts brought under his notice in this important debate. He did not deny that the Local Government Board was composed of very able men, but he thought there ought to be some elective element upon that Board, and pending the only true solution of the trouble of governing Ireland, which was Home Rule, there ought to be no difficulty in carrying out the suggestion that the various councils in Ireland should be allowed to elect one representative to the Local Government Board. He hoped that the Chief Secretary would give this nursing question his careful consideration. The new regulations would have serious consequences upon the young women of Ireland who wished to fill in their own county the very important position of superintendent nurses in district hospitals unless it was speedily altered.

Then there was another important question, namely, that of introducing into Irish workhouses Irish nuns. He was a Protestant himself, but he should be only too glad in case of necessity to be nursed by a nun. The nuns, if not trained nurses in the strict sense of the word, would quickly become so, and would change the atmosphere of these institutions, at least in the north of Ireland, from veritable hells into a comparative paradise. One other matter which he desired to call attention to was the disgraceful condition of some of the smaller workhouse hospitals. He did not desire to exaggerate, but he had no hesitation in saying that some of their Irish workhouses would be a disgrace to any civilised country. In one workhouse he was acquainted with there were only straw beds, with straw pillows, and there was not one properly trained nurse to look after a number of helpless people. In this workhouse they still had the old tressle beds, which were used at the time of the famine, and the staff was so small that the food had to be served to the inmates by the workhouse master. Every time he went into one of these workhouses he felt nothing but shame that the central authority in Dublin, which was supposed to look after the comfort of those poor people, so shamefully neglected to enforce their authority on the district councils and board of guardians.

There were a great many other matters which concerned the well-being of the poorer classes which he would have liked to have drawn attention to, but the few examples he had given would, he hoped, receive attention, more especially the nursing question and the question of looking after the helpless poor in the workhouses, and insisting that they should be provided with proper beds and attendance. Since he had been in the House of Commons he had observed the great interest which the Chief Secretary had taken in all matters affecting Ireland, and he felt sure that the right hon. Gentleman had a great sympathy for Ireland, and was most anxious that everything that could be done should be done to remove her grievances.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.) said he wished to say a few words, in which he would express the views of local authorities in the county of Fermanagh. He represented one of the divisions of that county, and in what he was going to say he was not simply voicing the opinions of Nationalists. The local governing

bodies of Fermanagh agreed that it was the greatest possible pity in the world that the Local Government Board was not an elective or partially elective and popular Board. They required a Board of that sort in the country, and, so far as they were concerned, they had no objection whatever to the Local Government Board merely as a local governing body. What they did say was that the present Board was not in sympathy with the local authorities or with the people of Ireland, and their idea was that the Local Government Board, in dealing with the local bodies, was arbitrary in its tone and too commanding. The Board was very persistent in its demands, and what they decided the local bodies were compelled to carry out. In certain cases this Board had been most unreasonable, and there ought to be more give and take and more consultation between the county and other authorities all over the country and the Local Government Board in order to avoid friction. If more consultations took place he was sure the Local Government Board would get on much better. In the county of Fermanagh they used to pay their assistant county surveyor £;80 a year, but when the Local Government Act came into operation they raised this salary from £;80 to £;100 a year. The assistant surveyors would not take this salary, and they appealed to the Local Government Board, and without an inquiry of any kind, and without even hearing the views of Fermanagh County Council, the Local Government Board fixed the salaries at £;120 a year.

He was glad to hear the Chief Secretary state that it was possible in the future to introduce some economy in the bookkeeping. He thought there should also be more economy practised in regard to advertisements and printing. The advertisements might be shortened and curtailed with advantage, and the amount of printing might very well be reduced. In the county of Fermanagh the printing used to cost about £;500, but for the first year under the Local Government Act it had increased to £;2,000. They had determined to do the very best they could under the new Act for the better government of the counties of Ireland, and he thought the Local Government Board ought to assist them in their efforts to carry on local government with as much economy as possible. He did not know where the workhouses existed which were in the state complained of by the hon. Member for North Monaghan. In the county of Fermanagh they had improved the condition of the workhouses without any pressure from the Local Government Board, and he thought he had a right to protest against the statement made by the hon. Member, which was a great reflection on the boards of guardians. It was all very well for medical men to talk about the nursing question in the way they did, but in his opinion the Local Government Board were pressing home this question of the nurses too much. He did not think it took such a high professional qualification to make a nurse. The standard for nurses had been placed so high by the Local Government Board that in Fermanagh it took them months to get a fully-qualified nurse at the salary which they offered. They advertised in vain for a nurse at £;40 and £;50 per annum, and at last they were obliged to pay £;60 a year with good rations and apartments, and a lady's maid to attend upon her, before they could get a nurse possessing the qualifications required by the Local Government Board. They only paid their medical officer £;100 per annum, and yet they were

compelled by the Local Government Board to pay almost as much for a fully-qualified nurse. They had nurses in the workhouses at much lower salaries who were much better nurses for their purposes than the highly-qualified nurses insisted upon by the regulations of the Local Government Board. The local authorities had no objection to improvement, but the Local Government Board was insisting upon such high salaries for official nurses and others and increasing so greatly the expense of advertising and printing that it entailed the most extravagant cost to the ratepayers. Although the number of paupers in Ireland was decreasing the expense was increasing, and the Local Government Board were insisting upon them employing nurses when there was very little for them to do. In dealing with the question of the labourers' cottages he said that as a matter of policy, not only on the part of the farmer, but on the part of the State, the labourers ought to be well housed. He had always been in favour of the Labourers Act. He thought the Local Government Board ought to be ready to accept hints which were practical in relation to economy from the various county councils and boards of guardians, instead of adopting the arbitrary tone which they sometimes assumed without consulting the local body. Occasionally inspectors recommended things which it was impossible to carry out, and they had no right to suggest things without indicating how they could be accomplished. They had far too much interfering from the Local Government Board and too little assistance.

MR. WYNDHAM: My reason for replying to the criticisms which have been made up to this stage is that the debate has mainly centred round the same subjects as those raised yesterday; nurses, the proper provision of labourers' cottages, the increase of salaries of existing officers, and the possibility of introducing some simplification of local government in Ireland, the economies in printing and book-keeping, and the cost of inspection. But there is not an entire unanimity of opinion on the part of hon. members on these subjects, and therefore it is needful to discount something from the criticisms which have been urged. The Board in Ireland has a difficult duty to discharge. Any central body charged with administering such Acts, and in seeing that the local bodies do not transgress the bounds of liberty given to them, is always open to great deal of criticism. Take, for example, the question of the nurses. I claim that, on the whole, the great body of opinion in the House has been in favour of the Local Government Board seeing that the pauper inmates in Irish workhouses are properly treated. We are all agreed that the standard of attention paid to the sick is not as yet what we all wish to see it. From mistaken motives of economy, or from ignorance of the advance which has been made in the science of nursing, many popularly-elected bodies believe they are doing all that their duty demands, whereas they are really not doing that at all. That being so, I propose to go forward under this general order, but not drastically or arrogantly. Every local body is given an opportunity of considering the merits of what is urged, not only by the Local Government Board, but by the general consensus of opinion in this House. If they do not, however, fall in with that view, then it is the duty of the Local Government Board to intervene for the protection of the inmates committed to their charge. The hon. Member for South Monaghan has stated that this is a newborn zeal on the part of the Local Government Board, but that

is not quite the case. There have been long controversies before on this very subject between the Local Government Board and some of the local boards of guardians in Ireland. This question has been the subject of voluminous correspondence for years, as far back as the year 1892, and even earlier. The hon. Member for North Monaghan pleaded for the usefulness of nuns in poorhouses and hospitals. I readily acknowledge the usefulness, but I do not think hon. members from Ireland are entitled to say for all Irish opinion that the nuns of Ireland should

be asked to perform all the duties which are incumbent on a sick nurse. I would remind hon. members that a letter issued in October, 1895, explicitly lays down that it is not right for nuns to assist in certain kinds of operations, and they are forbidden by the rules of their orders from doing this. I think the House will agree that the Local Government Board has acted with tact and discretion in this matter, and since nuns are not allowed to render all the services required in nursing, it is clear that there must be other qualified nurses introduced in those unions. With regard to the subject of the training of nurses, and the qualifications insisted upon by the Local Government Board, I think that the opinions expressed by the hon. Member for North Monaghan are entitled to very great weight upon this subject, and I shall certainly make a note of what he has suggested. I was not aware that the subject was going to be brought forward, and perhaps I have not brushed up upon this point as much as I should have done if I had received longer notice. The hon. Member for North Monaghan spoke of the exclusion of certain hospitals by reason of the order of the Local Government Board in reference to the qualification of trained nurses, but from my recollection of the order I should think that the hospitals mentioned by the hon. Member would not be excluded.

DR. THOMPSON said he could assure the hon. Gentleman that a number of the hospitals had not been recognised, and were excluded from the benefit of trained nurses.

MR. WYNDHAM: I take notice what the hon. Gentleman says, but it does not traverse what I have stated. The general Order of the Local Government Board issued in July did not preclude the Board from reserving to themselves discretion. I can say that our hands are free. The Order states, "Anyone who has received not less than two years training in a general clinical or other hospitals authorised by us." We are therefore at liberty to recognise any hospital, and we are not going to tie up our hands or limit our discretion. However, I shall carefully consider the view which has been urged by the hon. Gentleman. I do not think I need say any more on the subject of nurses.

I come now to the question of providing cottages for agricultural labourers under the Act. I dealt with that matter fully yesterday afternoon, but the hon. Member for Antrim did bring to my notice a specific case in which a mistake seems to have been made by the Local Government Board and not by the local authority. I undertake to give my personal consideration to that subject directly I get back to Ireland. I am disposed to agree that the Local Government Board should not accept a decision of the local bodies against which an appeal

had been lodged; but I guard myself by saying that in some parts of Ireland, as at present advised, the local authorities put forward an excessive number of claims. I think the Local Government Board would be wanting in duty, however disagreeable or unpopular it may be, if they allowed the newly elected bodies to impose too heavy burdens on the rates, especially in the rural districts, in the first years of their administration, and if they did not bring home to these bodies the great danger of over-burdening the rates in this matter. As time goes on these local authorities will have more and more responsibility thrown upon them, and if they swell the rates, that would be a matter for the electors; but in the early years of the local government by popularly elected bodies the Local Government Board has the duty of bringing home to the local authorities that heavy burdens fall upon the rates from the loss arising from excessive schemes for cottage buildings. Generally I agree that it is the interest of the farmers to see that the labourers are properly housed. In England we have the great economic difficulty in regard to the labourers herding into the towns, but Ireland is mostly free from that; and I certainly should consider whether an extension of the Labourers Cottages Acts can be carried so as to include the other classes referred to.

Many hon. members have inveighed against the Local Government Board for increasing the salaries of the local officials. It was said that some local bodies had offered £100 salary to the deputy surveyors instead of £80, but as no protest had been made, and both parties were agreed, the Local Government Board had no wish to interfere. But the Local Government Board, where there was no agreement, were bound by statute to determine whether there had been an increase of work, and if so, to increase the emoluments accordingly. Most of the speakers said that that had been done in excess. The fact that the Local Government Board unwittingly broke the law in a technical manner does not excuse them from attempting to obey the law, now that it has been defined by the highest courts in Ireland, and the Local Government Board will go on doing their best to obey the law, and take a fair view of the merits of these cases. That brings me to the possibility of simplifying and cheapening the local government in Ireland. If we can bring that about, then the discussion with reference to the increase of duties and salaries of local officers would be only academic. The hon. Member for Mid Tyrone said that the salaries had all been raised, but if the duties were decreased then there would be a decrease in the salaries. There certainly would be no obligation to pay for work not obliged to be done, and so economy might be effected in that way. I think myself that the best chance of arriving at a solution of the matter is to make an attempt at the simplification of the work of local government in Ireland, and effecting some economy in administration. The Act has been in force for three years. Many suggestions have been made to the Board, and of course some ideas have occurred to the members of the Board themselves, which will all tell in the direction of simplification and economy. The hon. Baronet who introduced the subject yesterday made a suggestion that it would be a mistake for the Local Government Board to set out by itself on an inquiry as to how simplification can be best achieved, and that it would be prudent for the Local Government Board to invite

co-operation of those who are administering the Act. With that suggestion I quite agree. I will be glad if the hon. Baronet and other chairmen of county councils would give the Local Government Board suggestions as to economies which may be adopted, and on

the part of the Local Government Board we shall be glad to nominate some member of the Board to collaborate with them. I believe it would be also wise to invite some of those officials in England who have had experience in book-keeping in some of the largest county councils to come and see if they can teach us in Ireland anything which we do not at present know in that respect, and how the accounts may be simplified. I do not wish to raise any hopes which may be doomed to disappointment, and therefore I feel bound to remind hon. members that these matters are more complicated in Ireland than in England. It is not easy to see how to get rid of many of the columns in the returns, owing to the fact that there are county guarantees for railways and other matters which introduce complication; but it is possible that we may hit upon some plan of dealing with all the different charges and assessments in different areas. Greater simplicity and economy in dealing with all these various matters is an object which ought to be pursued by all those who are interested in the proper and efficient management of local affairs in Ireland.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had met this question in a spirit far different from that to which the representatives from Ireland had hitherto been accustomed. He welcomed the promised inquiry into the administration of the Local Government Board, and he would be glad to give every assistance in his power towards arriving at some decision which would be satisfactory all round. He approved of the reduction of the inspection of roads from four to two in the quarter, but he wanted the Local Government Board to convey the reasons which led them to increase the salaries of the local officials. He made this suggestion in the interests of peace. As to the nurses, he was afraid that the Chief Secretary had misunderstood the purpose of his remarks the previous day. He did not object to the proper treatment of the inmates of the workhouse infirmaries. On the contrary, he was most solicitous for their welfare; and in his own country they had expended an enormous sum of money in remodelling the arrangements for the sick poor. In his opinion the Local Government Board should not treat the unions which had done their duty in the same way as those which had neglected their duty, and therefore he was glad that the Order was to be administered in a reasonable spirit.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr) complained of the manner in which the Local Government Board inspectors treated local bodies. He criticised the conduct of Major Fair, whom he charged with partiality in favour of the landlord interests in respect of labourers' cottages. He suggested that an entirely new set of inspectors should be appointed.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said he did not wish to prolong the discussion on this subject, although it was one in which the Irish members were very deeply interested. Speaking for himself, he appreciated the tone of the right hon. the Chief Secretary's remarks, and he only wished that that right hon. Gentleman

would be able to instil some of the tolerance which he had displayed into the minds of the permanent officials of the Local Government Board. They all recognised that that Board had not the confidence of the Irish people. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Board, of which he was president, hoped to work out reforms in a reasonable spirit, and in no spirit of arrogance. He was glad to hear these remarks from the right hon. Gentleman, because the Local Government Board had been a thorn in the side of the people of Ireland in connection with the manner in which they had conducted the administration of the poor law and the Grand Jury system. He thought the right hon. Gentleman, candidly reviewing the manner in which the local bodies had conducted their business since the Local Government Act of 1898 became law, would admit that these bodies had discharged their duty well and with a due regard to the interests of the ratepayers. He thought that the Local Government Board should do something to show their appreciation of that work. There were two ways of doing everything; and if the Local Government Board would throw aside a little of their arrogance it would be better for themselves and the ratepayers of Ireland at large. The result of the manner in which the local bodies were treated was to promote insubordination among the officials, and induce them to look to the Local Government Board, who were not their masters, and to carry out their views rather than those of the county councils. It must be acknowledged that that was the spirit which was engendered by the Local Government Board. It was only right that these officials should be pensioned after discharging their duties for a number of years, and a Bill for the purpose had been introduced, but so great had been the feeling created in Ireland by the Local Government Board that the Bill had little chance of becoming law until that body reformed its ways. The Local Government inspectors were drawn from a class opposed to the views of the people, and until the Local Government Board dealt direct with the representative bodies of Ireland in a more genial and less dictatorial manner, matters would not improve. He was glad the condition of the unions of Ireland had been improved, but at the same time he thought it was a most suspicious thing that the Local Government Board should have allowed the old state of things to go on for so many years, and should have only discovered the necessity for this improvement at the time when the landlords were exempted from paying half the expense, the whole of which now fell altogether on the poor. It was a matter which in his opinion the Local Government Board should have initiated years ago.

*MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) directed attention to the provision of the Local Government Act for the better provision of harmless lunatics in the workhouses of Ireland, which he said, owing to the action of the Local Government Board, had been altogether inoperative. He was connected with a board of guardians as chairman, and had submitted a scheme to the Local Government Board Inspector to utilise a portion of the workhouse at Carrick-on-Suir, which was built at a time when the idea as to the proper treatment of the poor in Ireland was not so far advanced as it was at the present time for the accommodation of 700 persons, and it would even under present ideas of management accommodate 450 persons, while the usual number of inmates did not exceed 200. There

were about 180 harmless lunatics in the workhouses of South Tipperary, and there was accommodation in that workhouse, and the suggestion had been made that a portion of the workhouse, which was nearly empty, should be used for the accommodation of harmless lunatics. It was a reasonable suggestion, and although it might be necessary to build houses for the officers, that would be a very small item of expense; but the Local Government Board inspector before whom the matter was brought had stated that there was not the slightest chance of the assent of the Local Government Board being given to the use of this empty building for such a purpose. He had urged as a reason for the acceptance of the proposal that about sixteen acres which was now let for grazing, which lay next to this building, could be set apart for the use of the harmless lunatics, but notwithstanding all the arguments that had been brought to bear the Local Government Board inspector told them there was no possibility that the Local Government Board would assent to that proposal. Under the Act of 1898 it was only necessary to provide a suitable building for this purpose, and the scheme which had been suggested could easily be carried out by dividing the workhouse. It was because the Local Government Board would not sanction such reasonable schemes as this that that provision of the Act had been inoperative. Another provision which had become inoperative was that by which the boards of guardians with the consent of the Local Government Board could convert a workhouse infirmary into a district infirmary. By the board of guardians of which he was a member such a resolution had been passed, and the Local Government Board had received notice of the resolution, but the reply which they received from the Local Government Board was that that body had not made the regulations which by the Act they were bound to make for district infirmaries. That reply was received in 1899, and from then till now no regulations had been made. If the Local Government Board was as anxious as the Chief Secretary suggested to promote the welfare of the inmates of these buildings, the imbecile and sick poor, the most helpless of all classes of the inmates of workhouses, they were going about it in a very peculiar way. They had done nothing whatever to make these regulations which were necessary in order to enable boards of guardians to secure the operation of the Act of 1898; they had given no facilities to enable a portion of these huge workhouses, which for the greater part were empty, to be used for harmless lunatics. He quite agreed with the strictures that had been passed upon the Local Government Board inspectors with regard to the erection of workmen's dwellings. Their action disclosed an extraordinary state of things. Where there was no opposition to applications for the erection of cottages the applications were rejected. The express object of these Acts was to enable the local authorities of Ireland to build houses for poor agricultural labourers and let them at rents which the labourers should be able to pay. The usual rent under the Act was 1s. a week, but in one case, because the agent or sub-agent of the Duke of Devonshire had four houses in a town to let at a rental of 2s. a week, the applications for additional houses were refused, although in that case there had been representations made for sixteen houses. There was a similar case in which the Marquess of Waterford objected, and the same kind of thing went on all over the country. It was such a matter of notoriety in that country that

where a landlord like the Marquess of Waterford opposed the erection of a cottage the application was bound to be thrown out that the people had to a great extent given up attempting to get better cottages. Since the passing of the Local Government Act they had resumed their attempts, but they found the Local Government Board inspector controlled the situation, and that if they wished to appeal they had to go before an even worse tribunal, the Irish Privy Council, which was packed with landlords. With reference to road-making in Ireland, the greatest trouble was that the assistant county surveyors did not give the whole of their time to their professional work, but in many cases either carried on a retail trade or worked for private individuals. In his opinion a rule should be made to prohibit them from doing either of these things. If road work in Ireland was to be carried on successfully the assistant county surveyor should be ready to inspect the roads at any particular moment, and not merely to inspect them twice a year. He thought it would be very desirable, now that all these salaries were being fixed, that a regulation should be made prohibiting assistant county surveyors from taking any work of a private nature, but that they should only be allowed to take up work in connection with public boards in their own districts. He thought the time had come when some change ought to be made in the system of appointing Local Government Board inspectors. Retired Army officers should not necessarily be regarded as proper persons for these posts, and some real qualification should be required, and he suggested that these positions should be occupied by persons who had been engaged in the work of the unions, clerks and masters of workhouses and others, who had in the past performed their duties efficiently; that the post of Local Government Board inspector should be regarded in the light of a legitimate promotion for those who had been good and efficient servants of the unions in the past.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said he would confine his remarks to the question of local government in Ireland. The Local Government Act being now an accomplished fact, they had to make the best of it. The efforts of the Irish county councils had made the Act more successful than it would otherwise have been in the peculiar circumstances under which Ireland was governed. He would endeavour to make some practical suggestions, to which he hoped the Chief Secretary would reply. The Irish county councils had endeavoured to carry out the provisions of the Local Government Act in Ireland efficiently and harmoniously. Having paid a fair price for local government in Ireland, they naturally expected to get the same advantages which local government had conferred upon England. Under the English Act he understood that the Association of

County Councils in England were allowed a certain sum to enable representatives of county councils to meet together for consultation on points about which differences existed. If a similar expenditure was allowed to the Association of County Councils in Ireland, conferences could be arranged with representatives of the Local Government Board and a good deal of friction might thereby be avoided. What the county councils of Ireland desired from the Local Government Board was less dictation and more consultation. He hoped that the same liberty

to use funds for this purpose would be given in Ireland as in England, and if this were done a good deal of friction might be avoided and a good deal of litigation saved.

In the matter of scientific investigation the English county councils were much better off than in Ireland, where no fund had been provided for this purpose as in England. He submitted a clause when the Bill was before the House providing for bacteriological investigations, but the Chief Secretary opposed that clause. At the recent Tuberculosis Conference a decision had been arrived at which was a very important matter for the Irish county councils, and yet they had no fund available for any such purposes, although this was a subject which was engaging the attention of all scientists throughout the civilised world. He wanted the Irish county councils to work in co-operation with the Local Government Board. They wanted less interference with their work from the Local Government Board and more consultation, and there ought to be less dictation from the permanent officials.

He had been making inquiries as to how it was that in matters affecting local government things were carried on so smoothly in this country. In England they had none of the friction and disappointment and litigation which took place in Ireland, and which ought not to occur in a country which was supposed to be constitutionally governed. In England in cases where there was likely to be friction the local boards and the Local Government Board generally held consultations, and as a rule the popular view prevailed. Those questions which produced so much friction

in Ireland were amicably settled in England by this process of consultation. He trusted that as a result of this debate something would be done by the right hon. Gentleman to bring about a similar state of things with regard to local government as existed in England. With regard to the question of the accommodation of harmless lunatics, he thought something ought to be done to lessen the expense and increase the efficiency in regard to their treatment. Under the Dublin County Council they had perhaps the most expensive asylum in Ireland. It would be less expensive if these harmless lunatics were treated in another institution, and it would be better for the lunatics themselves. It appeared to him that something ought to be done to appoint qualified gentlemen as inspectors. He made no charge in regard to existing inspectors, but there was no doubt that the local authorities had not the highest confidence in some of them. There was an element of unrest in this matter in which there ought to be confidence on both sides. In regard to the erection of labourers' cottages, the inspectors ought to be warned that they must not be frightened by the landlords. For years he had been aware that in many districts it was impossible to have labourers' cottages erected because the guardians and inspectors were opposed to it. The people of Ireland had undoubtedly had no experience in regard to local government, but he put it to the House whether disappointment had been created in regard to the manner in which they had carried out the Local Government Act since they had been endowed with that great constitutional freedom.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): Quite the contrary. We have been agreeably surprised at the success of the experiment.

MR. FIELD said that he remembered the time when hon. Gentlemen opposite said that there would be extravagance of the greatest kind and constitutional earthquakes when the Local Government Act came into operation in Ireland. In fact he thought that the local government bodies were almost too careful, and if extravagance could be

imputed to them it had been imposed upon them by the Local Government Board. He put it to the right hon. the Chief Secretary and the hon. and learned Attorney General that, after the experience they had had, whether some Amendment ought not to be introduced into the Act which would enable them to carry on the work of local government with less friction, less expense, and more harmony than hitherto. They wanted to give the Government every chance for fair play, and allow the Local Government Board to co-operate with the local bodies in an efficient and harmonious way at the least possible cost to the ratepayers.

*MR. ATKINSON thought it would be discourteous not to respond to the appeal which the hon. Gentleman had made to him to say a few words in reply to the criticisms he had passed. In the first place, he congratulated him on his speech because the hon. Member, without being false to his principles, had sought, as he always did, to secure some practical advantage for Ireland, and some amelioration in the government of its local affairs. But it must be remembered that it was the late Government which brought in the Local Government Act of 1898. He had the honour of some share in the framing and passing of the measure, and it seemed strange to him that those who framed the Act had sometimes failed to receive quite as much encouragement on the other side as they might have done, and should not have been regarded as the friends of local government, anxious for the perfection and success of the system which they themselves inaugurated. One of the persons who gave most aid in framing that measure was the present permanent head of the Local Government Board, and as he (Mr. Atkinson) was familiar with the knowledge which that gentleman had brought to bear on the subject, the policy he endeavoured to carry out, and the ideas he suggested, he thought it but plain justice to him to say that he had been from the first most anxious to make local government a success in Ireland. Local government in Ireland had been a great success, and nobody rejoiced more at that than he did, except possibly the permanent head

of the Local Government Board. But it must be remembered what the problem was that he had to deal with. He had to deal with a number of bodies, the constituent members of which were absolutely unacquainted with the conduct of local affairs. What was the problem? The problem was to nurse them, as it were, into acquaintance with the conduct of local government, to restrain them, so that when they were fairly set up on the road they might be able to go steadily and cautiously forward, and discharge their duties efficiently and well. Of course it must have occurred to the permanent head of the Board that the restraints necessary at the start would not necessarily stop as progress was made, and if he were to make a criticism upon the different local bodies in Ireland it would be that they were forgetful of two maxims. The first was that none of us was infallible, and the next was the rather homely one, that men should learn to walk before they run. After all, the county councils of Ireland

were only learning to walk at present. He wished to make it plain that there was every desire on the part of the Government to see that proper service should be secured to the poor of Ireland in the hospitals. That the Local Government Board insist upon, and so far as they were concerned it would be carried out. Then as to the question of labourers' cottages, That required a great deal of consideration. He could assure hon. members that there was nothing but good will towards the new system in the Local Government Board, and there was nothing but anxiety that it should succeed. Though there had been some friction, it had been to some degree due to an unfounded suspicion that the Local Government Board desired to treat the local bodies arrogantly. He quite agreed that the Acts might work more smoothly, but he thought everyone would agree that the permanent head of the Local Government Board in Ireland was anxious to receive with courtesy and consideration any member of a local authority who might approach him. It was recognised that it would be necessary from time to time to amend the Local Government Act, and nobody was more anxious than his right hon. friend and the permanent officials of the Board to consider every suggestion that might be made, but they must think of the effect of any proposal in different directions. These matters must be considered from every point of view, and he could not help feeling that hon. gentlemen shewed some impatience when they recommended something to the Local Government Board which was not immediately accepted, though it would not stand the test of careful examination, The complaint that no provision had been made for the expenses of the association of county councils would receive the careful consideration of his right hon. friend. There was no pressing necessity for legislation to establish institutions for scientific research; that was a matter for the future. Complaint had been made with regard to the conduct of Local Government Board inspectors, and it would be obvious that before any reply could be made to those complaints the answer of the inspectors should be heard. With regard to the Labourers Cottages Act, although it was desirable to house comfortably and properly the agricultural labourers required in any particular district, and by an extension of the Housing of the Working Classes Act to house properly the artisan class, of the towns as far as practicable, yet care should be taken not to give a kind of auxiliary outdoor relief by erecting cottages for labourers who were not wanted in any particular district, otherwise they would run the risk in establishing a man in a house with an inadequate amount of land attached to support him of setting up a class of pauper agriculturists, not labourers, with such disastrous results as were seen in the West on a larger scale. He doubted whether independent inspectors would please either the landlords or the tenants. He would bring before his right hon. friend the various points that had been raised, and he had no doubt they would be carefully considered.

*MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.) said he had listened with great interest to the debate, and taking as he did a great interest in the Work of local government in Ireland, he wished to acknowledge the conciliatory spirit in which the Chief Secretary had met the views of Irish members, and also the conciliatory spirit of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He merely wished to call attention to the

qualifications which were insisted upon by the Local Government Board for assistant county surveyors of county councils in Ireland. In his opinion, in the Order of February, 1900, issued by the Local Government Board, the programme of qualifications was extravagant in a country which was denied university education. It prescribed qualifications which involved almost university training. The position of assistant county surveyors was a very ordinary one, so far as its literary requirements were concerned. The duty of assistant county surveyor only required that a man should be able to read and write well, and be able to measure heaps of stone, but what was required more than anything else was an honest man. It appeared to him that in prescribing qualifications not attainable by the majority of the Irish people a privilege had been created for the old ascendancy classes of Ireland. Under this rule it provided that any person who had filled the position of assistant county surveyor was entitled without further examination to be appointed county surveyor in any other county. All over Ireland there were assistant surveyors who had been illegally appointed by the county surveyors, who could not pass the qualifying examination required under Section 43 of the Act of 1836. In county Meath there were six assistant surveyors, only one of whom had passed an examination, and he came from another county. The whole or, at any rate, a great deal of the trouble under the Local Government Act came from the county and assistant surveyors, and the Chief Secretary was in error in stating that they could have been compulsorily retired before a certain date. The county councils were obliged to take over these men, and some people thought it would be an excellent thing if the county councils were enabled to borrow money in order to buy them out, and to set up in their place a new staff of competent men. One of the reasons put forward for keeping on the old officials was that it would be impossible for the new bodies to work with new hands. That certainly had not been his experience. As chairman of the body described by the Attorney General as the best-managed county council in Ireland, he had found that the men who knew nothing about the grand jury system were the men with whom he had least trouble. When the new men were in any difficulty they referred to the Act and found out the right thing to do, whereas the old officials relied on their former experience and carried out their work according to a law no longer in operation. These men had been trained in a bad school. Instead of the county officials being governed by the grand juries, the grand juries were governed by the county officials. On the question of expenses, those unacquainted with the practical working of the county councils in Ireland had said there was no reason why a one-clause Act should not have been passed, merely setting up an elected body to transact the duties formerly transacted by the grand juries. Such persons did not understand the tremendous changes effected in local government by the Local Government Act and the Orders in Council thereunder. Not a single thing was the same now as before the passing of the Act. Not merely had the functions of the grand juries been transferred to the county councils, but also the functions of the boards of guardians as the great rating authorities, of the boards of guardians under the Diseases of Animals Acts, of the magistrates under the Explosives Acts, and of numerous other smaller bodies. A great deal of expense arose from printing,

clerical work, and law charges, and much of the clerical work was in consequence of the orders prescribed by the Local Government Board. Some forty books and forms were prescribed for an authority, the predecessor of which kept only one or perhaps two. A number of the forms were admittedly unnecessary, and many of the expenses might be saved by the bodies themselves. The advertisement charges could be reduced, as there was no provision in law requiring advertisements to be published except in regard to audit, and even then the publication of one table only was necessary. Other expenses, however, were inherent to the Act, and incidental to the fact that the councils, unlike the grand juries, were corporate bodies. Formerly, if a man drove into a ditch at night he had no remedy; now he would bring an action against the county council and recover damages. The expenses of registration had been considerably increased by the Registry Act, 1898. Formerly, one polling sheet for each parliamentary polling district was required; now there had to be a separate unit for each local government polling district, and every poor law electoral division was a local unit. This had enormously increased the expenses of registration. The hon.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Duke, Henry Edward

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S.)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Fellowes, Hon. A. Edward

Lowe, Francis William

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc.

Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)

Arrol, Sir William

Finch, George H.

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Finlay, Sir R. Bannatyne

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Balcarres, Lord

Firbank, Joseph Thomas

Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Fisher, William Hayes

Macdona, John Cumming

Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds)

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Fitzroy, Hon. E. Algernon
Maconochie, A. W.
Banbury, Frederick George
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Gardner, Ernest
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Garfit, William
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Godson, Sir A. Frederick
Majendie, James A. H.
Bignold, Arthur
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Bigwood, James
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Milton, Viscount
Bond, Edward
Gordon, Maj. Evans- (T'rH'mts
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby- (S'lop
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Bousfield, William Robert
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Goschen, Hon. G. Joachim
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Bull, William James
Goulding, Edward Alfred
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Butcher, John George
Groves, James Grimble
Morrell, George Herbert
Carlile, William Walter
Hain, Edward

Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Mount, William Arthur
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Myers, William Henry
Chapman, Edward
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Charrington, Spencer
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Heaton, John Henniker
Parker, Gilbert
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Henderson, Alexander
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Pierpoint, Robert
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hoult, Joseph
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Houston, Robert Paterson
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Plummer, Walter R.
Colomb, Sir John C. Ready
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pretymann, Ernest George

Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Purvis, Robert
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Pym, C. Guy
Cranborne, Viscount
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Randles, John S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Rankin, Sir James
Crossley, Sir Savile
Law, Andrew Bonar
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Lawson, John Grant
Reid, James (Greenock)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants., Fareham)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Rentoul, James Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Renwick, George
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Member was proceeding to refer to the financial clauses of the Act, when;
It being Ten of the clock, Mr. SPEAKER, in pursuance of the Order of the House
of the 7th August, put forthwith the Question necessary to dispose of the
resolution then under consideration.
Question put accordingly, "That the House doth agree with the Committee in the
Resolution."
The House divided::Ayes, 197; Noes, 122. (Division List No. 446.)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Walker, Col. William Hall

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Webb, Col. William George
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Spear, John Ward
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Robinson, Brooke
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-Lyne)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Williams, Rt Hon J Powell (Birm)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Round, James
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Rutherford, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Sackville, Colonel S. G. Stopford-
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Thornton, Percy M.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
William Walrond and Mr.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Anstruther.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Valentia, Viscount
Smith, H C. (North'mb, Tyneside)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Harwood, George
O'Doherty, William
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell John (Mayo, S.)
Bell, Richard
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boland, John
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Dowd, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Holland, William Henry
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Boyle, James
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Brigg, John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Malley, William
Broadhurst, Henry
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Mara, James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Burns, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Shee, James John
Burt, Thomas
Joyce, Michael
Partington, Oswald
Caldwell, James
Kennedy, Patrick James
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cameron, Robert
Lambert, George
Reddy, M.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leamy, Edmund
Redmond, William (Clare)
Channing, Francis Allston

Levy, Maurice
Rickett, J. Compton
Clancy, John Joseph
Lloyd-George, David
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Lough, Thomas
Roche, John
Colville, John
London, W.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Crean, Eugene
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Crombie, John William
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Soares, Ernest J.
Cullinan, J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sullivan, Donal
Daly, James
M'Fadden, Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Govern, T.
Tennant, Harold John
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N.
Delany, William
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks., W. R.)
Dillon, John
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Wallace, Robert
Doogan, P. C.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Duffy, William J.
Moss, Samuel
Weir, James Galloway
Elibank, Master of
Murnaghan, George

White, Luke (Yorks., E. R.)
Emmott, Alfred
Murphy, John
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Field, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whiteley, George (Yorks., W. R.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks., W. R.)
Grant, Corrie
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Hammond, John
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Captain Donelan.

Mr. SPEAKER then proceeded, in pursuance of the same Order, to put forthwith severally the Questions, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of each Class of the Civil Service Estimates, the Navy Estimates, the Army Estimates, the Revenue Departments and other outstanding Estimates."

MR. LOUGH: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask if it is not necessary to state the amount we are asked to vote.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member will read the resolution he will see that there is nothing in it about the amount.

MR. LOUGH: But the resolution does refer to the amount.

*MR. SPEAKER: Not in that part of it which affects the Votes on Report.
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Doxford, Sir W. Theodore
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Duke, Henry Edward
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir W. Hart
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Arrol, Sir William
Eellowes, Hon. A. Edward
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol), S.
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Man'r
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Fielden, Edw. Brocklehurst
Lowe, Francis William
Balcarres, Lord
Finch, George H.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Finlay, Sir R. Bannatyne
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Fisher, William Hayes
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Banbury, Frederick George
Fitzroy, Hon. E. Algernon
Macdonald, John
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Gardner, Ernest
Maconochie, A. W.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Garfit, William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Bignold, Arthur
Godson, Sir A. Frederick

M'Calmont, Col J. (Antrim, E.)
Bigwood, James
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Bond, Edward
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Majendie, James A. H.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gordon, Maj. Evans- (T'rH'mlts
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Bousfield, William Robert
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Binc.
Milton, Viscount
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Salop
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Bull, William James
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Goschen, Hon. G. Joachim
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Butcher, John George
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Carlile, William Walter
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Groves, James Grimble
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hain, Edward
Morrell, George Herbert
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Hamilton, Rt Hn. Lord G. (Mid'x
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. Wm.
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Mount, William Arthur
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Murray, Rt. Hn. A Graham (Bute

Chapman, Edward
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Charrington, Spencer
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Myers, William Henry
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Heaton, John Henniker
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Henderson, Alexander
Parker, Gilbert
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hogg, Lindsay
Pierpoint, Robert
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hoult, Joseph
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Collings, Rt. Hn. Jesse
Houston, Robert Paterson
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Plummer, Walter R.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pretymann, Ernest George
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Purvis, Robert
Cranborne, Viscount
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Pym, C. Guy
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Randles, John S.
Crossley, Sir Savile

Keswick, William
Rankin, Sir James
Cust, Henry John C.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Reid, James (Greenock)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lawson, John Grant
Remnant, James Farquharson
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Lee, Arthur H. Hants., Fareham
Renshaw, Charles Bine

CLASS I.

Resolutions read a second time.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class I. of the Civil Service Estimates."

The House divided::Ayes. 204; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 447.)

Rentoul, James Alexander
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Valentia, Viscount
Renwick, George
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Smith, H C (Northumb. Tyneside)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Webb, Colonel William George
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Smith, Hon. W. P. D. (Strand)
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Spear, John Ward
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-un.-Lyne)
Robinson, Brooke
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Williams, Rt Hn J. Powell- (Birm.)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)

Round, James
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath).
Rutherford, John
Strutt, Hon Charles Hedley
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Thornton, Percy M.
Sir William Walrond and
Seton-Karr, Henry
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Mr. Anstruther.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N.)
Hammond, John
O'Doherty, William
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Harwood, George
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Bell, Richard
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Dowd, John
Boland, John
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.)
Boyle, James
Holland, William Henry
O'Malley, William
Brigg, John
Horniman, Frederick John

O'Mara, James
Broadhurst, Henry
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jameson, Major F. Eustace
O'Shee, James John
Burns, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Partington, Oswald
Burt, Thomas
Jordan, Jeremiah
Power, Patrick Joseph
Caldwell, James
Joyce, Michael
Reddy, M.
Cameron, Robert
Kennedy, Patrick James
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lambert, George
Redmond, William (Clare)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rickett, J. Compton
Channing, Francis Allston
Leamy, Edmund
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Roche, John
Cogan, Denis J.
Lloyd-George, David
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel).
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lough, Thomas
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Crombie, John William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Soares, Ernest J.
Cullinan, J.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Sullivan, Donald

Daly, James
MacNeill, John Jordon Swift
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Dermott, Patrick
Tennant, Harold John
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Fadden, Edward
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
M'Kenna, Reginald
Ure, Alexander
Dillon, John
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Wallace, Robert
Donelan, Captain A.
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Doogan, P. C.
Moss, Samuel
Weir, James Galloway
Duffy, William J.
Murnaghan, George
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Elibank, Master of
Murphy, John
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Emmott, Alfred
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Field, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, S.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth).
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

O'Brien, Kendal (TipperaryMid.

Gilhooly, James

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Grant, Corrie

O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)

Mr. Lloyd Morgan and Mr.

Griffith, Ellis J.

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

Colville.

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

CLASS II.

Resolutions read a second time.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class II. of the Civil Service Estimates."

The House divided::Ayes, 209; Noes, 122. (Division List No. 448.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn)

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Gordon. J. (Londonderry, S.)

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Gordon, MajEvans- (T'rH'mlets

Parker, Gilbert

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby-(Salop

Peel, Hn. Wm. RobertWellesley

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Gore. Hon. S. F. Ormsby (Linc.)

Pierpoint, Robert

Arrol, Sir William

Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon

Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Plummer, Walter R.

Balcarres, Lord

Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Pretymann, Ernest George
Balfour, Rt Hon Gerald W. (Leeds)
Groves, James Grimble
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Hain, Edward
Purvis, Robert
Banbury, Frederick George
Hall, Edward Marshall
Pym, C. Guy
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Hamilton, Rt Hon Lord G. (Midd'x
Randles, John S.
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir Michael Hicks
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Rankin, Sir James
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Bignold, Arthur
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Reid, James (Greenock)
Bigwood, James
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Remnant, James Farquharson
Bond, Edward
Heath, James (Staffords., N W.)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Heaton, John Henniker
Rentoul, James Alexander
Bousfield, William Robert
Henderson, Alexander
Renwick, George
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Bull, William James
Hogg, Lindsay
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hoult, Joseph
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Butcher, John George

Houston, Robert Paterson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Carlile, William Walter
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Robinson, Brooke
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Round, James
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)
Rutherford, John
Chamberlain, J. Austen(Worc'r
Keswick, William
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Chapman, Edward
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Charrington, Spencer
Law, Andrew Bonar
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Lawson, John Grant
Seton-Karr, Henry
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Smith, H. C(North'mb.Tyneside
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine

Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Spear, John Ward
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Lowe, Francis William
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Cranborne, Viscount
Lowther, Rt. Hon. Jas. (Kent)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Crossley, Sir Savile
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Cust, Henry John C.
Macdona, John Cumming
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Davenport, William Bromley-
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Maconochie, A. W.
Thornton, Percy M.
Dickson, Charles Scott
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Tollemache, Henry James
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Majendie, James A. H.
Valentia, Viscount

Duke, Henry Edward
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Milton, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Webb, Colonel William George
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Weir, James Galloway
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Whiteley, H. Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
More, Robert Jasper (Shropsh)
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell- (Birm.
Finch, George H.
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Morrell, George Herbert
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Fisher, William Hayes
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Mount, William Arthur
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Gardner, Ernest
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir
Garfit, William
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
William Walrond and Mr.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Myers, William Henry

Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Doherty, William
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Bell, Richard
Harwood, George
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boland, John
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Dowd, John
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Boyle, James
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N)
Brigg, John
Holland, William Henry
O'Malley, William
Broadhurst, Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Mara, James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Burns, John
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Shee, James John
Burt, Thomas
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Partington, Oswald
Caldwell, James
Jordan, Jeremiah
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cameron, Robert
Joyce, Michael
Reddy, M.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Kennedy, Patrick James

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Lambert, George
Redmond, William (Clare)
Channing, Francis Allston
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rickett, J. Compton
Clancy, John Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Levy, Maurice
Roche, John
Colville, John
Lloyd-George, David
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lough, Thomas
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Crombie, John William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Soares, Ernest J.
Cullinan, J.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Sullivan, Donal
Daly, James
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Dermott, Patrick
Tennant, Harold John
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Fadden, Edward
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N
Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
Thomson, E. W. (York, W. R.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Mansfield, Horace Randall
Ure, Alexander
Dillon, John
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Wallace, Robert

Donelan, Captain A.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Doogan, P. C.
Moss, Samuel
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Duffy, William J.
Murnaghan, George
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Elibank, Master of
Murphy, John
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Emmott, Alfred
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Field, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Mr.
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Nussey and Mr. M'Kenna.
Grant, Corrie
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

CLASS III.

Resolutions read a second time.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt Sir Alex F.
Bond, Edward
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bousfield, William Robert

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Billiard, Sir Harry
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Arrol, Sir William
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Butcher, John George
Corbett, T. L. (Down, N.)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy
Carlile, William Walter
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Balcarres, Lord
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Cranborne, Viscount
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Cust, Henry John C.
Banbury, Frederick George
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Davenport, William Bromley-
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Beach, Rt. Hn Sir Michael Hicks
Chapman, Edward
Dickson, Charles Scott
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Charrington, Spencer
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Bignold, Arthur
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A Akers-
Bigwood, James
Cochrane Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Resolutions reported in respect of Class III. of the Civil Service Estimates."

The House divided:;Ayes, 206; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 449.)

Duke, Henry Edward

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S

Rentoul, James Alexander

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine

Renwick, George

Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart

Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)

Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge

Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward

Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green

Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Man.

Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Lowe, Francis William

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Finch, George H.

Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)

Robinson, Brooke

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. (Kent)

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Fisher, William Hayes

Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon

Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison

Round, James

Flannery, Sir Fortescue

Macdona, John Cumming

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Gardner, Ernest

Maclver, David (Liverpool)

Rutherford, John

Garfit, William

Maconochie, A. W.

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.

M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin&Nairn

M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Seton-Karr Henry
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'ml'ts
Majendie, James A. H.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Gore, Hn G R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Milton, Viscount
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John E.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Smith, H. C (Northmb Tyneside
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Moore, Wm. (Antrim, N.)
Spear, John Ward
Greville, Hon. Ronald
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Groves, James Grimble
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Stanley, Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk
Hain, Edward
Morrell, George Herbert
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Hall, Edward Marshall
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hamilton, Rt Hn. Lord G (Mid'x
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.)
Mount, William Arthur
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier

Haslett, Sir James Homer
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Murray, Col. W. (Bath)
Thornton, Percy M.
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Myers, William Henry
Tollemache, Henry James
Heaton, John Henniker
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Henderson, Alexander
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Parker, Gilbert
Valentia, Viscount
Hogg, Lindsay
Peel, Hn Wm Robert Wellesley
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Hoult, Joseph
Pierpoint, Robert
Walker, Col. William Hall
Houston, Robert Paterson
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Webb, Colonel William George
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Weir, James Galloway
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Plummer, Walter R.
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Bir.)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edw.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Purvis, Robert
Wilson, A. S. (Yorks, E. R.)
Keswick, William

Pym, C. Guy
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Randles, John S.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Law, Andrew Bonar
Rankin, Sir James
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Lawson, John Grant
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm
Reid, James (Greenock)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Remnant, James Farquharson
Sir William Walrond and
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Clancy, John Joseph
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst.)
Ambrose, Robert
Cogan, Denis J.
Field, William
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Colville, John
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Flynn, James Christopher
Bell, Richard
Crean, Eugene
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Boland, John
Crombie, John William
Gilhooly, James
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Cullinan, J.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Boyle, James
Daly, James
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Brigg, John
Dalziel, James Henry

Hammond, John
Broadhurst, Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Harwood, George
Burke, E. Haviland-
Delany, William
Hayden, John Patrick
Burns, John
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Burt, Thomas
Dillon, John
Healy, Timothy Michael
Caldwell, James
Donelan, Captain A.
Holland, William Henry
Cameron, Robert
Doogan, P. C.
Horniman, Frederick John
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Duffy, William J.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Elibank, Master of
Jameson, Maj. J. Eustace
Channing, Francis Allston
Emmott, Alfred
Jones, Day. Brynmor (Swansea)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Roche, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Joyce, Michael
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'r'ry, Mid
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Soares, Ernest J.
Leamy, Edmund
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Sullivan, Donal

Levy, Maurice
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Lloyd-George, David
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Tennant, Harold John
Lough, Thomas
O'Doherty, William
Thompson, Dr E C (Monaghan N.
London, W.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks, W. R.)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ure, Alexander
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
O'Dowd, John
Wallace, Robert
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
M'Dermott, Patrick
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
White, Luke (York. E. R.)
M'Fadden, Edward
O'Malley, William
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
M'Govern, T.
O'Mara, James
Whiteley, George (Yorks, W. R.
M'Kenna, Reginald
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
O'Shee, James John
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Partington, Oswald
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Wilson, Henry J. (York W. R.
Moss, Samuel
Reddy, M.
Murnaghan, George
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Murphy, John

Redmond, William (Clare)

Sir Thomas Esmonde and

Nannetti, Joseph P.

Rickett, J. Compton

Mr. Corrie Grant.

Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.

Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)

CLASS IV.

Resolutions read a second time.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Coghill, Douglas Harry

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'm'ts

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready

Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Compton, Lord Alwyne

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Arrol, Sir William

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow

Goschen, Hon. George J.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy

Cox, Irwin Edward Bain bridge

Greene, Hy. D. (Shrewsbury)

Balcarres, Lord

Cranborne, Viscount

Greville, Hon. Ronald

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Cripps, Charles Alfred

Groves, James Grimble

Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W (Leeds.)

Crossley, Sir Savile

Hain, Edward

Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Cust, Henry John C.
Hall, Edward Marshall
Banbury, Frederick George
Davenport, Win. Bromley-
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chath'm
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Bignold, Arthur
Dickson-Poynder, Sir J. P.
Heath, J. (Staffords., N. W.)
Bigwood, James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Henderson, Alexander
Bond, Edward
Doxford, Sir William T.
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Duke, Henry Edward
Hogg, Lindsay
Bousfield, William Robert
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hoult, Joseph
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Houston, Robert Paterson
Bull, William James
Emmott, Alfred
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Hozier, Hn. Jas. Henry Cecil
Butcher, John George
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Carlile, William Walter
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.

Fielden, Edwd. Brocklehurst
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Finch, George H.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Keswick, William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Fisher, William Hayes
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Fitzroy, Hon. Edwd. Algernon
Law, Andrew Bonar
Chapman, Edward
Gardner, Ernest
Lawson, John Grant
Charrington, Spencer
Garfit, William
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareh'm
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Godson, Sir Augustus F.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Resolutions reported in respect of Class IV. of the Civil Service Estimates."
The House divided::Ayes, 207 Noes, 122. (Division List No. 450.)
Leveson-Gower, Fredk, N. S.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Parker, Gilbert
Smith, A. H. (Hertford, East)
Long, Col Chas. W. (Evesham
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Smith, H. C (N'th'mb., T'neside)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Pierpoint, Robert
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)

Lowe, Francis William
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Spear, John Ward
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Plummer, Walter R.
Spencer, E. (W. Bromwich)
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. Ellison
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Macdonald, John Cumming
Purvis, Robert
Stone, Sir Benjamin
MacLver, David (Liverpool)
Pym, C. Guy
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Maconochie, A. W.
Randles, John S.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Rankin, Sir James
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Thornton, Percy M.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Tollemache, Henry James
Majendie, James A. H.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Milton, Viscount
Renwick, George
Valentia, Viscount
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Walker, Col. William Hall
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Webb, Col. William George
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Robinson, Brooke
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell- (Bir.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Wills, Sir Frederick
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Round, James
Wilson, A. S. (Yorks., E. R.)
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)
Mount, William Arthur
Rutherford, John
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Seton-Karr, Henry
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Myers, William Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Sir William Walrond and
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Gilhooly, James
Murphy, John
Ambrose, Robert
Grant, Corrie

Nannetti, Joseph P.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Bell, Richard
Hammond, John
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Boland, John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Harwood, George
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Boyle, James
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Brigg, John
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas. Seale-
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Broadhurst, Henry
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Holland, William Henry
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Burns, John
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Doherty, William
Burt, Thomas
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Caldwell, James
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Cameron, Robert
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Dowd, John
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.

Channing, Francis Allston
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Malley, William
Clancy, John Joseph
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Mara, James
Cogan, Denis J.
Leamy, Edmund
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Colville, John
Leigh, Sir Joseph
O'Shee, James John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Levy, Maurice
Partington, Oswald
Crean, Eugene
Lloyd-George, David
Power, Patrick Joseph
Crombie, John William
Lough, Thomas
Reddy, M.
Cullinan, J.
Lundon, W.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Daly, James
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Dalziel, James Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Rickett, J. Compton
Delany, William
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Dillon, John
M'Dermott, Patrick
Roche, John
Donelan, Captain A.
M'Fadden, Edward
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Doogan, P. C.
M'Govern, T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Duffy, William J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Elibank, Master of

Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Sullivan, Donal
Field, William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Tennant, Harold John
Flynn, James Christopher
Moss, Samuel
Thompson, Dr. E C (Mon'gh'n, N.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Murnaghan, George
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks, W. R.)
Ure, Alexander
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks, W. R.)
Wallace, Robert
Whitley, George (Yorks, W. R.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Weir, James Galloway
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Williams Osmond (Merioneth)
Mr. Soares.

CLASS V.

Resolutions read a second time.

Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of Class V. of the Civil Service Estimates."

MR. DILLON: On a point of order, I wish to submit that if these resolutions are put thus they will contain two Votes which under the rule cannot be included. An addition was made to this rule in 1898 in the following words;

"Provided always that any additional Estimate for any new service or matter not included in the original Estimates for the year shall be submitted for consideration in the Committee of Supply on any day not later than two days before the Committee is closed."

The First Lord of the Treasury, in introducing the rule, said that this proviso had been introduced for the purpose of meeting the views of the right hon.

Member for East Wolverhampton and an hon. friend of his own, who, he thought, was the Member for King's Lynn. The objection taken by those two Members was that the closure rule, which they were now engaged in putting into operation, was never intended and ought not to be allowed to apply to any Estimate which

had not been submitted for discussion in the House with the ordinary Estimates, or, at all events, two days before the closure was applied. I submit that under the wording of the proviso neither of these Votes, which are Votes raising new points and new policies, has been submitted to the Committee of Supply for consideration two days before the closure of the Committee, and that, therefore, they ought not to be, and cannot be, included in the operation of the rule to-night. The loan to the Viceroy of Wu-chang is a totally new subject, not considered by the House before, and the Treasury Chest Fund in its present shape, is, I contend, a new fund.

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. Member's point is a good one. It does not, in the first place, arise here at all. The question I have to put is "That the House do agree to all the resolutions reported in respect of Class V." This is reported as a resolution, and therefore I am bound to put the question. The question of the hon. Member is one which should have been raised, and probably was raised in Committee in order to be decided by the Chairman. I am not a court of appeal from him, and it does not arise on the question now before the House. I am not in a position to deal with anything that does not arise on the matter before the House. I may say further that I do not think the point was a good one in Committee. According to the construction put by the hon. Member on the rule, he contends, as I understand, that the resolution should be submitted to the actual decision of the House two days before the closure; that is, on Tuesday last. In point of fact, on Wednesday the House specifically ordered that all Votes in Supply should be dealt with under this Order, and they are being so dealt with accordingly; and they were so dealt with yesterday, and that altogether does away with the effect of the proviso. The point really does not arise on the question now before the House. It arose before the Chairman of Committees, and the Chairman decided upon it, and I must say I agree with his decision.

MR. DILLON: By way of personal explanation I may be permitted to say that when I raised that point in Committee the Chairman adopted a somewhat unusual course, because he said he had consulted you, and he alluded to you as a court of appeal. [Cries of "No no."] I am in the recollection of the House, and I only mention it because the right hon. Gentleman said I ought to have raised the point in Committee of Supply.

*MR. SPEAKER: I did not say anybody ought to have raised it. I said "if anybody raised it."

MR. DILLON: I will not of course argue your ruling. I desire to say my contention was based upon the words "submitted for consideration." and I claim that these Votes were not submitted.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: On a point of order. Inasmuch as you have ruled you are not a court of appeal from the Chairman, is there any way of bringing
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidst'ne
Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. (Kent)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Macdona, John Cumming
Arnold-Forster. Hugh O.
Finch, George H.
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Arrol, Sir William
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Maconochie, A. W.
Atkinson Rt. Hn. John
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Fisher, William Hayes
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.).
Balcarres, Lord
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Gardner, Ernest
Majendie, James A. H.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds
Gardfit, William
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Milton, Viscount
Banbury, Frederick George
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Gordon, J. (Londonderry. South
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'ml'ts
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Gore. Hn. G. R. C Ormsby- (Salop
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Bignold, Arthur
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)

More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Bigwood, James
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Bond, Edward
Goschen, Hon. George J.
Morrell, George Herbert
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Goulding. Edward Alfred
Morris, Hon. Martin Hy. F.
Bousfield, William Robert
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Midd'x.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Mount, William Arthur
Bullard, Sir Harry
Groves, James Grimble
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Hain, Edward
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Butcher, John George
Hall, Edward Marshall
Murray, Col. W. (Bath)
Carlile, William Walter
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Myers, William Henry
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Cayzer, Sir Chas. William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Haslett, Sir James Homer
Parker, Gilbert
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Chapman, Edward
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Pierpoint, Robert
Charrington, Spencer
Henderson, Alexander
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard

Clare, Octavius Leigh
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Hogg, Lindsay
Plummer, Walter R.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hoult, Joseph
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Houston, Robert Paterson
Pretymann, Ernest George
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Purvis, Robert
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pym, C. Guy
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Randles, John S.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Johnstone, H. (Sussex)
Rankin, Sir. James
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Cranborne, Viscount
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Law, Andrew Bonar
Remnant, James Farquharson
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lawson, John Grant
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Cust, Henry John C.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Davenport, William Bromley-
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Renwick, George
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm)

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalyb'dge
Dickson, Charles Scott
Leveson-Gower. Fredk, N. S.
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Ritchie. Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Robinson, Brooke
Duke, Henry Edward
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lowe, Francis William
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Round, James

the decision of the Chairman under review except by motion?

*MR. SPEAKER: As the hon. Member is very well aware, there is no way of questioning the decision of the Chairman except by motion.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 202; Noes, 122. (Division List No. 451.)

Royds, Clement Molyneux
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Webb, Colonel William George
Rutherford, John
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Sackville, Col. S. G Stopford-
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell (Birm.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Wills, Sir Frederick
Seton-Karr, Henry
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.

Sharpe, William Edward T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Thornton, Percy M.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Tollemache, Henry James
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Valentia, Viscount
Sir William Walrond and
Spear, John Ward
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Mr. Anstruther.
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Walker, Col. William Hall
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Doherty, William
Ambrose, Robert
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Harwood, George
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Dowd, John
Bell, Richard
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Boland, John
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Holland, William Henry
O'Malley, William
Boyle, James
Horniman, Frederick John

O'Mara, James
Brigg, John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Shanghnessy, P. J.
Broadhurst, Henry
Jameson, Maj. J. Eustace
O'Shee, James John
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Partington, Oswald
Burns, John
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Burt, Thomas
Jordan, Jeremiah
Reddy, M.
Caldwell, James
Joyce, Michael
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cameron, Robert
Kennedy, Patrick James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edmund
Rickett, J. Compton
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Levy, Maurice
Roche, John
Clancy, John Joseph
Lough, Thomas
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Colville, John
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Soares, Ernest J.
Crean, Eugene
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Sullivan, Donal

Crombie, John William
M'Dermott, Patrick
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Cullinan, J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Tennant, Harold John
Daly, James
M'Govern, T.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N.
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Kenna, Reginald
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks, W. R.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Ure, Alexander
Delany, William
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Wallace, Robert
Dillon, John
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Donelan, Captain A.
Moss, Samuel
Weir, James Galloway
Doogan, P. C.
Murnaghan, George
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Duffy, William J.
Murphy, John
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Elibank, Master of
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whiteley, Geo. (Yorks. W. R.)
Emmott, Alfred
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Field, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks, W. R.)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Grant, Corrie
O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Mr. Layland-Barratt.

CLASS VI.

Resolutions read a second time.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arrol, Sir William
Balcarres, Lord

Resolutions reported in respect of Class VI. of the Civil Service Estimates."

The House divided::Ayes, 201; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 452.)

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Groves, James Grimble
Plummer, Walter R.
Banbury, Frederick George
Hain, Edward
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Hall, Edward Marshall
Pretymann, Ernest George
Beach. Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G. (Midd'x
Pryce-Jones, Lieut.-Col. Edw.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.
Purvis, Robert

Bignold, Arthur
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Pym, C. Guy
Bigwood, James
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Randles, John S.
Bond, Edward
Heath, James (Staffs., N. W.)
Rankin, Sir James
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Henderson, Alexander
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Bousfield, William Robert
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Hogg, Lindsay
Remnant, James Farquharson
Bull, William James
Hoult, Joseph
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Butcher, John George
Houston, Robert Paterson
Rentoul, James Alexander
Carlile, William Walter
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Renwick, George
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Kenyon, Hon. C. T. (Denbigh)
Robinson, Brooke
Chapman, Edward
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Charrington, Spencer

Law, Andrew Bonar
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Round, James
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Lawson, John Grant
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Coghill, Douglas Harry-
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Rutherford, John
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Sadler, Col. S. Alexander
Colomb, Sir J. Charles Ready
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Long. Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Cranborne, Viscount
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Lowe, Francis William
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Smith, H C. (North'mb, Tyneside)
Cust, Henry John C.
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham)
Macdona, John Cumming

Spear, John Ward
Dickson, Charles Scott
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Maconochie, A. W.
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Duke, Henry Edward
Majendie, James A. H.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Milton, Viscount
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Emmott, Alfred
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Thornton, Percy M.
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Tollemache, Henry James
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Finch, George H.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Valentia, Viscount
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Fisher, William Hayes
Morrell, George Herbert
Walker, Colonel William Hall

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Webb, Col. William George
Gardner, Ernest
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Welby, Sir Charles G. (Notts.)
Garfit, William
Mount, William Arthur
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-Lyne)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Williams, Rt. Hon. J. Powell (Birm)
Gordon, Hon. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.)
Gordon, Maj. Evans (T'ramlets)
Myers, William Henry
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)
Gore, Hon. G. R. C. Ormsby- (S'lp)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Parker, Gilbert
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Peel, Hon. Wm. R. Wellesley
William Walrond and Mr.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Pierpoint, Robert
Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Ambrose. Robert
Bell, Richard
Boyle, James
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Boland, John
Brigg, John

Broadhurst, Henry
Holland, William Henry
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Dowd, John
Burns, John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Burt, Thomas
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Kelly, Jas. (Rosscommon, N.
Caldwell, James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
O'Malley, William
Cameron, Robert
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Mara, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Joyce, Michael
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Shee, James John
Channing, Francis Allston
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Partington, Oswald
Clancy, John Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Reddy, M.
Colvile, John
Levy, Maurice
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lough, Thomas
Redmond, William (Clare)
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
Rickett, J. Compton
Crombie, John William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighsh.)
Cullinan, J.

Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Roche, John
Daly, James
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Fadden, Edward
Soares, Ernest J.
Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
Sullivan, Donal
Dillon, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Donelan, Captain A.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N.
Doogan, P. C.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks, W. R.)
Duffy, William J.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Ure, Alexander
Elibank, Master of
Moss, Samuel
Wallace, Robert
Field, William
Murnaghan, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Murphy, John.
Weir, James Galloway
Flynn, James Christopher
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White. Luke (Yorks., E. R.)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Gilhooly, James
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whiteley, George (Yorks., W. R.)
Grant, Corrie
Norman, Henry

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks., W. R.)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Harwood, George
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Thomas Esmonde and Dr.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Doherty, William
Shipman.
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

CLASS VII.

Resolutions read a second time.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Bull, William James
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bullard, Sir Harry
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Cranborne, Viscount
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Butcher, John George
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Arrol, Sir William
Carlile, William Walter
Crossley, Sir Savile
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Cautley, Henry Strother
Cust, Henry John C.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Davenport, William Bromley-
Balcarres. Lord
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Dickson, Charles Scott
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Banbury, Frederick George
Chapman, Edward
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Charrington, Spencer
Doxford, Sir W. Theodore
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Duke, Henry Edward
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Bignold, Arthur
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Bigwood, James
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fellowes, Hon. A. Edward
Bond, Edward
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Bousfield, William Robert
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Resolutions reported in respect of Class VII. of the Civil Service Estimates."
The House divided::Ayes, 197; Noes, 120. (Division List No. 453.)
Finch. George H.
Lowe, Francis William
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson

Finlay, Sir R. Bannatyne
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Robinson, Brooke
Fisher, William Hayes
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Fitzroy, Hon. K. Algernon
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Round, James
Gardner, Ernest
Maconochie, A. W.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Garfit, William
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Rutherford, John
Godson, Sir Augustus F.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Majendie, James A. H.
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Gordon, Maj. Evans- (T'r H'mlts
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Milton, Viscount
Seton-Karr, Henry
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Goschen, Hon. G. Joachim
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)

More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Groves, James Grimble
Morrell, George Herbert
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Hain, Edward
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Spear, John Ward
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. Wm.
Mount, William Arthur
Stanley, Hon. Arthur) Ormskirk
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Heath, J. (Staffords., N. W.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Henderson, Alexander
Myers, William Henry
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Hogg, Lindsay
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hoult, Joseph
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert W.
Thornton, Percy M.
Houston, Robert Paterson
Pierpoint, Robert
Tollemache, Henry James
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Platt-Higgins. Frederick
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Hozier, Hon. J. Henry Cecil
Plummer, Walter R.

Tufnell, Lieut. Col. Edward
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Valentia, Viscount
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Walker, Col. William Hall
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)
Purvis, Robert
Webb, Colonel William George
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Pym, C. Guy
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Randles, John S.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-Lyne)
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Rankin, Sir James
Williams, Rt. Hon. J. Powell- (Birm.)
Lawson, John Grant
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Wills, Sir Frederick
Lee, A. H. (Plants, Fareham)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks. E. R.)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Remnant, James Farquharson
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Leveson Gower, Frederick N. S.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Renwick, George
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
William Walrond and Mr.
Lonsdale. John Brownlee
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Anstruther.
NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Crombie, John William
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Ambrose, Robert
Cullinan, J.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Daly, James
Holland, William Henry
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Dalziel, James Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Bell, Richard
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Boland, John
Delany, William
Jameson. Major J. Eustace
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Dillon, John
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Boyle, James
Donelan, Captain A.
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Brigg, John
Doogan, P. C.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Broadhurst, Henry
Duffy, William J.
Joyce, Michael
Burke, E. Haviland-
Elibank, Master of
Kennedy, Patrick James
Burns, John
Emmott, Alfred
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Caldwell, James
Field, William
Leamy, Edmund
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Flynn, James Christopher
Levy, Maurice
Channing, Francis Allston

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Lough, Thomas
Clancy, John Joseph
Gilhooly, James
Lundon, W.
Cogan, Denis J.
Grant, Corrie
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Colville, John
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Hammond, John
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Crean, Eugene
Hayden, John Patrick
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Fadden, Edward
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Sullivan, Donal
M'Govern, T.
O'Dowd, John
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
M'Kenna, Reginald
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Tennant, Harold John
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n N.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
O'Malley, William
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks, W. R.)
Moss, Samuel
O'Mara, James
Ure, Alexander
Murnaghan, George
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Wallace, Robert
Murphy, John
O'Shee, James John
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Partington, Oswald
Weir, James Galloway
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Power, Patrick Joseph

White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Reddy, M.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Norman, Henry
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Whiteley, George (Yorks, W. R.)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Redmond, William (Clare)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid)
Rickett, J. Compton
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighsh.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Roche, John
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks, W. R.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Sheehan, Darnel Daniel
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
O'Doherty, William
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Mr. Mansfield.
NAVY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.
Resolutions read a second time.
Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cranborne, Viscount
Griffith, Ellis J.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Groves, James Grimble

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Crombie, John William
Hain, Edward
Arrol, Sir William
Crossley, Sir Savile
Hamilton Rt. Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cust, Henry John C.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Dalziel, James Henry
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Balcarres, Lord
Davenport, William Bromley-
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Henderson, Alexander
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Banbury, Frederick George
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Hogg, Lindsay
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Holland, William Henry
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A Akers-
Horniman, Frederick John
Bignold, Arthur
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Hoult, Joseph
Bigwood, James
Duke, Henry Edward
Houston, Robert Paterson
Bond, Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Bousfield, William Robert
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)

Emmott, Alfred
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Brigg, John
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Butcher, John George
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Caldwell, James
Finch, George H.
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Carlile, William Walter
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Fisher, William Hayes
Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Gardner, Ernest
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Garfit, William
Lawson, John Grant
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Chapman, Edward
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Lee, A. H. (Hants, Fareham)
Charrington, Spencer
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Gordon, Maj. Evans- (T'r Hamlets

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Leng, Sir John
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Colville, John
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Resolutions reported in respect of the Navy Estimates."
The House divided:;Ayes, 225; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 454.)
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Pierpoint, Robert
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Plummer, Walter R.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Lowe, Francis William
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Soares, Ernest J.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Spear, John Ward
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Purvis, Robert
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Macdonald, John Cumming
Pym, C. Guy
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Maconochie, A. W.
Randles, John S.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Rankin, Sir James
Stone, Sir Benjamin

M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, K)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Majendie, James A. H.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Tennant, Harold John
Milton, Viscount
Rentoul, James Alexander
Thomson, F. W. (York. W. R.)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Renwick, George
Thornton, Percy M.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Rickett, J. Compton
Tollemache, Henry James
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Moore, William (Antrim N)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col, Edward
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Ritchie. Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Ure, Alexander
Morgan, J. (Walthamstow)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Valentia. Viscount
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Morrell, George Herbert
Robinson, Brooke
Walker, Col. William Hall
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Wallace, Robert
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Round, James
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)

Royds, Clement Molyneux
Webb, Colonel William George
Mount, William Arthur
Rutherford, John
Weir, James Golloway
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Welby, Sir Charles C. E. (Notts.)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-un.-Lyne)
Murray, Col., Wyndham (Bath)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Myers, William Henry
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York. E. R.)
Norman, Henry
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Partington, Oswald
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Sir William Walrond and
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, W. (Cork, N. E.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale-
O'Doherty, William
Ambrose, Robert
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boland, John

Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Dowd, John
Boyle, James
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Broadhurst, Henry
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Leamy, Edmund
O'Malley, William
Burns, John
Levy, Maurice
O'Mara, James
Campbell, J. (Armagh, S.)
Lough, Thomas
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Lundon, W.
O'Shee, James John
Clancy, John Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Reddy, M.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Redmond, William (Clare)
Cullinan, J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Roche, John
Daly, James
M'Govern, T.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Delany, William
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Sullivan, Donal
Dillon, John
Moss, Samuel
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Donelan, Captain A.
Murnaghan, George

White, Luke (York. E. R.)
Doogan, P. C.
Murphy John
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Dully, William J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whiteley, George (York. W. R.)
Field, William
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W. R.)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Grant, Corrie
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Hammond, John
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Mr. Bell.
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
ARMY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.
Resolutions read a second time.
Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the outstanding
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Dyke. Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Lowe, Francis William
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Elibank, Master of
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Emmott, Alfred
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Arrol, Sir William

Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Macdona, John Cumming
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Maconochie, A. W.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Finch, George H.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Balcarres, Lord
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Fisher, William Hayes
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Majendie, James A. H.
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Banbury, Frederick George
Gardner, Ernest
Milton, Viscount
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Garfit, William
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Bignold, Arthur
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Bigwood, James
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r Hamlets
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow
Bond, Edward
Gore. Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop)
Morrell, George Herbert
Bousfield, William Robert
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Lincs.)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim

Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Brigg, John
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Bull, William James
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Mount, William Arthur
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute)
Butcher, John George
Groves, James Grimble
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Caldwell, James
Hain, Edward
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Carlile, William Walter
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Middl'x
Myers, William Henry
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Norman, Henry
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Hay, Hon. Claude G.
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Henderson, Alexander
Partington, Oswald
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Chapman, Edward
Hogg, Lindsay
Pierpoint, Robert
Charrington, Spencer
Holland, William Henry
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Horniman, Frederick John
Plummer, Walter R.

Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Hoult, Joseph
Pretymann, Ernest George
Coghill Douglas Harry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Collings, Rt. Hn. Jesse
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Purvis, Robert
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Randles, John S.
Colville, John
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Rankin, Sir James
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Cranborne, Viscount
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Crombie, John William
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Renwick, George
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Rickett, J. Compton
Cust, Henry John C.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Dalziel, James Henry
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Lawson, John Grant
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Layland-Barratt, Francis
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Robinson, Brooke
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Round, James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Rutherford, John
Duke, Henry Edward
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Resolutions reported in respect of the Army Estimates."
The House divided::Ayes, 219; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 455.)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Webb, Colonel William George
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Weir, James Galloway
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Tennant, Harold John
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks. W. R.)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Thornton, Percy M.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York. E. R.)

Smith, Abel H. (Hertford. East)
Tollemache, Henry James
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Ure, Alexander
Soares, Ernest J.
Valentia, Viscount
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir
Spear, John Ward
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
William Walrond and Mr.
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Walker, Col. William Hall
Anstruther.
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Wallace, Robert
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
NOES.
Abraham, W. (Cork, N. E.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Ambrose, Robert
Hayne, Rt. Hon. C. Seale-
O'Doherty, William
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Bell, Richard
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boland, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Dowd, John
Boyle, James
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Broadhurst, Henry-
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Burke, E. Haviland-

Loamy, Edmund
O'Malley, William
Burns, John
Levy, Maurice
O'Mara, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lough, Thomas
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Lundon, W.
O'Shee, James John
Channing, Francis Allston
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Clancy, John Joseph
MacNeill, John Cordon Swift
Reddy, M.
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, William (Clare)
Crean, Eugene
M'Govern, T.
Roche, John
Cullinan, J.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Daly, James
Moss, Samuel
Sullivan, Donal
Delany, William
Murnaghan, George
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Dillon, John
Murphy, John
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Doogan, P. C.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Whiteley, George (Yorks, W. R.)
Field, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks, W. R.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brian. Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Hammond, John
O'Connor. James (Wicklow, W.)
Captain Donelan.
REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1901–2.
Resolutions read a second time.
Question put, "That this House doth
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Agg-Gardner, James-Tynte
Banbury, Frederick George
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Butcher, John George
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir Michael Hicks
Carlile, William Walter
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Arrol, Sir William
Bignold, Arthur
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bigwood, James
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bond, Edward
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Balcarres, Lord
Bousfield, William Robert
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex

Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds)
Bull, William James
Chapman, Edward
agree with the Committee in the outstanding Resolutions reported in respect of
the Revenue Departments."
The House divided::Ayes, 185; Noes, 106, (Division List No. 456)
Charrington, Spencer
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh.)
Renwick, George
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Lambton, Hon. Frederick, Wm.
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Law, Andrew Bonar
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Lawrence, Wm. E. (Liverpool)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Cranborne, Viscount
Lawson, John Grant
Robinson, Brooke
Crossley, Sir Savile
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cust, Henry John C.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Rutherford, John
Davenport, William Bromley
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Dickson, Charles Scott

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lowe, Francis William
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Duke, Henry Edward
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Smith, H. C. (Nrth'mb. Tyneside
Macdona, John Cumming
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Maconochie, A. W.
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Spear, John Ward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Finch, George H.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Majendie, James A. H.
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Fisher, William Hayes
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Milton, Viscount
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Strutt, Hn. Charles Hedley
Gardner, Ernest
Montague, G. (Huntingdon)

Sturt, Hn. Humphry Napier
Garfit, William
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow)
Thornton, Percy M.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Tollemache, Henry James
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'mlets)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Gore, Hn. G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Mount, William Arthur
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute)
Valentia, Viscount
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Myers, William Henry
Webb, Colonel William George
Groves, James Grimble
Weir, James Galloway
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Welby, Sir. Charles G. E. (Notts)
Hain, Edward
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und-Lyne)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Midd'x)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Wills, Sir Frederick
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Pierpoint, Robert
Wilson, A. Stanley (York. E. R)

Hay, Hon. Claude George
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wodehouse Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Plummer, Walter R.
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
Henderson, Alexander
Pretymann, Ernest George
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Hogg, Lindsay
Purvis, Robert

TELLERS FOR THE AYES;

Hoult, Joseph
Sir William Walrond and
Houston, Robert Paterson
Randles, John S.
Mr. Anstruther.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Rankin, Sir James
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Reid, James (Greenock)
NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Caldwell, James
Cullinan, J.
Ambrose, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Daly, James
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Dalziel, James Henry
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Clancy, John Joseph
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Bell, Richard
Cogan, Denis J.
Delany, William
Boland, John
Colville, John
Dillon, John
Boyle, James
Condon, Thomas Joseph

Donelan, Captain A.
Brigg, John
Crean, Eugene
Doogan, P. C.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Crombie, John William
Duffy, William J.
Elibank, Master of
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Power, Patrick Joseph
Emmott, Alfred
M'Dermott, Patrick
M'Fadden, Edward
Reddy, M.
Field, William
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Redmond, William (Clare)
Flynn, James Christopher
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Rickett, J. Compton
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Gilhooly, James
Moss, Samuel
Roche, John
Murnaghan, George
Hammond, John
Murphy, John
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Hayden, John Patrick
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Holland, William Henry
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, S.)
Sullivan, Donal
Horniman, Frederick John
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
Thomson, F. W. (York. W. R.)
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Ure, Alexander
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Joyce, Michael
O'Doherty, William
White, Luke (York. E. R.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Whitley, George (York. W. R.)
O'Dowd, John
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W. R.)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
O'Malley, William
Levy, Maurice
O'Mara, James
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Lough, Thomas
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Lundon, W.
O'Shee, James John
Mr. Broadhurst.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Partington, Oswald
SUPPLY [31ST JULY.]
Resolution reported.

"That a sum, not exceeding £100,000, be granted to His Majesty to be issued to
Field Marshal Earl Roberts of Candahar, K.G., K.P., G.C.B., G. G.S.I., G.C.I.E.,

V.C., Commander-in-Chief of His Majesty's Forces, in recognition of his eminent services during the war in South Africa."

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Bond, Edward

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Bousfield, William Hubert

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bullard, Sir Harry

Cranborne, Viscount

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Butcher, John George

Crossley, Sir Savile

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Carlile, William Walter

Cust, Henry John C.

Arrol, Sir William

Cautley, Henry Strother

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)

Davenport, William Bromley

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire

Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Dickson, Charles Scott

Balcarres, Lord

Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Chapman, Edward

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds

Charrington, Spencer

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers

Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.

Clare, Octavius Leigh

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Banbury, Frederick George

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.

Duke, Henry Edward

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Coghill, Douglas Harry

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Elibank, Master of
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Emmott, Alfred
Bignold, Arthur
Colville, John
Bigwood, James
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Fellowes, Hon. A. Edward

Resolution read a second time.

Question put, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

The House divided::Ayes, 192; Noes, 73. (Division List No. 457.)

Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Robinson, Brooke
Fielden, Edw. Brocklehurst
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Finch, George H.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Finlay, Sir R. Bannatyne
Lowe, Francis William
Rutherford, John
Fisher, William Hayes
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Fitzroy, Hon. E. Algernon
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Gardner, Ernest
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Garfit, William
Macdona, John Cumming
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Godson, Sir A. Frederick
Maconochie, A. W.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Gordon, Maj. Evans- (T'r H'ml'ts
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tyneside
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Milton, Viscount
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Goschen, Hon. G. Joachim
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Spear, John Ward
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Groves, James Grimble
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hain, Edward
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. Wm.
Mount, William Arthur
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Murray, Rt. Hn. A Graham (Bute
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Tennant, Harold John
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.

Myers, William Henry
Thornton, Percy M.
Henderson, Alexander
Tollemache, Henry James
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Hogg, Lindsay
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Holland, William Henry
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Hoult, Joseph
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert Wellesley
Ure, Alexander
Houston, Robert Paterson
Pierpoint, Robert
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Valentia, Viscount
Hozier, Hon. J. Henry Cecil
Plummer, Walter R.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Walker, Col. William Hall
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Webb, Colonel William George
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Purvis, Robert
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
White, Luke (York. E. R.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Randles, John S.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-und. Lyne)
Rankin, Sir James
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Law, Andrew Bonar
Remnant, James Farquharson
Wilson, A. Stanley (York. E. R.)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)

Rentoul, James Alexander
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E R. (Bath)
Lawson, John Grant
Renwick, George
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Sir William Walrond and
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Mr. Anstruther.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Duffy, William J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Ambrose, Robert
Field, William
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
M'Dermott, Patrick
Boland, John
Flynn, James Christopher
M'Fadden, Edward
Boyle, James
Gilhooly, James
M'Govern, T.
Brigg, John
Hammond, John
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Broadhurst, Henry
Hayden, John Patrick
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Scale-
Moss, Samuel
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Healy, Timothy Michael
Murnaghan, George

Clancy, John Joseph
Horniman, Frederick John
Murphy, John
Cogan, Denis J.
Jameson, Major J. Eustace
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Jordan, Jeremiah
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Crean, Eugene
Joyce, Michael
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
Cullinan, J.
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Daly, James
Leamy, Edmund
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Delany, William
Levy, Maurice
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Dillon, John
Lough, Thomas
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Doogan, P. C.
Lundon, W.
O'Doherty, William
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Shee, James John
Sullivan, Dona
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
O'Dowd, John
Reddy, M.
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W. R.)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.)
Redmond, William (Clare)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
O'Malley, William
Roche, John
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
O'Mara, James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

Captain Donelan.

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Shipman, Dr. John G.

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1890–1900.

Resolutions reported.

Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, and the statement appended thereto, as follows, viz.:

(a) That the gross expenditure for certain Navy Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £;1,151,718 11s. 2d., as shown in Column No. 1 of the schedule hereto appended; while the gross expenditure for other Navy Services fell short of the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £;1,749,812 15s. 2d., as shown in column No. 2 of the said appended schedule, so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Navy Services fell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £;598,094 4s.;

(b) That the total actual receipts in aid of the grants for Navy Services exceeded the total estimated receipts by

SCHEDULE.

Number of Vote.

Navy Services, 1899–1900. Votes.

Gross Expenditure.

Appropriations in Aid.

Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure.

Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure.

Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

1.

2.

3.

4.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

1

Wages, etc., of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines

;

29,559

17

0

;

5,078

14

0

2

Victualling and Clothing for the Navy

245,366

4

17

;

;

;

94,407

5

11

3

Medical Establishments and Services

;

29

16

11

;

1,745

7

6

4

Martial Law

2,601

17

8

;

;

;

40

17

2

the sum of £;265,185 6s. 6d., as shown in column No. 4 of the said appended schedule;

(c) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.;

£;

s.

d.

Total Surpluses

1,793,043

11

2

Total Deficits

929, 764

0

8

Net Surplus

£;863, 279

10

6

And whereas the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge on Exchequer Grants for certain Navy Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the estimated Appropriations-in-Aid, in respect of the same Services; and have also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services.

1. "That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

Number of Vote.

Navy Services, 1899–1900. Votes.

Gross Expenditure.

Appropriations in Aid.

Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure.

Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure.

Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

1.

2.

3.

4.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

5

…

Educational Services

;

5,001

12

6
;
395
7
3
6
…
Scientific Services.
;
1,148
15
2
;
5,159
13
10
7
…
Royal Naval Reserves
42,243
13
1
;
95
3
3
8
…
Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.:
Sec. 1
…
Personnel
64,419
0
2
;
;
240
9
11
Sec. 2
…
Matériel
809,951
11
11

;
;
;
126,088
17
4
Sec. 3
…
Contract Work
;
;
1,489,405
13
5
;
315
3
3
9
…
Naval Armaments
;
124,970
1
9
;
19,413
14
9
10
…
Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and Abroad
;
40,256
2
7
;
10,865
15
8
11
…
Miscellaneous Effective Services
27,140
8
7
;
;
;

1,135

0

2

12

…

Admiralty Office

;

4,499

8

8

;

10

7

13

…

Half-pay, Reserved and Retired Pay

;

808

7

5

;

17

3

6

14

…

Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances

;

10,130

5

1

;

118

17

10

15

…

Civil Pensions and Gratuities

;

1,759

1

7

;

25

4

7

16

…

Additional Naval Force for Service in Australasian Waters

42

16

0

;

;

;

42

0

0

Amount written off as irrecoverable

2,196

12

0

;

;

;

;

1,151,718

11

2

1,749,812

15

2

;

265,185

6

6

Net Surplus,

£;598,094

4

0

Surplus,

£;265,185

6

6

Surplus surrendered to the Exchequer

£;863,279

10

6

Where as it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, and the statement appended thereto, as follows, viz.:

(a) That the gross expenditure for certain Army Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £;950,384 16s. 6d., as shown in column No.

1 of the schedule hereto appended; while the gross expenditure for other Army Services fell short of the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of

£;1,634,061 5s. 2d., as shown in column No. 2 of the said appended schedule; so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Army Services fell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £;683,676 8s. 8d.;

(b) That the receipts in aid of Certain Army Services fell short of the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £;262,092 2s. 3d., as shown in column No. 3 of the said appended schedule; while the receipts in aid of other Army Services exceeded the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £;1343,217 16s. 10d., as shown in column No. 4 of the said appended schedule; so that the total actual receipts in aid of the Grants for Army Services fell short of the total estimated receipts by the net sum of £;131,874 5s. 5d.;

(c) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.:

£;

s.

d.

Total Surpluses

1,437,483

17

3

Total Deficits

885,681

14

0

Net Surplus

£;551,802

3

3

SCHEDULE.

No. of vote.

Army Services, 1809–1900. Votes.

Gross Expenditure.

Appropriations in Aid.

Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure.

Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure.

Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

1.

2.

3.

4.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

1

Pay, etc., of Army (General Staff, Regiments, Reserve, and Departments)

;

1,086,432

15

4

129,050

6

7

;

2

Medical Establishments: Pay, etc

29,480

6

5

;

;

425

0

10

3

Militia: Pay, Bounty, etc.

;

250,294

11

1

;

2,916

8

5

4

Yeomanry Cavalry: Pay and Allowances

;

4,661

5

5

3

0

0

;

5

Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances

;

10,664

15

2

;

736

15

8

6.

Transport and Remounts

110,470

9

5

;

;

38,237

8

3

7.

Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies

491,877

10

11

;

;

58,983

5

11

8

Clothing Establishments and Services

88,006

0

11

;

58,404

3

6

;

9

Warlike and other Stores: Supply and Repair

201,370

16

4

;
;
;

770

3

2

10

Works, Buildings, and Repairs: Cost, including Staff for Engineer Services

;

224,270

4

7

51,015

13

1

;

11

Establishments for Military Education

1,411

12

3

;

;

;

3,729

11

7

12

Miscellaneous Effective Services.

23,058

8

5

;

;

;

21,197

15

10

13

War Office: Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges

3,308

10

9

;

;

;

130

1

0

14

Non-effective Charges for Officers, etc.

;

54,553

3

6

20,962

4

6

;

15

Non-effective Charges for Men, etc.

;

3,184

10

1

2,656

14

7

;

And whereas the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge on Exchequer Grants for certain Army Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the Estimated Appropriations-in-Aid, in respect of the same Services; and have also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services.

2."That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

No. of vote.

Army Services, 1899–1900. Votes.

Gross Expenditure.

Appropriations in Aid.

Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure

Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure.

Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

1.

2.

3.

4.

16

Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.
£;
s.
d.
£;
s.
d.
643
2
8
;
;
91
6
2
Balances irrecoverable
757
18
5
1,634,061
5
2
;
;
950,384
16
6
1,634,061
5
2
262,092
2
3
130,217
16
10
Net Surplus,
£;683,676
8
8
Net Deficit,
£;131,874
5
5
Surplus surrendered to the Exchequer
£;551,802

3

3

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I rise for the purpose of moving the adjournment and, at the same time, making a suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the business of the House to-night. This resolution and the one which immediately follows on the Paper were discussed last night at considerable length, one of the contentions of my hon. friends being that there was no absolute necessity for the Government to bring them on then, as it was not proposed to take the Second Reading of the Appropriation Bill until Thursday. The Government, however, persisted, and there was a long discussion. There is no disposition on the part of my hon. friends to repeat that long discussion to night, and what I would suggest to the Government is that they should allow the Report of these two resolutions to stand over until Monday, and the House to adjourn immediately, on the understanding, which I have no hesitation in entering into, that when they come up on Monday there shall not be the slightest disposition on the part of my hon. friends to prolong the discussion thereon. They may desire to take a division, but so far as discussion is concerned there will be no disposition to stand in the way of the Government getting the resolutions on Monday. Under these circumstances, I think it would be for the general convenience of the House now, and for the convenience of the despatch of business next week, if the Government acceded to the suggestion I have made, and accepted the motion I now move.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I need scarcely say that the Government have every desire to consult the convenience of the House, consistently with the due despatch of public business, and certainly there is no desire on the part of the Government to keep the House sitting to-night unnecessarily after the late sitting of last night. The hon. Gentleman makes the proposal that these two resolutions, instead of being taken to-night, with, perhaps, long discussion, shall be taken on Monday, when he gives the ordinary undertaking across the floor of the House that, so far as he and his friends are concerned, there will be no discussion;

MR. JOHN REDMOND: No protracted discussion.

*MR. RITCHIE: Although there may be a division. That would enable the Government to introduce the Appropriation Bill on Monday, beyond which it is necessary it should not be delayed. The Government are prepared to accept the assurance of the hon. Gentleman, and on that understanding we will consent not to take these resolutions to-night.

Report deferred till Monday next.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn ";(Mr. John Redmond), put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at twenty minutes before One of the clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 12th August, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

DERBY CORPORATION BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

HARROGATE CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

King's consent signified; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

LLANELLY HARBOUR BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without amendment.

RUGBY WATER AND IMPROVEMENT BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

CITY AND BRIXTON RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; to be read the third time.

WATFORD AND DISTRICT TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords]. (NOT AMENDED.)

Considered; to be read the third time.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) (RE-COMMITTED) BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

PAISLEY DISTRICT TRAMWAYS ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

[UNDER THE PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.]

Read a second time; to be considered to-morrow.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:

Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 4) BILL.

Ordered, That, in the case of the Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4)

Bill, the Standing Orders be suspended, and that the Bill be now read a second time. (Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

Bill accordingly read a second time.

Ordered, That the Sanding Orders be suspended, and that the Bill be now read the third time.;(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

Bill accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Loch Leven Water Power Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to;

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill [Lords];

Leeds Corporation (General Powers) Bill [Lords];

South Lancashire Tramways Bill [Lords];

Stratton and Bude Improvement Bill [Lords]: without amendment.

PETITIONS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Petitions for alteration of law, from Dunston and Metherringham; Knuzden; and Lincoln; to lie upon the Table.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Petitions for alteration, from Cotton Spinners and Cotton. Manufacturers of Lancashire; and Flax Spinners and Linen Manufacturers of Ireland; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Rotherhithe; and South Norwood; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL AND ROYAL DECLARATION BILL.

Petition from Tewkesbury against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Report of the Board of Education, 1900–1901. Vol. I.
The Report [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Report of the Board of Education, 1900–1901. Vol. II.
Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Report of the Board of Education, 1900–1901. Vol. III.
Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 8th August, 1901, entitled the East
Africa (Lands) Order in Council, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

FUGITIVE OFFENDERS ACT, 1881, AND FOREIGN JURISDICTION ACT, 1890.

Copy presented, of Order in Council of 8th August, 1901, applying the Fugitive
Offenders Act, 1881, to certain South African Colonies and Protectorates [by
Act]; to lie upon the Table.

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (ENGLAND).

Copy presented, of Sixty-third Annual Report of the Registrar General, 1900 [by
Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION LICENCES, 1900–1901.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th August; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to
lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 328.]

MINES AND QUARRIES.

Copy presented of General Report and Statistics for the year 1900; Part II.,
Labour; General Report and Statistics relating to persons employed and accidents
at Mines and Quarries in the United Kingdom, and to the enforcement of the Mines
and Quarries Acts [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COUNTY COURTS (PLAINTS AND SITTINGS).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 6th August; Mr. Jesse Collings]; to
lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 329.]

LUNACY (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Forty-third Annual Report of the General Board of
Commissioners in Lunacy for Scotland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GOVERNMENT LABORATORY.

Copy presented, of Report of the principal Chemist upon the work of the
Government Laboratory for the year ended 31st March, 1901, with Appendices [by
Command]; to lie upon the Table.

INLAND REVENUE.

Copy presented, of Forty-fourth Report of the Commissioners for the year ended
31st March, 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL DEBT.

Copy presented, of Return showing (1) the Aggregate Gross Liabilities of the
State as represented by the Nominal Funded Debt, Estimated Capital Value of

Terminable Annuities, Unfunded Debt, and other Liabilities in respect of Debt, the Estimated Assets, and the Exchequer Balances at the close of each financial year from 1835 to 1900; and (2) the Gross and Net Expenditure charged annually during that period against the Public Revenue on account of the National Debt, and other payments connected with Capital Liabilities (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper [C. 350] of Session 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POST OFFICE.

Copy presented, of Forty-seventh Report of the Postmaster General [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CUSTOMS.

Copy presented, of Forty-fifth Report of the Commissioners of Customs for the year ended 31st March, 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ENGLISH, SCOTCH, AND IRISH LOANS WRITTEN OFF.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th August; Mr. Austen Chamberlain]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 330.]

EAST INDIA (RAILWAYS).

Copy presented, of Administration Report on the Railways in India for the year 1900, by F. R. Upcott, Esquire, C.S.I., Secretary to the Government of India, Public Works Department, Railways [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LUNACY (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Fiftieth Report, with Appendices, of Inspectors of Lunatics (Ireland) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE (GALWAY).

Copy presented, of Report of the President for the Session 1900; 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) OFFICIALS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th March; Mr. Wyndham]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 331.]

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 1st July; Mr. Patrick O'Brien]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 332.]

COUNTY COURT VALUERS (IRELAND)

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 1st August; Mr. Jordan]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 333.]

RAILWAY AND HARBOUR GUARANTEES (KERRY).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 2nd August; Mr. Thomas O'Donnell]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 334.]

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 5th August; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 335.]

COLONIAL IMPORT DUTIES, 1901.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th August; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 336.]

- 1.
- 2.

- 3.
- 4.
- 5
- 6.
- 7.

Date when Closure moved.

By whom moved.

Questions before House or Committee when moved.

Whether in House or Committee.

Whether assent given to Motion or withheld by Speaker or Chairman.

Assent withheld because, in the opinion of the Chair, a decision would shortly be arrived at without that Motion.

Result of Motion, and, if a Division, Numbers for and against.

(in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 331, of Session I. of 1900).";(Mr. Caldwell.)

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

1. Inquiry into Charities (County of Lancaster).;Further Return relative thereto [ordered 8th August, 1898; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to be printed. [No. 337.].

2. Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Durham).;Further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February, 1900; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to be printed. [No. 338.]

3. Inquiry into Charities (County of Montgomery).;Further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February, 1900; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to be printed. [No. 339.]

4. Charitable Endowments (London).Further Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August, 1894; Mr. Francis Stevenson]; to be printed. [No. 340.]

ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER No. 17.

Return ordered, "of Motions for Adjournment under Standing Order No. 17, showing the date of such Motion, the name of the Member proposing, the definite matter of urgent public importance, and the result of any division taken thereon during Session II. of 1900 and the Session of 1901 (in the same form as, and in continuation of, Parliamentary Paper No. 329, of Session I. of 1900).";(Mr. Caldwell.)

CLOSURE OF DEBATE (STANDING ORDER No. 25).

Return ordered, "respecting application of Standing Order No. 25 (Closure of Debate) during Session II. of 1900 and the Session of 1901, under the following heads;;

DIVISIONS OF THE HOUSE.

Return ordered, "of the number of Divisions of the House in Session II. of 1900 and in the Session of 1901; stating the subject of the Division, and the number of Members in the majority and minority, Tellers included; also, the aggregate number in the House on each Division; distinguishing the Divisions on Public Business from Private; and also the number of Divisions before and after midnight (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 0.207 of Session I. of 1900).";(Mr. Caldwell.)

PUBLIC BILLS.

Return ordered, "of the number of Public Bills, distinguishing Government from other Bills, introduced into this House, or brought from the House of Lords, during the Session II. of 1900 and during the Session of 1901; showing the number which received the Royal Assent; the number which were passed by this House, but not by the House of Lords; the number passed by the House of Lords, but not by this House; and distinguishing the stages at which such Bills as did not receive the Royal Assent were dropped or postponed and rejected in either House of Parliament (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 0.215, of Session I. of 1900).";(Mr. Caldwell.)

PUBLIC PETITIONS.

Return ordered, "of the number of Public Petitions presented and printed in Session II. of 1900 and in the Session of 1901; with the total number of signatures in that year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 0.216, of Session I. of 1900).";(Mr. Caldwell.)

SELECT COMMITTEES.

Return ordered, "of the number of Select Committees appointed in the Session of 1901, including the Standing Committees and the Court of Referees; the subjects of inquiry; the names of the Members appointed to serve on each, and of the Chairman of each; the number of days each Committee met, and the number of days each Member attended; the total expense of the attendance of witnesses at each Select Committee, and the name of the Member who moved for such Select Committee; also the total number of Members who served on Select Committees (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 0.214, of Session I. of 1900).";(Mr. Caldwell.)

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

Return ordered, "of the number of days on which the House sat in Session II. of 1900 and in the Session of 1901, stating for each day the date of the month and day of the week, the hour of the meeting, and the hour of adjournment; and the total number of hours occupied in the Sittings of the House, and the average time; and showing the number of hours on which the House sat each day, and the number of hours after midnight; and the number of entries in each day's Votes and Proceedings (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 0.217, of Session I. of 1900).";(Mr. Caldwell.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (DAYS OCCUPIED BY GOVERNMENT AND BY PRIVATE MEMBERS)

Return ordered, "showing, with reference to Session II. of 1900 and the Session of 1901, (1) the number of Sittings on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Fridays at which Government Business had precedence; (2) the number of Sittings on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Fridays at which Private Members had precedence; (3) the number of other Sittings at which, in accordance with the Standing Orders of the House, Government Business had precedence; (4) the number of Sittings at which Government Business had precedence under a special Order of the House; (5) the number of Saturday Sittings; (6) the total number of Sittings at which Government Business had precedence; (7) the total number of days on which the House sat; (8) the total number of Motions for Adjournment of the House on a matter of urgent public importance; and (9) the number of days on which Business of Supply was considered (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 331, of

Session I. of 1900).";(Mr. Caldwell.)

PRIVATE BILLS AND PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Return ordered, "of the number of Private Bills, Hybrid Bills, and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders introduced into the House of Commons and brought from the House of Lords, and of Acts passed in the Session of 1901, classed according to the following subjects; Railways; Tramways; Tram-roads; Subways; Canals and Navigations; Roads and Bridges; Water: Gas; Gas and Water; Improvement; Police and Sanitary Regulations; Corporations, etc. (not relating to Police and Sanitary Regulations); Ports, Piers, Harbours, and Pocks: Churches, Chapels; and Burying Grounds; Markets and Fairs; Inclosure and Drainage; Estate; Divorce; Naturalisation; and Miscellaneous.

"Of all the Private Bills, Hybrid Bills, and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders which in the Session of 1901 have been reported on by Committees on Opposed Private Bills or by Committees nominated partly by the House and partly by the Committee of Selection, together with the names of the selected Members who served on each Committee; the first and also the last day of the sitting of each Committee; the number of days on which each Committee sat; the number of days on which each selected Member has served; the number of days occupied by each Bill in Committee; the Bills the Preambles of which were reported to have been proved; the Bills the Preambles of which were reported to have been not proved; and, in the case of Bills for confirming Provisional Orders, whether the Provisional Orders ought or ought not to be confirmed.

"Of all Private Bills and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders which, in the Session of 1900, have been referred by the Committee of Selection, or by the General Committee on Railway and Canal Bills, to the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, together with the names of the Members who served on each Committee; the number of days on which each Committee sat; and the number of days on which each Member attended.

" And, of the number of Private Bills' Hybrid Bills, and Bills for confirming Provisional Orders withdrawn or not proceeded with by the parties, those Bills being specified which have been referred to Committees and dropped during the sittings of the Committee (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No, 0.213, of Session I. of 1900).";(Mr. Caldwell.)

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF SIXTY-FIVE).

Copy ordered, "of Treasury Minute, dated the 9th day of August, 1901, stating the circumstances under which certain Civil Servants have been retained in the Service after they have attained the age of 65, and of the Return therein referred to.";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA; TRANSVAAL MINING CONTRACTS AND LEASES.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, having regard to the fact that a proclamation was issued on or about the 4th July by Lord Kitchener, as Administrator of the Transvaal Colony, declaring in substance that where parties possessed of mineral rights in the Transvaal under contracts or leases made before the outbreak of the war have been prevented from fulfilling their obligations under such contracts or leases

owing to the state of war, such parties shall be released from their obligations under such contracts or leases from the outbreak of war until a date to be fixed; whether he will lay the proclamation upon the Table of the House.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The proclamation shall be laid.

EXECUTIONS OF REBELS; COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE OF BURGHERS.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he can now state whether inhabitants of Middelburg and Cradock were compelled by the military authorities to attend at the promulgation of the death sentences upon Marais and Coetze, respectively; whether leading residents of the same towns were compelled to witness the execution of these two men; whether the orders enforcing attendance on these occasions were addressed to any residents of British blood in these towns; and whether any, and, if so, what penalties were threatened for disobedience to the above orders.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I have no information at present on these subjects, but I hope it will very shortly arrive.

LORD KITCHENER'S DESPATCHES.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): May I ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office why copies of the despatches from Lord Kitchener as to the conduct of the war, which have appeared in the newspapers as parliamentary Papers, have not been distributed among Members, and are still unobtainable at the Vote Office?

*LORD STANLEY: I do not know, but I have asked for information on the subject. I hope to let the right hon. Baronet know in the course of the evening.

CENSORSHIP; FREEMAN'S JOURNAL CORRESPONDENT.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that the letters and articles sent by Mr. J. J. Comerford, as correspondent of the Freeman's Journal in South Africa, posted weekly at Cradock during February and March, 1900, with two exceptions, were never received; and that, on Mr. Comerford making complaint to the Chief Military Press Censor in Pretoria of the seizure of his letters and articles, Major Sawyer was directed to investigate the matter, but on his making inquiries at Cradock he was suddenly transferred to another station, and no further step in the investigation was taken; and, having regard to the fact that Mr. Comerford has addressed repeatedly letters to the Chief Military Press Censor on this matter, and has received no reply, whether any, and if so what steps will be taken to restore to this gentleman the photographs and manuscripts seized in transmission through the post, or to compensate him for the loss of his literary work as a journalist not at the seat of war and not holding a military licence.

*LORD STANLEY: I will inquire into, this matter.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Was not the noble Lord a press censor?

*LORD STANLEY: Yes, Sir.

GERMAN MADE FIELD GUNS.

MAJOR EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can say how many of the 108 field guns, purchased from the Rheinische Metal Waarenfabrik have been issued, how many remain in store, and how many of those issued have broken down; and having regard to the fact that such breakdowns have occurred during ordinary field battery drill, when guns and limbers were subjected to no such strain as would be thrown upon them on active service, whether any conditions and tests as to the quality of the material supplied, such as are invariably imposed on manufacturers at home, were imposed on the German company; and whether guns of identical pattern made by the same firm are in use in the German or any other Continental army.

*LORD STANLEY: Of the eighteen batteries bought, fifteen are in the hands of the troops. No guns have broken down; defects have been found in the carriages, but have been put right. One brigade division has completed its annual practice at Imaal with perfectly satisfactory results. The batteries were under inspection during manufacture. It is believed that guns of this pattern are under trial by several European Powers, but none have yet decided to adopt them.

UNDER AGE RECRUITS;CASE OF HENRY MELLON.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): On behalf of the Member for North Aberdeen, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, with reference to the case of the boy Henry Mellon, who was accepted as a recruit for the Royal Highlanders when only fifteen years of age, and who after being kept almost continually marching in South Africa was found asleep from physical exhaustion when on duty, if he can state who was the officer responsible for his acceptance, and if any reprimand has been made for the enlistment of a lad nearly three years under the regulation enlistment age of eighteen; whether the Government are aware that boys of fourteen, fifteen, and sixteen years of age are induced to leave their parents and to enlist by recruiting sergeants who desire to secure the Government bounty irrespective of the real age of the lad; and, in the interests of recruiting and of the parents and the lads concerned, and to prevent danger to military efficiency from immature lads being enlisted as men, whether the Government will introduce a check to such a system of recruiting. May I at the same time ask if arrangements can be made to let this boy visit his parents for a few days before being again sent to South Africa.

*LORD STANLEY: I know nothing as to that. In answer to the question on the Paper, I have to say that this soldier gave his age on enlistment as eighteen years three months, and as he was 5 feet 4 inches in height and nearly 34 inches across the chest, no one could possibly be blamed for accepting his statement. Further, no application (as far as I can ascertain) for his discharge as under age has ever been made. I am not aware of any such action as alleged against recruiting sergeants in the last paragraph.

ARMY SERVICE CORPS;WAR REWARDS.

MR. CHANGING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether it is proposed to reward by a step in rank or otherwise the warrant and non-commissioned officers of the Army Service Corps who have gained distinction in the war and received special mention in despatches.

*LORD STANLEY: Yes, Sir, as far as possible.

RETIRED ARMY MEDICAL OFFICERS' TITLES.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if he will consider the advisability of abolishing the compound titles of retired Army medical officers.

*LORD STANLEY: This question has been very carefully considered, and it was not held advisable to abolish the compound titles except in the case of retired officers who were recalled or re-employed.

CIVIL SURGEONS WITH THE ARMY.

DR. THOMPSON: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office if civil surgeons now serving with His Majesty's Army in Great Britain and Ireland are entitled to an increase of salary after three years service, and also to a gratuity of £100 on completion of their engagement.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. They are not so entitled, but the question of the increase of salary is receiving consideration.

VOLUNTEER CAMP GRANTS.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire. Spalding): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, having regard to the order issued by the War Office which makes it compulsory for every individual volunteer to attend camp for a week at least every two years, and to the loss this will entail on the poorer section of the Volunteer force, he will consider the advisability of granting an increase of pay to these men.

LORD STANLEY: The hon. Member is evidently unaware that public grants to Volunteer corps take the form of capitation grants to the corps and not of pay to the individual man. In order to cover the extra cost of the longer attendance in camp the capitation grants were this year increased.

DESTITUTE VETERANS; CASE OF WILLIAM M'GOWAN.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that William M'Gowan, a man upwards of seventy years of age, who served for twenty-five years in the 31st Regiment, and was in the Crimean campaign, and the campaigns in North China in 1860 and in South China in 1863, and is the holder of three medals, is now without a pension or any gratuity whatever from the War Office, and is at present an inmate of the workhouse, Ballyshannon, county Donegal; and will the authorities of the War Office take any, and, if so, what steps to rescue this man, having regard to his long service, from destitution.

LORD STANLEY: The facts are as stated in the question. The hon. Member is, however, evidently unaware that this man was discharged with ignominy for drunkenness and absence, thus forfeiting all claim to pension, and that he had been previously tried eleven times by court-martial for similar offences and had eighty-seven entries in the regimental defaulters' book. His medals which had been conferred were forfeited owing to his bad conduct. His claim to a pension has been considered by the Chelsea Commissioners, but was rejected owing to the circumstances of his discharge.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Then how is it the man was allowed to serve twenty-five years and was awarded three medals?

COLOURS FOR BATTLESHIPS.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, in addition to experiments with black, trial has been made of grey paints of the French, United States, or German shades as colours for adoption for the Fleet. THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Yes; experiments are being made such as those indicated by the hon. Member, and ships are being; or are about to be; painted grey, and black and grey, with the view of ascertaining what is the best colour for service in time of war.

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Paint them khaki.

COOPER'S HILL COLLEGE.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can say how long the last Report of the Visitors of the Cooper's Hill College has been presented to his department; whether he will present it to Parliament this session; and, if not, whether he will make sufficient communication to the House as to the recommendations in that Report to enable the subject to be adequately debated upon the Indian Budget.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The Report of the Board of Visitors was received on the 12th July, and the instructions to be issued upon the points with which it deals are now under consideration. The Report is lengthy, and its purport is not such as admits of a condensed communication to the House as the hon. Gentleman suggests.

MOUNTED INFANTRY FOR INDIA.

MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state what is the amount estimated for cost of buildings and other initial outlay to be incurred in respect of the new scheme for mounted infantry regiments in India; and what is the consequent anticipated annual addition to Indian military expenditure; are any of the British troops while stationed in India to be included under this system of special training; what portion of this mounted infantry will be liable to be called upon for service outside of India; and what proportion of the cost of this addition to the military forces of the Empire will be borne by the British Treasury.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The Government of India has estimated that the cost of accommodation for the mounted infantry will be Rs. 11,75,400, and that the further outlay will be initial Rs. 4,28,337 and recurring Rs. 4,91,088. The mounted infantry will be taken from both British and Native troops, and all might be liable for service outside India under the same conditions as the rest of the Indian Army. No proportion of the cost will be borne by the British Treasury.

IMMIGRANTS IN AUSTRALIA.

MR. WILLTAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the nature or form of the educational test proposed to be put in force by the Australian Parliament in reference to immigrants.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no information beyond that which has appeared in the press as to the nature or form of the educational test, if any, which the Commonwealth Government propose to introduce into the law affecting immigration to Australia.

THIBETAN MISSION TO RUSSIA.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can now give the House any information concerning the composition, the aims, and the results of the recent so-called Thibetan Embassy to His Majesty the Emperor of Russia.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg has reported that the Thibetan Mission consisted of two envoys, with their suite. The principal member of the Mission was the Llama Akban Dorgiew, who had brought a complimentary letter from the Dalai Llama to the Emperor of Russia. His Excellency was assured by Count Lamsdorff that the Mission had no political or diplomatic character.

CHINA; TERMS OF SETTLEMENT.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if His Majesty's Minister at Peking notified the representatives of the other Powers that he was unable to sign the protocol embodying the terms of settlement; and, if so, whether he can state the reasons for this action.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The final form of the protocol is still under discussion by a Committee of the Peking Conference; it is hoped that an agreement will be arrived at shortly.

CAIRO FOX-HUNTING INCIDENT.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether a date has been fixed for the hearing of the appeal in the case of Mr. Blunt's servants at Cairo, and whether in the meantime the prisoners will be released on bail.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Acting Agent and Consul General at Cairo telegraphed on the 6th instant that the hearing of the appeal had been postponed for a week at the request of the counsel for the defendants. His Majesty's Government have no information to enable them to answer the second part of the question.

AFRICAN BIG GAME PRESERVES.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Foreign Office has received any representation from Sir H. Johnston in reference to the tract of country in the neighbourhood of Mount Elgin in which he found quantities of large game; and whether any steps will be taken to preserve this region as a national park, with a view to preventing the extinction of the larger wild animals native to Africa.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: (1) The representation made by Sir H. Johnston on this subject will be found at page 12 of his report laid before Parliament in Africa, No. 7, 1901. (2) Very large regions have already been set apart as reserves in East Africa and Uganda in pursuance of the conclusions of the International Convention for the Preservation of Animals in Africa. The question of enlarging or altering these reserves depends on local considerations.

VACCINATION; CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that William Venables, of Thornton Hough, was granted an exemption from vaccination as a conscientious objector by

the Birkenhead county magistrates for his first child in June, 1899, and that he was refused exemption by the same court in July, 1901, for another child, then under four months old; and whether there is any way in which he can obtain exemption for this child also.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The facts are as stated. It appears that in the second case the applicant failed to satisfy the justices of his conscientious belief that vaccination would be prejudicial to the health of the child in question. It is open to him to apply to any other justice for a certificate of exemption until the child attains the age of four months.

BOLTON LICENSING APPEAL.

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to an appeal, heard at the quarter sessions for Bolton held on the 12th ultimo, by the licensee of the Standard Arms beerhouse in that borough against a conviction for selling drink to a drunken person; whether he is aware that the publican was represented by counsel before the appellate tribunal, but that the police who laid and furnished the information against the house failed to instruct counsel to represent the prosecution on the appeal, and that the Deputy Recorder stated that, in arriving at a decision, he had had the assistance of the other occupants of the bench, who were two borough justices, and of the clerk; and whether, in view of Section 158 (1) of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, he will take steps to secure a due observance of the law by the justices of Bolton.

*MR. RITCHIE: Inquiry is being made into this matter, but on the facts before me I find no ground for action on my part.

MERCHANT SHIPPING SERVICE COMMITTEE.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state anything in reference to the proposed Committee on the Merchant Shipping Service.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): No, Sir. I am not yet in a position to make any definite announcement with regard to the appointment of a Committee.

FENNY COMPTON SHUNTING FATALITY.

MR. CORRIE GRANT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the death of George William Cherry, a porter on the Great Western Railway, who was killed at Fenny Compton on Thursday, 1st August, while shunting with a tow rope; and seeing that this death might have been prevented if there had been a second set of points, whether he will state what steps he proposes to take to prevent similar accidents at this station in future.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have ordered an inquiry into the circumstances attending this accident.

THE "PRIMROSE HILL."

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the owners of the "Primrose Hill" have returned to the parents of

the twelve apprentices who were drowned in that vessel the premiums which were paid by them; and whether he can take any steps to secure some compensation for the families of the officers and men who also lost their lives in the "Primrose Hill."

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, I am glad to say that the owners of the "Primrose Hill" have informed me that all the premiums paid for apprentices on that vessel were returned some time ago. The question of compensation for the families of the officers and men who also lost their lives is not one in respect of which I have any power to inter fore.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Take power.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS RETURN.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the fact that the latest annual return of railway accidents shows an increase of forty-seven killed and 116 injured as compared with the previous year; and can he state what steps are being taken by the Board of Trade regulations towards the reduction of accidents on railways.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The figures given by my hon. friend relate to the increase in the total number of railway servants (including servants of contractors) killed and injured on railways and railway premises not only in the course of the movement of traffic but from all causes. The rules already drafted by the Board of Trade under the Act of last year I hope may help to bring about some reduction in the number of accidents occurring in the course of the movement of traffic. The objections to these proposed rules which have been filed by the railway companies are under the consideration of Lord James of Hereford and two officials of the Board of Trade. The Board will use every endeavour to make the draft rules effective as soon as circumstances will allow.

In reply to a supplementary question by Sir Fortescue Flannery, Mr. GERALD BALFOUR said it was better that the railway companies should agree to the rules than that they should be made the subject of appeals to the Railway Commission.

AUTOMATIC RAILWAY COUPLINGS.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that there is an automatic coupler which can be affixed on the spot to a train of loaded waggons about to start on its journey, which coupler at once substitutes automatic connection for manual; and whether he can state what steps are being taken by the Board of Trade to encourage railway companies towards the more usual adoption of automatic couplings.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: My attention has been directed to several forms of coupler, automatic and non-automatic, which are said to be readily applicable to existing rolling-stock. The question of the introduction of a suitable coupler is receiving the attention of leading railway companies, and experiments are being made. I cannot at present make any statement as to the action which may be taken by the Board of Trade if the companies fail to select a suitable coupler, but I can assure my hon. friend that I shall carefully watch the progress of events.

MULLER'S ORPHANAGE, BRISTOL.

MR. HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the recent death of Lilian Mabel Filer, aged nine years, in the charity barrack school, known as Muller's Orphanage, at Bristol, who had died in that institution from cardiac failure without the attendance of a doctor; whether he can state the number of children in that asylum, and the death rate for the last ten years; and, having regard to the number of children living together without a properly qualified doctor on the premises, can he state what steps he proposes to take to induce the authorities to take better care of the children committed to the care of the orphanage.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I have seen a newspaper report of the inquest in the case referred to in the question. I have no information as to the number of children in the orphanage or as to the death rate there. The institution is in no way under my control, and I have no authority to interfere with regard to it.

POST OFFICES AS SERVANTS' REGISTRIES.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether in consequence of the increasing scarcity of servants, particularly farm hands, in Great Britain, he has any objection to a list being kept at country post offices of servants wanted in the neighbourhood, the expense being met by a fee of one penny to be paid by those whose applications are placed in the book to be provided at the country post offices.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The Postmaster General does not think it desirable to add the business of keeping a registry office for servants to the other functions of the post office.

REDIRECTION OF TELEGRAMS.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that halfpenny circulars are redirected free of charge, but telegrams on which 6d. and 1s. are paid are charged 1d. for redirection; and whether he will abolish this charge on telegrams redirected through the post.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. There is, however, a clear distinction between the two cases described by the hon. Member; and the Postmaster General is not prepared to abolish the charge which is made for postage when a telegram is converted into a letter and an entirely fresh service has to be performed.

TELEGRAPHIC CHARGE ANOMALIES.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can explain why in telegrams Westgate-on-Sea is charged as one word, but Birchington-on-Sea as three words.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The name of the second place mentioned by the hon. Member is "Birchington," and if the words "on-Sea" are added in any case they are charged for because they are superfluous.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: May I ask why Camden Town is charged as one word and

Woodford Green as two?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I informed my hon. friend of the reason for that about a week ago.

In answer to a question put by Mr. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet);

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Westgate-on-Sea is the proper address, and is, therefore, charged as one word. In the case of Birchington the words "on-Sea" are not necessary, and if anyone puts them in a telegram he must pay for them.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: Cannot you lay down a rule that the names of all places in the United Kingdom shall be charged as one word, and so save all these petty annoyances?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not prepared to alter the rule, of which I think my hon. friend knows the purport.

CARMARTHENSHIRE POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he has received a petition, signed by a number of inhabitants of the districts of Brechfa, Tirlclai, and Llwynceilyn, in the county of Carmarthen, in favour of a daily delivery of letters in those districts; whether inquiries have been made and the question considered by the Postmaster General; and, if so, whether he will state the result of the inquiries and the reasons for the decision arrived at.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has received the petition referred to by the hon. Member, and he has given careful consideration to the question of affording a daily delivery of letters in the districts mentioned, which are now served twice a week. Inquiry shows, however, that the cost of the existing service is so high in proportion to the correspondence, which is extremely small, that the Postmaster General would not be justified in sanctioning additional expense for the purpose of providing a more frequent delivery.

THURSO AND BETTYHILL MAILS.

MR. LEVESON-GOWER (Sutherlandshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state the terms of the contract for the carriage of mails from Thurso to Bettyhill, how long it has been in existence; and, if there is any loss to the Department, why new tenders are not invited.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The contract for the mail car service between Thurso and Bettyhill provides for the conveyance of mails once daily in each direction. The present contract has been in existence since the beginning of last year, and, as it is satisfactory, it is not considered advisable to invite new tenders.

MR. LEVESON-GOWER: Has there been any loss to the Department?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, I think so, but the difficulty is in getting a more satisfactory arrangement.

TELEGRAPHISTS' PAY.

SIR FRANCIS EVANS (Maidstone): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, having regard to the fact that on 31st July, 1900, the Central Committee of the Postal Telegraph Clerks' Association

forwarded a petition to the Postmaster General asking that clerks with five years service should receive 28s. per week in the provinces and 30s. per week in London, and that in May, 1901, the Committee appealed for an answer, whether an answer can now be given.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: As stated in a recent answer given upon this subject, the question respecting the pay of telegraphists with five years service, having been already settled in accordance with the recommendations of Lord Tweedmouth's Committee, is not regarded as open to discussion; and the Postmaster General informed a deputation from the Postal Telegraph Clerks' Association, which he received in July, 1901, to that effect.

ELECTORAL DISABILITIES; SOLDIERS ON SERVICE.

MR. CORRIE GRANT: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General, in view of the continuance of hostilities in South Africa, whether the Electoral Disabilities (Military Service) Removal Act, 1900 (63 Vic, c. 8), will extend to the registration proceedings of the current year.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): Yes, Sir. FOOTBALL IN EDINBURGH STREETS.

MR. CORRIE GRANT: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been called to the cases of David Craig, Albert Burns, James Burns, John Campbell, Peter M' Donald, and George Speakman, boys of seventeen to ten years of age, who pleaded guilty to having played football to the annoyance of the lieges in Wardrope's Court, Edinburgh; and were sentenced by Bailie Murray, who presided, James Burns to three days in the cells, and the others to receive each five stripes with the birch rod; and whether he will inquire into these cases.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The hon. Member's information is not quite accurate. The boys in question were charged with behaving in a disorderly manner, as well as with playing football in the street, and pleaded guilty to both charges. The offence of disorderly conduct is one which involves the punishment of imprisonment. James Burns, the eldest of the boys, being seventeen years of age, was sentenced to pay a fine of 5s. or suffer three days imprisonment. The other boys, all of whom were, in the opinion of the magistrate, under fourteen years of age, were sentenced to be whipped in lieu of imprisonment. The magistrate has power to pass such sentence both at common law and under Section 348 of the Edinburgh Municipal and Police Act of 1879. I may add that numerous complaints had been received from neighbouring residents regarding the behaviour of these boys, and they have all been previously cautioned by the police for similar conduct to that charged; while some of them have been convicted of other offences. Under these circumstances the sentences were legal, and, in my opinion, very proper.

LISCANNOR (CLARE) HARBOUR.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will consider the advisability of asking the Government to provide a special grant for the purpose of improving the harbour at Liscannor, county Clare, in view of the fact that there is a considerable industry in Liscannor in stone quarries, which is hampered owing to the state of the harbour.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I cannot undertake to approach the Treasury for a special grant for the purpose of improving Liscannor harbour; but should the Government be placed in funds hereafter for the carrying out of works of such magnitude, the claims of that harbour will receive every consideration.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the estimate for improvement of this harbour amounts to nearly £13,000, and in view of the great interests involved will he consider if he cannot help the local bodies in some way?

MR. WYNDHAM: The estimate before me amounts to £13,000. Unfortunately we have no money at our disposal.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: No, you want it all for the war.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: And for Lord Roberts.

KILKENNY MAGISTRACY.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the New Ross Petty Sessions District is largely made up of a portion of county Kilkenny, and whether the Lord Chancellor will consider the advisability of appointing at least one Nationalist magistrate resident in county Kilkenny.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no knowledge of the fact stated in the first part of the question, and in reply to the second part I can only say that the Lieutenant of the county and the Lord Chancellor are always prepared to consider the names of any suitable gentleman recommended for appointment to the commission of the peace.

PORTUMNA RAILWAY.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that £12,000 was promised by the Treasury under certain conditions to assist in the re-equipment of the Portumna Railway, and that this line cost £98,000 to construct; and seeing that the residents along the main portions of this derelict line have no railway accommodation within twenty miles, will he reconsider the position with a view to re-establish means of railway communication in this district.

MR. WYNDHAM: I can only refer the hon. Member to my replies to the several questions which he has already addressed to me on this subject. To these replies I have nothing to add.

MR. ROCHE was understood to ask if nothing could be done, although the line cost £98,000.

MR. WYNDHAM said he had already answered the question several times.

IRISH CENSUS.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why a portion of the taskwork in connection with the Irish Census is being done on this occasion by boy writers indoor, paid at 4d. an hour, instead of being given out to duly appointed taskworkers who had to pass a Civil Service examination specially for the position, and the remuneration for whom has been sanctioned by the Treasury.

MR. WYNDHAM: It has been found that certain classes of work which in 1891 were

performed by taskworkers could be efficiently done on the present occasion by boy copyists at a considerable saving of expense.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that a temporary female clerk on the Census has been appointed to a superintendentship of one of the sections of the Census Department to fill a vacancy caused by the resignation of Dr. Falkiner, who is also superintendent of statistics in the General Register Office; and seeing that five superintendentships on Census have hitherto been held by senior officials in the General Register Office, can he explain why a member on the present staff of that department was not appointed to the vacant post, and why a young girl should be placed in charge of a staff of male clerks.

MR. WYNDHAM: The vacant post of superintendent has not been filled by a female clerk. The section has been placed under the general direction of one of the other male superintendents, and a female clerk has been appointed to assist him in this section, which consists mainly of boys.

MR. NANNETTI: Will the right hon. Gentleman see that in future these appointments are given to senior officers, and not as in this case to a young lady of one and a half years' service.

MR. WYNDHAM: I believe the arrangements made are ample for the work to be done. No doubt should the work develop proper arrangements will be made.

MR. NANNETTI: But is it the intention of the department to appoint ladies in future over the heads of male workers?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think that is the intention at all.

WHITE ESTATE, BANTRY.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an order was made on 11th June by Judge Ross for the valuation of the White estate, near Bantry, with a view to its sale to the tenants under the 40th section of the Land Purchase Act, 1896; can he say whether the valuers have since visited the holdings; and seeing that this estate was in the Encumbered Estates Court for several years, will he have the sale expedited.

MR. WYNDHAM: The inspection of this estate has not yet been carried out, but no unnecessary delay will take place in undertaking this duty. I will bring the hon. Member's suggestion under the notice of the Land Commissioners.

UNITED IRISH LEAGUE MEETING AT RHODE.

MR. HAVILAND-BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on Sunday, 28th July last, an attempted meeting in support of the United Irish League at Rhode, in King's County, was ordered to disperse by Sergeant O'Dea, of the Royal Irish Constabulary, without any legal cause or warrant; and whether, in Ireland, it is within the discretion of any local police sergeant to determine, without having received any official instructions, whether a public meeting shall or shall not be held.

MR. WYNDHAM: An exaggerated report of the incident referred to appears to have reached the hon. Member. The sergeant did not disperse the meeting, or attempt to do so. A small crowd assembled near the post office to the obstruction of

persons passing to and from that building. The sergeant requested the individual who was addressing the crowd to move to the other side of the street; he did so at once, and continued to address the people without interference.

MR. HAVILAND-BURKE: Is it not the case that where this alleged obstruction took place there are not two dozen houses, which are scattered at intervals, and that the crossway is very broad? Was not the interference of the police sergeant totally uncalled for?

MR. WYNDHAM: I think the police sergeant did a reasonable thing in a reasonable way.

LOUTH LAND COURT APPEALS.

MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if appeals against Land Court decisions in the county of Louth can be arranged for hearing in Drogheda or Dundalk instead of in Dublin, thereby saving additions in the expenses to the parties interested.

MR. WYNDHAM: This is a matter for determination by the Land Commissioners, who I have no doubt will consult the convenience of all the parties so far as possible. I will bring the hon. Member's suggestion under the notice of the Commissioners.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN MILL-STREET (CORK) UNION.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board are aware of the proceedings at the last inquiry respecting labourers' cottages and additional half-acre plots in the Knocknagree division (Millstreet Union), county Cork, and whether he can state why the applications by two labourers on the Archdeacon Bland property for additional plots were rejected.

MR. WYNDHAM: The taking of these two additional allotments was opposed by the occupier of the lands on the ground of the unsuitability of the applicants. One was the former tenant of the lands from which he was evicted for non-payment of rent, and is on his own admission hostile to the occupier. The latter also averred that the other applicant and his friends prevented labourers from working for him. For these reasons the taking of the additional allotments was not recommended by the inspector.

MR. FLYNN: Then does the right hon. Gentleman lay it down as a principle that refusal to work for a man is a good ground for denying an applicant the benefit of this Act?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot enter into the merits of the case. I think the inspector acted properly on the evidence before him.

IRISH SCHOOL TEACHER'S SALARY.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Commissioners of National Education will say what is the cause of the delay in the payment of the salary due to the principal teacher of Roll No. 7138, District No. 52.

MR. WYNDHAM: The career of this teacher has been most unsatisfactory. He was reprimanded in 1896 for drunkenness, and in 1898 he was depressed in classification for inefficiency. The local manager was unable to certify that the rules of the Commissioners had been

complied with, or that the character of the teacher was satisfactory in the last quarterly return. Payment of his salary has, therefore, been suspended pending an investigation by the inspector.

SIR JOHN GARDEN'S GAME COVERTS.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that for several hours of two days of last January Mr. Henry Bruen, resident magistrate, Mr. R. J. Carden, J.P., Mr. George Ryan, J.P., and some Militia officers blocked the public road leading from Templemore to Borrisoleigh by discharging fowling-pieces at pheasants, and thereby prevented many persons in charge of horses from passing; and, seeing that this is a common practice of these gentlemen during a part of the shooting season each year, will he take measures to prevent a recurrence.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is true that the several gentlemen named stood for a period of about ten minutes on two separate occasions in January last on that portion of the public road which runs through one of the coverts in Sir John Carden's demesne. It is not true, however, that any person was prevented from passing. The circumstances have been greatly exaggerated, but, even comparatively harmless as they were, it is to be regretted that Mr. Bruen was concerned in them.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Is it not illegal to fire a gun on the public road, and do the Government intend to take any notice of the conduct of this resident magistrate, who in all cases concerning law and order is not only expected to preserve the peace, but also to set a good example?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think the hon. Gentleman heard me say that this road, although a public one, ran through a private covert. Certainly, some notice ought to be taken of what occurred, and I consider I have taken notice of it by the reply I have given.

MR. ROCHE asked whether firing was not actually prohibited within thirty yards of public roadways.

MR. WYNDHAM said he had not looked up the law on that point, but was perfectly aware that no one was allowed to fire a gun in a public road. But in this case the road ran through a private covert, and in similar circumstances he was not certain that he had not done exactly the same thing himself. The practice, though, was a reprehensible one, especially for anybody concerned with the administration of the law.

MR. ROCHE remarked that it seemed no one could fire in the public road unless he was a resident magistrate.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Or an Orangeman who can fire in the public road or anywhere else he likes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this very resident magistrate has fined farmers for a like offence?

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Satan reproving sin!

SKIBBEREEN LAND COMMISSION-MAJOR CRONSDALE.

MR. EDWARD BARRY (Cork Co., S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a Major Cronsdale has recently

acted as Land Commissioner in Skibbereen, and can he state how many farms were personally inspected by him on the occasion, and in how many of these cases was he present at the hearing of the evidence in Court.

MR. WYNDHAM: I believe the fact is as stated in the first part of the question.

In the absence, however, of Major Cronsedale, who is at present on leave of absence, I am unable to reply to the remainder of the question.

MR. DELANY (Queen's Co., Ossory): Is it not the fact that this gentleman's only qualification is that he is a Militia major, and that he knows nothing about farming?

[No answer was returned.]

FERMANAGH ELECTORAL DIVISIONS.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Fermanagh County Council employed the Tory election agent for county Fermanagh to draw up a scheme to change the county electoral divisions and electoral districts; has any other county council in Ireland taken any steps to change the county or district electoral divisions as fixed by the Local Government Board; and what steps do the Local Government Board intend to take in this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information on the first part of the question. The proposal to hold an inquiry into the inequalities of the present electoral system was adopted by the county council on the recommendation of a Committee of that body; the details of the scheme were worked out by the secretary and two of the principal officers of the council. So far the Board has not received other schemes of a similar nature. In answer to the third inquiry, I would refer to my reply to the question put to me on Thursday last by the hon. Member for South Fermanagh, †

DISCHARGING FIREARMS, COUNTY ANTRIM.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the 12th July last a number of Orangemen from Gortaherron, county Antrim, fired a number of shots into the house of a Roman Catholic named Mr. Andrew M'Mullen, of Tamloght; whether the police have prosecuted any of these Orangemen for their action; and whether any steps will be taken to prevent similar proceedings in this district in future, especially as they have hitherto been of annual occurrence.

MR. WYNDHAM: No shots were fired into the house of Mr. M'Mullen, as alleged. He reported to the police that a bullet struck his house on the date mentioned, but a careful examination made at the time by the police failed to satisfy them that this was so. It is

† See page 73.

the fact, however, that during the night of the 11th July a number of shots were fired from the Nationalist quarter in the direction of the Orange quarter, and vice versa, but no similar occurrence in the district came to the knowledge of the police in former years. This locality has received and will continue to receive the special attention of the police.

CAPPAWHITE EVICTIONS.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord

Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that, on the 28th June last, Thomas Franklin, of Cluanganhue, Cappawhite, county Tipperary, was evicted from his house by Mrs. Valentine Ryan; that no notice to provide accommodation for said Thomas Franklin was served on the relieving officer of the district, and that the guardians of the Tipperary board are cognisant of the fact; and can he state whether they have taken steps to proceed against Mrs. Ryan for disregarding the statute in such case provided, and will he inquire into this case.

MR. WYNDHAM: I understand that the guardians are taking steps to proceed against the landlord for her alleged failure to serve a notice in this case. The matter calls for no intervention on the part of the Government.

RABIES IN IRELAND.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he can state how many cases of rabies occurred in Ireland since January, 1901, to present date, whether those cases were authenticated by qualified veterinary surgeons, or whether they were reported upon by members of the constabulary force.

MR. WYNDHAM: Two cases of rabies occurred in Ireland since January last, one in February and the other in April. They were notified by the constabulary, and the existence of rabies in each case was authenticated by qualified veterinary surgeons, and by independent examination conducted by the Department of Agriculture.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): And is the occurrence of two cases a sufficient justification for boycotting all dogs, even sporting dogs?

DISPUTE BETWEEN SCHOOL LOCAL MANAGER AND TEACHER.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland what decision has the Board of National Education come to on the inquiry held on the 15th of March last in School No. 7245, District 46, has the decision been made known to the teacher, and have the representations which called for this inquiry been verified before the head inspector who presided.

MR. WYNDHAM: No final decision has been arrived at in respect to this inquiry. Correspondence is still proceeding in reference to the unsatisfactory relations between the local manager and teacher.

BELFAST VALUATION LISTS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain why in the new valuation lists for the city of Belfast there appears a primary valuation of £;1,000 for the city burial grounds, seeing that the provisions of Section 194 of the Public Health Act, 1878, prohibit any increase of burial grounds after acquisition of same.

MR. WYNDHAM: An appeal has been lodged in this case, and I am precluded, therefore, from making any statement in the matter.

MR. FIELD: If the law is correctly stated in my question, why need the revaluation be made?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not prepared to discuss the validity of the valuation, since an appeal has been lodged, and will be heard in due course.

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the English Local Government Board has at its disposal a yearly grant of funds for the purpose of promoting scientific investigation; and, seeing that the Irish Local Government Board has not at its disposal any sum for a similar purpose, would he recommend the placing of the Irish Local Government Board in this respect on the same footing as the similar Board in England.

MR. WYNDHAM: The grant provided for the purpose of scientific research in the Vote for the English Local Government Board was inherited, I am informed, in 1871 from the Privy Council Department. The results of the researches have been published in a supplement to the Board's Annual reports. The suggestion in the second paragraph will be considered. I have already stated that the present pronouncements of Dr. Koch in regard to the transmission of bovine tuberculosis are engaging the attention of the Irish Local Government Board in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture.

KINVARA HARBOUR.

MR. DUFFY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an excursion steamer was obliged on Sunday last to lie outside the bar of Kinvara harbour on account of the accumulation of sand and mud; and seeing that small boats are occasionally employed to carry in passengers and goods from vessels, whether he will hold the promised inquiry, and compel the collector of tolls to make the necessary improvements by deepening the entrance of the harbour so as to enable vessels to enter.

MR. WYNDHAM: My right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade has stated that so far as he could ascertain, there was no harbour authority responsible for the maintenance of this harbour. The Commissioners of Public Works have no jurisdiction to hold an inquiry with a view to compel the collector of tolls to improve the harbour.

ARDMORE ABBEY CHURCH.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the condition of the old Abbey Church, Ardmore, county Waterford; whether he is aware that a beautiful arch in the chancel is in a critical condition; and whether he will see that immediate steps are taken to preserve this arch and other portions of the abbey from destruction.

MR. WYNDHAM: My attention has not previously been drawn to the condition of these ruins. But I have referred the matter to the Board of Works, whose inspector will make an inspection of the ruins at an early date.

CROWN OFFICIALS ON IRISH GRAND JURIES.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it is in accordance with departmental regulations for paid officials of the Crown to act on grand juries whose only business now is confined to the finding of bills in criminal cases; whether he is aware that Mr. George Knight, clerk of the Crown and peace for county Meath, acted as such for the county Monaghan at the spring and summer assizes of this year; and whether on the occasions referred to he had permission from the Lord Chancellor

to be absent from the discharge of his public duties.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is no regulation, departmental or otherwise, prohibiting a paid official of the Crown from serving on a grand jury. The assize at Monaghan were held some days after the Meath assizes, and no public inconvenience was caused by Mr. Knight's absence from Meath. The answer to the third paragraph is in the negative; no such permission is requisite.

HAULING DOWN THE UNION JACK.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary whether it is true that on Tuesday last, in the Carlingford Lough, delegates from the Irish Nationalist Foresters, before proceeding on board the steamship "Pilot," demanded that the Union Jack should be hauled down, and it was hauled down amid the cheers of the delegates.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Union Jack was hauled down at Malta yesterday, and, if so, what action does he propose to take?

MR. WYNDHAM: No report of this incident has reached me. If it is correctly reported, the conduct of those in charge of the vessel was not only disloyal, but pusillanimous and contemptible. The Government will not take any steps, as the matter is one entirely for the owners of the vessel.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is there no answer to my question?

BAILIEBOROUGH (CAVAN) RURAL POSTMEN'S PAY.

MR. CREAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that rural postmen of the established class serving at Bailieborough, county Cavan, were paid on a scale commencing at 13s., rising by annual increments of 1s. to 17s. per week; and seeing that vacancies now occurring are being filled up by men put on a fixed pay of 15s. a week, whether he can state the reason for this reduction.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The scale of 13s.; 1s.; 17s. a week is an obsolete one. The proper wages for established rural postmen at Bailieborough on the occurrence of vacancies are 15s. or 16s. a week, fixed according to the distance walked.

CASTLE COVE RURAL POSTMAN'S PAY.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that Cornelius O'Shea, rural auxiliary postman between Cahirdaniel and Castle Cove, county Kerry, has received no increase of pay since April, 1897, although, through the extension of the house-to-house delivery, his work has been increased to the extent of one and a half hours daily; and, seeing that the daily duties, Sundays excepted, of this postman involve four and a half hours of practically continuous walking, and that he receives no boot money, whether under the circumstances an increase of pay, which is at present 9s. 6d. per week, will be granted.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Since his appointment as rural auxiliary in January, 1898, Cornelius O'Shea's hours of duty have been four and a quarter a day. Originally his four and a quarter hours of duty included an interval of one hour and forty minutes, during which he remained at the end of his walk. By the extension of the delivery the interval has now been reduced to less than half an

hour; but as he has been paid all along at the full rate for four and a quarter hours work, the Postmaster General regrets that no increase in his wages would be justified. He is not entitled to boot allowance.

INNISKEEN POSTMASTERSHIP.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will order an inquiry into the dismissal of a man named Fitzpatrick, who was postmaster at Inniskeen, county Monaghan, by an inspector named Lockington, whose brother has now got the post office; whether it is the practice for officials of the Post Office to be sent to localities where their relations reside, as in the case of this inspector, by which the late postmaster at Inniskeen has lost his position; whether he can state who selected the present postmaster, and if anyone else in the locality had the opportunity of applying for the position or of knowing that it was vacant before the workmen of the Post Office went to remove the telegraph wires from the old office; and whether he can state if the present postmaster at Inniskeen applied for the post; and, if so, who informed him that the position was vacant, as the late postmaster did not know of his dismissal until the workmen came to remove the telegraph wires.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The decision respecting the Inniskeen office was not arrived at without due consideration; and it is not in the Postmaster General's opinion necessary to reopen the matter. When it is necessary to institute such an investigation the

officer whose normal duty it is is sent irrespective of the question whether his relatives reside in the neighbourhood or not. The officer who conducted the inquiry in the present instance was at the time acting as postmaster at the Dundalk office, to which the Inniskeen office is subordinate, and it was part of his ordinary duty to conduct it. As already stated in reply to the hon. Member's question of the 1st instant, the person at present acting as sub-postmaster at Inniskeen is merely acting temporarily, and no appointment has as yet been made. The officer who made the inquiry is not responsible for his selection; and before an appointment is made the qualifications of all the candidates will be carefully considered.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Is it proper for an official to give a postmaster ship to his brother without notice, and have the Department no remark to make on it?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The inspector did not even temporarily give the job to his brother. The Postmaster General takes full responsibility.

MR. DALY: The hon. Gentleman has not answered the last part of my question.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am afraid I have no information as to that.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Was the man who was dismissed a Catholic and the one appointed in his place a Protestant?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have no information on that point.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Freemasonry again.

RATHKEALE MAILS.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that on Thursday, Friday,

and Saturday, the 25th, 26th, and 27th July last, also on Wednesday the 31st July, and Thursday, 1st August, the mails from Dublin due in Rathkeale at 11 a.m. did not arrive till 7.10 p.m.;

can he state the cause of the delay; and, seeing the inconvenience to the public in the county of Limerick caused by letters and the Dublin daily newspapers not arriving by the morning train, will he ascertain whether there was neglect of duty on the part of the Great Southern and Western Railway Company on these occasions in this matter.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is true that on the dates referred to by the hon. Member failures of connection occurred at Limerick between the day mail train from Limerick Junction and the mail train for Rathkeale, etc., and that the mails which should have gone forward by the latter train had to be kept back for the next available train. The primary cause of the delay was the late arrival at Holyhead of the Irish night mail train from London, and it appears that on the dates in question the passengers for Ireland were so numerous as to render it necessary for two trains instead of one to be run for their conveyance. When an additional train is run some delay seems to be unavoidable, but the railway company have been urged to take all possible measures for securing the early arrival of the mail train at Holyhead.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that it is a matter of daily occurrence in the city of Limerick for the mails to be two hours late? Will the department take care that the railway company fulfils its contract?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have no knowledge as to that.

BANTRY BAY FORESHORE.

MR. GILHOOLY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can say what are the rights reserved to the public in the agreement made between the Board of Trade and the trustees of the Bantry Estate in connection with the foreshore of Bantry Bay.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The conveyance to the Bantry Estate Trustees to which the hon. Member refers contains a reservation of all public rights of way to and over the property conveyed. The conveyance also contains a covenant by the trustees not to erect on the property conveyed without the consent of the Board of Trade any building which would, in the Board's opinion, be prejudicial to rights of navigation.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman let us have the conveyance in the form, say, of a parliamentary Paper?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not think that desirable.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Is it not a conveyance from a State Department to a private individual of a grant of foreshore over which the public had rights? How are we to know what the rights thus conveyed are?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have stated what the rights are.

STEAM LAUNCHES ON CARLINGFORD LOUGH.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that complaint has been made to the Board that the steam launches ferrying for hire between Omeath, county Louth, and Warrenpoint, on Carlingford Lough, do not exhibit notices as to the number of passengers they are licensed to carry;

can he state what the maximum number is; has this complaint that the launches are overcrowded, especially on Sundays and holidays, been investigated; and, if so, with what result, and will any steps be taken to prevent the public safety being endangered by overcrowding or by these launches taking crowded row boats in tow across the lough.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes. Sir, the Board of Trade have received certain complaints with regard to the steam launches to which the hon. Member refers. These launches hold Board of Trade certificates, authorising them to carry respectively a maximum number of sixty-five, thirty-eight, and thirty-one passengers. In one case it is stated that the certificate has not been exhibited on board, as required by the Merchant Shipping Act, and the question of prosecuting the owner or master is under consideration. No case of overcrowding the launches themselves has come to the notice of either the Board of Trade or the local police, or proceedings would have been taken, but I shall communicate with the local authorities and with the owners of the launches with a view to stopping the objectionable and dangerous practice I understand to prevail of launches full of passengers towing crowded rowboats across Carlingford Lough.

SLIGO BAY LIGHTS.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that the Sligo Harbour Commissioners have made frequent applications to the Commissioners of Irish Lights to have lights established at Bowmore for the purpose of enabling vessels entering Sligo Bay at night time to reach safe anchorage, and can he explain why the representations of the Sligo Harbour Commissioners have not been taken notice of by the Commissioners of Irish Lights.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am informed by the Commissioners of Irish Lights, with whom I have communicated, that they consider that the lights asked for at Bowmore are purely for local benefit, and should not be established at the cost of the General Lighthouse Fund.

SALMON FISHERIES COMMISSION.

MR. CLAUDE LOWTHER (Cumberland, Eskdale): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state when the Royal Fishery Commissioners, who finished sitting at the beginning of this year, will issue their Report; and whether, in the event of that Report being still unpublished at the beginning of next session, the Government will act upon the advice of former Royal Commissions, and take steps to redress the grievances of the Cumberland fishermen, owing to the state of the law on the English and Scotch sides of the Solway.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Assuming that the Royal Commission referred to in the question is the Salmon Fisheries Commission, I understand that it concluded taking evidence only last month, and is now considering the Report.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can make any statement about affording facilities for the passing of certain non-contentious private Bills in which substantial progress has

already been made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As my noble friend and the House are aware, no Bills are starred on the Order Paper at this period of the session but those to which it is fully clear no opposition is expected, and if opposition unexpectedly arises it is impossible for the Government to persevere with the starred Bill. With that qualification I understand that the Public Libraries Bill, which has reached the Report stage, and of which my noble friend has charge, is one which, I think, might be properly starred, also the Bishopric of Southwark Bill, the County Councils (Bye-laws) Bill, and the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Bill.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): Is not the Bishopric of Southwark Bill opposed?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand not.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): Has not notice of opposition been given from both sides of the House? Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake that we shall have full opportunity of discussing it?

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: After what hour will the right hon. Gentleman undertake that the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill shall not be brought on?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: At this period of the session it is dangerous to give any pledge of that nature. Of course, I am anxious that no important discussion shall be brought on late.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: How is it that this Bill is not starred?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is treated as a starred Bill.

MR. T. M. HEALY: IS not that a matter for Mr. Speaker to decide?

*MR. SPEAKER: The Government have announced to the House that they intend to treat it starred Bill.

MR. T. M. HEALY: But how are private members to know? Is it done merely in order to escape the twelve o'clock rule?

*MR. SPEAKER: If the point is raised at the proper time I shall be prepared to deal with it.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.): May I press the right hon. Gentleman to fix some limit of time after which the Sale to Children Bill will not be taken?

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: Is it not the fact that the Amendments introduced in the Grand Committee have altogether altered the nature of the Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The effect of the Amendments introduced is not to make the Bill a new Bill, but they may be better described as in the direction of "cautious" legislation.

SIR J. FERGUSSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake not to bring it on after one o'clock?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope my right hon. friend will not press that. It is absolutely necessary we should make some personal sacrifice in order to bring the session to a close.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the right hon. Gentleman undertake not to bring it on after four a.m.?

MR. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale): In view of the considerable opposition to it, does the right hon. Gentleman intend to bring on the Supreme Court of Judicature Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I confess I have the very faintest hopes of that.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) asked if questions could not now be commenced at 3.15.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, I understand that private business is now concluded, and on and after to-morrow public business will commence at 3.15.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Will the Naval Works Bill be the first Order for Wednesday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, that is my expectation, but it depends largely on what happens to-night and to-morrow. I must be allowed some latitude as to the arrangement of business.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: When do you propose to take the Irish Bills?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will communicate with the hon. Gentleman on that point.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Loan Bill, without amendment.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time to-morrow, and to be printed.

[Bill 292.]

ROYAL TITLES BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think the scope, purpose, and occasion of the Bill to which I now ask the House to give a Second Reading have been quite sufficiently expressed in the parliamentary papers laid before the House, which contain correspondence on the subject with the Governments of the great self-governing colonies. I cannot imagine anybody having any objection to the substance of the Bill; and, as regards the form, the only objection I have seen taken in any quarter is that the actual terms of the title are not contained within the four corners of the proposed statute. To this objection the

reply is that we have followed precedent, and I think it will be a more convenient course to do now as we did in 1876, and abstain from embodying the ipsissima verba of the new title in the clauses of the statute which makes legal a change in the style and title of the Sovereign. I do not think I need labour this point. The character of the change is perfectly well known to the House; it has been very clearly indicated, and, though I suppose I ought not to pledge the Government absolutely to every word and comma, I am entitled for all practical purposes to say that the only change proposed is by way of additional words which will be interpolated between the words "Ireland" and "King" in the present Royal style and title. The added words will be "and of all British Dominions beyond the seas." There is but one suggestion with regard to the form which the new title should take upon which I need say anything, and I only occupy the time of the House with this because it comes from a quarter which deserves respect. The suggestion is from Lord Rosebery that instead of "British dominions," the word "Britains" should be used. Well, there may be some Latin justification for the use of that word, but there is no English justification. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Or Irish.] It is not in accordance, I think, with the spirit of the English language, and it is certainly a great novelty in usage. I doubt whether

the public will ever be got to talk of each of our self-governing colonies as a Britain, and I do not think a man can go round the world and say he has visited half-a-dozen Britains. I think it is so violent a change, so great a revolution, in our accustomed phraseology, that, whatever might be said for it, had it embedded itself in our usage and practice, I do not think it would be possible to start it now by statute, or to impose it by law or by proclamation upon the practice of His Majesty's subjects. There is a still further objection to the suggestion which I think deserving of consideration. If I understand aright, Lord Rosebery's object in making the change was, in his view, that wherever Britons settled themselves down with free institutions in other lands, carrying with them, if not the letter, at all events the spirit of our Constitution, carrying with them our religion, our laws, and the general characteristics of a British community, there a Britain, a new Britain as it were, arose from out of the wilderness. I think there is something to be said for that view as regards the great self-governing colonies, but we do not wish to confine it to those colonies, and the new title will apply to many dominions of His Majesty which do not fit in with the description I have just given of a new Britain beyond the seas; the dominions of His Majesty where the greater number of the inhabitants do not belong to our race, do not speak our tongue, and are subjected to a jurisprudence which is neither the common law nor the statute law of this land. I hope that in all such places British views of justice and order and of personal liberty prevail, but it cannot be said that in the colonies to which I have referred a new Britain, on the model of the old, can in any sense be asserted to have arisen. For these reasons I venture to think the form of declaration I have read to the House will meet with more general favour than the alternative suggestion, important as the quarter is from which that suggestion emanates. I will, therefore, say no more in defence of the particular wording by which it is proposed to amend the present style and title of the Sovereign. I would only remind the House that when in 1876, amid considerable controversy and some little excitement, a change was made in the Royal style and title by the addition of the words "Empress of India," an earnest plea for the recognition of the colonies was advanced by Mr. Forster and others, and Lord Beaconsfield, then Mr. Disraeli, expressed his sympathy with the proposal. He said;

"It was a question of much difficulty, and, though he did not despair that the time might yet arrive when so happy a result might be consummated, he was unprepared at that moment to meet the requirements of the case."

I think that happy result may now be attained; I think that the propitious moment has now arrived. As long ago as 1887 a colonial conference expressed its desire that some change might be made in the Royal style and title to indicate the vast growth in our colonial dominions which had taken place since the beginning of the reign of the late Queen. Their wishes expressed in 1887, Mr. Disraeli's and Mr. Forster's wishes expressed in 1876, should now, I think, find their adequate and worthy fulfilment in 1901, and we shall for the first time give to our Sovereign the title which covers the whole of the vast ground occupied by the British Empire. In those circumstances

I hope that without controversy, without a dissentient voice, the House will consent to the Second Reading of this Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN(Stirling Burghs): I do not anticipate that there will be any substantial opposition, at all events to the Second Reading of this measure; the circumstances are entirely different from those in which the most recent alteration in the style and title of the Crown was brought about. We all remember how great a storm arose from the proposal to create the title of Empress of India. That storm arose from the apprehension on the part of the public, not, I think, either an unworthy or an unreasonable apprehension, that this new and more sonorous title might swallow up and swamp the old familiar traditional names of King or Queen, which are thought much more characteristic of our country, not only in its domestic, but in its Imperial aspect. There was great fear lest we should become accustomed to alterations in the title, not only of the Crown itself, but of the Royal Family. I remember a most impassioned speech made by Mr. Joseph Cowen, whose principal, overwhelming fear was that the old name of Prince of Wales should be merged in some such title as the Imperial Crown Prince, or some designation of that kind. Well, there is nothing of that kind at all in this proposal. There is merely an acknowledgment and expression of a fact which already exists, and the King at this moment is King over all the dependencies of the country, and as it has been desired especially on the part of our fellow subjects in other parts of the world this fact should be recognised, and I certainly see no reason why there should be any great jealousy or susceptibility on the subject. At the time when the Royal Titles Bill of 1876 was discussed, as the right hon. Gentleman said, it was suggested that some words should be introduced acknowledging the colonial empire, and I confess to a great relief at finding that the Government have rejected all the rhetorical and fantastic suggestions that have been made, and have adhered to a simple and unadorned statement of the fact. The original proposal, which emanated, I think, from the Colonial Secretary, and was submitted to the colonies, in his name, not in the name of the Government, was that the words Greater Britain should be used. Since then we have had the other proposal by a noble friend of mine, that Britains should be used in the plural number. That is liable, I think, to all the objections which the right hon. Gentleman has stated against it. The colonies themselves, in the answers they gave to the inquiry of His Majesty's Government, preferred the less ambitious, less poetical, simpler title, and I think in that they showed their good sense, and that the country and people at large will be of that opinion. I did not catch that the right hon. Gentleman read to the House the actual title which was to be used, but it is sufficiently known. The only observation I should like to make upon it is this. Of course, everyone has his own idea of what the proper title ought to be; I am not very much enamoured of the word "dominions," for many reasons, but among others that it clashes a little with the fact that one of our great colonies has assumed the title of Dominion itself, and others may assume other names. I should have thought that the familiar words "colonies and dependencies," King of Great Britain and Ireland, and the colonies and

dependencies thereto belonging, or thereof, words which have authority and usage in their favour, would have been a simpler suggestion to have adopted. But it really does not matter very much; the Government make this proposal in order to carry out the desire of many of our fellow-subjects in the colonies, who, it must be remembered, are quite as much our fellow-subjects as if they lived in this country. I believe it is undoubtedly the case that any fellow-subject of ours among the whole dominions of His Majesty if he came over here and qualified himself, by residence and otherwise, could vote in our elections just as much as if he had been born, and bred, and lived all his life in this country. So that we are really one people essentially, and this slight alteration or addition to the title of the Crown merely gives public recognition and expression to that fact. I, therefore, do not see why anyone should raise, as I said, substantial objection to the title.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) said that the Leader of the House in the space of five minutes made two cardinal mistakes, and the Leader of the Opposition, who followed, was a good second, because he made one mistake. The Leader of the House made a cardinal mistake when he said there was no precedent whatever for permitting an Act to be passed containing the actual terms of the title to be assumed by the Sovereign. The right hon. Gentleman would at once cite in support of his contention the Royal Titles Bill of 1876. He would tell the right hon. Gentleman that was not a precedent. That Act was based on the precedent of the Act of Union, which Mr. Gladstone asserted was no precedent at all. The present Bill, therefore, was clearly distinguished from the Royal Titles Act of 1876, which was an infraction of constitutional usage. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, who was never very accurate in details, made another mistake, and the reason he made the mistake was that in 1876 he was absorbed in the tactics of the "Fourth Party," and teaching the Nationalists the methods of obstruction. This is what Mr. Disraeli said in 1876;

"It is absurd to suppose that our colonial fellow-subjects misconceive the spirit in which we are proposing to legislate; but, on the contrary, I believe there would be great cause of complaint if we drew a line and made a distinction between those of Her Majesty's subjects who live in the United Kingdom and those who are to be found in Canada or elsewhere."

The Leader of the Opposition had said that this Bill was desired by the colonies. That was a mistake. The initiative of the Bill did not come from the colonies at all; it came from the Colonial Secretary, and it had the "Brummagem" brand from top to bottom. It was not the legislative offspring of the Cabinet, but a genuine product of Birmingham. It was a mean attempt, inspired by the absurd and vulgar spirit of Imperialism, to subsidise the Crown with a parvenu title, and a tawdry, gew-gaw decoration. This amplification of titles was a bad sign; a sign of decadence. On the eve of the French Revolution the nobility of France invented new titles and indulged in this kind of peacock grandeur, when power was actually slipping from their hands. From a psychological point of view this Bill showed the fondness of the Colonial Secretary for pageantry and ceremonial. Moreover, it differed from

every other Bill with reference to the Royal title in two respects. First it did not contain the addition to the title. The Bill which created Henry VIII.

"Defender of the Faith" named that title, and it was said that it would be high treason to deny that the King was "Defender of the Faith." He supposed it would be high treason to deny hereafter that the King was "King of the British Dominions Beyond the Seas." Again, when the King was made King of Ireland in 1545 that was done by Act of Parliament. In 1876 when the Royal Titles Bill was introduced there was considerable controversy as to what the title should be in relation to the Queen's sovereignty over India, and the title was kept back for something like ten or twelve days after the introduction of the Bill into the House of Commons. But before this Bill was introduced at all in the House of Lords a most ridiculous and ludicrous correspondence took place between the Colonial Secretary and the colonies. The Colonial Secretary asked the cabinets of the colonies to select a title, and they having selected a title the right hon. Gentleman would have nothing to do with it. He excluded the title from the Bill in order that the King might himself assume the title. He would remind the House that the prerogative was entirely independent of an Act of Parliament, and there was no reason for the omission of the title in the Bill except the author's contempt for Parliament. The second respect in which this Bill differed from all others amending the Royal title, certainly since the Revolution, was that it came

down from the House of Lords, while all these other Bills of a like nature had been first introduced in the House of Commons, and for the perfectly proper reason that the King ruled by a statutory title, and the House of Commons, as representatives of the people, had a large voice in determining what that title should be. In fact, he at one time had thought of taking the extreme step of objecting to the First Reading of the Bill as not being in agreement with constitutional principles.

Further, he maintained that the Bill meant nothing after all, because His Majesty was King of the colonies in a far more absolute sense than he was King of this country. The colonies were mere settlements to which our Acts of Parliament did not apply unless they were specially mentioned in these Acts. If the Colonial Secretary had ever read the history of the North American War he would have known that one of the chief contentions during that war was that the King himself was the legislator and sole executive power of the colonies, and that the orders of the King in the colonies, had the force of the law. Again, in 1858, a Royal Proclamation was issued, with which the right hon. Gentleman ought to have been familiar, by which the Charter of the old East India Company was abrogated and the territories of the East Indies were brought under the dominion of the Crown. In that Proclamation the Sovereign was described as Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, Canada, South Africa, Australia, and all the Colonies. There was therefore no necessity for any new title stating that His Majesty was King of the colonies. In 1876 it was urged very strongly in debate that when India was brought under subjection to the British Crown in 1858 then would have been the time to make an alteration in the title of the Queen; but the answer made by Mr. Disraeli to that argument was that they could not introduce an

alteration in the title of the Queen when our swords after the Mutiny were simply reeking with the blood of our fellow subjects in India. Why, then, introduce a Bill conferring a ginger-bread title on the King, when our swords were reeking with the blood of our fellow-subjects in the South African Colonies, and when fierce racial passions had been invoked by the right hon. Gentleman mainly responsible for this war? In 1875 the despatches between the Home Government and that of India, in reference to the new title of the Queen, were repeatedly asked for by the Opposition of that day, but were refused for high State reasons. He could not conceive what malignant spirit had induced the Colonial Secretary to publish the despatches between himself and the Governors of the Colonies in regard to the King's new title. The first was;

"Mr. Chamberlain to Governor-General, the Earl of Minto (Canada), and Governor-General the Earl of Hopetoun (Australia); sent 7.10 p.m., January 29th, 1901. King Edward's accession offers an opportunity of considering the Monarch's titles."

;he was not a monarch at all; he was a king;

"and I am very desirous that the separate and greatly increased importance of the colonies should be recognised if possible. I therefore venture to suggest 'King of Great Britain and Ireland and of Greater Britain beyond the seas.'"

There was a fine suggestion, flamboyant enough for a signboard for a Birmingham shop.

"It is possible that some of the self-governing colonies might desire more special recognition, as King of Canada, King of Australia, but this would give rise to very great difficulty. Other self-governing colonies, viz., New Zealand, Newfoundland, the Cape of Good Hope, and Natal could hardly be excluded. It would be also desirable to refer to the Crown colonies, all of which would be covered by the expression I propose. I request that you will consult your Ministers most confidentially."

;everything was mystery with the Colonial Secretary;

"and inquire whether such recognition by the King would be gratifying to them, and, if so, whether they approve of the proposed style."

In 1876 there was one matter consistently pressed by those opposed to the Royal Titles Bill, and it was that no secret should be made of the title beforehand, and that the additional title should be made in consonance with the wishes of the people of this country and of India. But this new title was to be made in consonance with the wishes of the Colonial Secretary, and of no one else. At the very time that that despatch was

written Queen Victoria was lying dead, and her son was mourning for her, but the Colonial Secretary was devising a flamboyant title for her successor. The Queen was not buried until 4th February, and that horrible epistle was, from mere vanity, despatched on 29th January, by telegram. Everything was done by telegram by the Colonial Secretary except when we wanted to know the reverses in the war. The Governor-General of Canada took time to consider the matter, and did not answer the telegram until two days after the Queen was buried; while the Earl of Hopetoun, Governor-General of Australia, did not answer until 8th February. They

were more decorous than the right hon. Gentleman, who wished to worship the rising sun. He wondered, in respect to the very flamboyant title which the Colonial Secretary wished to give to the King, that his imagination had not done better. Had the right hon. Gentleman asked him, he could have suggested something from the title of the Prince of Siam, who, he believed, described himself as the brother of the sun, half brother to the moon, absolute master of the ebb and flow of the tide, and supreme lord of twenty-four golden umbrellas. The scandal was that the time of the House of Commons had been sacrificed for two hours over a Bill of this kind for the gratification of the Colonial Secretary, when they had not the time to discuss such things as the famine in India. Such a thing was treating parliamentary institutions with contempt. He did not think that such a Bill as this would in the slightest degree add to the dignity of the Crown, and, in his opinion, these new titles were only invented to cover the ignominy and defeat which the Empire had suffered.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I take a serious view of this Bill, and I desire to ask the House in the first place what they believe the intention of the Bill to be. It is not right for the Government to suggest alterations in the title of the Sovereign without some solid justification for that course. This Bill has been submitted to the House without a single word of argument or justification. If the Government had placed before the House any argument for this proposal, that argument, I take it, would have been the argument of former days, of binding the colonies together, but it would have been a much wiser course to allow the colonies to take the initiative in this matter; that was not done. In this particular instance the change in the title of the Sovereign had come entirely from the Home Government, and not from the colonies. I have never been a believer in this Imperialism, which is supposed to have come from the colonies, and I do not believe that the course pursued by the right hon. Gentleman during the eight years he has held the office of Colonial Secretary will meet with success, because I do not believe it will bind the colonies closer to this country, and I believe that the action of the Colonial Secretary will result in bringing a hitch between them and the home Government which will end all his policy. But even if I believed in this policy I do not believe the present policy of forcing upon the colonies such changes as we are now considering would be the best means of attaining the ends of the Imperialists.

Let us consider for a moment the purport of the Bill. We have been told by the First Lord of the Treasury that, although legislation is not to be allowed to fix the new Royal titles, His Majesty's advisers will advise him to add the words "King of the British Dominions, and of all British Dominions Beyond the Seas." First of all, that is a notice to us that Ireland has nothing to do with it. She is not British. Whatever meaning you attribute to "dominions," they are British, and not Irish colonies. You set aside Ireland, and by these titles gratuitously advertise the fact that Ireland is an outcast, and is not to have any share in the glories of the colonies or the Empire. I welcome the statement that we are to have no benefit from the colonies or the trade of the British Empire. While all your self-governing colonies have been prospering, Ireland has been perishing, and therefore I think you are wise in denying Ireland any share

in the titles. That will be taken notice of in Ireland, and if we are not to have any part of the so called glory, which you evidently consider it to be, let us at least have the power and advantage of taking our rank and position as a Power. Let us have

the freedom your colonies enjoy if we are not to have any share in the governing centre of the Empire. That is the first remark I make with regard to this Bill.

It bars us having a share, and I register our assent to it. These are British colonies, and the King of this country is King of Great Britain and Ireland.

Now, at the beginning of the new century, you place against Ireland a bar sinister. If, as the inferior partner, we are to be abandoned, and the predominant partner only is to take notice of the benefits from across the sea, we must have corresponding advantages.

Now, as to the second branch of this subject. Now that you have decided, in spite of the advice of Lord Rosebery, to assume the title of "King of All the British Dominions Beyond the Seas," we come to a much more serious matter, which hon. Members who regard this Bill so lightly do not appear to have the least conception of. Contrast the treatment which the House has received on this occasion with the treatment it received when the last alteration was made. When Mr. Disraeli, in 1876, suggested an addition to the Royal titles, he introduced it in a long and historical speech, and the debate upon the Second Reading consumed at least ten nights of parliamentary time; and I venture to say that it would never have entered into the minds of anybody in this House in those days to introduce a Royal Titles Bill in the last week of the session. When we compare the importance and gravity of the change which it is now proposed to make in the titles of the Sovereign with the change that was made in 1876, in my judgment, at least, the present proposal is quite as grave and as far-reaching as that made in 1876. The proposal to add the title of Empress to the Royal titles was, I have always thought, a mischievous thing, from the evils of which we are now suffering; but in that debate Mr. Disraeli was careful to show that it should only be a local title. But this title "King of the British Dominions Beyond the Seas" is to be an integral part of the title of the King, as was the case when upon the Union of Ireland the King was declared to be "King of Great Britain and Ireland"; so that it is a more important change with regard to the Sovereign of this country.

Now let me ask, what are the British dominions beyond the seas? Then are the self-governing colonies, and so far as they are concerned, if they had asked for this Bill, that would have been a very strong case for the new titles, always providing that they satisfied the home Government that a strong local feeling existed in this matter. Then there are the Crown colonies and the Uganda Protectorate, West Africa, and Egypt. Is Egypt a dominion of the British Crown? Is East Africa a dominion of the British Crown? What is to be said as to the Protectorates? We ought to have been told of this before, and if it be true that this title is to extend to Egypt, the Soudan, and Central Africa, then you have this embarrassment, among others, that every session we have well founded complaints from various quarters that the British flag flies over slavery. We know it flourishes all over the Soudan, as it does also in East Africa, and now

you are going to bring the matter closer home, because you are going to proclaim the King Sovereign of those countries in a special way.

But a more important consideration still, to my mind, is this. If there be any value at all in the institution of the Throne and King, that value must be found only in its historical associations. It is only that which gives the King of England or any sovereign in the world any value whatever. Nobody supposes that any country that had lost the continuity of its throne would deliberately set to work to reconstruct it. The whole history of the last generation shows that the only ground on which the Throne can stand is that of its historic associations. The traditions which surround the Throne in this country are very great; they are traditions of liberty, and it is upon those traditions that the greatness of the Throne depends, but you are now by this extension of the title to bring that Throne into direct contact with a multitude of Governments which are not dominated by any traditions of liberty. By this title the King is to be King of the Uganda Protectorate, of West Africa, of the Cape Coast, of the Gold Coast, and King of innumerable slaves, of at least thirty Governments under which no principle of liberty is practised, and I maintain, ridiculous as it will appear to you, that in making this change you are striking a blow at the stability of the British Crown. It is part and parcel of the whole policy of Imperialism, and it is for that and that alone that this change is introduced. Looking at it even from the point of an English Imperialist, I should think the proper amendment would be, instead, to adopt the description, "all the freely-governed dependencies of the Crown." That would include all the free governing colonies, and would have the British colonies brought in direct relationship with savage races or any community where slavery is practised. But I confess the nature of the titles is to my mind a matter of minor importance, the real thing is what is the object which is aimed at; the object is the same as that which was based on the policy, which was initiated at the time of the two Jubilee processions, upon which the Government has floated so triumphantly. We are to have a great performance next year. We are to have another great display next year, with a promenade of various loyal colonists, Indians, and negroes from the Soudan and West Africa; who, we are told, may be used in the next European war; to intimate to Europe that this is a great Empire, and, above all, to maintain the present Government and to keep up the Imperialistic game. I hope the people will take note of how that game is played. From the last procession the Irish were the only absentees. Every other dependency of the Crown sent loyal representatives to take part, but the only so called representatives of Ireland were the Royal Irish Constabulary who rode behind the carriage of Her Majesty; the representatives of the loyalists of Ireland! Four years have since passed, and the policy of Imperialism has cost you £200,000,000 and the lives of 30,000 men. When the procession next year passes through the streets of this city mother of your great dependencies will have dropped out. The Cape, which was loyal then, and which, of all the colonies, came forward at the Jubilee and offered a ship for the Navy, has been driven by this base and wretched policy of Imperialism into rebellion, which may end in revolution. When that time comes, I

hope the people of this country, beginning to suffer from the pinches of depressed trade and overburdened with taxation, will calculate how much they are paying for this gaudy game. The present proposal, the object of which is to increase the Imperialistic enthusiasm of the country, will be a blow struck at the real prosperity and power of the nation, and because every blow so struck increases the poverty and misery of our country I shall oppose the Bill at every stage.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): The speech of the hon. Member for East Mayo is entirely beyond my comprehension. A great part of that speech was to the effect that this Bill will deal a very severe blow to the prosperity of the nation which the hon. Member and his friends have always professed to seek to destroy. ["No."] If I was an enemy of this country, and a Bill was introduced which I thought was likely to strike a telling blow against its strength and security, I should support that measure. The hon. Member, however, after arguing that the Bill would strike a blow at Imperialism and the Imperial principle, wound up by saying that the Imperial principle was one which he would always uphold and protect, and, therefore, he should vote against the Bill. I do not wonder that the hon. Member and his friends look upon this measure with very great bitterness. The Bill is the crowning stone of the great Imperial movement which has been going on for some years. Where was the great Imperial principle born? It was born in Ireland, and the hammer of Home Rule, with which hon. gentlemen opposite thought to shatter the Empire, has proved to be the hammer that has welded the Empire into a great and powerful whole, more closely connected than ever before. I take this Bill to be a gracious acknowledgment on the part of the King, the Government, and the House of Commons of the noble part the colonies have recently played, and it will be regarded by the colonies in that light. It does not in the least interfere with our legal relations with the colonies, but it is a sign and symbol that we recognise the manifestation of solidarity on the part of the colonies in time of danger and trial. The hon. Member for East Mayo said that this country had a noble tradition of freedom and liberty. In what other country in the world does liberty exist so completely? Where else would hon. gentlemen be permitted to come to Parliament, take the oath of allegiance, and then go back to Ireland to preach open treason? [Cries of "Oh, oh!" and "Withdraw."]

*MR. SPEAKER was understood to call for order, but in the uproar his voice could not be heard in the Press gallery.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I will not pursue that further. Even hon. gentlemen from Ireland cannot deny that perfect freedom of the subject is permitted by the Constitution of this country, and if the Bill has the effect of pointing out to the people of the colonies, and others whom it may concern, that the glory of this country is its freedom in all respects, the measure is one undoubtedly deserving our support and admiration. The hon. Member seemed to be in a slight tangle. He admits the King is King of Great Britain and Ireland, but, in his estimation, this proclamation in some way dissevers Ireland from all connection with the rest of the kingdom. I do not know what he means.

MR. DILLON: It is proposed to call these dominions beyond the seas British, and

we are not British.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: Ireland belongs to Great Britain, and is a part of the British Empire. Whatever the hon. Member may say or think, he is and will remain British. Ireland is just as much a part of the British Empire as Scotland or Wales, and when the King's title is proclaimed to the nation at large, Ireland will have that honourable share in it which the hon. Member for East Mayo so intensely desires. It cannot be denied that in the immediate past there has been on the part of our colonies an indication of loyalty to the mother country which no one a few years ago could have hoped ever to see. Long before the Coronation the war will have ceased, and whatever hon. members may think, the action of Great Britain in South Africa has not alienated a single loyal man. ["Oh, oh!"] We have not alienated the Boers, for they were alienated at the start; they were not colonists of ours. We have not alienated the Dutch in Cape Colony, for they never professed to be loyal to us;["Oh, oh!"];though I guard myself by saying there are a minority of the Dutch who are and have all along been loyal to Great Britain. But I venture to say that at the Coronation we should have a large representation of loyal representatives from South Africa, the country to which I believe we shall bring prosperity and freedom.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): As far as I am concerned, the King may adopt a separate title for each of the dependencies of the Crown, beginning by calling himself the Emperor of the Island of Fiji. There is, however, one particular, at any rate, in which this Bill requires amendment, and in Committee I should propose that whatever new title His Majesty may see fit to assume he should no longer continue to call himself "Defender of the Faith." That title was conferred on the English King by Pope Leo for his defence of the Catholic Church against the attacks of Luther, and subsequently, when the authority of the Pope and of the Catholic Church was overthrown and disregarded in this country by Henry VIII., Pope Leo withdrew the title. It is quite true that afterwards the English Parliament passed an Act directing the King to continue to assume the title of "Defender of the Faith," but the whole meaning of the words was lost when the Pope revoked the title. That His Majesty should continue to call himself "Defender" of a faith which, when he ascends the throne, he describes as "superstitious and idolatrous," is a piece of absurdity.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must not speak in terms of disrespect of the Sovereign.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I did not use any term of disrespect to the Sovereign. His Majesty in these matters

has neither power nor discretion, and only does as he is directed by Act of Parliament. It is absurd that one Act of Parliament should compel His Majesty to stigmatise as idolatrous and superstitious the very faith of which, by another Act of Parliament, he is described as the "Defender."

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is quite in order in describing the state of the law as absurd, but he did use words;I do not think he intended to do so;which attributed the action which he describes as absurd rather to the Sovereign personally.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I should be very sorry to attribute to His Majesty any of the absurdities which are continually being enacted by Parliament in his name. If Parliament would only leave the King alone, I think he would very willingly do without this title of "Defender of the Faith," and also refrain from making the absurd declaration which he is obliged to make immediately after his accession. There are millions of people in addition to Roman Catholics, in this country and over the seas, who object to the title of "Defender of the Faith." Dissenters disapprove of the title, having reference simply to the Church of England. I am surprised that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite should have been guilty of the indiscretion of saying that the occurrences in South Africa have not alienated a single loyal man from Great Britain in that country, and that none of the Dutch were ever loyal.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I expressly stated there were a minority who were loyal.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: That is an exact contradiction of all that has been said again and again by the supporters of the Government, and by nobody more emphatically than the Colonial Secretary. We have heard over and over again of the extreme loyalty and wonderful forbearance of the Dutch colonists all over South Africa ever since this war commenced, and now, because they have not risen in open rebellion and taken up arms, they are sneered at by the right hon. and gallant

Gentleman as people unworthy of notice, as people who never were loyal, and therefore unaffected by the progress of the war. Does the right hon. and gallant Gentleman forget that the majority of the Parliament of Cape Town was Dutch, and that the Dutch Ministry and Parliament subscribed for the upkeep of the British Navy of this country £30,000 per annum? We are told now that these men were never loyal, that their position need not be considered, and that nothing has alienated one loyal man. That is a statement which will not be endorsed by those best acquainted with South Africa. I had not long ago the pleasure of speaking to a gentleman who held a high position in the Government and the Ministry of Cape Colony, and he told me that whereas for twenty-five years he had lived upon the best possible terms with Dutch colonists of the Cape, since this war commenced the disaffection amongst the Dutch had become so pronounced that it was now a painful thing for an Englishman to live there, remembering the good terms upon which they lived before the war. A more extraordinary statement and a more extraordinary occasion to choose to make such a statement I never heard of in my life.

The right hon. and gallant Gentleman says that Imperialism was born in Ireland. I never heard that argument before, but I do say that Irish people, in common with millions of the best people in this country; I do not use the term in the sense in which it is used with reference to people who mix in high society, such as lords and dukes and things like that I mean the masses of the working people of this country, who have to pay the taxes, and I say in common with them, and in common with the Irish people, that we hold that there are two kinds of Imperialism; one which is perfectly legitimate and reasonable, and which populated and developed the Australian continent and New Zealand, and which induced millions of people to seek fresh fields for their energies in those

colonies which were open to them. That is the Imperialism which is legitimate and reasonable and has resulted in much benefit to millions of the Irish people as well as to the Scotch and the English people. That is the Imperialism which is legitimate that is the Imperialism which the late Mr. Gladstone would have supported, and which millions of the sober-minded people of this country are prepared to support, because it is a natural development which does not necessitate either robbery or bloodshed. Imperialism of that kind I do not imagine anybody would object to but the Imperialism of which the right hon. and gallant Gentleman says this is the crowning act is the Imperialism which is illustrated by the great imperialistic spirit which has recently spread over the country. What kind is that? That is not the Imperialism which developed and populated Australia and New Zealand. It is not like the Imperialism which opened up the great desert tracts of Canada to the working classes. No. The Imperialism which the hon. and gallant Gentleman glorifies, and which he says the people are steeped in to the lips, is the Imperialism of South Africa. This Imperialism does not go to a country awaiting development, but to countries where other people have already gone.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order order! The hon. Member cannot go into that subject upon the Titles Bill, and he cannot discuss the question of the Imperial policy in South Africa.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I think every gentleman sitting in the House will do me the justice of admitting that what you, Sir, have taken exception to was in reply to the argument of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman. I will not pursue the matter further beyond saying that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman referred to this Bill as the result of the Imperial spirit which had sprung up in this country. He alluded to South Africa, and said that this Bill was a reward for the action of the colonial troops in the South African War, and having said those things, I thought that I was justified in saying that the kind of Imperialism he referred to was the wrong Imperialism, and was not an Imperialism which should be marked or rewarded in any way, much less by conferring titles upon the Sovereign. As you, Mr. Speaker, have decided that it is not in order for me to go further into the matter, I say that I object to this Bill not so much because it confers another title or two upon the Sovereign, but I object because even on the showing of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman this Bill is the result of the war in South Africa. It is the result of the action of the colonies in sending troops to fight in South Africa, and it is a sort of reward and glorification for all the treasure that has been wasted, and the blood which has been shed in South Africa. If this be the object of this Bill, then it is a measure which I hope every man who loves justice and fair play will vote against, because, so far from marking our approval of this war in any way by giving additional titles to the Sovereign, I think it is a thing which really ought to be the cause of national mourning and regret. You cannot read your newspaper any day without finding that there is still bloodshed, misery, and wretchedness existing everywhere in South Africa, and in view of those circumstances, and the fact that the war is not yet over; and no man is able now to get up and put a period to the war; the time is singularly ill-chosen for

conferring new titles. As far as I am concerned;and I believe it is the opinion of many other Irish Members;we do not object to this Bill on account of any particular title which Parliament may authorise the King to assume. These titles make very little difference to us, but we object because we believe that the time is inopportune, and our votes will be recorded as one of the long list of protests we have made, and which I hope we shall continue to make, when Parliament meets again,
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt.Sir Alex. F.
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Cranborne, Viscount
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Caldwell, James
Crombie, John William
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Carlile, William Walter
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Arrol, Sir William
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Balcarres, Lord
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Duke, Henry Edward
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Chapman, Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Charrington, Spencer
Elibank, Master of
Banbury, Frederick George
Clare, Octavius Leigh

Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Ferguson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Bignold, Arthur
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Colomb, Sir J. Charles Ready
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Fisher, William Hayes
Broadhurst, Henry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Bull, William James
Cox, Irwin Edward Bain bridge
Flannery, Sir Fortescue

against the injustice and the iniquity of this cruel and robbers' war in South Africa.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I rejoice with the hon. Member for East Mayo at the fact that this is the first time for a hundred years that Ireland has dissociated herself altogether from the Imperialism which is at the bottom of this Bill. If at the passing of this Bill conferring additional titles upon the Sovereign of this country in respect of other dominions beyond the sea we dissociated ourselves from all responsibility in conferring these titles upon the King, I cannot help thinking that it is only fair that those colonies should share in the expenses of this great Empire.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is quite out of order.

MR. O'MARA: I was only wishing to point out that in a new Bill conferring additional titles on the Sovereign which enables the colonies to share in the glories of the Empire and the so-called glories of Imperialism they should also be called upon to share some portion of the expenses of this Empire.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member cannot discuss the question of contributions from the colonies.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 210; Noes, 63. (Division List No. 458.)

Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.

Leigh, Sir Joseph

Randles, John S.

Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S W

Leveson-Gower, Fred K. N. S.

Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Reid, James (Greenock)
Gardner, Ernest
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S)
Rickett, J. Compton
Gordon, Hon. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'RH'ml'ts)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Round, James
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Rutherford, John
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Macdonald, John Cumming
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Grant, Corrie
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Maconochie, A. W.
Saunderson, Rt. Hon. Col Edw. J.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Majendie, James A. H.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)

Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E. (Wigt'n
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Milton, Viscount
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Mitchell, William
Spear, John Ward
Harris, Fredk. Leverton
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Harwood, George
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Mord, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Strachey, Edward
Heaton, John Henniker
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Sturt, Hn Humphry Napier
Helme, Norval Watson
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Henderson, Alexander
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Tennant, Harold John
Higginbottom, S. W.
Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Holland, William Henry
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Hornby, Sir Wm. Henry
Moss, Samuel
Thornton, Percy M.
Horniman, Frederick John

Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Hoult, Joseph
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Howard, John (Kent Faversh.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Norman, Henry
Valentia, Viscount
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Parker, Gilbert
White, Luke (Yorks., E. R.)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
Jones, Dav. Brynmor (Swansea
Partington, Oswald
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne
Jones, William (Carnarv'nshire
Paulton, James Mellor
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Williams, O. (Merioneth)
Keswick, William
Pemberton, John S. G.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Lambton, Hn. Frederick W.
Pierpoint, Robert
Wilson, A Stanley (Yorks, E. R.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth
Plummer, Walter R.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Lawson, John Grant
Pretymann, Ernest George

Lee, Arthur H. (Hants Fareham
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Lesse, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Purvis, Robert
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pym, C. Gup
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Doherty, William
Ambrose, Robert
Gilhooly, James
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Boland, John
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Dowd, John
Boyle, James
Hayden, John Patrick
O Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Burns, John
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Lundon, W.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Channing, Francis Allston
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Clancy, John Joseph
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Reddy, M.
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Condon, Thomas Joseph

M'Govern, T.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Crean, Eugene
Murnaghan, George
Roche, John
Cullinan, J.
Murphy, John
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Daly, James
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sullivan, Donal
Delany, William
Nolan. Col. John P. (Galway, N.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Dillon, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Doogan, P. C.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Duffy, William J.
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Field, William
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

PACIFIC CABLE BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I am surprised that a Bill of this magnitude and involving important principles has been moved without a word of explanation. I think the House ought to understand what is proposed.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I have already explained what is proposed to be done by the Bill. I explained it once on the Committee stage and once on the Report stage of the resolution.

MR. FLYNN: The hon. Member did not go at any length into the reasons for the Bill. He did not state the reasons why His Majesty's Government have changed their attitude with regard to the Bill. He did not explain why the colonies of Canada and Australia have been able to induce His Majesty's Government to change their policy, and why this country is to be committed to an expenditure of a capital of £2,000,000, and the Lord knows how much of an annual expenditure, without any guarantee that the cable will pay. There is another point on which I

wish to be informed in the course of the discussion. This is the first time that the Government have engaged in an enterprise with the resources of the country at their back against a private enterprise; namely, the Eastern Telegraph Company. I maintain that the Government in this matter have completely changed their mind in less than a couple of years, and it is not difficult for anyone who has read the proceedings of the Committee, and who have followed the correspondence issued from the Colonial Office, to see how the Government proceeded from step to step until the Colonial Secretary capitulated to Australia and Canada in order that these colonies might have a reduction of the tariff for cablegrams.

The Government are engaging in a dangerous enterprise, and committing the country to the expenditure of a large sum of money. I find from the Colonial Office correspondence which has been issued that the Government in April, 1899, laid down two principles which are being flatly contradicted by this Bill. The first principle was;

"Her Majesty's Government have never concealed their opinion that the construction of a Pacific cable is of greater importance to Australia and Canada than to the United Kingdom, and they would not have been disposed to recommend Parliament to aid it but for their desire to afford the support and assistance of the Mother Country to her great self-governing colonies in a project the success of which cannot fail to promote Imperial unity."

The other principle, which, to my mind, very much more strongly emphasised the view of the Government, was;

"That Her Majesty's Government consider the responsibility for constructing and working the cable should be borne by the Governments of Canada and Australia, to whom any profits which may accrue would fall."

I think the House is entitled to know what has occurred since April, 1899, to cause the Government to change their mind, and why, instead of allowing the responsibility for the construction and working of this cable to be borne by the Governments of Canada and Australia, this Government should take upon themselves the responsibility of conducting the cable. There is a clause in the Bill which places on this country the entire responsibility for the annual maintenance of the cable if it does not pay. It seems to me that the Colonial Secretary had changed his mind on this matter, as on many others, and we know that when the Colonial Office moves in a certain direction the whole of the Government have to follow. [Hear, hear.] Does the right hon. Gentleman dispute that in connection with this Bill? If he does, I think he should give the House an intelligent argument and not an inarticulate interruption. Clause 3 of the Bill says;

"The amount required in each year for the annual expenses of the Pacific cable, including any such expenses incurred before the passing of this Act, shall be defrayed out of the receipts arising in connection with the cable, and, so far as those receipts are not sufficient, out of moneys provided by Parliament."

I am perfectly convinced that the House is not generally aware of the importance of this matter, and that at least the majority of the members cannot have read the correspondence which was issued in 1899 and 1900. A long correspondence passed between the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company and the Government, and

the House will be interested to mark the proceedings. The Telegraph Company naturally concluded that the Foreign Office was the authority to whom the correspondence should be addressed, and they accordingly addressed their letter to the Prime Minister. After some weeks the Telegraph Company was informed that the matter was in the hands of the Colonial Office, and two months passed before the Telegraph Company got the courtesy of a reply to their most important communication.

What is the nature of the case put forward by the Eastern Telegraph Company? I need not say that neither I nor any of my colleagues have any interest in upholding a monopoly by the company, but we wish to oppose the proposal of the Government to embark on a scheme which is to run in direct opposition to private enterprise. This company have spent millions in the development of their telegraph system. Now, instead of this Pacific cable being undertaken by a private company, relying upon the scheme paying because of its merits, we have the Government of the day advancing the capital and pledging themselves to a large annual expenditure in order to compete with the Eastern Telegraph Company. That company have provided a system of telegraphic communication between Canada and Australia which has given satisfaction, and with regard to which no complaint has been made. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] I suppose the hon. Member will have an opportunity of speaking later on, but I would ask hon. Members' attention to this fact that in the whole of the correspondence there is no allegation on the part of the Colonial Office or anybody else that the Telegraph Company have not done their duty properly. They may have a monopoly to some extent, but in the very last communication they made they state that they are willing to grant most reasonable terms. They go on to state that the cable traffic between Canada and Australia has been greatly exaggerated by those interested in this enterprise. In the evidence brought before the Pacific Cable Committee it was shown that in September, 1899, the number of messages exchanged between Canada and Australia was thirty-five, and, taking these at an average of thirteen words per message, there would be 5,460 words per annum, and at the present tariff of 6s. 3d. per word, that would represent £1,706 per annum. The House was asked to undertake responsibility for £2,000,000 of capital, and a cost of £25,000 or £30,000 a year for maintenance in respect of an enterprise which only brings in £1,706 of revenue altogether. No doubt the main motive in this matter of the Australian colonies was the expected reduction of the tariff. That would not be denied. We have no objection to that, but I presume there is a point at which the cable would be carried on at a loss. If the Australian colonies or the mother country want better terms and a reduction of the tariff, let them pay for it, and not come to the taxpayers of this country, who are already overburdened with other charges. The main object is the protection of the cable. They point out that on the traffic between Europe and Australia the rate at one time was 9s. 4d. a word; the Australian colonies thought this rather high, and they negotiated with the Eastern Telegraph Company with a view to the reduction of the tariff. After some time the company agreed to a reduction of 4s., but stipulated that they should be partially guaranteed by the colonies against loss. Who complained of

that arrangement? The colonies! It did not pay, and the Australian colonies themselves reopened the matter, and, notwithstanding the advice of the Eastern Telegraph Company, they raised it to the present rate of 4s. 9d. per word. No doubt it would be very good business for the colonies if, at the expense of the mother country, they could get this cable laid and get half, or even one-third, of the present cable traffic which passes through the Eastern Telegraph Company's cable. If only one-third of the traffic could be diverted this cable would pay, but the Eastern Telegraph Company would require compensation. Is Parliament prepared to compensate

this company, and if not, why not? But it is impossible for this company to pay; the cable traffic to Australia is not increasing at all. The Australian colonies themselves in the last negotiations with the company had to raise the rate, because the lower rate resulted in a loss to them under their guarantee, and no doubt there is nothing they would like better than a reduction in the tariff at the expense of the mother country. The decrease in cable traffic in 1897 was 80 per cent. on the number of words cabled, and it has further decreased since. I think this House should ask why the last despatch from the Eastern Telegraph Company, making certain offers of reduction, which offers were communicated to the Australian colonies, was not answered, and not even referred to.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Would the hon. Gentleman tell me the date he refers to?

MR. PLYNN: September 28th, 1899. The offer of the cable company was this; "The proposal recently submitted to the Australasian Colonies by the companies for extending the Cape cable to Australia not only provides for an immediate reduction of tariff to 4s. per word, but involves the application to the Australasian traffic of the same sliding-scale principle as adopted for the Cape traffic, by means of which the tariff might, without any sacrifice on the part of the Australasian Colonies, be further reduced in 1901 to 3s. 6.1. per word, to 3s. in 1902, and to 2s. 6d. in 1903, provided the traffic satisfactorily responds to the proposed reductions."

That was a fair offer, and why is it there was no reference to that letter, and that Parliament has no information as to the view the Australian colonies took of that letter? I can quite understand Australia liking to get a reduction in the price of cable traffic, and I do not blame them for their action if they take the responsibility themselves; but the Eastern Telegraph Company urge that it will not pay on the present basis of work done. I understand upon the present amount of traffic between Australia and Canada what will be affected by this is only 5 per cent. of the whole, and I should think the House would hesitate before embarking in such an enterprise. I want to know something more about this offer by the

telegraph company; whether it was considered reasonable or otherwise. Is the Government justified in embarking in a large expenditure when this strong opposition is already at work? With regard to the possibilities of its paying a large revenue, let me read this statement from the letter of the company of the 19th July, 1899:;

"With regard to the twentieth paragraph of your Lordship's letter, I have already pointed out the fallacy of supposing that there will be a large

development of revenue arising from the traffic between Canada and the United States and Australia";

I would ask the House to consider the two branches of the subject; there is the amount of cable traffic between Australia and Canada and the amount between Canada and this country to be considered;

"or that the lowering of rates will immediately increase the general revenue arising from the Australasian traffic. I am at a loss to understand the statement in this paragraph that 'it is from these sources' (really nonexistent) 'rather than by any diversion of business from the Eastern Extension Company that the new cable will look for employment, and that there is no intention of working the new cable on other than commercial lines, and at remunerative rates.'"

Now what is the reply;

"If His Majesty's Government really imagines that the traffic between Canada and the United States of America and Australasia, together with the increased volume of business which a reasonable lowering of rates is expected to produce, can give remunerative employment to a Pacific cable, this is an absolute delusion; for the Report of the Committee avows that, even with the diversion of between one-third and a half of the companies' European-Australasian traffic and the estimated, and indeed over-estimated, annual increase of 10 per cent. (which my former letter showed to be greatly exaggerated), no profit, taking into consideration the necessity for a duplicate cable, can be expected from the scheme for at least ten years, even with the aid of His Majesty's Government in raising the money at 2½; or 2½; per cent. Such a scheme, I submit, is not framed on commercial lines."

My first objection to this is that it is an unwarrantable interference with private rights. What did Mr. Raikes say? The late Mr. Raikes, when Postmaster General, said;

"It would be without precedent for the Government itself to become interested in such a scheme in such way as to constitute itself a competitor with existing commercial enterprises carried on by citizens of the British Empire."

And the permanent official of the Post Office before the Cable Committee gave evidence to the same effect.

The whole weight of evidence is overwhelmingly against the scheme. The whole evidence goes to prove that the scheme has been adopted hastily, and that this is a policy pledging the Government of this country to an expenditure of £2,000,000 without adequate consideration. One understands municipal enterprise for the supply of such things as gas and water and other things now regarded as necessities of life, but that is obviously an entirely different thing to embarking in a scheme to which you were originally opposed, and in regard to which you have no guarantee that it will pay, and which, if it is to be an advantage, will be an advantage to Canada and Australia, but not to this country. We know the argument that this Pacific cable will be an all-British cable; but if only that is the idea, why not take the cable round by way of the Cape, which the Colonial Secretary admitted would be of great strategical importance, and which the Eastern Telegraph Company agreed to do without asking

any money from this House? There is not an argument left in this enterprise; it is nothing but another development of the shoddy Imperialism which has met us at every turn in this House for the last two years. If it is necessary to have the cable, why not let the Colonies make it? But why make it at all when an existing company is willing to make a communication through the Cape of Good Hope, which is admitted to be a more economical route? There is one thing in regard to this matter which one almost hesitates to touch, but which raises a rather curious aspect of the question. One of the prime movers in this matter is Lord Strathcona, who is, as everybody knows, a man of unimpeachable integrity, but it does not enhance my confidence to know that he is to be one of the directors of this company, and he is largely interested in the government of Canada, and in the Pacific cable, and other matters. Now in the corporation of my native city such a thing as that would be looked upon with the gravest suspicion. I think no case has been made out for this Bill, but that a strong case has been made out against it. I think the making of this all-British cable has been gone about in the most expensive manner, and that after the offer made in September, 1899, by the company, the embarkation in this wild-cat scheme shows in itself that the House is losing all its sense of commercial undertakings.

*MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I regret the absence of our chief the hon. Member for Hythe, who is chairman of the Telegraph Committee. I desire to tell the House in a few words the story of the cable communication with Australia. In 1870, when Australian communication was desired, the firm of John Pender and Co. jockeyed; I am sorry to have to use the word; a certain portion of the Australian Government into constructing an enormous land line, which considerably increased the cost of cable communication. When that company was established it worked so badly and inadequately that Government subsidies were obtained to the amount of £32,000 a year. When the company got their cable line to Australia they charged enormous rates, first of all £10 or £12 a message, which on pressure being brought to bear was reduced to 10s. 6d. a word, and then 7s. 6d. a word. Only by the Australian Government promising a large subsidy was the rate reduced to 4s. a word, and to-day we have got it down to 3s. 6d. To this company and its satellites we in Australia now pay £1,200 a day for telegraphing to and from England; they receive £400,000 a year. That is an enormous sum, and it gives an enormous profit to the company. I know no monopoly in the world that is doing more injury to trade than the concentrated companies represented by the Eastern Telegraph Company and its six or seven satellites. Hon. members opposite do not realise how much our trade has suffered from these high cable charges. Take the case of India; the rate to India has been kept at 4s. a word at a time when the rate to Australia, double the distance, is 3s. 6d. a word. Why is that? Because they have the whip-hand in competition. I once described John Pender and Co. as an octopus which, with its tentacles in every direction, is sucking the life-blood out of the Empire. For the first time now we have an opportunity of establishing an alternative line to Australia. The Pacific cable will stretch over a great extent of water and touch many islands of the Pacific belonging to the British Empire which are now without cable communication. The hon. Member quoted some

remarks of Mr. Raikes against the cable. As a matter of fact, Mr. Raikes was one of a board of directors of a company formed to construct the line from Canada to Australia. I was another of the directors. I knew that Mr. Raikes strongly believed in the project, The House of Commons and the country have lately come to the opinion that the cables of the British Empire should become the property of the Government. We shall never have a great Empire until we have cheapened cable communications to the lowest possible limit, and so annihilated distance. We are determined to have the cables of the world in the hands of the Government, for if the Government purchases them the tariff can be reduced by half. The hon. Member referred to the position of Lord Strathcona in connection with this cable project, and declared there was something suspicious in his action. Lord Strathcona is well known everywhere for his high and honourable character. I know that Lord Strathcona dislikes the work, that he has other interests, and that nothing would please him more than to be relieved of it; but he is bound by the Government he represents to occupy a seat on the board. I trust therefore that the hon. Member will withdraw a most unfair, ungenerous, and unfounded statement against the character and reputation of Lord Strathcona. I will leave other speakers to deal with the terms of the contract. All I know is that the Canadian Government are doing the lion's share of the work. I know it is the intention of the Canadian Government, as I hope it is of the English Government also, to construct a cable from England to Canada, and I look forward to the day when we shall have sixpenny telegrams to India, shilling telegrams to Australia, and penny telegrams to America. I am sure that that day will come; and I regard the scheme now before the House as a great step forward towards the breaking up of one of the greatest monopolies the world has ever seen, and towards the consolidation of the Empire. I thank the House for its attention.

MR. O'MARA said that the hon. Member who had just spoken had referred to the fact that the cable companies had a great monopoly; but the House should recollect that the hon. Gentleman had spent the greater portion of his life as a newspaper proprietor in Australia. He did not, however, contend that that had influenced the hon. Member's views. It would be very far from him to attribute any such motive to the hon. Gentleman, who was a most enlightened man; but still the fact that he had been a newspaper proprietor, and had to pay very heavy charges for cables, might have coloured his view somewhat as to the necessity for a competitive scheme. When the hon. Member complained of high charges he forgot to tell the House that for the distance the present charge of 4s. 9d. a word was absolutely the cheapest telegraph charge in the world. The hon. Member did not deny that.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I decidedly deny it. The cable companies have always treated me with the greatest possible consideration, and I have no feeling at all against them.

MR. O'MARA said that it could not be denied that for the distance 4s. 9d. was the cheapest telegraph charge in the world. Therefore he thought that the complaints of the hon. Member were to a great extent discounted. Of course the scheme before the House had emanated from the Colonial Office. It was a curious

coincidence that that evening two schemes exemplifying the latest development of Imperialism should have been under discussion, namely, the Royal Titles Bill and that Bill. In 1897 the Colonial Secretary invited the colonies to consider the advisability of that scheme. A Committee was thereupon appointed, not a single member of which had any practical acquaintance with cable or telegraph work. Two members of the Committee were Englishmen, and four were colonials. Of course the Committee were very carefully chosen, and they reported as favourably as they possibly could in accordance with the wishes of the Colonial Secretary. His point was that the Colonial Secretary was alone responsible for the Committee, and that the scheme was the outcome of his Imperialism. As he had stated, the Committee reported as favourably as they possibly could, but even that Report ought to have opened the eyes of any ordinary business man as to the business side of the scheme. The Committee reported that the scheme would lose in the first year £12,000, after spending in construction between £1,500,000 and £1,800,000; but by assuming an increase of ten per cent. in the business, the Committee stated that the scheme might pay in some indefinite number of years. He desired to lay particular stress on that. In fact, the Report was so unfavourable that it was hung up in the Colonial Office for two and a-half years, and did not see the light of day until the very end of the session, when the Colonial Secretary now tried to smuggle it through without sufficient discussion. With reference to the business aspect of the scheme, there was no doubt whatever that even at the lower rate of 3s. 6d. per word there was not sufficient business to pay for two cables to Australia. In addition to that, it should be remembered that, apart from the scheme before the House, there would be another cable to Australia which was to be laid down by the Eastern Telegraph Company from the Cape. Accordingly, if that scheme were to be carried out, there would be three cables, and they would not be able to pay their working expenses. Of course it would be a great advantage to the colonial Governments, and to colonists generally, to have low cable rates, but he could not see what benefit it would be to the mother country. A few individual firms who had business relations with the colonies might benefit, but he could not see what benefit would be conferred on the taxpayers of the country. Consequently, as far as the reduction of rates was concerned, the colonies would benefit, but England would not, and as for any chance of the scheme ever making a profit, it could not

be said by any hon. Member who had studied the official documents that the cable would ever be able to pay its way, or ever be anything but a source of expense to the English Government, and an advantage to the colonies, who never subscribed to any Imperial project whatever.

To his mind there ought to be some give and take when a scheme of this kind was initiated. But there was no give and take in this matter; nor, in fact, was there any give and take in all the exhibitions of Imperialism we had had from the colonies. The Colonial Secretary was now endeavouring to rush through the scheme, but according to the documents he had, only a few years ago, no great wish for it. Writing in 1899 to the Governor General of Canada he said that he did not regard the scheme as urgent. Therefore he could not understand why it

should not be postponed until next session. The right hon. Gentleman also stated that the cable would be of comparatively small advantage to England, as one of its terminals would be in Canada and the other in Australia, and it would be administered by the colonies. The right hon. Gentleman also stated that the offer of a subsidy of £20,000 a year for twenty years was fair and generous; and he could not understand what arguments had since been used to induce the Colonial Secretary to exceed that offer. Instead of £20,000 for twenty years, they were now asked to embark on a scheme which would involve the guarantee of an unlimited amount of money, and there was, in his opinion, no possible reason why the offer of the Colonial Secretary in 1897 should have been exceeded. The most ridiculous part of the whole scheme was the creation of a board to control and work the cable. That board was to contain a very large majority of colonial members. England would be represented by three members, Canada by two, New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland by two, and New Zealand by one. There would therefore be five colonial members, as against three representatives of the home Government. He asked the House if that was a fair representation for the home Government, which proposed to build the cable without any help from the colonies? He said that it was not. Then it appeared that the board would take sole possession of the cable. It was very remarkable indeed that the property of the home Government should be handed over to a board containing a majority of colonists to be used for the purposes of the colonies. The colonies, of course, would know that any loss would not fall very largely on them, and accordingly they would not use the cable in an ordinary commercial manner; and they would have every possible interest in reducing the rates, possibly to the point mentioned by the hon. Member for Canterbury. The result would be a loss of hundreds of thousands of pounds, which the home Government would have to meet. He could not understand how such unbusinesslike machinery had been set up by the Colonial Secretary, who was reputed to have such a businesslike mind. The members of the committee could have no possible idea of how to manage a cable, or how to let out contracts for repairs and other matters. He would have to move several Amendments in Committee to that portion of the scheme in order to protect the property of the taxpayers. There was one point in regard to the Bill which struck him, and that was that it sought to cover up something which had been already done. In fact it was an Indemnity Bill in connection with contracts which had been illegally entered into. When the resolution was in Committee the Chancellor of the Exchequer stated that the contracts had been already entered into, although the House of Commons had not approved of them. The Bill also provided for the repayment of temporary loans for the purposes of the cable. That was the first information they had had of any loans in connection with the matter, and it was most illegal. He should like to know what these loans were for, and why they had been raised. They had no knowledge of those matters, and yet they were expected, with their eyes shut, to indemnify the Treasury and the Colonial Secretary for raising money without the sanction of Parliament. They had a right to know how far the House was already committed to the scheme, and how far the Colonial Secretary went

without parliamentary sanction to carry out his ideas. He had no intention of impeaching the personal character of the right hon. Gentleman, but it was a strange thing that general suspicion was aroused by any act of his which was not fully disclosed to the public.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON;(Belfast, S.): On a point of order. Is the hon. Member justified in casting imputations of personal motives on the Colonial Secretary?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member was getting very near the line.

MR. O'MARA said he did not impute any personal motives to the right hon. Gentleman. His point was that contracts had been illegally entered into, and money illegally raised, before the passage of the Act, and that such transactions had not been disclosed to Members of the House of Commons, although they were now asked to pass an indemnity measure. The right hon. the Colonial Secretary had put forward the claim in support of the subsidy that this would be an all-British line, but he understood that there was an exclusive contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Commercial Cable Company under which telegrams would have to pass over American lines. He therefore wished to know whether this cable was to be worked entirely by British subjects and whether any arrangements had been entered into in regard to rates. The Colonial Secretary had evidently surrendered himself body and soul to the colonies in this matter, and he only wished to say that the scheme was a hairbrained one for providing money to the colonies, who were very well able to look after themselves, for an enterprise which would involve a heavy burden on this country for the next fifty years.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Anyone who has sat in this House for the last three-quarters of an hour must have felt that the hon. Member who has just sat down was not so much concerned with the Bill as in making or insinuating charges against the Colonial Secretary. I do not think it necessary to take up the time of the House by even alluding

to these aspersions. I shall deal with the issue before the House; what are, in the opinion of the Government, the merits of the agreement? But before going to that I must say a word as to what has been said with regard to the connection of Lord Strathcona with this Bill. My hon. friend below the gangway said truly that everyone here respects and admires Lord Strathcona as he is respected in Canada. But it is cruel to make use of the fact that he has been selected to represent the Government on the Pacific Cable Board in order to bring charges against him.

MR. FLYNN: I made no charges against Lord Strathcona. All I said was that his Lordship should not have been a director named in this Bill, while he was at the same time, and had been for years, a director of the Commercial Cable Company.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think the hon. Member's memory deceives him. I think I need not say that Lord Strathcona's reputation stands too high to be affected by anything the hon. Member has said. The history of this Bill is, shortly, this.

For many years the Australian colonies have been complaining of the high rates and of the insufficient service they have received, and they, together with the Dominion of Canada, have been anxious for a further cable connection to be constructed between this country and Australia, via Canada, which should touch only on British soil, and should have all the safeguards which attach to that

condition. That is no new idea; it has been the subject of resolutions in two separate colonial conferences. The object of His Majesty's Government has been to secure an all-British cable, which would safeguard our interests in time of war, and in time of peace facilitate British trade, which would come from a reduced tariff. The Eastern Telegraph Company and its allies had, since this proposal had taken practical shape, and since His Majesty's Government had expressed their willingness to co-operate with the colonies in laying this cable, offered terms which they never offered before. They had contended, earlier, that the traffic would

not bear any reduction of rates, that it did not pay at the present time, and that they could not afford to make the concessions which the colonies and correspondents in this country desired. I do not think it desirable that our cable communications should remain under the control of one company. It was only when competition had become almost a certainty that the Eastern Telegraph Company, whose subsidies had amounted to over a million sterling, offered concessions they had never contemplated before in order to avert that competition. Is it to be contended that, because we have helped that company so much, we must not help any other enterprise?

I have been asked whether, in agreeing to help to make this cable, we have taken the precautions we would take if we were dealing with a subsidised company as to Government messages and British employees. Of course, British employees would be employed by the Pacific Cable Board. Not being in the position of men running a purely commercial business, the representatives of the British colonies and of the British Government did not require to be tied down in the same way as a commercial company would. In the same way, too, as regards Government messages, it will probably be convenient that they should go at half rates, as they do under most of our cable agreements. But that matter is of much less consequence when the cable is owned by us, for the profits, instead of going to somebody else, as they do when we are dealing with a commercial company, will come back to us. It does not matter so much, therefore, whether we pay the full rates or half rates on Government messages. I have also been asked what payments have already been made. Roughly, they amount to £290,000, due to the contractors in accordance with the condition named in the contract. This is the first time when our great self-governing colonies have approached this country with a proposal for combined action in a great commercial undertaking. They have done it in the hope of promoting inter-British trade, of increasing inter-British intercourse, and I think we would have ill responded to the feeling which animated our countrymen if we had not met their advances in a friendly spirit. His Majesty's Government would

be loth at any time to refuse altogether to consider proposals of such a nature seriously put forward by our great colonial Governments. We hold that this country has an interest, if not as great as that of the colonies, at any rate a great interest, in promoting these trade communications and increasing these cable facilities. We hold that the construction of this cable will be of material advantage to us in time of war, and we ask the House to ratify the agreement we have made and to carry out the undertaking which has already been

ratified by every colonial Government concerned an undertaking which will form, I hope, a lasting and successful monument to the co-operation between the colonies and the mother country. I look upon it as one of the most fruitful and hopeful schemes that has come before us in recent times, and I warmly recommend it to the House.

MR. DILLON: A certain bitterness of tone seems to have been imported into the discussion by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury which I do not propose to follow. But I wish to say a few words as to the observations which my hon. friend the Member for Cork has made as to the connection of Lord Strathcona with this cable. All that my hon. friend said was that Lord Strathcona was a director of the Commercial Cable Company, and that, under the circumstances, it would have been better if someone had been placed on the board who had not direct financial profits to be derived from the decisions of the board. What did the Secretary to the Treasury say when he came to justify this extraordinary new departure? That complaints had been made for many years by the colonies of the excessive cable rates. No doubt; but have there been no complaints in Great Britain and Ireland of excessive railway rates? The hon. gentleman further said the object of the Bill was to secure the advantages of British trade which would accrue from reduced cable rates. Might he not turn his attention to the great advantages which would accrue from reduced railway rates? All we contend for in our opposition to this Bill is some more satisfactory explanation of the grounds on which the Government justify this departure from the well-established policy of the country. That policy has been that when under the sanction of the law private capital has been invested in enterprises the Government of the country should not use public money or sanction the use of rates by local authorities to compete with those private undertakings. It is on that ground that London has never been permitted to obtain its own water supply without reference to the water companies. On what logically defensible grounds can the Government justify the application to the industry of cable-laying of a totally different principle to that which is applied to private enterprises at home? Why was it last year when the Government proposed to compete with the Telephone Company the whole of the House of Commons and the country were turned upside down? Even the Minister, one of the ablest on the Treasury Bench, has, I believe, suffered severely in his position because he was inclined to give some effect to the principle of using public funds to compete against a monopoly. I am a strong supporter of municipal enterprise, but it is a new experience for me to hear the Tory party denouncing monopolies and advocating the principle that public funds may be legitimately used to compel those monopolies to reduce their rates. Are we to expect this new policy to be applied to Irish railways, shipping companies, and other matters in which home trade is interested? If the Government have made up their minds to sanction the use of public money for the purpose of freeing the public from so-called monopolies, it would be much better to act on the old maxim that charity begins at home. It is said that the Eastern Cable Company is a monopoly, but that is not so in the true sense of the word.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: They have a monopoly of landing rights in Egypt and other

parts of the world.

MR. DILLON: Then surely the Government can give other companies equal rights. It is not a monopoly to so great an extent as that of the railway companies of this country. To justify such a proposal on the ground that they are beating down a monopoly is a most

unprecedented course for a Government to take. According to a letter written by Lord Tweeddale to the Colonial Office on 19th June, 1899, Mr. Leonard Courtney, when Secretary to the Treasury, said;

"It would be highly inexpedient to encourage on light grounds competition against a company in the position of the Eastern Telegraph Company, which has embarked much capital in existing lines."

If ever there was a man who was not a friend of monopolies, it was Mr. Leonard Courtney, and yet that is the view held by him.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I assure the hon. Member that we cannot construct a telegraph line to India or Egypt, because of the monopoly of the Eastern Telegraph Company.

MR. DILLON: Then let the hon. Member apply to the Government to abolish that monopoly. If the Government are so enthusiastically in favour of abolishing monopolies and reducing rates, why do they not start a steamship line in opposition to the P. and O. Company? What is the distinction between a steamship company and a cable company? In view of the necessity of manning the British Navy, there is much more to be said in favour of establishing a steamship service with the colonies, in order to give British trade the great advantage of cheap freights, than can be said for the present proposal. Even-argument in favour of establishing this Pacific Cable applies with even stronger

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Chamberlain, J. Austin (Worc'r

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn E.

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud

Charming, Francis Allston

Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir. J (Manch'r

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Chapman, Edward

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Charrington, Spencer

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Arrol, Sir William

Clare, Octavius Leigh

Fisher, William Hayes

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Coghill, Douglas Harry

Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S W
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Gardner, Ernest
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Cranborne, Viscount
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Bignold, Arthur
Dickson, Charles Scott
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Bigwood, James
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Goschen, Hn. Geo. Joachim
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Bull, William James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Grant, Corrie
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs
Cavendish, V C. W (Derbyshire
Duke, Henry Edward
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Groves, James Grimble

force to the setting up by the Government of steamship lines. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reply to a deputation, said;
"If any Government were mad enough, or the Cabinet were inclined to allow any Government to spend the money of the taxpayers in order to enter into competition for the purpose of destroying private industry, the position would be a dangerous one."

That is precisely what the Government are at now. Apparently the Government have gone "mad," because, according to the provisions of this Bill, the House of Commons is asked to sanction the very thing which the Colonial Secretary described as "madness." I maintain that the proposal now submitted to the House of Commons is entirely without precedent, and is revolutionary in its character, and I think we are entitled to demand that if such principles are to be admitted at all they should first be applied at home, so that we might obtain relief from the railway and other excessive rates which interfere so grievously with our trade.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) rose to continue the debate, when

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:;Ayes, 167; Noes, 77. (Division List No. 459.)

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Maclver, Daxid (Liverpool)

Round, James

Hambro, Charles Eric

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x

M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)

Rutherford, John

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.

M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd

Majendie, James A. H.

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)

Haslett, Sir James Horner

Mather, William

Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos Myles

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E. (Wigt'n

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Heaton, John Henniker

Mitchell, William

Sinclair, Louis (Romford)

Helme, Norval Watson

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East V.

Higginbottom, S. W.

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)

Smith, H C (N'rth'mb, Tyneside

Hogg, Lindsay

More, Rbt. Jasper (Shropshire

Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Holland, Wm. Henry
Morgan, David J (Walth'mst'w
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Horniman, Frederick John
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Spear, John Ward
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Hoult, Joseph
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Strachey, Edward
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Parker, Gilbert
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Parkes, Ebenezer
Tennant, Harold John
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Thornton, Percy M.
Keswick, William
Pierpoint, Robert
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Law, Andrew Bonar
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Lawson, John Grant
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Valentia, Viscount
Lee, Arthur H (Hants. Fareham
Plummer, Walter R.
Vincent, Col Sir C E H (Sheffield)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pretymann, Ernest George
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

Leigh, Sir Joseph
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Purvis, Robert
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Pym, C. Guy
Wills, Sir Frederick
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Randles, John S.
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Rensbaw, Charles Bine
Wood, Sir J. T. (Huddersfield),
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Rentoul, James Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Rigg, Richard
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Macartney, Rt Hon W. G. Ellison
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Macdonald, John Dimming
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.)
Bell, Richard
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Malley, William
Boland, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
O'Mara, James
Boyle, James
Joyce, Michael

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Broadhurst, Henry
Leamy, Edmund
O'Shee, James John
Burns, John
Lundon, W.
Partington, Oswald
Caldwell, James
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Reddy, M.
Clancy, John Joseph
M'Fadden Edward
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Govern, T.
Redmond, Wm. (Clare)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Kenna, Reginald
Roche, John
Crean, Eugene
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Scott, Charles P. (Leigh)
Cullinan, J.
Moss, Samuel
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Daly, James
Murnaghan, George
Sullivan, Donal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Delany, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Thomas, J A (Gl'morgan, Gower
Dillon, John
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n N.
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Duffy, William J.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)

Field, William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Whiteley, George (Yorks, W. R.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Gilhooly, James
O'Doherty, William
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Harwood, George
O'Dowd, John
Question put accordingly, "That the I Bill be now read a second time."
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Arrol, Sir William
Balfour. Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
The House divided:;Ayes, 183;. Noes, 59. (Division List No. 460.)
Balfour, Capt, C. B. (Hornsey)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Plummer, Walter R.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Harwood, George
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Pretymann, Ernest George
Bell, Richard
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Heaton, John Henniker
Purvis, Robert

Bignold, Arthur
Helme, Norval Watson
Pym, C. Guy
Bigwood, James
Higginbottom, S. W.
Randles, John S.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Hogg, Lindsay
Reid, James (Greenock)
Broadhurst, Henry
Holland, William Henry
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Bull, William James
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Rentoul, James Alexander
Burns, John
Horniman, Frederick John
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Caldwell, James
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Rigg, Richard
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hoult, Joseph
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Houston, Robert Paterson
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Gayzer, Sir Charles William
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Round, James
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Rutherford, John
Chapman, Edward
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Charrington, Spencer
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Coghill, Douglas Harry

Keswick, William
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Law, Andrew Bonar
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lawson, John Grant
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Colston, Chas Edw. H. Athole
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)
Smith, A. H. (Hertford, East)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside)
Cranborne, Viscount
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Spear, John Ward
Dickson, Charles Scott
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Stanley, E. J. (Somerset)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Strachey, Edward
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf. Univ.
Duke, Henry Edward
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Tennant, Harold John
Dyke. Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.

Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Macdona, John Cumming
Thornton, Percy M.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Tomlinson, W. E. Murray
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
M'Calmont Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
M'Killop, J. (Stirlingshire)
Valentia, Viscount
Fisher, William Hayes
Majendie, James A. H.
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H. (Sheffield
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Mitchell, William
White, Luke (Yorks, E. R.)
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Whiteley, George (Yorks, W. R.
Gardner, Ernest
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-un.-Lyne
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Moss, Samuel
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)

Grant, Corrie
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Groves, James Grimble
Parkes, Ebenezer
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Partington, Oswald
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Hambro, Charles Eric
Pemberton, John S. G.
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Pierpoint, Robert
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Hardy, L. (Kent. Ashford)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Crean, Eugene
Flynn, James Christopher
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Cullinan, J.
Gilhooly, James
Boland, John
Daly, James
Hammond, John
Boyle, James
Delany, William
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Dillon, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Channing, Francis Allston
Doogan, P. C.
Healy, Timothy Michael
Clancy, John Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Joyce, Michael
Cogan, Denis J.

Field, William
Leamy, Edmund
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Lundon, W.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Reddy, M.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
O'Doherty, William
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
M'Fadden, Edward
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Redmond, William (Clare)
M'Govern, T.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Roche, John
Murnaghan, George
O'Dowd, John
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Murphy, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Sullivan, Donal
Nannetti, Joseph P.
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Thompson, Dr E C Monagh'n, N
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
O'Malley, William
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
O'Mara, James
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Capt. Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
O'Shee, James John
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Power, Patrick Joseph

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) stated that there were some points on which he and those with whom he was acting were beaten in Committee, and they were quite prepared to accept the decisions of the Committee in most cases where they were beaten, provided that the same principle was observed in other directions when proposals were defeated in Committee. It would be very

unfair, however, that they should not be allowed to re-open points, if all the points in which they succeeded in carrying the judgment of the Committee were to be again reviewed. He begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 5, line 12, to leave out from the word 'class' to the word 'factories,' in line 14, inclusive.";(Sir Charles Dilke.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon) said it was quite impossible for him to give the right hon. Baronet a general undertaking that the points on which he and those with whom he was associated succeeded in Committee would be accepted now by the House. There were one or two points with which he would be bound to ask the House to disagree.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he did not expect any general undertaking on the matter. He was glad to hear that there were only one or two points on which the House would be asked to disagree with the decisions of the Committee. He begged leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. TEXNANT (Berwickshire), in moving the next Amendment, quoted from the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories to show that the lady inspectors specially desired that the Secretary of State should have the power referred to.

Amendment proposed;

"In Clause 9, page 6, line 5, at end to insert, '(2) The Secretary of State shall, by special order, determine what is sufficient and suitable accommodation within the meaning of this section.'";(Mr. Tennant.)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put and agreed to.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE moved an Amendment on Clause 12, in order to give greater safety to persons working; near machinery in motion. The Committee had substituted eighteen inches for twelve inches. He did not see that this was a necessary change, and, while he did not wish to divide the House, he begged to move the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,;

"In page 7, line 24, to leave out the word 'eighteen,' and insert the word 'twelve.'";(Sir Charles Dilke.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'eighteen' stand part of the Bill.

*MR. RITCHIE said the right hon. Baronet placed him in an awkward position. He refrained from taking positive action in regard to a matter with which he was not content on the understanding that the proposal he now made would be accepted. He really wished the right hon. Baronet would allow the House to decide. In the original Bill the word was "twelve," but it was altered to eighteen because the argument was largely used on both sides that there was a portion of the frames of the machines included in the twelve inches which ought not to be included. It was stated that if the word "eighteen" were inserted in the Bill the work could be done without increasing the danger of the people engaged at the machines. Of course, if the right hon. Baronet moved the Amendment he would vote for "eighteen."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said twelve was the space recommended by the factories inspector. He would not press the matter to a division.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE moved the insertion of words in Clause 13 for the purpose of giving to young persons protection against accidents in certain circumstances where he considered they were not properly protected. He would not divide the House on this Amendment, but he called attention to the matter in order that they might know what they were doing.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 8, line 8, after the word 'child,' to insert the words 'or young person.'";(Sir Charles Dilke.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he would not press the Amendment, which was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) moved an Amendment on Clause 13, modifying the provision which makes it illegal for any young person to clean under any portion of machinery in motion. He pointed out that machinery was in many instances so constructed that one part moved while another part did not.

Operatives were agreed that there would be a great deal of hardship if cleaning was not allowed under large portions of the machines which did not move, and in connection with which there was no danger whatever.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 8, line 14, after the word 'power,' to insert the words, 'provided that the Secretary of State may, by special order, except any part of the machinery in a textile factory or any place under such machinery from the provisions of this sub-section.'";(Mr. Harwood.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. RITCHIE said the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment had only told the House what he proposed to do in regard to machinery which was not in motion. He had omitted to state that he proposed also to allow the cleaning of machinery in motion. Under the Bill there was no alteration of the law in regard to this point. The hon. Gentleman proposed to repeal what had been the law since 1895, or previous to that;he was not sure;and to allow the cleaning of moving machinery with the sanction of the Secretary of State. He was not desirous that the Secretary of State should be burdened with that responsibility. The Committee carefully considered this matter, and decided to retain the provision which the hon. Gentleman wished to repeal.

MR. HARWOOD: The law is broken.

*MR. RITCHIE: It is an undesirable thing that the law should be broken.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford) said it was of importance that means of exit should be provided, but he thought the clause would be somewhat marred and an injustice would be done to owners if Sub-section 7 were retained in the Bill. If a man built a factory and spent money in making a large portion of it fire-proof to enable workpeople to get out of that special place where they were employed, he thought the occupier of that section of the factory should be equally as

responsible as the owner in seeing that the means of exit were not barred by the placing of things on the staircase, and that he should be equally responsible to the factory inspector in case they did not comply with the Act. This was an admirable Bill, but he feared that in many cases there would be injustice, and, if he might say so, anomalies and hardships, on various tenants who worked under its provisions. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would consider the point, and that he would amend the clause so that the actual occupiers of fire-proof factories would be equally responsible with the owners.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 10, line 5, to leave out Sub-section (7) of Clause 14.";(Mr. Louis Sinclair.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*MR. RITCHIE said it would be impossible to place on individual tenants a responsibility which must rest on the owner.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. TOMLINSON (Preston) said a good deal of apprehension existed in regard to buildings not commenced before the commencement of the Act. It would be very unfair to put existing factories at the mercy of some of the bye-laws which might be adopted. Supposing the bye-laws insisted upon every factory providing an outside staircase for use in case of fire, in the case of some buildings it would be almost impossible to carry out this provision without buying the adjoining property. He thought that some opportunity should be given of the owner being heard against what might be arbitrary requirements.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 10, line 20, after the word 'workshop,' to insert the words 'the construction or rebuilding of which was not commenced before the commencement of this Act.'";(Mr. Tomlinson.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. RITCHIE: I am sure my hon. friend will admit that whether a fire takes place in old or new buildings there ought to be some escape for the people inside those buildings. No doubt it would be a hardship if the local authorities were to make bye-laws involving great structural alterations in old buildings. There is, however, sufficient protection against action of this kind, because it is assumed that the local authority would be reasonable, and the Local Government Board, who have to confirm those bye-laws, would exercise some reasonable supervision over a matter of this kind. My hon. friend is mistaken in supposing that the local authorities are inclined to make bye-laws which would necessitate great structural alterations. Their bye-laws might provide in some cases for a moveable fire escape, which could easily be done. The one essential thing, however, is that in all factories there should be some means of escape.

*MR. TOMLINSON said that after these explanations he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he did not know whether it was possible to make the amendment he desired at this stage, or whether the Government would undertake to

make an alteration in another place. In order to give the right hon. Gentleman an opportunity of expressing his views upon the question he begged to move.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 11, line 17, after the word 'is,' to insert the words 'so constructed or.'";(Sir Charles Dilke.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. RITCHIE: I am not prepared to say whether there is anything in the particular point which the hon. Baronet has raised, but I will undertake to consider it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. RENSRAW (Renfrewshire, W.) said his object in moving this alteration was that there had always seemed to him

to be an enormous number of very trivial returns of accidents which could not be of any use to the office or any benefit to statisticians. The present law was that if any person was away for five hours in any one of the three days succeeding an accident, that accident had to be reported. A representative of the Home Office stated that as many as 80,000 accidents, under the provisions of the Factory Acts and the Mines Regulation Acts, were reported in one year. He remembered that upon one occasion they wanted particulars in regard to a certain class of accidents, but they were told that the great number of accidents sent in made it almost impossible to classify them. With the view of inviting the right hon. Gentleman to state his views upon this matter, he begged to move.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 12, line 2, to leave out from the word 'him,' to the word 'work,' in line 4, inclusive, in order to insert the words 'from being employed after the expiry of the three working days next after the occurrence of the accident.'";(Mr. Renshaw.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea): said he hoped that the Home Secretary would adhere to the words of the Bill, because the present standard of accidents had been in operation now for many years, and both inspectors and medical officers had adapted themselves to it. The present standard was recognised to be a reasonable one, and a great compliment had been paid to that standard, because several Continental Governments had adopted it as a basis of calculation. In those days when they wanted a common standard it would be a great mistake to alter the practice and do away with the excellent work in statistical matters which the Home Office had shown itself so capable of doing.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE pointed out that the word "accident" did not cover explosions, however violent, where there was no actual damage or injury done to the persons employed. It often happened that there were serious accidents occurred, such as the recent accident with a torpedo, in which nobody was hurt, and which were not reported in consequence. He thought the word "accident" ought to cover instances where explosions took place of a very dangerous nature, although no person was hurt.

*MR. RITCHIE: My hon. friend who moved this Amendment has referred to the clause

which was dropped in Committee. I admitted at the time that the law with regard to these accidents was not satisfactory, and I stated before that I should be very glad to see; and I hope that it may be my privilege to deal with it; some much more uniform system adopted. It would be better if we had some more uniform system of reporting accidents. There are accidents which occur in mines and quarries as to which there is no standard at all, and I am told that the present law is such that not more than one accident in ten is reported. This seems to me to call for an amendment of the law generally, and I think if we dealt with it partly by the clause in the Bill we might hamper ourselves when we had an opportunity of dealing with the matter more comprehensively. I hope my hon. friend will be content with the assurance that the matter is not likely to be lost sight of. Although I agree that the Amendment is a reasonable one, I would ask him not to press it, but to take my assurance that we hope to be able to deal with the matter in a more comprehensive way.

SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said there was evidence that many accidents happened in coal mines which did not cause loss of life or limb. The workpeople felt that those accidents ought to be reported, because, although perhaps no mischief might arise in any given case, a similar accident on another occasion might cause loss of life.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR said the object of the Amendment he desired to move was to prevent accidents being hushed up by employers, and to ensure that the onus should not rest entirely

on the occupiers. It was only reasonable that the person who employed labour should be the person to report injuries to workmen under his charge. It was absolutely necessary that he should give notice in order to prevent recurring accidents, because if notice of an accident was given it was to be hoped the inspector would have the cause thereof removed.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 12, line 6, after the word 'district,' to insert the words 'and such notice shall in all cases be given by the immediate employer of the injured person.'"; (Mr. Louis Sinclair.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. RITCHIE: This is an Amendment which cannot possibly be accepted. Under the existing law it is the occupier of the factory or workshop who is required to send in notice, and in my opinion it is essential to the working of the Factory Acts that that should continue to be so. If we were to adopt the proposal of my hon. friend it would mean in many factories that the workman who employed other people below him to do certain work would be the person responsible for reporting; a workman would have to make the report. I think the occupier ought to be the responsible person, and if you insert any other person you will greatly injure the working of the Acts.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR said that, if machinery was not kept in proper and effective order, injury might be caused to the people working it. It was therefore absolutely necessary that the responsibility for having effective machines

should lie upon the employer of labour, and that he should see that the place in which the machine was kept was fitted for the purpose. He begged to move the second part of the Amendment of which he had given notice.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 12, line 26, after the Word pounds,' to insert as a new sub-clause, '(6) in case of any defective machinery or construction in any building brought about either by decay or want of proper skilled attention, the person responsible shall be the immediate employer, and not the owner or occupier.'";(Mr. Louis Sinclair.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. RITCHIE: This is as bad as the other, if not worse. My hon. friend would now place on some subsidiary workman the responsibility for all the plant and machinery. That has only to be stated to show that it is quite impossible to accept the Amendment.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR disclaimed any such object.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. RENSRAW moved to omit the word "noon" in order to insert "one o'clock in the afternoon." This Amendment raised probably the most important question to be decided in the course of that night's proceedings. The proceedings in the Grand Committee on the day when this clause was amended were such as to warrant the House in reconsidering the decision then arrived at. The Committee had been sitting on Mondays and Thursdays, but, in order to get the Bill through, it was suggested the Committee should meet on Tuesday, 26th July. This was done, but unfortunately two other Committees, in which members interested in trade questions were concerned, were meeting at the same time, and a considerable number of members were prevented from attending the Grand Committee on Trade. Only about one-half of the members of the Committee were present, and the decision he now asked the House to reverse was arrived at by twenty-one votes against thirteen. Only half the members were present when the matter was under consideration, and the Amendment which the House was now asked to reconsider was only carried by a third of the members of the Grand Committee. It was represented, in the course of the short discussion which took place, by the hon. Member for Bolton, that there was considerable unanimity of opinion between employers and employed in Lancashire on the matter. But the petition he presented that day signed by 1,040 employers in Lancashire, representing an enormous number of spindles and looms, showed that that unanimity did not really exist. He would ask the House to consider whether in that matter it would be safe to take Lancashire as a guide for all the industries of the country, and whether it was right that a highly-prosperous trade carried on in one particular part of the country should be the criterion to be applied to all other trade and industries. Representations had been made to him and, he was sure, to many other hon. members showing how seriously particular trades would be affected by the Amendment which had been carried in the Grand Committee. He would refer particularly to the jute and flax trades. With reference to the jute trade, he had received a letter from one of the most important jute firms in Dundee; Messrs. Cox Brothers, Limited; of which the

following was an extract;

"You are doubtless aware that India as well as the Continent has been for many years in keen competition with Dundee in the jute trade. With abundance of cheap labour the double shift system and the absence of time limits our competitors have been and still are extending their plant and increasing their trade all over the world. Moreover, this Amendment has at least in Scotland been sprung upon manufacturers so suddenly as to preclude opportunity for consideration or discussion, and in the absence of any definite movement by textile employees in favour of fewer hours. As large employers of labour, and having the common interest at heart, we must emphatically protest against this rash and superficially conceived Amendment. When India and the Continent legislate to bring hours of labour in textile factories parallel with ours, it will be quite time enough to consider further progress. When Britain was the workshop of the world such experiments were safe; conditions are now so modified that they may prove fatal."

It might be urged that, after all, the difference made by the Amendment was a difference only of one hour a week; but that meant fifty-two hours a year, or practically a working week taken off the time in which a great industry was carried on, or a reduction of 2 per cent. in the productive capacity of the country. What was the particular time in which it was proposed to carry out a great change of that kind? The country had been called upon to respond, and had responded gladly, to an addition of something like twenty-five millions of taxation. Was that a desirable time in which to introduce such a provision? He would also appeal to the Government on another ground. The Amendment was carried in the Grand Committee as recently as the 26th of July, and was not in the Bill as it was introduced and considered by the manufacturers throughout the length and breadth of the country. The manufacturers had had no notice of the change whatever. It had been sprung on them during the holiday season, and he ventured to say that it was not a matter which ought to have been sprung on the country. They could not tamper lightly with a great industrial occupation, and he would appeal to the House to make it perfectly clear that an alteration of that kind could only be carried at the instance of a responsible Government, and after full, ample, and due notice had been given to the people interested.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 15, line 19, to leave out the word; 'noon,' and insert the words 'one o'clock in the afternoon.'"; (Mr. Renshaw).

Question proposed, "That the word 'noon' stand part of the Bill."

MR. HARWOOD said, as he had been responsible for the clause which had been inserted in the Grand Committee, he might be allowed to trouble the House with a few reasons as to why they should not go back on what the Committee had decided. As to the attendance at the Committee, he quite acknowledged that on that particular day, and on the vote on that particular Amendment, the number present was not quite equal to the average, although it was not very much lower. But he should like to remind the House, having gone into the matter, that the absent Members were about equally divided on the subject, and therefore he thought they

should turn rather to the merits of the question than to the particular incident of the division. The hon. Member for Renfrew stated that he had said that there was practical unanimity. He did not remember having said anything of the kind. What he did say was that he was quite sure that if the change were effected it would soon be accepted

with unanimity, and that he maintained. With reference to the petition, he happened to be present while it was being signed, and he could give the House some idea as to the value to be attached to it. As to springing the Amendment on the country, he would ask the House to excuse him if he dealt with that at some length. The alteration would directly affect nearly a million and a half operatives, and a large number of very important trades, and he agreed that the House should not adopt it in any hasty way. But if the House opened its eyes properly it would see that the change was fair and reasonable and ought to be made. No representations had been made to him with reference to the jute trade, but many hon. Members knew that in Lancashire it was a leading question at the last general election, and that it was discussed in Yorkshire in 1895, and was a burning question ever since. As to the general principle, the proposal was to cease work at twelve o'clock instead of at one o'clock. That would reduce the hours of work by one in fifty-six and a half. In the textile trades the hours of work had remained the same since 1874, but while the hours had remained the same it was undoubted that the intensity of labour had increased enormously. He was quite within the mark when he stated that the speed of machines was now 20 per cent. greater, and that the machines were much larger and more numerous than in 1874; and considering the increase in speed, the increase in the size of the machines, and the increase in their number, he was well within the mark when he stated that the productiveness of labour had increased 40 per cent. while the hours remained the same.

It was said that the sanitary and other conditions had improved, but the House should remember that there were essential conditions in the cotton trade which no change could affect. The temperature in which the cotton trade was carried on was from 80 degrees to 100 degrees, and was it unreasonable that the same conditions should be applied to that trade as to other trades, especially as for a quarter of a century there had been no reduction in the hours of work? During that period the engineers had reduced

their hours from fifty-eight to fifty-three, and if the change proposed were made the factory hours would still be fifty-five and a half. He was speaking for women and children. In his own constituency 19,500 women and children would be affected by the change. Therefore, were they to say that men who could look after themselves should have a reduction of hours, but that helpless women and children should have no reduction?

What would be the effect on the trade? Would it be said that that trade alone could not afford any reduction whatever in the hours? Everyone knew that the working classes, when they were asked whether they would take out their share of the prosperity of an industry in higher wages or shorter hours, had invariably decided in favour of shorter hours. The employees in the cotton industry now asked in all humility for a reduction in the hours after a period of twenty-

seven years, during which the strain and intensity of their work had greatly increased. There were particular reasons why a change was called for in the reduction of hours on Saturday. What was the position at present in many towns? The bulk of the men and boys worked in machine and engineering shops, while the women and girls worked in factories. Every machine and every engineering shop in Lancashire closed at 12 o'clock on Saturdays. The men insisted on that, and got it a long time ago. What was the effect on the home life? The men and boys returned at 12 o'clock, and the women and children at 1 o'clock. Could it not be easily understood what was happening to the Saturday dinner and to the home life on that particular day? That was a grievance which was felt every week. The movement to remove it started not from the top, but from the bottom, and it would go on, because it was a grievance which burned into the home life of the people every week. It should be remembered also that on Saturday in factories the period of employment between breakfast and stoppage was half an hour longer than on any other day of the week, and that four and a half hours, instead of four, were worked. Not only that, but the work was hardest on that day, as the cleaning had to be done, and consequently the women had to work hardest in the factories on the very day on which their home work was hardest also. As to the reduction of 2 per cent. in productive capacity, put as the hon. Member put it, it seemed to be that way, but it was not so at all. It was not giving one hour out of fifty-six and a half, it was giving the worst hour of the whole week, the hour in which the employees worked in the slackest way. The change proposed would not cause a reduction of 2 per cent., nor a reduction of 1 per cent., and he ventured to say that in twelve months there would be no reduction at all. What was the result of our experience in the past? The last reduction in 1874 was three and a half hours, the previous reduction to that was also three and a half hours, but the quality of the labour increased more than the quantity diminished, and he had statistics which showed that in two years time there was practically no reduction whatever. Speaking on behalf of the operatives, he said they were quite prepared to give up their share of their wages if there was going to be any loss. If there was to be a reduction of one-fifty-sixth, there would be a reduction of one-fifty-sixth in wages, and the operatives; 90 per cent. of whom were paid by the piece; were quite prepared to give up any proportion of their wages which the reduction of hours might involve. At the same time they were quite sure that ultimately there would be no loss at all to them or to their employers. Therefore it was unreasonable to resist the change. It was said that factories could not work overtime; but the engineers would not work after twelve o'clock on Saturday. It was true that the factories did not work overtime, but the total time worked in factories was longer than the total time worked in the engineers' shops, even with overtime. The engineers so much valued stopping at 12 o'clock on Saturday that nothing would induce them to work overtime on that day. His own interest was entirely wrapped up in the trade but he was not so chicken-hearted as to listen to a Jeremiah. They were told of foreign competition, but foreign competition was of two kinds. There was the foreign competition of States which did not mean to receive our products at any price, and no alteration in the cost of production

would make the slightest difference as to that. When he heard melancholy statements about foreign competition in the cotton trade, he would say that where we had a free field our pre-eminence was as undoubted as ever it was. In India, and in all other countries where we could meet our competitors on equal terms, we were easily first. It was said that we now produced comparatively a small proportion of production, but positively we produced a great deal more than ever we did; and foreign competition had only taken from us certain countries which were determined to produce for themselves. It was absurd to suggest that a change of this kind would upset the commercial stability of the country. Might he appeal on another point? Parliament had taken under its care the textile trades. Why? Because Parliament said that it should look after those trades in order to protect the women and children. What was that protection worth if the result was that those trades were the only trades in which there had been no reduction of hours for a quarter of a century? Would not those trades very much question the advantage of parliamentary protection if they did not get what they certainly would have got had they not been a parliamentary trade? The question was a domestic question of the greatest importance. It was also a question of the physical condition of the people. It was not an easy thing for a Member to question in the House the physical pre-eminence of, his constituents, but everyone who knew the inhabitants of the cotton districts knew that they were physically inferior to the general population of the country. He believed that that was due to the strain put upon them and their forefathers, and he believed that the change now proposed would remove that strain on the day on which it was most intense, and give the people an opportunity of developing their physical condition. He believed it would also improve the supply of labour. In the cotton trade there was a great deficiency of boys. They all went into the engineering trade because the conditions were more favourable. He believed that the masters would benefit by having a larger supply of labour, and that that labour would be of a better quality. He begged the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary to associate his name with a change which would not do any harm whatever, and which would be an enormous boon to thousands.

*MR. JAMES KENYON (Lancashire, Bury) said he desired to associate himself with the hon. Member for Bolton in his remarks. In the textile factories, three-fourths of the workers were women and young persons, and it was a very serious matter in the home life of those people that they should have the confusion which resulted from their not being able to be at home at the same hour as other members of their families on Saturdays. The hon. Member for Bolton mentioned the engineers, but there were also the building trades; stonemasons, bricklayers, and their labourers; who stopped work at twelve o'clock, and therefore the families of those men were just as much interested as the engineers. Surely the working people of the country, having regard to the pressure under which they had been working for the last few years, deserved that additional hour on Saturdays. He believed it would be most beneficial to their health, as it would give them an opportunity of getting a holiday. In winter they had only about two hours on Saturdays before it was dark, and the additional hour would therefore be of very

considerable benefit to them. There had been very considerable talk as to whether the cotton trade, could afford it. He had taken great interest in that trade, and during the years 1899 and 1900 twenty-two mills were put up in South-east Lancashire, not old-fashioned mills, but enormous concerns, with a working capital of over three millions. He begged to submit to the House that expenditure of that kind certainly did not show that the cotton trade was a decaying industry. When the workpeople saw new mills being put up in different parts of the country, they naturally concluded that the trade was prosperous, and they petitioned for one hour additional on Saturday as their fair share of that prosperity. With reference to the petition that had been presented, he knew some of the people who had the getting up of it, and one or two of them did not work at all on Saturday. They stopped on Friday night. He might point to the result of

the Spinners' Combination, the chairman and vice-chairman of which were members of the House. Although adverse opinions were freely expressed by Jeremiahs at the time, ever since that great combination was formed, the shares, which had been issued at 20s., had been selling at 40s., and they were now about 36s. or 37s. He had pleasure in supporting the hon. Member for Bolton in the matter. He did not believe that the extra hour's holiday on Saturday would detrimentally affect the trade at all, but he believed it would be a boon and a blessing to the workpeople, and he thought the extra work which they would be able to do during the week would make up for any deficit which might take place.

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) said that some derogatory remarks had been made with reference to the petition which he had presented that afternoon, but there was no doubt that it was signed by 1,040 firms, many of them having 2,000 spindles and others over 3,000 spindles. It was all very well for hon.

Members to shower contempt on a petition of that kind, but it was signed by, perhaps, all the greatest firms, and the great majority of all the firms in Lancashire. That was a strong indication of what the manufacturers thought of the proposal. It was all very well to entirely ignore the manufacturers, but who were the best judges as to whether the large factories would or would not be able to withstand competition? The manufacturers were the generals of industry, and they stood between the workpeople and their being able to get their weekly wages or not. They had conducted their business so that they had been able to provide wages for their workpeople, and in many respects the manufacturers and the workpeople were bound together in bonds of friendship and bonds of material welfare. The matter affected those two sets of people, and did not affect to any great extent anyone else. A large number of the manufacturers said that they were afraid that if this automatic rule as to twelve o'clock on Saturdays was made, it would seriously affect their prosperity, and then the prosperity of the workpeople would also be affected. That was

the question they had to consider. The manufacturers risked their money, and directed their operations against foreign competitors, and it was on the successful direction of those operations that the wages of the operatives depended. It was a very serious thing to say that a certain set of operatives in a certain trade should stop at twelve o'clock instead of at one o'clock. If

regulations of hours were to be made, they ought to be made, as far as possible, by common agreement between employer and employed, and not by law. What the manufacturers felt was that there ought to be some elasticity. If restrictions were put upon labour in prosperous times it might be very little felt; but what the manufacturers said was that they did not want any restrictions to which elasticity could not be applied, so that if times of great depression came, as no doubt they would, then the hours might be lengthened, not only in the interests of the workpeople themselves, but in the interests of the industrial supremacy of the country. With reference to the reduction of hours, it was far better that there should not be any reduction with regard to time, but that the number of hours of work of women and young persons should be limited to a certain number per week. Elasticity was wanted in every way in which it could be given. The great number of holidays now taken in the course of the year was not referred to. He believed it was a fact that operatives in Manchester in the textile trade took altogether something like two weeks in the course of the year. The hon. Member for Bolton spoke of foreign competition in a very jaunty way. He said that if the manufacturers were given a fair field they would be afraid of nothing. Given a fair field the English manufacturer was afraid of nothing; but was there a fair field? It was perfectly certain that in many countries there was not. America poured her goods into England, and last year only £7,000,000 of all kinds went back. Manufacturers who used to send thousands and thousands of pounds worth of goods to America did not now send sixpennyworth. The same applied to Germany. A large amount of English manufactured goods used to be sent to Germany, but the quantity was now restricted, and many firms did not now export to that country at all. Yet those two countries were able to dump down their goods in England, while English manufacturers were not able to compete with them in their home markets. The same applied to Belgium, France, Austria, and Russia; and therefore he could not join in the view of the hon. Member for Bolton with regard to the future of English trade. There was a cloud coming over it, and it would require all the experience, pluck, and capital of the British manufacturer to meet the trouble which was lying in front. The House should not interfere with an important industry in the manner proposed, against the opinion and wishes, not only of the manufacturers of Lancashire, but of the manufacturers of the north of Ireland and Scotland as well. He thought it would have been far better and wiser to have left the matter entirely alone. It was true, as his hon. friend stated, that a great many Members who took a very strong interest in the matter were absent from the Grand Committee. One of the members of the Committee referred repeatedly to "we." That was the hon. Member for Berwickshire, and an Irish member asked whom "we" meant.

*MR. TENNANT said that on the occasion when the question was asked "we" meant his right hon. friend the Member for Forest of Dean, who was sitting next to him, and himself, and they were speaking at the moment for the textile trade of Yorkshire.

COLONEL PILKINGTON said that, unfortunately, the power of "we" was felt with full force, and Members who thought differently were absent. It should also be

remembered that the manufacturers read the Bill as it had been introduced, and that they had no notice of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bolton. He trusted, therefore, the Government would resist the change. It was unfair to manufacturers that they should have Amendments of this sort sprung upon them unexpectedly, and he trusted the House would treat that class with the consideration which every Member in his heart desired.

MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said he could not agree with the hon. Member for Renfrewshire that the decision of the Grand Committee had been come to without sufficient discussion or that the majority was not a considerable one, while an examination of the names of the members who were absent on that occasion would show that there were among them as many in favour of the change to noon as there were against. The question was certainly not new to any Member who contested a seat in Lancashire at the last election; in fact, it was almost a test question. The operatives in Lancashire and Yorkshire were practically unanimous in their support of the change, believing it would conduce greatly to their comfort and benefit. These people had as perfect a right to their recreation as had those Members of the House who had disappeared to go grouse shooting in Scotland, and this single hour added to their Saturday afternoon would be a very valuable addition. He admitted there would be a slight loss in production, but he did not think that should be set against the improvement which would follow in the social amenities of the working classes. The loss of production would, he thought, not be quite as much as 2 per cent., but the fact that the wages of the operatives, who were asking for this reduction, would be reduced pro tanto, seeing that they were almost all pieceworkers, proved the genuineness of the demand. He admitted that foreign competition was no bogey, but the question of whether or not we kept our textile trade did not depend on this last most laborious hour. More than a quarter of a century had passed since the last reduction of hours. Meanwhile other trades had had their hours reduced, and it was not to be supposed that the textile workers would be content to remain as they were. Foreign competition would be met not by long hours, but by better methods, more science, and greater enterprise. The hon. Member for Newton had said that this was a matter not for legislation, but for mutual agreement between employers and employed. If such an agreement were likely to be arrived at that would be very well, but the employers class feared any reduction of hours whatever. The only other method by which workpeople could obtain a reduction was by means of a strike. It was difficult to believe that the employers could imagine that the result of a strike, even if they were successful, would be any gain to them during the next ten or twenty years, as compared with a peaceful settlement by legislation on the lines here proposed. He hoped the Home Secretary would allow the opinion of the House to be freely expressed, and that hon. Gentlemen on both sides would agree to give this boon to a large and deserving class.

*MR. RITCHIE: I do not imagine that any arguments either for or against this proposal are likely to alter the decision at which most Members have arrived as to the way in which they should vote on this question. I hope, therefore, it will not be necessary greatly to prolong the discussion on the Amendment, which,

of course, is a very important one. There are a few considerations I wish to place before the House. I do not think anyone can complain at the House being asked to give a decision upon a question which came before the Grand Committee, and which was there decided against the views I then expressed. It is quite true the circumstances were somewhat peculiar. The day on which this decision was arrived at was not the usual day of meeting, and there were other Committees sitting, upon which many Members were specially engaged. It is not surprising, having regard to the importance attached to this question by those particularly interested; namely, the textile manufacturers, not of Lancashire and Yorkshire only, but throughout the country; that they should ask the House to revise the decision arrived at by the Committee. No doubt the cotton trade of Lancashire has of late been in a prosperous condition, and what may now be very lightly looked upon might be a much more serious matter if a condition of things arose such as that which existed some years ago when a great number of spindles were standing for want of work. Reference has been made to 2 per cent. being a somewhat insignificant figure. If it is true that this alteration would make a difference of 2 per cent.; and it is generally admitted it would be about that figure; it is not an insignificant amount at all, and I have known times when, in manufacturing operations, 2 per cent. made all the difference between standing and going on. It is naturally, therefore, under certain conditions of trade, a serious consideration. It has been admitted by the representatives of the workmen that this change if carried into operation would mean something like £120,000 or £130,000 a year in the cotton industry alone. We, therefore, cannot be surprised that the manufacturers should desire the House to express an opinion on the question, bearing in mind, also, the fact that they had no reason to expect that this matter would arise in connection with this Bill. They naturally supposed if there was to be any rearrangement of hours in connection with factories and workshops it would have formed part of the original Bill. I think they are justified in saying the matter has taken them by surprise, so that they are now only just beginning to raise their voices and to show the hardship this change would inflict upon them. What is the argument used in favour of the change? Is it that the women and young persons are overworked on Saturday? Surely it cannot be contended that to keep open the factories until one o'clock is a hardship upon the workers? It cannot be contended that there is not a good half-holiday after work ceases? But it is not really contended that this change is advocated altogether in the interests of women and young people. Certain pastimes are very popular in Lancashire and Yorkshire on Saturdays, and I think I am using a phrase which is in everybody's mouth when I say that there is really a "football stop."

MR. HARWOOD: Is not the manner in which the working classes use their leisure their own business?

*MR. RITCHIE: I do not in the least dispute that. I am simply saying that this has been called a "football stop," and that it is more from that point of view than of women and young persons being overworked that the alteration is advocated. But this is much more than a Lancashire and Yorkshire question. I can quite understand that both employers and employed in many of our other

manufacturing districts resent having to close their factories because this earlier closing is desired in Lancashire, and partially in Yorkshire. It must be remembered that it is rather a serious question for all piece-workers in textile factories throughout the country that they should, by enactment, be called on to earn an hour's wages less per week, simply because in certain districts this change is advocated. The matter must be regarded from the point of view, not of Lancashire only, but of its effect upon the whole textile industry of the country. It is stated that in Lancashire operatives and employers are practically agreed on this question. If that is so, why can they not come to an arrangement by which their factories could be closed an hour earlier? I am told that there are a considerable number of factories in Lancashire and Yorkshire which do so close, and I should have thought, seeing that this is a change keenly demanded in one particular portion of the country, and not asked for at all in others, that it was a matter much more for voluntary arrangement than for legislative enactment.

These are the views I placed before the Committee when the matter was there considered, and I do not know that I can add anything to them. I regard the decision at which the House is asked to arrive as a somewhat serious one in the interests of the trade of the country, and I earnestly trust, having regard to the large area which will come under the operation of the Act, that a demand coming from one section only of the manufacturing industry will not commend itself to the House as being one to be dealt with by legislative enactment. On these grounds I ask the House not to agree to the decision arrived at by the Committee, but to restore the Bill to its original condition.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH (Manchester, N.W.) regretted the Home Secretary was not more sympathetically inclined towards the proposed change, and he thought the right hon. Gentleman hardly understood the real position. If this had been merely a question of the reduction of hours in the textile industry, although there were many arguments in favour of such a reduction, he should not have been obliged, as he

now was, to go against the right hon. Gentleman. This hour on Saturday, however, was a special question. It was not right to say that Lancashire was unanimous on the matter. This was a unanimous demand from the operatives, and he could not conceive how any operatives, not only in Lancashire and Yorkshire, but throughout the country, could do otherwise than support the alteration. The demand was really that the operatives might have the benefit of the Saturday half-holiday. He could not understand the Home Secretary taking such a serious view of the loss that would be caused by the reduction of this hour. In the textile trade Saturday was a broken day at best, and his own impression was that if this hour was conceded the production on Saturday would probably be even more than at present; he was certain it would if only the leaders of the operatives would help the manufacturers in the matter. A voluntary arrangement had been suggested, but those who made the suggestion apparently forgot that the main objection of the manufacturers who had signed the petition which had been presented was that a voluntary arrangement worked so unjustly between the manufacturers who paid attention to the wishes of their workpeople and those who

were more harsh and careless in the treatment of their employees. He believed the opposition was to a great extent half-hearted. Whenever the operatives asked for a concession the manufacturers thought they ought to oppose it, even though they did not consider it an unreasonable or dangerous change; they usually appeared to be much

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)

Cawley, Frederick

Elibank, Master of

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Channing, Francis Allston

Emmott, Alfred

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc. Stroud)

Clancy, John Joseph

Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone)

Ambrose, Robert

Clare, Octavius Leigh

Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Cogan, Denis J.

Field, William

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Colville, John

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Flannery, Sir Fortescue

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Crean, Eugene

Flavin, Michael Joseph

Bell, Richard

Crombie, John William

Flynn, James Christopher

Bignold, Arthur

Cullinan, J.

Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry

Boland, John

Daly, James

Gardner, Ernest

Boyle, James

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Gilhooly, James

Broadhurst, Henry

Delany, William
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Burns, John
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'mlets
Caldwell, James
Dillon, John
Grant, Corrie
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Doogan, P. C.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Duffy, William J.
Groves, James Grimble

more militant than they really were. If the change were made he believed things would settle down, and in twelve months they would scarcely know there had been any alteration whatever. During the last few years much had been done to provide opportunities for the rest and recreation of the working classes, and the operatives should be enabled to take advantage of the opportunities which had been provided. In many cases this hour would make all the difference between a full Saturday afternoon and only half the afternoon; it would be a great boon to the working classes, and only a small concession on the part of the employers. Under those circumstances he had no hesitation in supporting this change in the hours of labour, because he thought it would be a great advantage to the working classes. This was a boon which the working classes had set their hearts upon, and he thought employers would be well advised not to oppose this proposal, even if they thought they would be successful in throwing it out. He had every reason to believe that this small concession by employers, which would be felt as a great boon to the working classes, would go far to stave off a much more serious question which was in the air; that of a reduction of hours all round of a very drastic nature. He had had the honour of presiding at a conference between employers and operatives, and the view he had just expressed was put forward very strongly.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 163; Noes, 141. (Division List No. 461.)

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Moss, Samuel
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Murnaghan, George
Rutherford, John
Hammond, John
Murphy, John

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sadler, Col. S. Alexander
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Hayden, John Patrick
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. T. Myles
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Norman, Henry
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Spear, John Ward
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
Holland, William Henry
O'Doherty, William
Strachey, Edward
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Sullivan, Donal
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley
O'Dowd, John
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Tennant, Harold John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William
Thompson, Dr E C (Monaghan N

Lambton, Hon. Fred. Wm.
O'Mara, James
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks. W.R.)
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Shee, James John
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Leamy, Edmund
Partington, Oswald
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Paulton, James Mellor
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Peel, Hon. Wm. R. Wellesley
White, Luke (Yorks. E.R.)
Lough, Thomas
Pemberton, John S. G.
White, Patrick (Meath, North
London, W.
Pierpoint, Robert
Whiteley, George (Yorks. W.R.)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
M'Fadden, Edward
Randles, John S.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
M'Govern, T.
Reddy, M.
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Redmond, William (Clare)
Mather, William
Rickett, J. Compton

TELLERS FOR THE AYES;Mr. James Kenyon and Mr. Harwood.

Mitchell, William

Rigg, Richard

Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)

Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)

Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)

Roche, John

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Dickson, Charles Scott

Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Dorington, Sir John Edward

Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Hudson, George Biekersteth

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Johnston, William (Belfast)

Arrol, Sir William

Duke, Henry Edward

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Keswick, William

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart

Law, Andrew Bonar

Balcarres, Lord

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward

Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Lawson, John Grant

Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds

Fisher, William Hayes

Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham

Banbury, Frederick George

Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Bigwood, James
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gore, Hon S. F. Ormsby- (Line.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Brassey, Albert
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Bull, William James
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Macdona, John Cumming
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wor'c
Hambro, Charles Eric
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Chapman, Edward
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Maconochie, A. W.
Charrington, Spencer
Hanbury, Rt Hon. Robert Wm.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Cog hill, Douglas Harry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Harris, Frederick Leverton
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Majendie, James A. H.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Heaton, John Henniker
Milton, Viscount

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Henderson, Alexander
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Higginbottom, S. W.
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Cranborne, Viscount
Hogg, Lindsay
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Hoult, Joseph
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst'w
Cust, Henry John C.
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Rentoul, James Alexander
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Mount, William Arthur
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Thornton, Percy M.
Nicholson, William Graham
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Tollemache, Henry James
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Robertson, H. (Hackney)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Round, James
Valentia, Viscount
Parker, Gilbert
Saunderson, Rt. Hon. Col. E. J.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Parkes, Ebenezer
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Penn, John
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside

Purvis, Robert

Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Pym, C. Guy

Smith, Hon. W. E. D. (Strand)

Reid, James (Greenock)

Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)

Remnant, James Farquharson

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Renshaw, Charles Bine

Stirling- Maxwell, Sir John M.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) moved, "That this House do now adjourn"; but Mr.

SPEAKER, being of opinion that the motion was an abuse of the rules of the House, declined to propose the Question thereupon to the House.

MR. RENSHAW said that he desired to ascertain whether this change of hours was to apply to all the textile industries of the country, or only to those of Lancashire, and for that purpose he would move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 15, line 30, after the word 'whatever,' to insert the words, 'Provided that these hours shall apply to employment in a cotton spinning mill or cotton cloth factory only.'"; (Mr. Renshaw.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he wished to speak on this point because it was one which was brought before the Committee at the express wish of the woollen and worsted trades of the West Riding of Yorkshire. They had been told that this matter had been sprung upon the Committee and upon the country, but he would remind the House that he moved an Amendment on behalf of the woollen and worsted trades of the West Riding of Yorkshire in the year 1895. Ample notice had been given of the Amendment, which was first placed upon the Paper, and it had been fully discussed by every Chamber of Commerce throughout Yorkshire and Lancashire. The Member for Renfrewshire had told the House that this matter was only discussed in regard to the cotton industry, but in saying that the hon.

Member

could not have heard the admirable speech which had been just been delivered by the hon. Member for Manchester, who was himself one of the greatest cotton manufacturers in the world, and who spoke in the name of the textile industries generally. The matter had been discussed throughout the West Riding of Yorkshire, and although on several Chambers of Commerce a majority of the manufacturers were against the change, it was a majority of the kind which had been described by the hon. Baronet the Member for Manchester. There were four leading manufacturers in Yorkshire strongly in favour of the change, and one Chamber of Commerce had carried a resolution unanimously in its favour. There was just as strong a feeling in Yorkshire as in Lancashire regarding this change in the law, and it would be a monstrous thing, after the House had so clearly shown its feeling on the subject, to attempt to dissociate Lancashire and

Yorkshire.

*MR. RITCHIE: I think the House has given a very clear decision upon this matter, and I believe that in coming to this decision the House did not desire to confine itself to any one branch of the textile industry. As for the Government, we accept the decision as being applicable to the textile industry as a whole. (An IRISH MEMBER: Run away from your guns.) Under these circumstances, I appeal to my hon. friend not to press his Amendment. I know that he feels very strongly upon this point, especially in regard to textile manufacturers outside Lancashire, but having regard to the decision the House has just come to I do not think it would be wise to press this Amendment.

MR. T. M. HEALY: The right hon. Gentleman has shown great resignation, but not the sort of resignation we want.

MR. RENSCHAW: I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.
Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. TENNANT said he was encouraged to move his Amendment by the result of the division which had just taken place. He asked for a half holiday for the non-textile workers of the country, not beginning at twelve or even at one o'clock, but at two o'clock. What sort of an afternoon off was a holiday which only began at four o'clock? His hon. friend the Member for Bolton made an appeal on behalf of the textile workers because they were employed on Saturdays for a longer spell than usual, a spell of four and a half hours, but the workpeople he was now appealing for were compelled to work for a spell of five hours at a time every day. This was a question which deserved more sympathy than the question which they had just been discussing. The people he was pleading for had no unions, and were a lowly and inarticulate class, whereas those people whom they had just given longer holidays to were the very aristocracy of labour. They had spoken about high pressure of work being applied, but the class he was now pleading for wore a class to whom the highest pressure of all had been applied, namely, sweating. He was pleading for the dressmakers and others of that class who were employed for a great

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Crossley, Sir Savile

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Brassey, Albert

Cust, Henry John C.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bull, William James

Davenport, William Bromley-

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire

Dickson, Charles Scott

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Cawley, Frederick

Dorington, Sir John Edward

Arrol, Sir William
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Duke, Henry Edward
Balcarres, Lord
Chapman, Edward
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Charrington, Spencer
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Har
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G.W. (Leeds)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Banbury, Frederick George
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Fisher, William Hayes
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Colston, Charles Edw. H Athole
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Bignold, Arthur
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Bigwood, James
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S W
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Cranborne, Viscount
Gardner, Ernest

number of hours at a time. He sincerely trusted that the House would agree to this Amendment.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 17, line 12, to leave out from the word 'afternoon,' to the word

'afternoon,' in line 15, inclusive.";(Mr. Tennant.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*MR. RITCHIE: This Amendment was rejected in Committee;

MR. TENNANT: Yes, by three votes.

*MR. RITCHIE: This Amendment stands in a totally different position to the Amendment which has just been accepted. With regard to the other Amendment, there has been a very strong agitation, but with regard to this proposal no such agitation has been raised.

MR. TENNANT: No, because they are not organised, and cannot express themselves.

*MR. RITCHIE: I am rather surprised to hear they are not in a position to express their views. We have no evidence that this demand is approved of by a large section of the population, and I hope the House will not accept this Amendment.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 176; Noes, 127. (Division List No. 462.)

Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.

Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Rentoul, James Alexander

Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn

Lowther, Rt Hn J. W. (Cum, Pen

Ridley. Hn M. W. (Stalybridge)

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas Thomson

Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Line.)

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth

Round, James

Goschen, Hon. George J.

Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Macdona, John dimming

Rutherford, John

Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury

Maclver, David (Liverpool)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)

Maconochie, A. W.

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Groves, James Grimble

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos Myles

Hambro, Charles Eric
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd.)
Majendie, James A. H.
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Milton, Viscount
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Mitchell, William
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Moore, Wm. (Antrim, N.)
Smith, H. C (North'mb, T'neside
Heaton, John Henniker
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Henderson, Alexander
Morgan, David. J (Walthamstow
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Higginbottom, S. W.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Spear, John Ward
Hogg, Lindsay
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Hope, J. F. (Sh'effield, Brightsd.
Mount, William Arthur
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Stirling-Max well, Sir John M.
Hoult, Joseph
Nicholson, William Graham
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J G (Oxf'd Univ.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Thornton, Percy M.
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil

Parker, Gilbert
Tollemache, Henry James
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Parkes, Ebenezer
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Pemberton, John S. G.
Valentia, Viscount
Keswick, William
Penn, John
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Walker, Col. William Hall
Law, Andrew Bonar
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth
Plummer, Walter R.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Lawson, John Grant
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wills, Sir Frederick
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Pryce-Jones, Lt. Col. Edward
Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Purvis, Robert
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Randles, John S.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Reid, James (Greenock)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Remnant, James Farquharson
Sir William Walrond and
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Mr. Anstruther.

NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Emmott, Alfred
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc. Stroud)
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidst'ne
Lough, Thomas
Ambrose, Robert
Field, William
Lundon, W.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Flynn, James Christopher
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
Bell, Richard
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
M'Fadden, Edward
Boland, John
Gilhooly, James
M'Govern, T.
Boyle, James
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
M'Kenna, Reginald
Burns, John
Grant, Corrie
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Caldwell, James
Griffith, Ellis J.
Mather, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Haldane, Richard Bunion
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Hammond, John
Moss, Samuel
Channing, Francis Allston
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Murnaghan, George

Clancy, John Joseph
Harms worth, R. Leicester
Murphy, John
Cogan, Denis J.
Hayden, John Patrick
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Colville, John
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas. Seale-
Nolan, Col. John P (Galway, N.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Crean, Eugene
Healy, Timothy Michael
Norman, Henry
Crombie, John William
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md
Cullinan, J.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Daly, James
Holland, William Henry
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Delany, William
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Doherty, William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Jones, David Brynm'r (Swans'a
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Dillon, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Joyce, Michael
O'Dowd, John
Doogan, P. C.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Duffy, William J.
Leamy, Edmund
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Elibank, Master of

Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
O'Malley, William
O'Mara, James
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
White, Luke (Yorks. E. R.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
O'Shee, James John
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.
Whiteley, George (Yorks. W. R.
Partington, Oswald
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Paulton, James Mellor
Strachey, Edward
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Power, Patrick Joseph
Sullivan, Donal
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Reddy, M.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Thomas, J A (Glamorg'n, Gower
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf d
Redmond, Wm. (Clare)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Rickett, J. Compton
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks. W. R.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Rigg, Richard
Trevetyan, Charles Philips
Mr. Tennant and Mr. Broadhurst.
Roche, John
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.

MR. RENSRAW said the result of the Sub-section (4) as carried in Committee would be to prevent any woman or young person being employed outside the regular hours of a factory or workshop, so that if a woman had spent three or four hours in a workshop in the morning, and, having no other duties to discharge, was employed in selling goods in the shop at night, she would be contravening this sub-section. The provision would also have the extraordinary effect that if a young woman was employed in a workshop in the morning, and in the evening worked for another employer, the employer for whom she worked in the morning would be

liable to the penalty for her employment at night. The clause as originally introduced was in precisely the same terms as the Amendment he now desired to move.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 20, line 17, to leave out subsection (4) of Clause 31, and insert the words, (4) 'If a woman or young person is employed by the occupier of a factory or workshop on the same day, both in the factory or workshop, and in a shop, then;

(a) the whole time during which that woman or young person is employed shall not exceed the number of hours permitted by this Act for her or his employment in the factory or workshop on that day; and

(b) if the woman or young person is employed in the shop, except during the period of employment fixed by the occupier, and specified in a notice affixed in the factory or workshop in pursuance of this Act, the occupier shall make the prescribed entry in the general register with regard to his or her employment.";(Mr. Renshaw.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said no reason had been given why the law should concern itself only with employment by the same employer. The Amendment carried in Committee followed the precedent of the Shop Hours Act. He had taken advice on the point raised in Committee as to the possibility of the wrong employer being penalised, and the opinion of the competent lawyer to whom he referred the matter was that it would be comparatively easy to detect the illegality, as the clause was now governed by the period of employment, and that a magistrate would dismiss a charge if wrongly brought against the first employer.

*MR. RITCHIE: There are two points in the Amendment;the period of employment, and double employment. With regard to the period of employment, the difference in the Bill as it stood and as my hon. friend wishes to restore it, is that originally the number of hours which could be worked by the individual under two employers was limited to the number of hours which could be worked under the Factory Acts. That is to say, if the period under the Acts was ten hours, the period of employment under the two employers would be ten hours and no more. As to the question of one employer or two employers, the difficulty about the Amendment, as proposed by the right hon. Baronet, is that it would be absolutely impossible for any inspector to know whether an individual who was working beyond a certain hour for one employer had been working for some other employer in the earlier portion of the day.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: That objection applies to the Shop Hours Act.

*MR. RITCHIE: Yes, but the Factory Act does not deal with the Shop Hours Act. I think it is a mistake to insert anything which cannot possibly be administered under the Factory Acts.

These words would put upon the factory inspector a responsibility which he could not by any possibility discharge. Moreover, if a young person goes to a shopkeeper and asks for evening employment, how on earth is the shopkeeper to

tell whether or not this young person has been in somebody else's employment earlier in the day?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he was anxious to save time, and if the right hon. Gentleman intimated his intention of amending the proposed Amendment by accepting an Amendment lower on the Paper, he would not trouble the House with a division.

*MR. RITCHIE: I intend to support my hon. friend in the whole of his Amendment. Under our original proposal, if a woman or young person had worked, say; for an hour or two in the, morning, she might work for a few hours in the evening in a shop, although the period of employment might extend beyond the hour at which she would have to leave if employed in a factory; but under the clause as it now stands, if she had worked for two or three hours in the morning, although she did not, work at all in the middle of the day, she would have to leave off her work at the time she would have had to do if still working in the factory. That is the whole difference. I think, on the whole, the proposal of our Bill is the light one.

*MR. TENNANT said he was very disappointed at the attitude taken up by the right hon. Gentleman, and he thought they had very good reason to complain of the course taken. The matter was thoroughly discussed in Committee, and the Amendment now embodied in the Bill was carried by twenty-one votes to eighteen.

*MR. RITCHIE: I was not at the Committee meeting when this decision was come to.

*MR. TENNANT said it was a very unfortunate circumstance, and the Committee stage was a mere waste of time if everything adopted in Committee for the betterment of labour were to be overridden by the majority in that House.

[Ministerial cries of "No."]

That was what they were trying to do, but luckily the majority had hitherto been against such action. He resented very hotly the course the Home Secretary seemed inclined to take. If the law was amended as the hon. Member for Renfrewshire wished it, it would be impossible for the inspectors of factories to administer any law at all. He wanted these milliners and dressmakers all over London and Great Britain to be allowed to work at five or six o'clock in the morning and as late as eleven or twelve o'clock in the evening.

MR. RENSCHAW said the effect of his Amendment would be to limit the number of hours, but not to fix the period between which those hours might be worked.

*MR. TENNANT contended that any proposal which had the effect of allowing a girl to work at five o'clock in the morning and eleven o'clock in the evening of the same day was one which Parliament ought not to sanction. Surely at a time when they were trying to make some forward step it was absolutely wrong for this House to pass such legislation.

MR. COHEN (Islington, E.) said that this Amendment was moved in Committee in the absence of the Home Secretary, but the next time he attended the Committee after it had been adopted his right hon. friend stated that when the Bill came to this House he should feel it his duty to oppose the decision which the Committee had arrived at, and the right hon. Gentleman had then stated that the effect of this Amendment was to very seriously alter the terms of the Bill as it was originally introduced. The question they had to decide was what attitude they should take

up with regard to this Amendment. He ventured to urge that this Amendment, which was opposed by those who posed as the friends of the working classes, was one passed in the truest interest of the workers, and was so regarded by the workpeople themselves. Over and over again many a youth and young woman had dated their preferment in their respective vocations from the fact that they had been able to occupy themselves in work in the evening different to that which they were engaged in during an earlier part of the day.

These women were only too anxious to add to their earnings in the evening. He hoped the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for Renfrewshire would be carried, for it would restore the Bill to the condition in which it was introduced in this House.

MR. JOHN BURNS said he trusted the House would support the Bill as amended in Committee by a substantial majority. This was a very difficult matter to follow. Supposing the Factory Act allowed a young person or a young woman to be employed ten hours per day, from eight o'clock to six. If the Amendment of the hon. Member for Renfrewshire was carried, if ten hours were exceeded the employer had to notify. If this Amendment was carried a girl could go to work at eight o'clock in the morning and work till twelve o'clock at noon for one employer, and she could work from four o'clock in the afternoon till ten o'clock in the evening for another employer, and yet would not exceed the ten hours allowed by the Factory Act. Did hon. Members wish to see that state of things? That meant that the girl had to get up at seven o'clock to start at eight o'clock, and work till twelve o'clock at noon, and then she had four hours doing nothing. She then started at four o'clock in the afternoon and worked till ten o'clock in the evening, and would probably take an hour to get home. That meant that she was away from home from seven o'clock in the morning until eleven o'clock at night. That was a condition of things which no just employer of labour would like to see, and it was not permitted even by the Shop Hours Act, and the Factory and Workshop Acts ought not to allow such a state of things. If they were going to insist that a girl should not work more than ten hours for two employers, look at the amount of inspection and spying that would be necessary to prevent this. It was a condition of things that was preposterous and ridiculous, and it would make Factory Act administration a bye-word to subject these girls to such inspection. In cases where the girls had to go two or three miles to get to their homes, they would not be able to get back during the afternoon interval between their two employments, and they would probably hang about the streets three or four hours, probably to their physical and moral detriment, under conditions which they had no right to submit girls to. He appealed to the House to stand by the decision of the Committee.

SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College) thought the right hon. Gentleman had not made out a very good case for restoring the Bill to its original condition. If the hours of labour were to be regulated at all it was reasonable that distinct limits should be imposed. The proposed alteration would have no practical effect, and he should support the Bill as it stood.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) regretted the existence of a tendency to revise the findings of the Standing Committee. The Amendment was carried by a large

majority after a full discussion of the subject. The Attorney General, who was then in charge, raised an objection to the Amendment, but, when it was carried against him, said, "Oh! never mind the work of this Committee; it is nothing; we will put the matter right when we get downstairs." That was not the sort of treatment Grand Committees expected. The Home Secretary had been incited to this unconstitutional proceeding by the extreme pressure of hon. Members behind him. Such action should not be supported, and he hoped the House would uphold the work of the Committee.

MR. TOMLINSON said the clause as it left the Grand Committee was looked upon by a majority of the Members as being impracticable and unworkable.

MR. T. M. HEALY said they had been given to understand that a man could not serve two masters, but the Amendment of the hon. Member seemed to suggest that a woman might be sweated by two mistresses. The mover of the Amendment contended that by some means; which had not been made plain; the person to be subjected to the legal penalty was made clear in his Amendment, whereas it was not clear in the proposal of the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean. It appeared to him, however, that from the legal point of view there was just as much difficulty in construing the Amendment now before the House. If a woman or young person was employed in a factory or shop, the whole time of employment must not exceed the number of hours permitted by the Act. But if, as a matter of fact, that number of hours was exceeded, who was to be punished?

*MR. RITCHIE: Surely the hon. Member must see that there is the greatest difference in the world between an offence being committed by one employer and it being divided between two employers.

MR. T. M. HEALY: My argument is that the offence is equally divided between two employers under the Amendment of the hon. Member opposite.

*MR. RITCHIE: No.

MR. T. M. HEALY submitted that that was the case. If the period of employment permitted was ten hours, and a young person worked for five and a half hours for each of two employers, who was to be punished? Where was the certainty of procedure in the Amendment of the hon. Member?

MR. RENSCHAW said the words which limited the matter in the Amendment were in the first line; "If a woman or young person is employed by the occupier of a factory or workshop on the same day"; that was to say, by the same employer.

MR. T. M. HEALY said it might be clear to the hon. Member, but, reading the words hurriedly, it did not appear to him that the magistrates would be relieved of the difficulty urged against the proposal of the right hon. Baronet. But it was a very small matter, and it was not worth the while of the Government to engage in this contention. Was it credible that, after employer No. 1 had wasted the energies of the young person in the heat of the day, employer No. 2 would take her fagged and worn out instrument and pay her wages for the evening? The thing was absurd.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): As the clause left the Committee there was protection given not only to the woman or young person who worked under one employer in two separate capacities, but to the woman or young person who worked under two separate employers in different capacities. Does the

right hon. Gentleman propose to throw over the second class altogether, and to give no protection whatever to the woman or young person who serves two separate employers?

*MR. RITCHIE: I do not wish a young person to be unduly employed either by one employer or by two employers. My point is this in regard to the two employers: that it would be wholly impossible for the inspectors of the Home Office to see that the law was complied with. How on earth could an inspector, seeing a young person employed at a particular hour, know whether or not that person had been employed by somebody else earlier in the day? On the other hand, how is the shopkeeper who employs this young person in the evening to know whether or not she has been employed by another employer in the morning?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: How does the Amendment help you?

*MR. RITCHIE: It is wholly a matter of machinery, and under the clause as it now stands it is wholly impracticable.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) asked whether the Home Secretary would object to the insertion, after "if a woman or young person is employed," of the words "by the same employer."

*MR. RITCHIE: I have stated before that I do not attach much importance to this matter, and I do not think that the question is a large one. I am not the mover of this Amendment, but as it has been moved I feel bound to support it.
Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 129; Noes, 162. (Division List No. 463.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)

Hammond, John

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud

Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil

O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)

Ambrose, Robert

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Malley, William

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-

O'Mara, James

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Healy, Timothy Michael

O'Shee, James John

Bell, Richard

Helme, Norval Watson

Partington, Oswald

Boland, John

Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)

Power, Patrick Joseph
Boyle, James
Holland, William Henry
Reddy, M.
Broadhurst, Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Burns, John
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Caldwell, James
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh'e
Rickett, J. Compton
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Joyce, Michael
Rigg, Richard
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Roche, John
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leamy, Edmund
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Cawley, Frederick
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Scott, Charles P. (Leigh)
Channing, Francis Allston
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Charrington, Spencer
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Clancy, John Joseph
Lough, Thomas
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R (Northants)
Colville, John
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Strachey, Edward
Crean, Eugene
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Sullivan, Donal

Crombie, John William
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Cullinan, J.
M'Fadden, Edward
Thomas, J A (Gl'morg'n, Gower)
Daly, James
M'Govern, T.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Delany, William
M'Kenna, Reginald
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks., W.R.
Dillon, John
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Donelan, Capt. A.
Mather, William
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Doogan, P. C.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Warner, Courtenay C. T.
Duffy, William J.
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport)
White, Luke (Yorks., E. R.)
Elibank, Master of
Moss, Samuel
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Emmott, Alfred
Murnaghan, George
Whiteley, G. (Yorks., W. R.)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst'ne
Murphy, John
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Field, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Williams, O. (Merioneth)
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Wilson, H. J. (Yorks., W. R.)
Flynn, James Christopher

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
O'Doherty, William
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Grant, Corrie
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Sir Charles Dilke and Mr. Tennant.
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Haldane, Richard Burdon
O'Dowd, John
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Chapman, Edward
Fisher, William Hayes
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond Univ
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick S. W.
Anstruther, H. T.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Gardner, Ernest
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Arrol, Sir William
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Balcarres, Lord
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Gore, Hon S. F. Ormsby- (Line.)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)

Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Cranborne, Viscount
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Crossley, Sir Savile
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Balfour, K. R. (Christchurch)
Davenport, William Bromley
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Dickson, Charles Scott
Groves, James Grimble
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Hambro, Charles Eric
Bignold, Arthur
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x
Bigwood, James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Hanbury, Rt Hon. Robert Wm.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Duke, Henry Edward
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Brassey, Albert
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Bull, William James
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Henderson, Alexander
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manch'r
Hogg, Lindsay
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Houldsworth, Sir Win. Henry
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)

Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos Myles
Hoult, Joseph
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw J.
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Howard, J (Midd., Tottenham)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Mount, William Arthur
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Nicholson, William Graham
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Keswick, William
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Spear, John Ward
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Law, Andrew Bonar
Parkes, Ebenezer
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ
Lawson, John Grant
Penn, John
Thornton, Percy M.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col Richard
Tollemache, Henry James
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Plummer, Walter R.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Long, Rt. H. Walter (Bristol, S.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Valentia, Viscount
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pretymann, Ernest George
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Lloyd, Archie Kirkman
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edw.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Purvis, Robert
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir William H
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Randles, John S.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne
Macartney, Rt Hon W. G. Ellison
Reid, James (Greenock)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Macdonald, John Cumming
Rentoul, James Alexander
Wills, Sir Frederick
MacLver, David (Liverpool)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R (Bath)
Maconochie, A. W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
McCalmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
McKillop, James (Stirlingshire
Round, James
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Majendie, James A. H.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Mr. Renshaw and Mr. Banbury.
Milton, Viscount
Rutherford, John
Mitchell, William
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Sadler, Col. Samuel A.
Words inserted.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said the House ought to understand what it was doing in

Clause 42. At present there was a complete exemption from, the Factory Acts of the assistants for gutting, salting, and packing fish, as regarded hours, and there was an exemption for four months in the year in regard to the fruit trade. He thought it was disgraceful on the part of the House of Commons to re-enact those exemptions, especially after the report which had been issued since the decision of the Committee. Without further discussing the question, he would move the omission of words to confine the exemption to full-grown women, and he confidently asked the House to reverse the decision of the Committee on this point.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 26, lines 27 and 28, to leave out the words 'young persons and.'";(Sir Charles Dilke.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University) appealed to the Home Secretary to accept the Amendment, in favour of which there was a very strong case, especially in regard to young persons employed in the jam trade. In practically all well-conducted factories the excessive hours were not required, so that the provision would really only apply to inferior factories conditions which other factories applied to themselves.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) on behalf of the fish trade, begged the Home Secretary not to accept the Amendment. The report to which the right hon. Baronet had referred might be the report of a very good inspector, but not of a practical person who knew anything about the matter. He strongly protested against the use of such words as "disgusted" in this connection, and he hoped the Home Secretary would not give way.

MR. BROADHURST contended that the report to which reference had been made presented a strong case for the Amendment, and he hoped it would be accepted.

*MR. RITCHIE: It would hardly be imagined from the remarks which have been made that an alteration of the law

in regard to the conditions under which this trade is carried on has been made by this clause, which, to a large extent remedies the state of things to which reference has been made. Under the law as it now stands, during certain periods of the year these operations are taken completely out of the scope of the Factories Acts, as regards both hours and sanitary conditions. It is because the conditions under which these people work are so insanitary at present that the remarks in the report of the inspector were made. We are now bringing these operations under the sanitary provisions of the Acts, so that the inspectors will be able to insist on all the operations in connection with both of these trades being carried on under proper sanitary conditions. It is quite true that as regards hours these trades are to a certain extent exempted from the Bill, but anybody who knows the conditions under which the fish have to be cured at once, in order to preserve a valuable article of food for the people, will recognise that it is imperative there should be no restriction of hours such as there would be if the operations were brought under the Factory Acts. By the alteration we propose to make, I think we shall remove all grounds of complaint.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that if the Amendment were pressed to a division he should certainly support the Government.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I rise, not to enter into this discussion, but to take advantage of the question before the House to ask the Government how long they intend to go on to-night, and what their intentions are in regard to business. After this point which we are now discussing there are one or two other matters of secondary importance, and then we get to the question of overtime and of laundries, the latter being a very large and thorny subject. I hope the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury will choose some favourable opportunity to state what he proposes shall be taken. The House might then take up the next Order, which is the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill. [Cries of "No, no!"] His Majesty's Government have starred that measure, and it is somewhat in decent for hon. Gentlemen opposite to receive my suggestion in this manner. That is an arrangement which I think would lead to the proper procedure of our business, and I do not think there would be any disposition on the part of my hon. friends to prolong unnecessarily the discussion of this Bill or the other. There has been a little inducement for opposition by the measure of success which we have attained to-night, but even that will not turn the heads of my hon. friends if some arrangement, such as I have suggested, is made.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think that in regard to the Bill we are now discussing the two main points are, firstly, the question of overtime; and, secondly, the question of the laundries. I think we ought to deal with overtime before we part with this Bill to-night, and I also agree that it would be unreasonable to deal with the question of laundries, which I propose to defer until to-morrow. As regards the Children's Bill, it will be almost too late to ask the House to take up that measure to-night. I do not, however, think that the delay will imperil the future progress of the measure.

*SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: When will it be proceeded with? [An HON. MEMBER: Not at all.]

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not know which of my hon. friends used that expression, but I shall put the Bill down for to-morrow.

SIR CHARLES DILKE said that as there was a division of opinion as to whether it would be wise to divide the House he would not press his Amendment.
Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he would move his Amendment to Clause 46 in order to obtain from the right hon. Gentleman his view as to what the effect of this clause would be.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 28, line 3, to leave out Clause 46." (Sir Charles Dilke.)

*MR. RITCHIE: There may arise certain cases in which possibly something of this kind might happen, but I would remind the right hon. Gentleman that it can only be put in force by a special rule laid before Parliament.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. RENSCHAW said that the Amendment he wished to move dealt with the overtime

question. It was a very simple question, and for the purpose of making it clear he wished to point out that the omission of the word "two" and the insertion of "three" had reference to the number of days in one week in which they might work overtime in certain regulated trades scheduled in the Act of 1878. He thought that in the opinion of all those who had had representations made to them upon overtime the question of working a larger number of days in any particular week was more important than the total number of days which were permitted for overtime. The reason for that was because the overtime arrangement at present sanctioned was important, in consequence of the great pressure of orders at certain seasons of the year. That was pre-eminently so in certain trades.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 29, line 14, to leave out the word 'two' and insert the word 'three.'";(Mr. Renshaw.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of the Bill."

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) supported the Amendment. He said his colleague and himself had received a very large number of protests against the proposal of the Bill from the women workers in the silver-plating trade of Sheffield. They were trades which exactly corresponded to the description given by his hon. friend. They received a great pressure of orders about Christmas time, and there had been no demand whatever by the women workers in the silver-plating trade for this restriction upon their earning power. He knew that the Federated Trades Council of Sheffield had sent a petition in favour of the Bill as it stood, but they did not appear to have called any meeting of the workers, and he had received no letter from them on the subject. He desired most strongly to support the Amendment which had been moved by his hon. friend.

*MR. TENNANT said this proposal was one which he was responsible for having carried in the Grand Committee on Trade. The House might like to hear a little story in connection with this matter. The hon. Member for the Hallam Division, in whose name the Amendment stood, wrote a letter to his Sheffield friends stating that there was no demand for this proposal, and that unless they received a demonstration of some kind they would know that there was no demand for it at all. The Trades Council passed a resolution declaring that overtime amongst the women in the silver-plating trade was unnecessary and was injurious to them physically and morally, and they further stated that to diminish the number of days would cause neither the employers nor the women workers any inconvenience. That council represented 20,000 members, which included every branch of the silver-plating trade. Anyone who had studied this question at all knew that for the last twenty years the inspectors had been clamouring, if not for total abolition, at least for a reduction of the number of hours which were possible for overtime. Everybody who knew anything about the subject must know that overtime was merely a question of arrangement. Many of the best manufacturers throughout the country had arrived at an arrangement by which they were able to do without overtime. The commercial supremacy of the country did not depend on working the amount of overtime represented by the difference between two or three days in the week, and he hoped the hon. Member would not

succeed in obtaining a reversal of the decision of the Committee.

*MR. RITCHIE: I think it right to inform the House that since this Amendment was inserted in the Bill we have received at the Home Office very important representations in regard to this matter. We are told that in many places if the overtime is reduced

from three to two days a week it will seriously interfere with business. The annual value of the Amendment carried in the Committee amounts to a reduction from thirty to twenty-five days, and if the representations which have come to me from different districts are to be relied on; as I believe they are; I do not think such a reduction is worth the inconvenience and loss which will be inflicted on the trades concerned.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE regretted the right hon. Gentleman had come to such a decision, which he was afraid would have an evil effect on the Bill, as they would now have to divide upon all the overtime clauses. If there was one subject with regard to which the working classes were more unanimous than another it was the abolition of overtime. ["No."] During the whole of the time trades union congresses had existed; ["Oh!"] Did hon. Members really believe that the trades unions did not represent the working classes? ["Yes."] Then he pitied them, because there had not been a single question of this kind for years past upon which a general opinion had been expressed in regard to which the trades unionists had not been shown to have spoken virtually the unanimous opinion of the working classes. The trades unions throughout the country objected to overtime in toto. In the Committee the total abolition of overtime was defeated by only one vote, and the milder Amendment of the hon. Member for Berwickshire was carried by twenty-nine against thirteen. In every Factory Act up to the present the amount of overtime allowed had been reduced, but now it was proposed that on the present occasion it should not be touched. Every trade in the country had its "seasons," and almost every trade could manage to meet the extra demand at that time if it chose without overtime.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) thought the right hon. Baronet underrated the necessity for overtime, especially in the aerated water trade, in regard to which there was a very great over-demand in the summer and an under-demand in the winter. No doubt excessive overtime was a very bad thing, but it was necessary in some special trades, and the Home Secretary would make a great mistake if he paid too much attention to the desire for its abolition.

MR. HALDANE thought this was a question on which the decision of the Grand Committee ought to carry much weight, as it was a matter of detail for experts. The Home Secretary was refusing to carry on the progressive curtailment of overtime, and permitting the decision of the Grand Committee to be overruled, simply because it was urged that two trades would materially suffer. Surely the aerated water and the biscuit trades were in no worse position than the average season trade? Both were articles which could to some extent be made in advance. ["No."] In any case, these detailed matters could be treated as special exceptions, so that the principle embodied in the clause would not be infringed. Rather than have these constant departures and yieldings, he for one would prefer to defer legislation in the direction of the amendment of the Factory

Acts until Parliament was more in the mind to grapple with admitted evils.

MR. TAYLOR said the House were really discussing two totally different questions; the increase of the days per week on which overtime could be worked, and the total number of days' overtime in the year. He suggested as a compromise that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Renfrewshire should be accepted if the Home Secretary would agree to keep the Bill as it came from the Grand Committee in regard to the total number of days overtime in the year.

MR. JOHN BURNS wished to know whether the right hon. Gentleman desired this Bill to have that easy and safe passage through the House which many of them were anxious to give it. If the Home Secretary was continually going to accept Amendments from the hon. Member for Renfrewshire the House had better know, and then the closure could be applied and the Bill got through just as the hon.

Member for Renfrewshire desired to see it. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would disregard

the advice of the hon. Member and conduct his Bill with the same spirit of reasonableness which he displayed in Grand Committee. It was not likely that much support would be given to the Bill if the concessions were to be all on one side, and he rose to protest against "three" being substituted for "two." He wished to say a few words upon the question of overtime. In regard to mineral waters, he wanted to see that industry grow, but when the pressure came upon the mineral water industry, instead of working the women overtime, a well-organised mineral water manufacturer frequently employed double shifts and left the women and young persons out altogether. He should say that the making and the wearing of cotton goods was as much a season trade as the manufacture and the drinking of mineral waters. For something like seventy years the Lancashire textile trades had been able to do without overtime, and no one could say that this had been a disadvantage. Even the Government factories had found it not only advantageous but profitable to dispense with overtime altogether except in case of a national emergency. What had given England in recent years her present grip on the world-wide market? It was due to the fact that they had systematised their production and made regular what in other countries was casual and precarious. Through the regular employment of capital and labour without overtime they had been able to supply the world's market more regularly than any other nation. With regard to the manufacture of jam and biscuits and the preservation of fish and meat, the same conditions did not apply as applied ten or fifteen years ago. The introduction of the refrigerator had destroyed the necessity for overtime in those trades, and he did appeal to the Home Secretary not to allow the hon. Member for Renfrewshire to destroy the Bill and take the guts out of it. If this whittling down process went on the Bill would be useless. He was convinced that the nation which worked the most overtime was the nation which had most to fear in the world's competition. If they removed overtime altogether they cheapened the cost of production and improved the health of their workmen. During the last few years in the engineering trade the efforts of employers had systematically tended to reduce overtime, and in that trade they had now a normal nine-hour day and in some cases eight and a half hours, and it was gradually coming down to

eight hours. By abolishing overtime in the engineering trade they had lengthened the average life of the operative engineer from the age of forty-two years to fifty-four, and that had been accomplished in less than forty years. To add ten or twelve years to the working life of an engineer was a great thing to have done by the abolition of overtime. If this could be done with engineers, why not with unskilled workmen and, above all, in the case of unorganised women and children and young persons? He appealed to the Home Secretary not to adopt the policy put forward by the hon. Member for Renfrewshire.

MR. RENSRAW said his Amendment did not apply to young persons or children, and it only applied to women.

MR. T. M. HEALY thought the right hon. Gentleman should have further time to consider what Amendments he would move in Committee, for there were very few Amendments indeed in the name of the Home Secretary.

MR. BELL (Derby) protested against this Amendment, and said that for a great number of years he had advocated the abolition of all overtime. Probably because the hon. Member for Renfrewshire was interested in a trade in which the people worked longer hours he would like to see the hours increased in other trades. He accepted the Amendments of the hon. Member for Renfrewshire with a great deal of suspicion, and he had noticed that the hon. Member on the debates upon various measures generally had the greatest number of Amendments on the Paper. As a representative of the trades unionists of the country, he protested against the acceptance of the Amendment of the hon. Member to increase the overtime.

MR. EMMOTT (Oldham) was bitterly disappointed at the action of the Home Secretary on this question of overtime. The alteration was carried in the Grant Committee by twenty-two against thirteen, and six of the twenty-two were Unionists. After such a decisive division it was rather hard that the House should be called upon to reverse that decision.

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)

Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.

Ambrose, Robert

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

O'Malley, William

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.

O'Mara, James

Harry, E. (Cork, S.

Healy, Timothy Michael

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Helme, Norval Watson

O'Shee, James John

Boland, John
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Boyle, James
Holland, William Henry
Power, Patrick Joseph
Broadhurst, Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Reddy, M.
Caldwell, James
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Joyce, Michael
Rigg, Richard
Channing, Francis Allston
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Clancy, John Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Cogan, Denis J.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Crossley, Sir Savile
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Spencer, Rt Hn C R. (Northants)
Cullinan, J.
MacNeill, John Cordon Swift
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Daly, James
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Sullivan, Donal
Delany, William
M'Fadden, Edward
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
M'Govern, T.
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ)
Dillon, John

M'Kenna, Reginald
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Donelan, Captain A.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Tennant, Harold John
Doogan, P. C.
Mather, William
Thomas, J A Glamorgan, Gower
Duffy, William J.
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport
Thompson, Dr E. C. (Monag'n N.
Elibank, Master of
Moss, Samuel
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks. W. R.)
Emmott, Alfred
Murnaghan, George
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Field, William
Murphy, John
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
White, Luke (Yorks., E. R.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Grant, Corrie
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Doherty, William
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks. W. R.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Haldane, Richard Burdon

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Hammond, John
O'Dowd, John
Mr. John Burns and Mr. Bell.
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Charrington, Spencer
Godson Sir Augustus Fredk.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Anstruther, H. T.
Colomb Sir John Charles Ready
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)
Arrol, Sir William
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Groves, James Grimble
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cranborne, Viscount
Hambro, Charles Eric
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Mid'x
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Hardy. Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Higginbottom, S. W.
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Bigwood, Arthur
Duke, Henry Edward
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hoult, Joseph
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Howard, John (Kent Faversh.
Bull, William James
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Hozier, H on. James Henry Cecil
Cavendish, V C W (Derbyshire)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Fisher, William Hayes
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S W
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wore.
Gardner, Ernest
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Question put.
The House divided::Ayes, 113; Noes, 138. (Division List No. 464.)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Lawson, John Grant
Mount, William Arthur
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Legge, Col. Hn. Heneage
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Leveson-Gower, Fredck. N. S.
Nicholson, William Graham
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.

Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Spear, John Ward
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Pemberton, John S. G.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Penn, John
Thornton, Percy M.
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richd.
Tollemache, Henry James
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Macdona, John Cumming
Plummer, Walter R.
Valentia, Viscount
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Maconochie, A. W.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Walker, Col. William Hall
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
Purvis, Robert
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Randles, John S.
Whiteley, H (Ashton-und-Lyne
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Reid, James (Greenock)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Majendie, James A. H.
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Wills, Sir Frederick
Milton, Viscount
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)

Round, James

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

More, Robt. Jas. (Shropshire)

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Mr. Renshaw and Mr. Banbury.

Morgan, David J. (Walthamst.)

Rutherford, John

Question put, "That the word 'three' I be there inserted."

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F

Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Gordon, Hn. J E. (Elgin & Nairn

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.

More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Gore, Hn. S.F. Ormsby-(Line.)

Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)

Anstruther, H. T.

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Morris Hon. Martin Henry F.

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs)

Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford)

Arrol, Sir William

Groves, James Grimble

Mount, William Arthur

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Hambro, Charles Eric

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

Balfour, Rt Hon. A. J. (Manch.)

Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G. (Mid

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. W.

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds

Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd

Parkes, Ebenezer

Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.

Harris, Frederick Leverton
Peel, Hn Wm Robert Wellesley
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Pemberton, John S. G.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Penn, John
Bignold, Arthur
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Br'ghtsde
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col Richard
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Houlds Worth, Sir Win. Henry
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Hoult, Joseph
Plummer, Walter R.
Bull, William James
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Pretymann, Ernest George
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Hozier, Hn. James Henry Cecil
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Purvis, Robert
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Randles, John S.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc r
Kenyon. Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Reid, James (Greenock)
Charrington, Spencer
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Law, Andrew Bonar
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas Thomson
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lawson, John Grant
Round, James
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Royds, Clement Molyneux
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Rutherford, John
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Cranborne, Viscount
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Sadler, Col. Sameul Alexander
Crossley, Sir Savile
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Smith, H C (North'mb. T'neside
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Spear, John Ward
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Duke, Henry Edward
Macdona, John Cumming
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Maconochie, A. W.
Thornton, Percy M.
Fielden, Edward Brockleburst
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Tollemache, Henry James
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Fisher, William Hayes
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Valentia, Viscount

Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, SW.
Majendie, James A. H.
Vincent. Col-Sir CEH (Sheffield
Gardner, Ernest
Milton, Viscount
Walker, Col. William Hall
The House divided::Ayes, 138; Noes, 108. (Division List No. 465.)
Walrond. Rt. Hn. Sir William H
Wills, Sir Frederick
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Whiteley, H. (Asliton-u.-Lyne)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Mr. Renshaw and Mr. Banbury.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
O'Dowd, John
Ambrose, Robert
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Hayne, Rt.Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Malley, William
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Mara, James
Boland, John
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Boyle, James
Holland, William Henry
O'Shee, James John
Broadhurst, Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Power, Patrick Joseph
Caldwell, James
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Reddy, M.

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Joyce, Michael
Redmond, William (Clare)
Channing, Francis Allston
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rigg, Richard
Clancy, John Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Cogan, Denis J.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Cullinan, J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants)
Daly, James
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Delany, William
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Sullivan, Donal
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
M'Fadden, Edward
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Dillon, John
M'Govern, T.
Tennant, Harold John
Donelan, Captain A.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r)
Doogan, P. C.
Mansfield, Horace Kendall
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N
Duffy, William J.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Thomson, F. W. (York. W.R.)
Elibank, Master of

Moss, Samuel
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Emmott, Alfred
Murnaghan, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Field, William
Murphy, John
White, Luke (York. E. R.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'rery Mid
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Grant, Corrie
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary N.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W. R.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Doherty, William
Mr. John Burns and Mr. Bell.
Haldane, Richard Burdon
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Amendment proposed;

"In page 29, line 16, to leave out the word 'twenty five,' and insert the word 'thirty.'";(Mr Renshaw.)

Question proposed, "That the words 'twenty-five' stand part of the clause."

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said this was a case of the reversal of the opinion of the Committee upon a point of great importance, and he did not think the opposition ought to give way upon it, because the Government had not tried to meet them.

*MR. RITCHIE: I wish to remind the right hon. Baronet that these matters formed no part of the original Bill, and they were never contemplated by me in preparing this Bill. I admit that there

were a vast number of questions which required reforming in the factory laws, and which have received my attention. I do not think that the right hon. Baronet

is justified in saying that the Government have not tried to meet hon. Gentlemen opposite. I will, however, make a further proposal. I propose to ask my hon. friend not to move his Amendment in the case of perishable articles, because, as a matter of fact, overtime in these trades is very rare, and I propose to allow this provision to stand as it is.

MR. T. M. HEALY said the right hon. Gentleman's statement showed how desirable it was that the Government should propound their own Amendments. The Home Secretary gave away his case when he said that the Government did not contemplate these matters in draw-

ing up the Bill as it now stood. Therefore it was the duty of the Government to put down their own Amendments. The hon. Member for Renfrewshire, without a word of explanation, moved this Amendment in the style of an Attorney General. At this hour of the morning that was not the usual way to deal with a question of this kind. He suggested to the Government that they should now postpone this clause and proceed with some less contentious business.

*MR. RITCHIE: We cannot postpone this clause.

MR. T. M. HEALY thought they should insist upon the Government putting down their own Amendment, because they had been Renshawed enough for one night.

MR. JOHN BURNS suggested that the right hon. Baronet should accept the offer of the Home Secretary and agree to the two Amendments of the hon. Member for Renfrewshire on condition that they had no more from the hon. Member. If that was the view of the Home Secretary, there was no reason why the House should not reach Clause 80 before they adjourned, provided the hon. Member for Renfrewshire would pair with him and they both went home.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that, as far as he was concerned, he thought they ought to accept the offer of the right hon. Gentleman, because, although it reversed the decision of the Committee on one point, it still showed that the tendency of the House was to reduce the number of hours.

MR. RENSRAW said he was willing to withdraw the other Amendments, but he wished it to be clearly understood that, in placing his Amendments on the Paper, he had had no consultation with the Government whatever.

Amendment agreed to.

Other Amendments made.

*MR. RITCHIE: The object of the next Amendments standing on the Paper in my name is to make it clear that all

underground bakehouses which are in existence at the time of the passing of the Bill may obtain a certificate of sanitary fitness if they can show themselves to be fit. Of course, after the date no new underground bakehouse will be allowed at all.

Amendment proposed;

"In Clause 101, page 54, line 19, to leave out 'A place underground,' and insert 'An underground bakehouse.'";(Mr. Ritchie.)

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed;

"In Clause 101, page 54, line 20, to leave out 'on the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-six,' and insert 'at the passing of this

Act."";(Mr. Ritchie.)

MR. T. M. HEALY suggested that the Amendment, instead of reading "after the passing of this Act," should set forth some definite date in 1901 or 1902.

*MR. RITCHIE said that he had adopted the ordinary phraseology, and would prefer to adhere to it.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment proposed;

"In Clause 101, page 54, line 22, at beginning, to insert 'Subject to the foregoing provision.'";(Mr. Ritchie.)

MR. TENNANT inquired the object of the Amendment.

*MR. RITCHIE: I have already stated the object of all three Amendments. The House will remember that I undertook when the clause was under consideration in the Grand Committee to make it perfectly clear that no underground bakehouse could be built after the passing of the Act, and the Amendments are simply to carry out that undertaking.

MR. JOHN BURNS asked whether the Amendments would impair what the Government had originally put in the Bill.

*MR. RITCHIE: Certainly not. It strengthens it very materially.

Amendment agreed to.

*MR. THORNTON (Battersea, Clapham) explained that the Amendments he had placed on the Paper would, if carried, allow the machinery and engines connected with steam bakeries to remain in their present position. Moreover, these Amendments would permit rooms below the surface being utilised for the purpose of storing eggs and milk, which are necessary adjuncts to baking and need a cool temperature for preservation. As for the engines which drive the steam bakeries, they would have to be removed in a vast majority of cases unless these Amendments were accepted. He had been asked to bring the matter up by the master bakers of London, and therefore he hoped the House would accept this and the next Amendment.

Amendment proposed;

"In clause 101, page 54, line 26, after the word 'any' to insert the word 'baking.'";(Mr. Thornton.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'baking' be there inserted."

*MR. RITCHIE: The object of the Amendment, which I think is a perfectly right one, is to make it clear that the term "baking room" includes any room in which any process incidental to baking is carried on; that is to say, there can be no underground apartment connected with baking, but there may be an engine room.

MR. JOHN BURNS said that was not what the hon. Member for Clapham wished. What he wanted was that eggs and other things necessary for the making of bread and confectionery should be allowed to be stored underground. It did seem to him (Mr. Burns) that if an underground bakehouse was not to be allowed, then surely the reason which had induced the Government to take that step applied also to the storage of milk and eggs in underground apartments. He advised the Home Secretary not to allow food to be stored in places in which he would not allow bread to be baked.

*MR. RITCHIE: No one can be keener in this matter of bakehouses than I am; but

surely the hon. Gentleman is going a little too far when he says that eggs or milk cannot be safely stored in an underground apartment. I should have thought that both eggs and milk were better if kept underground.

Amendment agreed to.

Other Amendments made.

MR. COHEN moved the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for North Hackney, providing that where the occupier applied to a court of summary jurisdiction, under the Act, for an order concerning the expense, or apportionment of the expense, of so altering premises as to enable them to obtain a certificate of fitness, the court may either make such order. "or in the alternative may, at the request of the occupier, determine the lease." He explained that he had himself placed an Amendment on the Paper, but that of his hon. and learned friend better carried out the object which he had in view.

Amendment proposed;

"In Clause 101, page 55, line 13, at end to insert 'or in the alternative the court may, at the request of the occupier, determine the lease.'";(Mr. Cohen.)

Amendment agreed to.

Other Amendments made.

Further Proceedings on Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), deferred till to-morrow.

LIGHT RAILWAYS [SALARY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of a salary not exceeding £1,000 a year to another of the Commissioners appointed under the provisions of the Light Railways Act, 1896.;(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

Resolution to be reported this day.

EAST INDIA LOAN (GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY DEBENTURES) BILL.

Read a second time and committed for this day.

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1899–1900.

Resolutions reported.

Whereas it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, and the statement appended thereto, as follows, viz.:

(a) That the gross expenditure for certain Navy Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure; by a total sum of £1,151,718 11s. 2d., as shown in Column No. 1 of the schedule hereto appended; while the gross expenditure for other Navy Services fell short of the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £1,749,812 15s. 2d., as shown in column No. 2 of the said appended schedule, so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Navy Services fell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £598,094 4s.;

(b) That the total actual receipts in aid of the grants for Navy Services exceeded the total estimated receipts by

SCHEDULE.

Number of Vote.

Navy Services, 1899–1900.Votes.

Gross Expenditure.

Appropriations in Aid.

Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure.

Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure.

Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

1.

2.

3.

4.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

1

…

Wages, etc., of Officers, Seamen, and Boys, Coast Guard, and Royal Marines

;

29,559

17

0

;

5,078

14

0

2

…

Victualling and Clothing for the Navy

245,366

4

10

;

;

94,407

5

11

3

…

Medical Establishments and Services

;

29

16

11

;

1,745

7

6

4

…

Martial Law

2,601

17

8

;

;

;

40

17

2

5

…

Educational Services

;

5,001

12

6

;

395

7

3

6

…

Scientific Services

;

1,148

15

2

;

5,159

13

10

7

…

Royal Naval Reserves

42,243

13

1

;

95

3

3

8

…

Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.:

Sec. 1

…

Personnel

64,419

0

2

;

;

240

9

11

Sec. 2

…

Materiel

809,951

11

11

;

;

126,088

17

4

Sec. 3

…

Contract Work

;

1,489,405

13

5

;

315

3

3

the sum of £;265,185 6s. 6d., as shown in column No. 4 of the said appended schedule;

(c) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.;

£;
s.
d.
Total Surpluses
1,793,043
11
2
Total Deficits
929,764
0
8
Net Surplus
£;86,3,279
10
6

And whereas the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge on Exchequer Grants for certain Navy Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the estimated Appropriations-in-Aid, in respect of the same Services; and have also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services.

1."That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

Number of Vote.

Navy Services, 1899–1900. Voters.

Gross Expenditure.

Appropriations in Aid.

Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure.

Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure.

Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

1.

2.

3.

4.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.
9
…
Naval Armaments
;
124,970
1
9
;
19,413
14
9
10
…
Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and A broad
;
40,256
2
7
;
10,865
15
8
11
…
Miscellaneous Effective Services
27,140
8
7
;
;
1,135
0
2
12
…
Admiralty Office
;
4,499
8
8
;
10
7
13
…

Half-pay, Reserved and Retired Pay

;

808

7

5

;

17

3

6

14

…

Naval and Marine Pensions, Gratuities, and Compassionate Allowances

;

10,130

5

1

;

118

17

10

15

…

Civil Pensions and Gratuities

;

1,7591

1

7

;

25

4

7

16

…

Additional Naval Force for Service in Australasian Waters

42

16

0

;

;

;

42

0

0

Amount written off as irrecoverable

2,196

12

0

;
 ;
 ;
 ;
 ;
 1,151,718
 11
 2
 1,749,812
 15
 2
 ;
 265,185
 6
 6
 Net Surplus,
 £;598,094
 4
 0
 Surplus,
 £;265,185
 6
 6
 Surplus surrendered to the Exchequer
 £;863,279
 10
 6

Whereas it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900, and the statement appended thereto, as follows, viz.:

(a) That the gross expenditure for certain Army Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £;950,384 16s. 6d., as shown in column No. 1 of the schedule hereto appended; while the gross expenditure for other Army Services fell short of the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £;1,634,061 5s. 2d., as shown in column No. 2 of the said appended schedule; so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Army Services Cell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £;683,676 8s. 8d.:

(b) That the receipts in aid of certain Army Services fell short of the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £;262,092 2s. 3d., as shown in column No. 3 of the said appended schedule; while the receipts in aid of other Army Services exceeded the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £;130,217 His. 104, as shown in column No. 4 of the said appended schedule; so that the total actual receipts in aid of the Grants for Army Services fell short of the total estimated receipts by the net sum of £;131,874 5s. 5d.;

(c) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.:

£;
 s.
 d.

Total Surpluses

1,437,483

17

3

Total Deficits

885,681

14

0

Net Surplus

£;551,802

3

3

And whereas the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge on Exchequer Grants for certain Army Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the Estimated Appropriations-in-Aid, in respect of the same Services; and have
SCHEDULE.

No. of Vote

Army Services, 1899–1900. Votes.

Gross Expenditure.

Appropriations in Aid.

Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure.

Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure.

Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts.

1.

2.

3.

4.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

£;

s.

d.

1

Pay, etc., of Army (General Staff, Regiments, Reserve, and Departments)

;

1,086,431

15

4
129,050
6
7
;
2
Medical Establishments: Pay, etc.
29,480
6
5
;
;
;
425
0
10
3
Militia: Pay, Bounty, etc.
;
250,294
11
1
;
2,916
8
5
4
Yeomanry Cavalry: Pay and Allowances.
;
4,661
5
5
3
0
0
;
5
Volunteer Corps: Pay and Allowances
;
10,664
15
2
;
736
15
8
6

Transport and Remounts

110,470

9

5

;

;

;

38,237

8

3

7

Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies

491,877

10

11

;

;

;

58,983

5

11

8

Clothing Establishments and Services

88,006

0

11

;

58,404

3

6

;

;

9

Warlike and other Stores: Supply and Repair

201,370

16

4

;

;

;

770

3

2

10

Works, Buildings, and Repairs: Cost, including Staff for Engineer Services

;

224,270

4

7

51,015

13
1
;
11
Establishments for Military Education
1,411
12
3
;
;
;
3,729
11
7
12
Miscellaneous Effective Services
23,058
8
5
;
;
;
24,197
15
10
13
War Office: Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges
3,308
10
9
;
;
;
130
1
0
14
Non-effective Charges for Officers, etc
;
54,553
3
6
20,962
4
6
;
15
Non-effective Charges for Men, etc
;

3,184
10
1
2,656
14
7
;
16
Superannuation, Compensation, and Compassionate Allowances
643
0
8
;
;
;
91
6
2
Balances irrecoverable
757
18
5
;
;
;
;
950,384
16
6
1,634,061
5
2
262,092
2
3
130,217
16
10
Net Surplus,
£;683,676
8
8
Net Deficit,
£;131,874
5
5
Surplus surrendered to the Exchequer
£;551,802

3
3

also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services.

2."That the application of such sums be sanctioned."

MR. DILLON said these resolutions were discussed at some length on Thursday last, and having asserted their right to discuss them, although there were several other points which he should like to raise, he would make an urgent appeal to his hon. friends not to insist upon their rights to discuss these resolutions further. They had asserted their right of discussion in this matter, and in view of the conciliatory action of the Home Secretary he would appeal to his hon. friends to allow these resolutions on Report to pass.

Resolutions agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS [8TH AUGUST].

Resolution reported;

"That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the Service of the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, the sum of £86,756,285 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom."

Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by The Chairman of Ways and Means. Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr Austen Chamberlain.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

"To apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March one thousand nine hundred and two, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament."

Presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time tomorrow.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick in the Chair.)

MR. T. M. HEALY said he would not offer any opposition to this Bill. The principle of excluding tenants had gone far enough, and he had the gravest doubts as to the wisdom of the measure. He had intended to put down some Amendments, but in view of the circumstances of the case he would not do so.

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not propose to move any Amendments which stand in my name.

Bill reported, without amendments; read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

MARRIAGES LEGALISATION BILL [Lords].

Considered in Committee; Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

NATIONAL GALLERY (PURCHASE OF ADJACENT LAND) [EXPENSES].

Resolution reported;

"That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by

Parliament, of all Expenses incurred by the Commissioners of Works under any Act of the present session for the acquisition of certain land, near the National Gallery in London, and for other purposes connected therewith."

Resolution agreed to.

NATIONAL GALLERY (PURCHASE OF ADJACENT LAND) (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without amendment; read the third time, and passed.

LUNACY (IRELAND) BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

A Clause (Limitation of costs);(Mr. Secretary Ritchie);brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

Further Proceeding on Consideration, as amended (by the Standing Committee), deferred till to-morrow.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [17th June], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

LUNACY (IRELAND) BILL [EXPENSES],

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all Expenses incurred in relation to Criminal Lunatics under any Act of the present Session to amend the Law relating to Lunatics in Ireland.:(Mr. Wyndham.)

Resolution to be reported to-morrow.

PRISONS (SCOTLAND) BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE (APPEALS) BILL [Lords].

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

CUSTOMS DUTIES (ISLE OF MAN) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick, in the Chair.)

Clause 1:

An Amendment made.

MR. T. M. HEALY understood there was a separate customs house in the Isle of Man, and he asked what was the position of the island with regard to the coal tax and the sugar duty.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) said the position of the Isle of Man with regard to the coal duty was similar to that of Ireland. The inhabitants of the Isle of Man would not pay the coal duty, but the Budget Bill recently passed gave the Treasury power to limit the exportation of coal from the Isle of Man, so as to protect the revenue. It

was not proposed to impose the sugar duty. The Court of Tynwald had imposed duties which were dealt with in the Bill, and the Bill was necessary to confirm the action of the Tynwald Court.

MR. T. M. HEALY asked whether any Papers on the matter would be laid on the Table, as Members for Ireland were interested in the question of a separate customs house.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said no Papers had been laid and there were none to lay. The resolution of the Tynwald Court was a very simple one, merely continuing the duties and customs imposed last year.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

COLONIAL ACTS CONFIRMATION BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said there was a great deal of difference of opinion upon this question and he hoped the measure would not be pressed at this late hour of the evening.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The object of this Bill is simply to legalise certain matters which ought to have been reserved for the Royal Assent.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he hoped that his hon. friend would not persevere with his opposition to this Bill.

MR. POWER said that, in deference to the view which had been expressed by the right and learned Member for Waterford, he would withdraw his objection.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 22nd day of July last, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter after Three of the clock, a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 13th August, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS.

Ordered, That Standing Orders 220 and 246, relating to Private Bills, be suspended for the remainder of the Session.

That as regards Private Bills already returned by the House of Lords with Amendments, such Amendments be now considered.

That as regards Private Bills to be returned by the House of Lords with Amendments such Amendments to be considered forthwith.

That when it is intended to propose any Amendments thereto, a copy of such Amendments shall be deposited in the Private Bill Office, and notice given on the day on which the Bill shall have been returned from the Lords.:(The Chairman of Ways and Means.)

LOCH LEVEN WATER POWER BILL.

(IN PURSUANCE OF THE ORDER OF THE HOUSE OF THIS DAY.)

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

PAISLEY DISTRICT TRAMWAYS ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].
[UNDER SECTION 9, SUB-SECTION (4), OF THE PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE
(SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.]

Considered; to be read the third time to-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to London County Council (Tramways and Street Widenings) Bill; Devonport Corporation (Gas) Bill; Southampton and Winchester Great Western Junction Railway Bill; London County Council (General Powers) Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to Leeds Corporation Water Bill [Lords]; Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill [Lords]; Weston-super-Mare Gas Bill [Lords]; Bristol Corporation (Docks and Railways, Etc.) Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

PETITIONS.

AGRICULTURAL RATES ACT, 1896, ETC., CONTINUANCE BILL.

Petition from Abington, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

GOVERNMENT OF MALTA.

Petition of Members of the Council of Government of Malta, for the appointment of a Commission of Inquiry; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Praze (two); Rotherhithe; and Scottish National Sabbath School Union; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Speymouth, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL AND ROYAL DECLARATION BILL.

Petition from Bristol, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FEE FUND (HOUSE OF LORDS).

Account presented, of the Fee Fund of the House of Lords from 1st April, 1900, to 31st March, 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PARKS AND GARDENS (LONDON AND DUBLIN).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 1st July; Mr. T. M. Healy]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 341.]

CIVIL SERVANTS (RETIREMENT AT THE AGE OF 65).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 12th August; Mr. Austen Chamberlain]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 342.]

ELECTRIC SUPPLY UNDERTAKINGS (LOCAL AUTHORITIES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 1st April; Mr. Bartley]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 343.]

ELECTRIC SUPPLY UNDERTAKINGS (COMPANIES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 1st April; Mr. Bartley]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 344.]

LOCAL TAXATION (ENGLAND) ACCOUNT, 1900–1901.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 9th July; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 345.]

SECONDARY EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Report for the year 1901 by Sir Henry Craik, K.C.B., on the Inspection of Higher Class Schools in Scotland, and the Examination for leaving Certificates [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CHINA (No. 6, 1901).

Copy presented, of Further Correspondence respecting the Disturbances in China (in continuation of China (No. 5, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2691 to 2693 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

1. Adjournment Motions under Standing Order No. 17.;Return relative thereto [ordered 12th August; Mr. Caldwell]; to be printed. [No. 346.]

2. Closure of Debate (Standing Order No. 25).;Return relative thereto [ordered 12th August; Mr. Caldwell]; to be printed. [No. 347.]

3. Divisions of the House.;Return relative thereto [ordered 12th August; Mr. Caldwell]; to be printed.

4. Private Bills and Private Business.;Return relative thereto [ordered 12th August; Mr. Caldwell]; to be printed.

5. Public Bills.;Return relative thereto [ordered 12th August; Mr. Caldwell]; to be printed.

6. Public Petitions.;Return relative thereto [ordered 12th August; Mr. Caldwell]; to be printed.

7. Select Committees.;Return relative thereto [ordered 12th August; Mr. Caldwell]; to be printed.

8. Sittings of the House.;Return relative thereto [ordered 12th August; Mr. Caldwell]; to be printed.

9. Business of the House (Days occupied by Government and by Private Members).;Return relative thereto [ordered 12th August; Mr. Caldwell]; to be printed. [No. 348.]

10. Sittings of the House (Divisions and Questions).;Return relative thereto [ordered 8th August; Mr. Loder]; to be printed.

EAST INDIA (INDIAN RAILWAY MATERIALS).

Address for "Return, in tons and value, of all rolling stock, railway material, and stores supplied for Indian State and Guaranteed Railways during the years 1896 to 1900, inclusive, distinguishing those supplied by British and Foreign Year.

Supplied by British firms or persons.

Supplied by Foreign firms or persons.

Shipped in British vessels.

Shipped in Foreign vessels.

Tons.

Value.

Tons.

Value.

Tons.

Value.

Tons.
Value.
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
Totals

;(Sir Charles Cayzer.)

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Address for "Return of the names of every Member returned to serve in each Parliament from the year 1885 to the dissolution of Parliament in the year 1900, specifying the names of the county, city, university, or place for which returned (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 21, of session 1887).";(Mr. William Redmond.)

LONDON (EQUALISATION OF RATES) ACT, 1894.

[ACCOUNTS UNDER SECTION 1 (7) OF THE ACT.]

Return ordered, "showing, according to the Accounts for the twelve months preceding the 31st day of March, 1901, furnished to the Local Government Board under Section 1 (7) of the London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894;

(1) The authorities to whom payments under the Act were made by the London County Council during the year;

(2) The amount so received by each authority during the year;

(3) The amount of the expenses incurred during the year by each such authority (a) under the Public Health (London) Act, 1891 (including expenses of scavenging streets); (b) in respect of lighting; and (c) in respect of streets (other than the expenses of scavenging); and

firms or persons, and distinguishing whether shipped to India by foreign or British vessels, in the following form;

(4) The amount expended during the year by each such authority out of the sums received by them under the Act

(in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 323, of Session 1900).";(Mr. Grant Lawson.)

HARBOUR AUTHORITIES.

Return ordered, "from the Authorities of the Harbours, etc., of the United Kingdom;

(1) Giving a description of works executed within the last twenty years, distinguishing piers, docks, dredging, lighting and buoying, other works, and giving the total cost of Works under each head;

(2) Giving present area and depth of accommodation in Harbour for ships and boats, as compared with area and depth twenty years since;

(3) Giving the names of the engineers employed, stating if any engineers' reports on the Harbour Works have been made, and by whom and when;

(4) Giving an account of the present state of the Works, including depth of water at low water on the bar at entrance;

(5) Giving the time of high water at full and change of the moon, also the rise

of the tide at ordinary springs and neaps above low water mean spring tide;
(6) Giving a statement of the Income for the last twenty years arising from tolls, dues, and rates;
(7) Stating, in the case of a Fishery Harbour, the ordinary draft of fishing vessels when loaded;
(8) Giving copies of existing Harbour bye-laws and regulations;
(9) Giving the name and constitution of the trustees, managers, or owners of the Harbour or Harbour Works;
(10) Stating whether the Harbour Authority is constituted by Statute or by Provisional Order, and quoting the Statute or Provisional Order;
(11) Giving the limits of the harbour as defined by Statute or Provisional Order, distinguishing (1) conservancy jurisdiction and (2) rating area. In cases where the limits are not so defined, stating what are the recognised limits and quoting the authority therefor.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;LORD KITCHENER'S PROCLAMATION OF 7TH AUGUST.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.) had on the Paper the following question, but was not in his place to put it:;"To ask the right hon. Member for North Armagh whether he has asked or intends to ask the Government for facilities for the moving of a resolution of which he has given notice with reference to the terms of the proclamation issued by Lord Kitchener on 7th August."

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): May I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it is in order to put such a question to a private Member of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, as it appears to have reference to a resolution which the right hon. Member has set down on the Paper subsequently.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) asked the Leader of the House whether he could give him facilities for moving the resolution referred to.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The subject can be raised on the

Second Reading of the Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, which I hope to put down for Thursday.

MILITARY AMBULANCES.

MR. ROUND (Essex, Harwich): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he can state what progress has been made in the construction of ambulances of a lighter character than those used at the commencement of the war in South Africa, and if those sent out during last year, as stated by Lord Raglan, have given complete satisfaction,

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Experiments are still in progress with an improved ambulance and a special Committee is considering the subject. No reports have been received in regard to the wagons referred to in the last paragraph.

CASE OF THOMAS MACKIE.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that the gross misconduct which led to Thomas Mackie being deprived of his pension consisted in his having, whilst smarting under a sense of what he believed to be an act of injustice involving him in

pecuniary loss, sent a postcard to his superior officer with a view to inciting the latter to raise an action for libel against him; whether he is aware that apart from this Mackie's conduct was reported of the highest during the whole of his twenty years service in the Army; and whether, taking these facts into consideration, he will advise that this man's case be reconsidered by the Commissioners.

LORD STANLEY: I have nothing to add to the replies which I have already given to the questions put by the hon. Member on this subject.

PURCHASE OF FIELD GUNS IN GERMANY.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the

application by the authority of the Treasury of surpluses on certain grants for Army services to cover other grants for Army services in the year 1900–1901 includes the allocation of sums derived from the Clothing and other Votes to the purchase of field guns in Germany; and whether sanction will be sought next session for such application.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): Yes, Sir.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Will the hon. Gentleman undertake to bring on this resolution at a reasonable time?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot give any undertaking as to the conduct of public business.

NON-EFFECTIVE WARSHIPS.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, having regard to the fact that the "Glatton," the "Gorgon," the "Hecate," the "Cyclops," the "Hotspur," the "Orion," and the "Wyvern," and also the gun vessels "Swift" and "Linnet," are armed with muzzle-loading guns, whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to strike these vessels off the effective list.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The "Glatton," "Gorgon," "Hecate," and "Cyclops" are ships of no military value, and will shortly be removed from the effective list of the Navy. The "Hotspur" is in commission and is at present performing useful duties as guardship. The question of removing her from the effective list will be considered at the end of her present commission. The "Orion" is in reserve at Malta, and it has not yet been decided to strike her off the list. The "Wyvern" is to be used as a target ship on the China Station. The "Linnet" and "Swift" have already been removed from the effective list.

NAVAL MANŒUVRES;LEAVE TO SAILORS.

MR. GROVES (Salford, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can state whether the usual leave will be granted to the officers and men who have taken part in the recent Naval Manœuvres, including those engaged in the regular Channel Squadron, as has been the custom in former years on the conclusion of the said manœuvres.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Leave for ships commissioned for manœuvres will be granted as usual. Leave to ships not specially commissioned is entirely

dependent on the exigencies of the Service.

NEW ROYAL YACHT.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, with reference to the return of the new royal yacht to Portsmouth, he can give particulars of her defects and state what the Admiralty propose to do with the yacht.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Admiralty is not aware of any defects in the royal yacht. It is proposed to use the vessel for the purpose for which she was designed; namely, as a yacht for the use of His Majesty the King. I may add that during her recent voyage to Flushing and back the conduct of the ship was in every way satisfactory.

NAVAL WORKS BILL; COALING FACILITIES AT NAVAL PORTS.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty if he can now specify the places for which coaling facilities are to be provided under the Naval Works Bill.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The ports at which coaling facilities are to be provided under the Naval Works Bill are Devonport, Portland, Portsmouth, the Medway, Malta, Gibraltar, Hong Kong; and, if there are sufficient funds, at Halifax, Bermuda, and Jamaica.

COALING STATIONS; NAVAL OR MILITARY CONTROL.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the question between the War

Office and the Admiralty as to the transfer of the defence of the coaling stations to the Navy has been decided.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No decision has yet been come to.

NAVAL EXPENDITURE.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will issue a statement of money spent under the Naval Works Acts, 1895, 1896, 1897, and 1899, bringing the account up to 31st March, 1901 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 80), before taking the Second Reading of the Naval Works Bill.

*MR. PRETYMAN: As the accounts of expenditure for the year ending 31st March last will not be finally completed until January next, it is impossible to comply with the hon. Member's request.

WEST AFRICAN CABLES.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether in consequence of the recent purchase by the French Government of telegraph cables on the West Coast of Africa, the property of the West Africa Telegraph Company, the lines previously worked by that company will be so deviated as to avoid Bathurst and Accra, with which British possessions these lines are at present in connection.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The purchase by the French Government of the cables referred to by the right hon. Member has not yet been completed, but it has been arranged that the cables which are to be transferred to the French Government will be deviated so as not to touch at Bathurst and Accra. Those places will continue to be telegraphically

connected with this country by other lines which are in British hands.

ROMAN CATHOLIC PROCESSION AT WESTMINSTER.

COLONEL SANDYS(Lancashire, Bootle): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Government is aware that, on the afternoon of 23rd June last, a Roman Catholic procession carrying a crucifix and images, with priests in robes exercising the rites and ceremonies of their religion and wearing the habits of their order, passed through the streets of Westminster protected by police, the public traffic being stopped to admit of the procession passing, much disapprobation being openly expressed at the time by those present; and, seeing that the ecclesiastics in this procession were acting in contravention of the statute, 10 Geo. 4, c. 7, s. 26, whether the Chief Commissioner of Police, who is responsible for permitting and protecting processions in the streets of London, will in future be directed to refuse permission and the protection of the police for processions of the kind mentioned.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, W.): Is there any truth in the suggestion that these people required protection?

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I am informed that the Commissioner of Police gave no permission for the passage of the procession in question through the streets, and that the police simply performed their ordinary duty, their action being limited to the regulation of the traffic and preservation of order.

MR. FLAVIN: Why does not the hon. and gallant Member who put the question come down here with a proposal that the law be enforced?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member has no right to ask such a question of a private Member.

BURNLEY WEAVING SHEDS.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware of the system which is in operation in the weaving sheds in Burnley which allows the employers to deduct from the operatives' wages one halfpenny per loom for the purpose of having the machinery oiled, and whether steps will be taken to have the practice abolished.

*MR. RITCHIE: I have made inquiries and find that the practice described in the question exists and is alleged to give rise to abuses. In any other industry the factory inspectors would be able to deal with such abuses under the Truck Act, 1896, but operatives engaged in cotton weaving were at their own request excluded from the operation of that Act, and the Factory Department is, therefore, powerless to intervene.

RAILWAY RATES FOR FOREIGN TIMBER.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the rate for foreign timber is 8s. 6d. per ton, and the rate for native timber is 16s. 10d. per ton, and whether he will cause inquiries to be made and a remedy provided in this case of a preferential rate in favour of the foreigner.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): No, Sir, I am not aware that the figures are correct, and I cannot undertake to

embark upon a general inquiry. I would point out to the hon. Member that he gives no particulars as to the incidence of the rate, where charged, or for what sort of timber. From a letter he has forwarded to me I gather that the rates are said to be charged between; Cardiff and Birmingham. This information is not, however, sufficiently definite to support a complaint under Section 31 of the Railway and Canal Traffic Act; such a complaint should contain a specific case of alleged undue preference, with full particulars, and should be made by or on behalf of a trader aggrieved.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETURN.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he will grant the Return relating to Members of Parliament standing on to-day's Paper.

*MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sir.

MEMBERS' BATHROOMS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether it is his intention to reduce the number of bathrooms at present in the House for the convenience of Members; and, if so, whether, before reducing the number of rooms, he will inquire whether, because of the increased number of Members who use those bathrooms during the session, and the difficulty often experienced by Members to get the use of a room, an increased number of bathrooms is required; and whether he will provide more rooms.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): The Report of the House of Commons' Accommodation Committee recommended that the existing four bathrooms should be removed in order to provide the corridor to the additional smoking rooms; and, in lieu thereof, it was proposed to place three new bathrooms immediately adjoining the present dressing rooms. If, however, it is possible to increase the number of such rooms, I shall be most happy to consider it.

WALSALL SCHOOL EXEMPTIONS.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that the Walsall School Board, at its meeting in July, granted a number of complete and partial exemptions, and whether the Education Department propose to hold any inquiry or to take any steps to prevent this body from breaking its own bye-laws.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The Board of Education have addressed a letter of inquiry to the Walsall School Board on the subject.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, under paragraph 8, page 9, of the Revised Instructions applicable to the Education Code of 1901, it is intended to withdraw from responsible certificated teachers in infant schools the right to administer, where necessary,

personal chastisement, even of the lightest and most trivial character.

SIR J. GORST: The Board of Education intends to lay down the principles that

punishments which excite the emotion of terror in a child should not be employed; that in an infant school no punishment should be permitted which causes bodily pain; and that in schools for older children corporal punishment should be discouraged as an ordinary expedient in boys' schools, and altogether in girls' schools. The application of these principles is left to the discretion of the managers and teachers.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE IN INCLEMENT WEATHER.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, under the new arrangements for not marking the school registers in country districts in the case of inclement weather, the Board of Education will rigidly insist upon the condition set forth in Article 83 of the Education Code for 1901 to the effect that the school must have been open not less than 400 times; or whether the Board of Education will issue a Minute adding a new exception to Article 83 of the Code, so as to render the new regulation of Appendix II., page 37, of the Revised Instructions, of greater practical utility to the country schools.

SIR J. GORST: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative, and, consequently, to the second in the negative.

WOTTON-UNDER-EDGE POST OFFICE.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the Post Office at Wotton-under-Edge, Gloucestershire, has recently been made an R.S.O. office; whether the department will take into consideration the advisability of restoring it to its former position; and, if not, can he say whether the officials have been instructed to demand that the words R.S.O. shall be added to the address of all telegrams received in the town.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The substitution of a sub-post office for the former head office at Wotton-under-Edge was decided upon for administrative reasons, and, as the change does not involve any curtailment of the existing postal facilities for the public, the Postmaster General is not prepared to alter the decision. It is not necessary to add the letters R.S.O. to the address of telegrams, as "Wotton-under-Edge" is a sufficient address for telegrams for that place.

PROSECUTION UNDER THE DEBTORS (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1880; CASE OF SAMUEL WOLFFE.

MR. PARKES (Birmingham, Central): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Edgbaston Division of Birmingham, I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he can give the reasons why in the case of Samuel Wolffe, late of 152, Sauchiehall Street, Glasgow (whose estate was sequestrated in 1899), the Procurator Fiscal, after having ordered a prosecution in respect of offences under the Debtors (Scotland) Act, 1880, and issued a warrant for the arrest of the debtor, caused the withdrawal of such warrant and the abandonment of the proceedings without communicating with the general body of creditors, and on what grounds he refuses to comply with the wishes of certain creditors who, on learning of the abandonment of the prosecution, communicated to him their desire that the same might be proceeded with.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL FOR SCOTLAND (Mr. SCOTT DICKSON, Glasgow, Bridgeton): The

charge against the bankrupt was originally preferred by the trustee in the sequestration who represents the general body of creditors, and a warrant was issued for apprehension. Subsequently, and after further inquiries, the trustee communicated to Crown counsel the desire of himself and the principal creditors, as expressed both by letter and by a motion to that effect carried at a meeting of creditors, that the charge should be withdrawn. A pre-cognition was taken and Crown counsel came to be of opinion that there was not sufficient evidence to make a conviction at all probable. In these circumstances Crown counsel in November, 1900,

ordered the abandonment of the prosecution. That decision was communicated to the accused, and it would not be in accordance with practice now to reinstitute criminal proceedings.

GOVERNMENT SERVANTS AND POOR RATES;CASE OF THOMAS EGLINGTON.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of Thomas Eglington, who, after serving six years in the Army and a further period of six years as postman in the service of the Post Office, has become a burden on the ratepayers of the Kenmare Union, county Kerry, in consequence of ill-health as certified by the medical officer, and is in receipt of 3s. per week outdoor relief; and whether he will consider the grant of some pension to this man who has given the best period of his life to the service of the Government to prevent his thus becoming a charge on the ratepayers.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I have no information on the first paragraph. The question of the grant of a pension in respect of service in the Army or Post Office does not rest with the Irish Government. I shall bring the question of the hon. Member under the notice of each of these Departments.

BANAGHER GREAT FAIR.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, with reference to the forestalling of Banagher Great Fair, he will consider the effect of such forestalling on the attendance of foreign or outside buyers, who find themselves disappointed upon arriving on the legal day of the fair in securing the class of horses they came to purchase; and whether, as such buyers are often the principal purchasers of the more valuable animals, he will take steps in the interest of farmers and breeders of horses to prevent the destruction of the legal fair by the practice mentioned.

MR. WYNDHAM promised to see what steps could be taken in the matter.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman inquire into the whole circumstances and not confine himself to one particular case?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir.

PROHIBITION OF THE DROMOD MEETING.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a public meeting was to have been held at Dromod, county Monaghan, on the 3rd instant, and that a local sergeant of police, named Sullivan, went through the neighbourhood cautioning the people against attending the meeting, and if he can state by what authority Sergeant

Sullivan acted in this case.

MR. WYNDHAM: The police had reason to believe that it was intended to hold a meeting on the 4th, not 3rd instant, in close proximity to a certain holding at Dromod, and that if held at this place it would lead to a breach of the peace and would be an unlawful assembly. The promoters were accordingly warned that the meeting would not be permitted in the immediate vicinity of the holding in question. A meeting was held elsewhere, however, without interference.

MR. DALY: Who instructed the sergeant to take this action?

MR. WYNDHAM: That would be done on general instructions. It was done on the authority of the Government, and I accept full responsibility for it.

MR. FLAVIN: May any policeman warn any person he likes?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is a general question.

MR. FLAVIN: It is a very pertinent one, though.

IRISH AGRARIAN OFFENCES.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the Return of

Agrarian Outrages during the quarter ended 30th June, 1901, the number of offences classed as incendiary fires, twenty, and as intimidation, twenty-three, is correctly stated; and if so, whether, in view of the nature of the evidence given at the recent summer assizes in Ireland in regard to incendiary fires, inquiries will be made as to how these figures are arrived at.

MR. WYNDHAM: Twenty-three threatening letters were reported during the quarter, and one case of intimidation (Donegal) other than by threatening letter. The number of incendiary fires reported was twenty. The reference to the evidence given at the recent assizes is not understood, but I may observe that in the majority of cases in which claims for compensation for malicious burnings are heard on appeal at assizes the offences are not of an agrarian character.

MR. FLYNN: Has the right hon. Gentleman's attention been called to the fact that it has transpired at the assizes that a large proportion of the cases were malicious only on the part of the persons claiming the compensation?

MR. WYNDHAM: There have been cases of that kind, and there have been cases where malice has not been proved, but the discrepancy referred to by the hon. Member is not accounted for by what I have stated.

MR. FLYNN: Will the right hon. Gentleman instruct the constabulary to go more minutely into these Returns?

MR. WYNDHAM: I think they do inquire very closely already.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.) asked as to the case of a man named Murphy, prosecuted by the Crown in connection with his evidence as to the burning of a cowshed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is now asking as to a case which is not on the Paper.

CAVAN COURT HOUSE.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that the agent to the Earl of Clanricarde, who is High Sheriff for the county of Cavan, on 1st July, without notice, broke open the door of the room in the courthouse which has been used by the finance committee of the County Council for its meetings, and by the secretary of the

County Council for his private office, removed the papers therein, and put a lock of his own on it; and on same date took possession of a room which the Cavan Urban Council has used as an office and for its meetings since 1854; did the late secretary of the Cavan Grand Jury always use the room in which the finance committee transacted its business as a private office; and as neither of those rooms was required for the use of the judges or bar in discharge of their duties, do the Government intend to take any notice of this gentleman's conduct or make any change in the law, so that county councils in Ireland shall have full control over the courthouses which have been built and maintained at the expense of the ratepayers, except when required at assizes or quarter sessions.

MR. WYNDHAM: The High Sheriff for the County of Cavan, who is the agent of Lord Clanricarde, desired to make the most convenient arrangements in the courthouse for the accommodation of the bar, the sub-sheriff, the county council, their secretary and his clerks, as well as for the finance committee, and, when and where possible, for the urban district council. He had the legal right to make these arrangements, which in themselves appear reasonable and proper. It is not true that he broke open the door of the room used by the finance committee or removed any papers, but it is true that he put a new lock on the door, as he designed the room for another purpose, offering the secretary a room in exchange. I shall be happy to supply the hon. Member with the details of the re-arrangements, which are too complicated to give in answer to a question. I have already replied to the queries contained in the concluding part of the question.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Are we to understand from the right hon.

Gentleman's answer that it is in the power of sheriffs of Irish counties to enter these courthouses and upset the arrangements of the local authorities?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is a matter of argument.

MR. FLAVIN: Has the sheriff a right to go in and;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is the very question I have just ruled out of order.

BOYCOTTING; TOBERCURRY CASE.

COLONEL M'CALMONT (Antrim, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the proceedings at Tobercurry Petty Sessions Court, county Sligo, on Thursday last, from which it appears that a Mr. Perdue had been boycotted for taking a farm under the eleven months system; that the Protestant clergyman had been boycotted because he had been seen speaking to Mr. Perdue; that a Roman Catholic youth had been boycotted and assaulted because he worked for this Protestant clergyman; and that his mother had been boycotted, an attempt made to assault her in the chapel with a stick, and that subsequently the form of a coffin had been placed on her door; and whether the Government are taking steps to prevent a recurrence of such a state of things, either at Achonry or elsewhere?

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are correctly stated in the first paragraph, except that Mr. Perdue did not take a farm on the eleven months system, but purchased a farm under the Land Purchase Acts, which the tenants in the locality considered should have been divided amongst themselves. The prosecution referred to was

instituted by the Government. The answer to the second paragraph is in the affirmative.

KINVARA HARBOUR.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that there is no available authority to compel the receiver of tolls at Kinvara Harbour to take such measures as will facilitate the entrance of vessels; and, seeing that the payment of tolls is levied for that purpose, he will institute inquiry as to the manner in which a remedy can be provided.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have nothing to add to my previous reply except that I will give the matter my personal attention during the recess.

IRISH LAND PURCHASE.

MR. LONDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing how much of the 30 millions of money voted for the purchase of land in Ireland under the Purchase Act of 1891 was allocated to each of the counties in Ireland, and how much of those various sums has been expended, and how much is yet available.

MR. WYNDHAM: A Return, showing the capital value of the share of each county in the cash and contingent portions of the Guarantee Fund under the Act of 1891, will be laid on the Table in the course of the present week.

TARA HILL.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Board of Public Works will take steps to prevent any further excavations at Tara Hill.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Board have no power to prevent excavations carried on with the consent of the owner, inasmuch as the guardianship of the mounds has not been vested in the Board. The fact that the mounds are scheduled to the Ancient Monuments Act does not vest the guardianship in the Board, or entitle it to interfere with any action taken by the owner.

MR. FLAVIN: Under the local Government Act, have the county council any control over these places? Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps with a view to securing the preservation of this historic property?

MR. WYNDHAM: It would be better if steps were taken by private individuals.

DIAMOND NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHER.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state why Mr. William J. Walters, late teacher of the Diamond National School, Crumlin District, Register No. 8,310, has not received a retiring gratuity.

MR. WYNDHAM: Mr. Walters is not entitled to a retiring gratuity under the Pension Rules. He resigned his school on the 28th February, 1894, in consequence of a dispute with the school committee. If he intended to apply for a gratuity on the ground of ill-health he should have done so within one year from the date of resignation. This he failed to do. In 1897 and 1898 applications on his behalf were received from two clergymen, but they were informed that Mr. Walters could not be granted a retiring gratuity. Under Pension Rule 2 (1) of 1898 the

Superintendent of the Pensions Office may extend the time within which notice of a claim for a gratuity under Rule 28 of the Superseded Pension Rules may be given, provided the Commissioners notify that there was reasonable excuse for the omission to make the application within one year, but no excuse has been given for the teacher's omission to comply with the rules in this case.

IRISH REVISION BARRISTERS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state upon what principle the Lord Lieutenant proceeds in the annual appointments of assistant revising barristers; whether he is aware that of the thirty-one gentlemen appointed to those offices last year twenty-five were Unionists, and that the proportion has been about the same ever since the present Government came into office; and whether he will give an assurance that in the appointments to be made for this and subsequent years the selections will be made equally from both political parties.

*THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): At the request of my right

hon. friend I will reply to this question. The Lord Lieutenant proceeds upon the principle of selecting the men best qualified by knowledge and experience to discharge the duties of the post, and not on account of their political opinions. As far as my knowledge goes the figures given by the hon. Member in the question are entirely erroneous. The undertaking asked for cannot be given.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: In what respect are the figures entirely erroneous?

MR. ATKINSON: As far as my memory serves me they are entirely erroneous in that they minimise the number of Nationalists appointed.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON: Do many Nationalists apply for the appointments?

[No answer was returned.]

IRISH DRIFT SURVEY; SOIL MAPS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that the Americans have recently decided on preparing a series of soil maps for the whole of the United States, and whether this example will be followed in Ireland, which is an agricultural country.

SIR J. GORST: The hon. Member has called my attention to the proceedings in America; the drift survey in Ireland is being carried out with due despatch.

MR. FIELD: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the last paragraph of my question.

SIR J. GORST: The Geological Survey is only a drift survey; a soil survey is something quite different.

MR. FIELD: I will repeat the question on Friday.

BANTRY BAY FORESHORE.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the rights of the Crown to the foreshore of Bantry Bay, between Mr. Murphy's deal-yard and the old pier, have been assigned to the trustees of the Bantry estate.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Assuming that the foreshore referred to forms part of that lying immediately to the west of the New Quay, Bantry Creek, the answer is, Yes.

INNISKEEN POSTMASTERSHIP.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will in the future see that no inspector or representative of the Post Office be sent to a district to investigate any case where the friends of the inspector reside or are interested, as was the case at Inniskeen, county Monaghan, where an inspector named Lockington took part in the transferring of a post office to his brother from a man who held the position for twenty-six years at Inniskeen.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General cannot give any such undertaking. The action taken by Mr. Lockington is not accurately described in the latter part of the hon. Member's question.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Is it not accurate to say that the inspector dismissed the postmaster and put his brother into the job?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: He did not dismiss the postmaster or put his brother into the place.

MR. DALY: Is it not the fact that Lockington conducted the inquiry as the result of which the postmaster was dismissed, and that Lockington's brother got the place?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have stated that Lockington conducted the inquiry. The postmaster was dismissed by the Postmaster General in consequence of what transpired at the inquiry, and at a trial which occurred in the locality. I should add that the post office has not been given to Lockington's brother, but to the occupant of a house which is owned by him, and this fact was stated by Lockington in his report to the Postmaster General when he submitted this and other houses as suitable for post-office purposes. The appointment has been filled temporarily and not permanently.

MR. DALY: Can the hon. Gentleman state how it came to the lot of this inspector to get Fitzpatrick dismissed after he had occupied the office so many years without complaint?

MR. SPEAKER: That is not the question on the Paper.

MR. DALY: I will put it down then.

DOWNPATRICK MAILS.

MR. RENTOUL (Down, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that letters arriving by the English mail at Downpatrick at 10.32 a.m. are not delivered in the neighbouring villages of Ardglass and Killough till 4.30 p.m. and 5.30 p.m. respectively, and that letters for the English mail leaving Downpatrick at 3.0 p.m. must be posted in Killough and Ardglass at 7.0 and 8.0 a.m. respectively: and, seeing that arrangements could be made with the County Down Railway whereby the delivery of the letters referred to could be made at Killough and Ardglass at least four hours earlier, and the time of posting for the English mail at least six hours later than at present, whether he will consider the advisability of these improvements being carried out; whether he will consider if the remuneration of 5s. a week to the messenger delivering letters at Ardglass twice daily could be increased; and whether, in accordance with the requests made by the inhabitants of the district, he will take steps to have letter-boxes placed in High Street, Ardglass, and at Coney Island, midway between Ardglass and

Killough.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The facts as regards the postal arrangements at Ardglass and Killough are substantially as stated in the first part of the question. The substitution of a day mail service by train for the present day mail service by car would, however, be objected to by many of the persons concerned. Moreover, the cost of the

existing service is so high that the Postmaster General would not feel justified in sanctioning any further expenditure on the post. The Postmaster General will cause further inquiry to be made as to the duties of the messenger at Ardglass, and will communicate with the hon. Member. The circumstances do not justify the establishment of letterboxes in High Street, Ardglass, or at Coney Island.

DEPORTATION OF PAUPERS FROM SCOTLAND TO IRELAND.

MR. MOORE (Antrim, N.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if he is aware that a warrant has been issued to Mr. John Reed, inspector of poor, at the instance of the local authority in Kilmarnock Union, for the removal to the Ballycastle Union, county Antrim, of Mary M'Auley, otherwise Kennedy, with eight children, from the parish of Kilmarnock; will he state the circumstances of this case; have any rules been made under Section 7 of the Poor Law (Scotland) Act of 1898, regulating appeals to the Scotch Local Government Board in such matters; and, seeing that the Ballycastle guardians wish to oppose the removal, will he ensure that no step shall be taken towards their actual deportation to Ireland until the fullest opportunities have been afforded the guardians for investigation in Scotland.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: I learn from the Local Government Board for Scotland that they are informed that the pauper in question has resided in Scotland for about six years, and that during that time she has been frequently chargeable, in different parishes, as a pauper. She has not acquired a settlement in Scotland, and the conditions have not been complied with which would entitle either the pauper or the Irish board of guardians to appeal against the removal. The Local Government Board have framed rules under Section 7 of the Poor Law (Scotland) Act, 1898.

MR. MOORE: May I ask on what ground the Scottish authorities sent this woman to Ballycastle? There was no more reason for sending her there than to Ballyshannon.

MR. SCOTT DICKSON: The Scotch Local Government Board have no duty in regard to place of removal.

BISHOPRIC OF SOUTHWARK BILL.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that notices of amendment to the Second Reading of the Bishopric of Southwark Bill have been given from both sides of the House, it is his intention to give special facilities for proceeding with the Bill during the present session; and, if so, whether he will arrange that the Second Reading shall be moved at a time when its provisions can be adequately discussed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to my hon. friend I have to say that if this Bill is to be made the text in any quarter of the House for a general discussion on

Church matters and matters ecclesiastical, it is evident that it is quite impossible to go on with it this session. I confess I had hoped that, as members of the Church of England and all shades of ecclesiastical opinion in the diocese desire the passing of the Bill, it might really be allowed to go through without discussion. But I have no control over that, and if it appears that the opportunity is to be taken, as technically it can be taken, for the wider discussion my hon. friend desires, of course it would be quite impossible to hope to pass the Bill into law in the course of this session.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR: I should like to ask whether the First Lord is aware that notice has been given from both sides of the House of motions for the rejection of the Bill on the Second Reading?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My opinion, which I give for what it is worth, is that the only obstacle to the passing of the Bill is this desire to discuss general ecclesiastical questions on this Bill. I cannot help thinking that if that stumbling-block were removed from its path the passing of the Bill would be assured.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can promise any special facilities for proceeding with the Church Discipline Bill either this or next session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend will recognise that it is quite impossible for me to give any pledge on this subject.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS BILL.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can say when it is proposed to take the Second Reading of the Elementary School Teachers Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As I stated the other day in answer to a question put to me from another quarter of the House, there does appear to be a desire to discuss this Bill which, if it exists, as I fear it does, will make it impossible for us to make further progress with the Bill.

DR. MACNAMARA: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is a very general agreement on both sides of the House as to the desirableness of securing this reform at as early a date as possible?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think there is a large body of opinion on both sides of the House of the kind the hon. Gentleman refers to; but nevertheless I believe there is a volume of opinion in the House which would never allow so large a change to come into operation without some opportunity for discussion.

DR. MACNAMARA: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there are only two notices on the Paper, one in the name of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich and the other in the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University? Are these the notices which make him believe that it is impossible to pass the Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not the notices which make it impossible to proceed with the Bill. It is the indications that these notices afford and other symptoms that have come to my knowledge that make me fear that further progress with the Bill this session is impossible.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is the right hon. Gentleman in a position to make any arrangement of the business for next week?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir; not yet.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Will the Appropriation Bill be the first business on Thursday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is the first important business, but there may be some small matters before it.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I suppose the Naval Works Bill will be taken to-morrow?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes; that is my hope.

MILITIA AND YEOMANRY BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

NEW BILL.

WAITERS, WAITRESSES, AND BAR ATTENDANTS.

Bill to limit the hours of employment of Waiters, Waitresses, and Bar Attendants, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Nannetti, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Keir Hardie, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Kendal O'Brien, Mr. Bell, and Mr. Field.

WAITERS, WAITRESSES, AND BAR ATTENDANTS BILL.

"To limit the hours of employment of Waiters, Waitresses, and Bar Attendants," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, and to be printed. [Bill 293.]

ROYAL TITLES BILL [Lords]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1.;

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he wished to move as an Amendment the addition of the words "provided always that the style and title of the Defender of the Faith shall no longer be used, and is hereby relinquished." He said one of his objects in moving this Amendment was to release His Majesty the King from the false and absurd position in which he had been placed by the action of Parliament. Not only Roman Catholics, but members of the various denominations of Protestants, objected to the King being obliged to assume a title which had reference, if it referred to anything at all, to only one branch of the Protestant religion. He did not intend to go at any length into the history of this title, "Defender of the Faith," but he would refer as briefly as possible to the circumstances under which this title was first adopted by the Kings of England. At the time of Luther, Henry VIII. wrote a book denouncing Lutheran heresies, and sent a specially engrossed copy of the book to Pope Leo X. He found in an account of that transaction that on the last page of the book presented to Pope Leo there were two lines written in Latin, to the following effect, "Henry, King of England, sends to Leo X. this work, as a pledge of his fidelity and friendship." This work was accompanied by a letter which conclusively proves that the faith of which King Henry VIII. became the defender was the ancient Catholic faith, and had nothing to do with the Protestant Church. These were the words;

"Not satisfied with this proof (this referring, it was to be presumed, to the statement of friendship earlier in the letter) of our zeal for the Catholic faith and our devotion to the Apostolic See, we resolved to show by our written words what we thought of Luther and his detestable books, thus to make it clear that we would be ever ready to defend and protect as well with the pen as with the sword the Holy Roman Church."

Upon the receipt of that flattering letter Pope Leo X. issued a Bull in these terms;

"Leo, servant of the servants" of the Lord, to his most dear son, Henry, King of England, Defender of the Faith; all health and happiness."

Then the Bull goes on to say;

"Sitting in this Holy See, and having with mature deliberation considered the business with our brethren, we do with their unanimous counsel and consent grant unto your Majesty, your heirs and successors, the title of 'Defender of the Faith,' and we do by these presents confirm it unto you, commanding all the Faithful to give your Majesty this title."

There could therefore be no doubt in the mind of any person who examined the historical records referring to those times that the origin of the title

"Defender of the Faith" had reference to the Catholic faith and no other. He did not think he need dwell at length on historical matters, but there was, he would remind hon. Members, a fresco in the parliamentary buildings which set forth in a very interesting manner King Henry VIII. and his six wives, one after the other. He did not propose to debate on the matrimonial enterprise of His Majesty, but he did wish to recall the fact that when the Pope refused to approve of the King taking a fresh wife while he had a wife living, Henry VIII. threw off his allegiance to the See of Rome, and Leo X. thereupon withdrew the title of "Defender of the Faith," which he conferred on the King for his defence of the Church which subsequently he denounced, reviled, despoiled and plundered in every possible way. No doubt Henry got the English Parliament to confer on him the title of "Defender of the Faith," and there was thus created the curious state of affairs that whereas the Pope had originally given the title and withdrawn it, the Parliament of England re-created it and re-gave it to the Sovereign, calling him "Defender of the Faith," which he was at the moment engaged in destroying with all his might and main. The next step in the curious history of this title was taken in the reign of Philip and Mary, when the Act conferring the title on the King of England was repealed, and subsequently, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, there being some doubt as to the validity of the Act passed in Mary's reign, the same Act was again repealed. He could not, therefore, understand how it could be argued that the title was now held by Act of Parliament, seeing that the Act conferring it on Henry VIII. had been twice repealed, and no legislative step had since been taken to reimpose it on the King of England. He submitted with great respect that it was unfair to the present King to ask him to assume a title which had its origin in the times when England belonged to the Catholic faith; a title which was conferred by the Pope; and at the same time to insist by another Act of Parliament that he should denounce as "idolatrous and superstitious" the very

religion for the defence of which this title was conferred upon his distinguished but much-married ancestor Henry VIII. In his accession oath the King was compelled to declare that "the invocation of the Virgin Mary or any of the saints, and the Sacrifice of the Mass as now used in the Church of Rome, are idolatrous and superstitious practices," and it was an absurd and unworthy position in which to place the King when they asked him to assume this title of Defender of the Faith, and in the same breath denounce the doctrines of that faith as idolatrous and superstitious. Of course he had no personal knowledge of His Majesty's views, but the chances were a hundred to one, in his opinion, that if the King himself were consulted he would be glad if Parliament relieved him of this absurd title, and from making the unpleasant declaration in which he singled out one religion for special denunciation. It was not merely from the Catholic point of view he raised this question. He would appeal to the Nonconformists of the country to say whether, in this matter, they would make a stand in the interests of the creed they professed. If the title had no reference to the Catholic faith, it had reference to the Protestant Church as established by law, and why should that Church be singled out from all other Protestant sects for that distinction? It was an absurd and obsolete title, carrying no honour whatever. The history of it as connected with Henry VIII. was a history of shame and dishonour of which he doubted whether any Englishman was proud at the present time. He begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name, and to express a hope that it would be supported by gentlemen of varying religious persuasions on both sides of the House.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 11, after the words 'seem fit,' to insert the words 'Provided always that the style and title of Defender of the Faith shall no longer be used and is hereby relinquished.'";(Mr. William Redmond.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.):

The hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment has introduced us not merely into the realms of history, but of theology, and he has contrived not only to deal with history and theology, but to drag in the Royal declaration, which seems to me to be in no sense germane to the discussion now before the Committee. I am not going to deal with the theological topics which the hon. Gentleman has raised. I will only say, as a mere matter of historical relevance, that I do not think anyone would be more surprised than Henry VIII., if he could be consulted, to learn that at any period of his life he ceased to profess the Catholic religion. He was no doubt wrong from the point of view of the hon. Gentleman opposite, but he believed to the end of his life that the faith he professed was the Catholic faith, and that the particular form of faith which he denounced was a perversion of it, and not its fulfilment. Everyone, I suppose, will admit in regard to this, as in regard to many matters which we have inherited from generations long gone by, that probably if the whole thing had to be done again it might be done better or it might be done worse, but that at all events it would not be done in exactly the same way. I am not at all concerned to say that if the House, for the first time in our long parliamentary history, set itself to work to frame a

proper adequate style and title for our Sovereign they would use the precise formula which our ancestors have handed down to us. If that is the argument of the hon. Gentleman or any Member of the House, it is a very thin and shallow argument, and not likely to carry weight inside or outside these walls. We belong to an historic monarchy, and the fact that it is an historic monarchy ought to oblige us; and I am sure inclines us; to treat with deference and respect any part of the historical traditions with which it is surrounded, unless it can be shown that any direct evil or offence arises out of this continuity of tradition. The title of "Defender of the Faith" has been borne by every single British Sovereign since Henry VIII, including Queen Mary. No doubt she rejected it, but it was resumed by her successor, and from the time of Elizabeth down to the present day the sovereigns of this country have been styled "Defender of the Faith." It would be perfect folly for us to set to work on a priori principles to remodel an ancient title of this kind, that injures neither he who bears it nor the people over whom he rules. Under these circumstances it seems to me it would be the height of folly if we, with no circumstances requiring it, unprovoked by any change in the position of the country or the opinion of its inhabitants, were to suddenly take in hand the task of remodelling the ancient, historic title of our kings.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.) pointed out that this was not the first proposal to interfere with an old and historic title, for a change in it was made in 1876, when Mr. Disraeli, against the opposition of the Liberal party, conferred on Her late Majesty the title of Empress of India. It was not merely the Irish Members who then resisted, but it was Mr. Lowe, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, and other Liberal leaders who objected to any interference, either by legislation or by proclamation, with the ancient title of the sovereigns of this country. It certainly was not fitting that a sovereign should style himself defender of a faith he was required to declare indolent and superstitious. The Leader of the House had stated that Henry VIII. believed himself to be a Catholic down to the day of his death. He agreed with him, and he found support for that view in a copy of a letter still extant, in which that monarch bequeathed money for Masses for the repose of his soul. It was clear that Leo X. conferred the title in recognition of work done by Henry VIII. in refuting the heresies of Luther, and he ventured to think that its retention under present circumstances could not afford satisfaction to the members of any religious creed in this country.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne) said he intended to vote in favour of the Amendment. It was impossible to define the faith of which the King was the defender, and it was, therefore, an unmeaning title. Even if the Church of England were united in faith and doctrine it still would not be the faith of the people. Nonconformists and Roman Catholics being largely in the majority, and both objecting to the title. It was time it fell out of use, and he should vote against it unless some better reason than antiquity could be given for it.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said he had some philosophic doubt in regard to the Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury had defended

the title on historic grounds, and upon no other, and thereby emphatically admitted the Catholic case. Look at the wretched condition of the Protestants and the magnificent position which the Catholics occupied in regard to this question. The Protestants were always reviling Rome and denouncing Roman jurisdiction, so that, from the Catholic point of view, there was no greater proof of the power of Popery than the persistence in the adoption of this title. It was idle to say that the title rested on statute, because when Cardinal Pole came over to this country Queen Mary repealed the Act of Henry VIII., and as soon as Elizabeth came to the throne she also repealed the same statute. It was said that the Pope could not derogate from his own grant, and that, having once granted the title to the King, there was no power in the Pontiff to withdraw what was really a complimentary title. It was some satisfaction to him as a Catholic to reflect that, so far as the statute was concerned, the King had no legal title whatever to the title of "Defender of the Faith," that it was a usurpation, and that he held it in the teeth of the statute, and solely by reason that it had been conferred upon him as a compliment by the Roman Pontiff. It was very satisfactory to Catholics that, although the King was not defender of the faith, or the eldest son of the Church, he held the title of defender of the faith by a Papal brief. He never could make out why it was that William III., who was to protect us all from brass money and wooden shoes, was regarded as a sound Protestant. He had always doubted King William III.'s soundness, and looked upon him as a Jesuit in disguise, because King William III. himself had been in certain relations with the Pope. He knew that hon. Gentlemen opposite, who claimed to be loyal Protestants, were absolutely obliged, three hundred years after their great and glorious Reformation, which was to redeem the country

from all sin and sorrow, to go into the lobby practically to uphold and support a gift from Rome to this country. He would vote for the Amendment of his hon. friend purely as a matter of convenience to relieve His Majesty from what he believed was an embarrassment to him every time he had to write down the title, while at the same time he heartily rejoiced that the Protestants of this country were now compelled to uphold the ancient jurisdiction of the Pope of Rome.

*MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) did not think that the First Lord had given any substantial reason why the Amendment should not be accepted. He said the title had been borne by sovereigns of this country since the days of Henry VIII., but that was not exactly the fact, for there were issued in 1849 coins now known as "Godless florins," on which the title of "Defender of the Faith" was not borne.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): That was when you had an Irish Roman Catholic, Richard Lalor Sheil, as Master of the Mint.

*MR. TULLY (continuing) said that, whatever the reason, the title was undoubtedly dropped at that time, and although every effort was subsequently made to call all the florins in, there were some in the possession of private individuals who highly prized them. He did not believe that the King himself, as a common-sense man, would wish to continue to hold the title. It was just as absurd as the practice which formerly prevailed of calling sovereigns of this realm "Kings of France." Think of the position of the hon. Member for South

Belfast. Was he staunch or true in his Protestantism in defending the retention of this title which was conferred by the Pope?

MR. T. M. HEALY: I rise to order, Sir. Is it in order to suggest that the hon. Member for South Belfast is not staunch or true in his Protestantism?

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)

Boland, John

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Barry, E. (Cork. S.)

Boyle, James

Clancy, John Joseph

Bell, Richard

Burke, E. Haviland-

Cogan, Denis J.

*MR. TULLY said he was not aware that he had trodden on the corns of any of them. He had been listening in the vain hope that the hon. Member for South Belfast would stand up and declare his views on the subject. It was a matter of perfect indifference to him where King Henry VIII. was. The hon. Member for Belfast was not consistent in voting against this Amendment, for he found that a gentleman who posed as an authority on religions matters had written a letter to the Standard, in which he said;

"Of what faith is His Majesty the Defender? During the Investiture with the ring the Archbishop is directed to say, 'Receive this Ring, the Ensign of Kingly Dignity, and of defence of the Catholic Faith.'"

The objection of the Irish Catholic Members to this title was that these words, used in this connection, added to the insult contained in the Royal Declaration that Catholics were idolatrous and superstitious. He hoped hon. Members on the opposite side of the House who were Nonconformists would follow the example of the hon. Member for Camborne and vote for the Amendment. To give such a title to the King conveyed a false impression, just as when the King of England was called the King of France. The Government had already announced that they would not proceed with the Royal Declaration Bill, which modified the Coronation Oath, and which had passed through the House of Lords.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member will not be entitled to discuss the provisions of that Bill.

*MR. TULLY said he bowed to the Chairman's ruling, but he might say that he, for one, preferred the naked brutality of the present King's Declaration to the watered-down Declaration the Bill proposed to adopt.

Question put.

The Committee divided::Ayes, GO; Noes, 188. (Division List No. 466.)

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Lundon, W.

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Crean, Eugene

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.

Cullinan, J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
O'Malley, William
Daly, James
M'Fadden, Edward
O'Mara, James
Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Dillon, John
Murnaghan, George
Power, Patrick Joseph
Donelan, Capt A.
Murphy, John
Reddy, M.
Doogan, P. C.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Roche, John
Field, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Sullivan, Donal
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N.
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien Patrick (Kilkenny)
Tully, Jasper
Hammond, John
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
White. Patrick (Meath, North)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Doherty, William
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks. W. R.
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. William Redmond and Mr. Caine
Joyce, Michael
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Dowd, John

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Arrol, Sir William
Fisher, William Hayes
Loder, Gerald Walter E.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Balcarres, Lord
Foster, P. S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Gardner, Ernest
Lucas, Col. F. (Lowestoft)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Lucas, B. J. (Portsmouth)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Banbury, Frederick George
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Macdona, John Cumming

Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Bignold, Arthur
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Maconochie, A. W.
Blundell, Col. Henry
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
M'Calmont Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Majendie, James A. H.
Brassey, Albert
Grant, Corrie
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Broadhurst, Henry
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Mitchell, William
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Groves, James Grimble
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Caldwell, James
Hain, Edward
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Mid'x)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Causton, Richard Knight
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd)
Moss, Samuel
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Mount, William Arthur
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Harwood, George
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Haslett, Sir James Horner
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Parker, Gilbert
Channing, Francis Allston
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Chapman, Edward
Heaton, John Henniker
Paulton, James Mellor
Charrington, Spencer
Helme, Norval Watson
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Higginbottom, S. W.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Holland, William Henry
Pretymann, Ernest George
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Pryce-Johns, Lt.-Col. Edward
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Horniman, Frederick John
Purvis, Robert
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Houldsworth, Sir Win. Henry
Randles, John S.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Hoult, Joseph
Reid, James (Greenock)
Colville, John
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Cranborne, Viscount
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Crombie, John William
Johnston, William (Belfast)

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Davenport, William Bromley-
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Round, James
Dickson, Charles Scott
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Rutherford, John
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Law, Andrew Bonar
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Duke, Henry Edward
Lawson, John Grant
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Strachey, Edward
White, Luke (Yorks. E. H.)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J G (Oxf'd Univ.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Sinclair. Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Tennant, Harold John
William S. Osmond (Merioneth
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks. E. R.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks. W. R.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Thornton, Percy M.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath.
Spear, John Ward
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
Tritton, Chas. Ernest
Stanley, Edward Jas (Somerset

Valentia, Viscount

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.

Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.

Bill reported, without amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. DILLON said that this was a Bill to which many of them strongly objected. It was an unbroken practice of the House that the third reading of a Bill should not be taken on the same day as that on which it had passed in Committee, except by general agreement of the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will not press the Third Reading to-day.

Bill to be read the third time tomorrow.

PACIFIC CABLE BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.

Clause 1::

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said it seemed to him to be a very extraordinary thing that a cable which was to connect Australia with Canada, and which would not come within 3,000 miles of England, should have to be built with funds provided out of the Imperial resources. If the cable was to benefit Canada and Australia so much, it ought to be built by money provided by the colonies. The working expenses were to be paid for in the ratio of five-eighteenths by this country, and the remainder by the colonies, and he could not see any reason why the same ratio should have been adopted in defraying the cost of building the cable.

In fact, that was a view that had been taken by the Colonial Secretary himself when the matter was first under discussion, as could be seen by his despatches to the Governor General of Canada and the Governors of the Australian colonies. That was a monstrous divergence from the traditional policy of the country, and if the country had to bear a part of the expense, it was logical that a portion of it should also be borne by the colonies.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 27, after the word 'of,' to insert the words 'five-eighteenths of.'"; (Mr. O'Mara.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) said he could not accept the Amendment of the hon. Member. It was perfectly true that the original proposal of His Majesty's Government was merely to subsidise the cable, and not themselves to take any part in its construction or management, but it was also a part of that proposal that His Majesty's Government should not share in the profits of the cable. That arrangement was not satisfactory to the colonies, and, in deference to their views, His Majesty's Government agreed to a plan which found greater favour with the colonies, and which was that this country should take part in the construction

of the cable with the colonies, should be joint owners with them, and should be jointly represented on the board of control. Nothing would be gained by the adoption of the hon. Member's Amendment. He understood the object of the hon. Member was to limit the liability and the ultimate loss which might fall on this country. The hon. Member need not be really anxious about that matter, nor would he secure anything more by his Amendment than was secured under the present agreement. In order that the capital for the construction of the cable might be obtained to the best advantage, His Majesty's Government agreed with the colonies that they should raise the whole of the money, and lend it to the cable board. He would ask the Committee to support His Majesty's Government in the action they had taken in that respect. The agreement with the different colonial Governments was that they should not only pay thirteen-eightieths of any loss in the working of the cable, over and above the revenue, but that they should bear thirteen-eightieths of all the charges in connection with the raising of the money and the construction of the cable, as well as with its maintenance and repair. It was quite true therefore that in the first instance the liability for the £2,000,000 rested with this country, because the Treasury had undertaken to raise the whole of the money, and would give their guarantee to those from whom it was borrowed. But the colonial Governments had accepted their full share as to thirteen-eightieths of that liability, and he did not think that anyone would suggest that the colonial Governments would be either unable or unwilling to discharge an obligation freely entered into by themselves for an object which they considered of great importance. He hoped the hon. Member would not persist in his Amendment.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said he could not understand why in regard to the whole matter the Government should have changed their mind since 1899. Two years was not very long in which to reverse a whole policy of that kind. The policy which was laid down in 1899 was that the Government considered that the responsibility for the construction and working of the cable should be home by the colonial Governments. That position had now been abandoned. The matter had been under consideration for six years, and at the time the Committee took evidence the general understanding was that the colonies were to find the capital for the construction of the cable and to maintain it in proper order. The correspondence showed that pressure had been brought to bear upon the Colonial Secretary to abandon that position, and now the whole responsibility, in the first instance at any rate, would fall on the mother country, and the Treasury was dragged by the Colonial Office into that hazardous undertaking. It was acknowledged that the cable was to be primarily constructed for the benefit of Canada and Australia, and that only a very indirect share of the advantage would accrue to this country. He did not follow the figures of his hon. friend with regard to five-eighths. He would propose that the Treasury should find £1,000,000, and that the liability for the other £1,000,000 should devolve on the colonies. If the colonies were anxious to have increased cable facilities they ought to pay a half or third of the expense of raising the capital. There was absolutely no mention of the colonies in the clause, and undoubtedly responsibility in the first instance rested with the Treasury. Were the

talismanic words "Imperial unity" responsible for the change in the policy of the Government? Could the colonies themselves raise the money in open market at three per cent.?

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): Yes.

MR. FLYNN: Then they ought to be responsible for raising at least £1,000,000 of the capital required. It should be remembered that the Eastern Company was laying a cable from the Cape to Australia, and he had it on very good authority that it was extremely doubtful whether three cables would ever pay. If the Pacific cable did not pay the Treasury would be liable for five-eighths of the loss, besides the advance in the first instance. He thought that the capital should be raised on the joint guarantee of the colonies and the mother country.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said that as an Irish Member he could not understand why it was proposed to raise a loan of £2,000,000 for the cable.

That was not the proper way to carry out an enterprise of this nature. The majority of hon. Members appeared to have a disposition to leave everything of a financial character to the occupants

of the Treasury Bench. The result was that the House of Commons hardly exercised any jurisdiction at all over money matters. There was a great principle at stake in the matter, and that was that Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen were about to inaugurate a new principle, which in his opinion was most dangerous. What had the colonies done for England, Ireland, and Scotland? They paid hardly anything towards the defences of the Empire, and now they wanted those three countries, already overtaxed and overburdened, to finance their commercial undertakings.

That was a new principle which required a great deal of consideration from hon. Members. The water companies of London and the railway companies of Ireland were in exactly the same position towards public utility, and it was a novel and extraordinary proposition that money was to be available for colonial purposes of that kind when it was not available for home purposes. He had taken the trouble to read the correspondence, and he found that the policy which had been laid down originally had been absolutely reversed. The fact was that hon.

Members did not know where they were with Ministers at the present time. He held very strongly that the Bill was a departure from a principle which had hitherto been observed in the House. The House was entering on a commercial undertaking and sanctioning the expenditure of money in order to convenience the colonies in a manner which would not be undertaken with reference to any home enterprise, and he hoped that a strong minority of the Committee would protest against that principle unless it were also extended to the inhabitants of the three kingdoms.

MR. DILLON said the object of the colonies was that these lines should be run at a loss in order that they might have cheap cable rates. They naturally objected to a subsidy of £20,000. The home Government was to get a share of the profits, but as a matter of fact there would be no profits to share, and it would therefore be more profitable to the colonies for the home Government to undertake the whole expenditure of the line, which would be run at a loss. The position of the Secretary to the

Treasury was entirely inconsistent with the understanding come to in the earlier stages of these negotiations. The hon. Gentleman had said there was not likely

to be any profit for the first few years, and there might be a loss. This cable was to be built with money borrowed from the public, which would have to be repaid, together with the cost of upkeep of the cable from the rates.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: When I said there might be a loss, I meant that there might be a loss on the working after allowing for the sinking fund.

MR. DILLON said in that case his observations would not apply so strongly, but what he wished to point out was that the result would be very likely worse than the hon. Gentleman anticipated, because under this Bill the British Treasury lost all control as to fixing the rates. The object of the cable was to get reduced rates; to get them reduced to a very low figure indeed; and the rates were to be fixed by the board, and the colonies being in a majority on the board the tendency to cut down the rates would be very great, and there would be a great loss, and the Treasury would lose all control; yet the burden of this expenditure was to be put on the taxpayers of this country. The declaration contained in the letter written by Lord Selborne to the Great Eastern Telegraph Company two years ago contained the most revolutionary statement of principle ever laid before the House. It amounted to a solemn declaration that the Colonial Secretary saw no difference between competition by a private firm and competition by the State. What would vested interests have to say if such a principle were introduced throughout the country? In paragraph 23 of the letter of the Colonial Office to the companies, of the 10th July, 1899, there is this statement::

"Mr. Chamberlain is unable to see why, so long as the project is conducted on commercial principles, fair competition by the State should give rise to a claim for compensation, which would not be suggested for a moment if the competitor were a private person or company, however wealthy or influential."

That was what the Treasury now admitted they had no intention of doing.

The hon. Gentleman anticipated that for some years there would be a loss. When had anybody ever heard of a great public company spending £2,000,000 for the purpose of having a loss on administration? That was not the principle of a commercial people. The whole idea of this being conducted as a commercial enterprise was a sham. He admitted that there was some incongruity in the Irish representatives posing as the champions of private interests, but it was not so much because he objected to the principle that he raised his voice against the Bill, as because of the curious way in which it had been introduced. Millions of money ought not to be spent on a thing of this kind for the Australian colonies when there were dozens of things infinitely more deserving of the money being spent on them. He supported the Amendment because it tended to lessen to some extent the responsibilities which the Government proposed to impose upon the taxpayers.

*MR. TULLY also supported the Amendment. He thought they were entitled to have some limit placed upon the expenditure, especially as to that portion which would fall upon Ireland. He believed in time of peace no such project as this would ever have been put forward. There had been many projects started to bring the colonies into communication with this country, and the hon. Member for Canterbury, who had done so much for postal reform, was naturally as anxious to

effect telegraphic reform. If this scheme was for the benefit of this country, he would give it his support, but his experience had been such as to make him view with suspicion any proposal put forward in this way. If the hon. Member for Canterbury said it was really to the interest of the public, he would be willing to consider it in a reasonable way, because at present, owing to the high cable rates, they could get more news from France than from the colonies. He thought it would be better if the rates were not reduced.

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork. N. E.)

Boland, John

Burke, E. Haviland-

Ambrose, Robert

Boyle, James

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Broadhurst, Henry

Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. Gentleman is not speaking to the Amendment.

*MR. TULLY bowed to the ruling of the Chair. He pointed out that the hon. Member for East Mayo had shown that the result would be a considerable loss; £2,000,000 for a cable, when, according to the report of the Cable Committee, £1,500,000 would be amply sufficient for the purpose; and he thought that five-eighteenths of that amount was quite enough for this country to be responsible for. He quite agreed that there should be competition with the Great Eastern Telegraph Company, and that they should not have a monopoly, but there was nothing in the Bill to safeguard them in getting the competition they wanted. If cables could be got at a penny per word, it would be a very good thing, but he could not see why the representatives of Ireland should be asked to vote money for this cable. They were told that this cable was to touch all British territory, but in time of war, if Britain lost command of the sea, this cable would be of no possible advantage, because the enemy's ships would fish it up and stop the communication. He would join his friends in opposing the measure at every stage until they had some pledge from the Government that if there was to be competition with the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company it would be genuine competition, and that it would not be mismanaged in the way the Post Office mismanaged the competition with the telephone companies. He believed the cable would be managed in such a way that for the first few years it would involve a loss, and the result would be that a syndicate of speculators would come in to take it off the hands of the Government at a very low price, and thus acquire the property the taxpayers were now asked to pay for.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 64; Noes, 218. (Division List No. 467).

Clancy, John Joseph

Leamy, Edmund

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)

Cogan, Denis J.
Lun on, W.
O'Dowd, John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell. Dr. Mark A.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Crean, Eugene
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Cullinan, J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
O'Malley, William
Daly, James
M'Fadden, Edward
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Murnaghan, George
Reddy, M.
Doogan, P. C.
Murphy, John
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Duffy, William J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Field, William
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Roche, John
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Sullivan, Donal
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N.
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Tully, Jasper
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Healy, Timothy Michael

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Doherty, William
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. O'Mara and Mr. Dillon.
Joyce, Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Horniman, Frederick John
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Dickson, Charles Scott
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Hoult, Joseph
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham
Arnold-Forster. Hugh O.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Arrol, Sir William
Duke, Henry Edward
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Balcarres, Lord
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Keswick, William
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Law, Andrew Bonar
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Fisher, William Hayes
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
Banbury, Frederick George
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Lawson, John Grant
Bell, Richard
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Bignold, Arthur
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gardner, Ernest
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Brassey, Albert
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Bull, William James
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Burns, John
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Lough, Thomas
Caine, William Sproston
Grant, Corrie
Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Caldwell, James
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Groves, James Grimble
Macdona, John Cumming
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hain, Edward
Maconochie, A. W.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Midd'x)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Chapman, Edward
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
M'Kenna, Reginald
Charrington, Spencer
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Harris, Frederick Loverton
Mitchell, William
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Harwood, George
Montagu, D. (Huntingdon)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Colville, John

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Heaton, John Henniker
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Cranborne, Viscount
Helme, Norval Watson
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Crombie, John William
Higginbottom, S. W.
Moss, Samuel
Crossley, Sir Savile
Holland, William Henry
Mount, William Arthur
Davenport, William Bromley-
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Muntz, Philip A.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Sadler. Col. Samuel Alexander
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Murray, Co). Wyndham (Bath)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Ed. J.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Ure, Alexander
Norman, Henry
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
Valentia, Viscount
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Sharpe, William Edward T.)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Parker, Gilbert
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
White, Luke (Yorks., E. R.)
Paulton, James Mellor
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Whiteley, George (Yorks. W. R.
Penn, John
Smith, H. C. (North'mb Tyn'side

Whitmore, Charles Algernon
 Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
 Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
 Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
 Platt-Higgins, Frederick
 Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
 Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
 Pretymann, Ernest George
 Spear, John Ward
 Williams, Rt. Hon. J. Powell- (Birm.)
 Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
 Spencer, Rt. Hon. C. R. (Northants)
 Wills, Sir Frederick
 Purvis, Robert
 Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
 Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks., E. R.)
 Randles, John S.
 Stanley, Edwd. Jas. (Somerset)
 Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
 Reid, James (Greenock)
 Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
 Wilson, Hon. J. (Yorks. W. R.)
 Renshaw, Charles Pine
 Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
 Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
 Rentoul, James Alexander
 Strachey, Edward
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
 Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. (Oxford Univ.)
 Yerbrough, Robert Armstrong
 Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
 Tennant, Harold John
 Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
 Thomas, J. A. (Glamorgan, Gower)
 TELLERS FOR THE HOUSE; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
 Royds, Clement Molyneux
 Thomas, F. W. (Yorks. W. R.)
 Rutherford, John
 Thornton, Percy M.
 Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
 Tomlinson, Wm. Edwd. Murray

MR. O'MARA moved that the loan to be raised for the purposes of the cable should be reduced from £2,000,000 to £1,500,000. He described this as an Indemnity Bill, and his purpose in moving the Amendment was to test whether the House approved of the thoroughly illegal practice of spending public money without the

sanction of Parliament being first obtained. When the resolution empowering the Government to bring forward the Bill was before the House, it was stated that contracts had already been entered into, and that part of the money had already been spent. He contended that this was a gross abuse of the privileges of Ministers, for which, so far as he knew, there was almost no precedent. Such a course should only be taken in the case of emergency and public danger. It was a pernicious practice, and he should like the Secretary to the Treasury to state by what law it had been done. If public money could be spent in this way, what was the use of bringing in a Bill at all? It could all be done by a stroke of the pen in the Treasury.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 27, to leave out the words 'two million,' and insert the words 'one million five hundred thousand.'";(Mr. O'Mara.)

Question proposed, "That the words 'two millions' stand part of the clause."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said it had not been possible to pass the Bill through the House so early as they had hoped. They had not been able to get the Bill in time for the money provided for under the Bill being available to meet the first sums becoming due to the contractors who were engaged in the construction of this cable. It would have been possible to delay making any contract for the construction of the cable until this Bill had been sanctioned by the House, but he did not think that would have been an economical procedure. Certainly the best contract would not have remained open indefinitely for that purpose; the Government might have lost by not accepting it, and this work, which the Government and the colonies were equally anxious to see carried through very rapidly, would have been very much delayed. The Government, therefore, thought it right to set the contractors to work at once. Under the terms of the contract, the Pacific Cable Board had had to pay one instalment of the contract price to the contractors. In order to meet that instalment the Pacific Cable Board had borrowed money from the Bank of England, and the money was lent by the Bank on the suggestion of the Treasury. These words were necessary to enable that money to be paid by the Pacific Cable Board, and he hoped the House would show by an overwhelming majority that they approved of the arrangement.

MR. FLYNN said that not alone had the contract been entered into by the Pacific Cable Boards which it was the purpose of the Bill to create, but money had been spent; and now the Government came forward with what was practically a Bill of Indemnity. That ought not to be allowed to go on. Was this House to exist merely for the purpose of recording and registering what had been done in the Cabinet? It was a most unprecedented thing that money should be spent and the Board appointed before the Bill authorising both had been introduced. He should be very sorry to charge the Secretary of the Treasury with being uncandid, but his advisers had certainly been most uncandid. The first knowledge which the House had of this matter was when a resolution was brought forward late at night a fortnight ago, and no one but a high-handed Minister would have ventured to indulge in such a course of procedure. The hon. Gentleman had said that the Bill could not be brought in earlier, but what was to prevent it? If

this was a matter of public policy, why not have brought the Bill in at the opening of Parliament? He meant to protest against this Bill at every stage the forms of the House would allow him; and he wanted to enter his solemn protest, not only as an Irish Member, but as an ordinary Member, interested in the procedure of the House and the fiscal affairs of the country, against the irregular, unconstitutional, and tyrannical manner in which the Colonial Office and its advisers had acted towards the House in this matter.

MR. FIELD said he did not wish to prolong the debate, but at the same time he thought the House ought to take note of the extraordinary circumstances under which the Bill had been brought before them. He did not pose as a constitutionalist, but hon. Gentlemen opposite did, and he was therefore surprised that they supported a Bill of this nature. The Treasury, in conjunction with a certain number of colonies, absolutely mortgaged the resources of this country to carry out a scheme which had not been discussed by the House. No more dangerous principle could be introduced, for it amounted to this: that a strong Minister, with the assistance of his permanent officials, might enter into a secret

agreement for certain undertakings, which, in their opinion might be of use to a portion of the empire. They took from Parliament that which was really the basis of the power of Parliament, that was the power of the purse; and then they came to Parliament with a Bill of indemnity. Of course, the Government had a vast majority in this House, and could press the Bill through; but what would happen if a majority of the House agreed with the Irish Members in their constitutional view, and refused to ratify the proceedings of the Treasury? The Cable Board was to be constituted by a majority of representatives from the colonies. This House advanced two millions of money, which was entrusted to gentlemen who had a direct interest in arranging such rates as would enable them to get better conditions from the existing company. They need not care whether the scheme paid or not. If that principle was to be adopted the country would be landed in bankruptcy.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said it appeared to him that this was one of the most extraordinary documents ever submitted to Parliament. He had listened to the defence put forward on behalf of the Government by the Secretary to the Treasury, but he thought it no defence at all. The Government were absolutely wrong in anticipating the decision of Parliament in regard to this important undertaking. He had always understood that the main object of Parliament was to vote money, but in this matter Parliament had been quite anticipated, and if the system was to be carried on they might just as well abolish Parliament altogether. It was a most unconstitutional proceeding, and he hoped his hon. friend would press his Amendment to a division.

*MR. TULLY said he supported the Amendment. The Member for South Kilkenny deserved a great deal of credit for the acumen he had shown on this question. He had found a flaw in the Bill, and that the two millions were to be paid not only for the construction of the cable, but to repay any temporary loan contracted for the purposes of the cable. One of the reasons which the hon. Gentleman gave for

spending the money was that the contract they had before them was a favourable one; but everybody knew that prices of materials for the construction of cables were not going up, but going down. If the Government had waited to take the ordinary legal and constitutional course they would have saved money instead of lost it. This cable was promoted in the interests of the colonies. England was now so much alone in the world that it had to look up friends at the other ends of the Empire, and it was in the interests of these people that this extraordinary Bill was being thrust on the House. The payment of promotion expenses was an entirely unheard of proceeding, and created a most dangerous precedent. Nothing was ever done by President Kruger equal to what had been done in this case. If it had been done by President Kruger the press of England would have rung with cries of the jobbery of such a transaction.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clauses 2, 3, 4, and 5, agreed to.

Clause 6::

MR. O'MARA said he had not moved the Amendments on the four previous clauses which he had on the Paper, because the Committee had apparently made up their minds to give this indemnity to the Colonial Secretary and the Treasury for the illegal proceedings they had taken, and he also recognised the fact that certain contracts had been entered into. It was only from a sense of public duty that he had taken the position which he had done in regard to this Bill. He intended, however, to move his Amendment on Clause 6 as follows;

"Clause 6, page 3, line 7, leave out from 'of,' to end of Clause, and insert 'the Treasury.'"

By this clause it was proposed to create the Pacific Cable Board, which they knew from the Secretary of the Treasury had already been created. He proposed that, instead of handing over the cable built by two millions of English money to be managed by the Pacific Cable Board the Treasury ought to take the step of appointing managers to manage the cable themselves. According to the constitution of the board there would be only three British members, two representing Canada, two representing the Australian colonies, and one representing New Zealand. The colonial representatives, therefore, would always be in a majority, and would be able to decide what the rates were to be. It would be to the interest of the Colonies that the rates should be as low as possible, while the comparative benefit to this country would be very small. He earnestly hoped that the Secretary to the Treasury would induce the Treasury to reconsider the constitution of the board, and give the whole control of the cable to the Treasury. The members of the board were prominent colonial politicians who had no knowledge of cable construction, maintenance, or management.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 3, line 7, to leave out from the word 'of' to end of clause, and insert the words 'the Treasury.'";(Mr. O'Mara.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said of course he could not possibly accept the Amendment which had just been moved. The hon. Member, he understood, moved it as a protest against what he thought was the laxity of the Treasury with regard to their control of the British contribution to the cable and their too great disposition to consult the feelings and wishes of the colonies. He must remind the Committee that for the cable, in which of course they were very greatly interested, the colonies had guaranteed thirteen-eightieths as to sinking fund, interest, expense of maintenance, and other charges. What the hon. Gentleman proposed was that, that being the position and the liability, the Treasury should have sole and complete control over the construction of the cable, and over its management after construction, and that the colonies should have no voice in the matter whatever. If the hon. Member would consider that from the point of view of the colonies he would see that it would be most unfair to them, and that it would be a gross breach of faith on the part of the Government if they gave any countenance to it. The hon. Gentleman complained that the representatives of the Government on the Board would be in a minority. That was perfectly true, but then the Government paid a minority of the cost, and he did not think under those circumstances that they had any right to insist on having a majority of the members on the Board. They had three representatives, one of whom would be the chairman, and if there was any difference of opinion on any important question, it was only necessary that a single colonial representative should vote with the representatives of the Treasury in order to give the Treasury a controlling vote, because of the casting vote of the chairman. But he altogether demurred to the idea that the interests of the colonies and of the Government were likely to be in conflict. The hon. Gentleman spoke as if it would be in the interest of the colonies to reduce rates to a figure which would not pay in order that they might procure five-eightieths of the deficit from the Government. But the colonies themselves would have to pay thirteen-eightieths, and therefore they were very interested in making the cable pay.

MR. O'MARA said the colonies would get the whole benefit of the reduced rate.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN asked if the hon. Member assumed that no business from this country would pass over the cable. If the hon. Member did assume that, he did not agree with him. As far as rates were reduced, the advantage of that reduction would be shared by all traders and others using the cable in the colonies as well as in this country, and it was very possible that they would get even a greater advantage than the colonies themselves. If the rates were to be unduly reduced, then the greater proportion of the loss that would follow would fall on the colonies, but he did not think that there was any reason to suppose that the colonies desired that the cable should be worked on lines which would bring permanent financial loss on themselves. No doubt there might be some loss in the earlier years, and the hon. Member for East Mayo thought he was contradicting his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies when he stated that it was the intention of the Government to work the cable on commercial lines. In great commercial undertakings, whether they were public or private, it was sometimes necessary to face a loss for a year or two in order to make a great commercial

success, and if they had not found private firms and public bodies in the country ready to do that, many of the enterprises of which they now had such good reason to be proud would not be in existence. The Government had agreed with the colonial Governments as to the proportion of representation each should have on the Board, and he asked the Committee to support the decision which had been arrived at. The Government could not go back on the pledges they had given. MR. FLYNN said he thought it would be quite possible to arrive at a compromise between the Secretary to the Treasury and his hon. friend the Member for South Kilkenny. They all recognised that the colonies should have some voice in the control of the cable, but it was a very different matter that their representation should be as five to three. He would ask the Secretary to the Treasury to remember that in their fiscal policy the colonies had never hesitated, whether by preferential duties or otherwise, to secure an advantage for themselves as against British trade; and it was therefore possible that they would not hesitate to pay thirteen-eightieths of the loss on the working of the cable if thereby they could get a cheaper service, and very possibly it would be a very good bargain for them. He thought that if the Secretary to the Treasury would accept the Amendment standing in his name increasing the number of British representatives to six his hon. friend would withdraw his Amendment. They could not overlook the fact that the colonial representatives had pressed the matter on a somewhat reluctant Colonial Office, and that the Colonial Office, only at the last moment, abandoned certain fixed principles on which public business had hitherto been conducted. If the hon. Gentleman would accept his Amendment he was sure his hon. friend would withdraw his Amendment.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said he could not accept that for the reasons he had already stated. His Majesty's Government had accepted the proportion of representation set out in the schedule as fair, and the Government could not depart from that arrangement.

MR. TULLY said that the explanation of the hon. Gentleman did not carry conviction. They ought to bear in mind that £2,000,000 of money was to be furnished by the Imperial Treasury, and the very least they ought to insist on was that the majority of the members of the Board, who would have the spending of that money, should be appointed by this Government. At present, although £1,000 per day was expended in cablegrams to Australia, most of them referred to business matters, and there were very few personal cablegrams. Australian newspapers got very favourable terms through a syndicate which they had formed, but there was no reciprocity about that, as no favourable terms were given to English newspapers for telegrams from Australia. That state of things would continue, and Australians would be able to benefit themselves at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. Victoria and some of the other colonies had protection as against this country, and if they had adopted a system of protection might it not be expected that, with a majority on the board, they would go in for running the new cable solely in their own interests, without any regard for the interests of this country? His hon. friend proposed that the cable should be under the management of the Treasury. He could hardly agree with him in that proposition. He was not in favour of putting large enterprises of

that kind under Treasury control. He would be quite willing, however, if some gentleman like the predecessor of the hon. gentleman the present President of the Board of Agriculture were appointed Chairman of the Board. The public would have some confidence then that the cable would be run on lines of wise economy. Experience did not warrant them in having any great confidence in what the Government proposed. In the case of the telegraphs in these countries, the Government proposed to buy them for a million or two, but they ultimately had to pay seventeen millions. The same thing occurred in the case of the telephones, in which the Government made a most foolish bargain. The telephone company captured all the patents and captured all the smaller companies, and then captured the Postmaster General, with the result that London had the worst telephone system in Europe. He thought, therefore, that hon. members were justified in assuming that what had occurred before would occur again. The cable would be run at a loss, and ultimately the Government might be asked, in order to save continual loss, to hand it over to some private firm.

The Telegraph Department at present was being run at a very considerable loss, and what guarantee had they that the cable would not be run at a perpetual loss also? He did not know what special qualifications the members of the Board had. All they knew about Lord Strathcona was that he raised a troop of horse.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member will have an opportunity of considering the items in the schedule a little later. He must not anticipate that discussion.

*MR. TULLY said he would not proceed with that argument. He could not agree, however, to substitute the Treasury for the Board. If the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Agriculture was at the head of it, he would have some confidence in it. He was an able and honest man, and strove to do his work honestly, with the result that he had been shifted from the Treasury Department.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The character of the President of the Board of Agriculture is really not relevant.

*MR. TULLY said that if the right hon. Gentleman had remained at the Treasury that proposal would never have been brought before the House. Question put, and agreed to.

Clauses 6, 7, and 8 agreed to.

MR. O'MARA said he wished to move a new clause, namely, that the rates charge charged either intermediate or through should be approved by the Treasury. He thought that it was most important that the Treasury should have some control over the rates.

New Clause (Rates);(Mr. O'Mara);brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be read a second time."

AYES.

Abraham, W. (Cork, N. E.)

Healy, Timothy Michael

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Joyce, Michael

O'Dowd, John
Boland, John
Leamy, Edmund
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Boyle, James
Lewis, John Herbert
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Brown, G. M. (Edinburgh)
Lough, Thomas
O'Malley, William
Burke, E. Haviland-
Lundon W.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Caldwell, James
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Reddy, M.
Channing, Francis Allston
MacNeill, John Cordon Swift
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Clancy, John Joseph
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, William (Clare)
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Govern, T.
Rigg, Richard
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Kenna, Reginald
Roche, John
Crean, Eugene
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Cremer, William Randal
Moss, Samuel
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Cullinan, J.
Murnaghan, George
Sullivan, Donal
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Murphy, John
Thompson, Dr. E. G. (M'n'gh'n, N.
Delany, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips

Donelan, Captain A.
Nolan, Col. John P Galway, N.)
Tully, Jasper
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Ure, Alexander
Duffy, William J.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Field, William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Wilson, H. J. (York. W. R.)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;Mr. O'Mara and Mr. Dillon.
Hammond, John
O'Doherty, William
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Bull, William James
Crossley, Sir Savile
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Bullard, Sir Harry
Gust, Henry John C.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Burns, John
Davenport, William Bromley-
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc, Stroud
Caine, William Sproston
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Causton, Richard Knight
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Arrol, Sir William
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Duke, Henry Edward
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Balcarres, Lord
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manc'r)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds)
Chapman, Edward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Balfour, Kenneth R. (CJristch.)
Charrington, Spencer
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Banbury, Frederick George
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fisher, William Hayes
Bell, Richard
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Bignold, Arthur
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.)
Bigwood, James
Colville, John
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Gardner, Ernest
Brassey, Albert
Cranborne, Viscount
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Broadhurst, Henry
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Crombie, John William
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the clause raised practically the question they had already discussed once or twice. He had already stated his views to the Committee, and could not accept the proposed clause.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 74; Noes, 220. (Division List No. 468.)

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter) Bristol, S.)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Grant, Corrie
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Rutherford, John
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Gretton, John
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Styles
Groves, James Grimble
Macdona, John Cumming
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Gurdon. Sir W. Brampton
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Hain, Edward
Maconochie, A. W.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)

Haldane, Richard Burdon
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tyn'sde
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Harwood, George
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Spear, John Ward
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (Northants
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Heath. James (Staffords., N. W.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Heaton, John Henniker
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Helme, Norval Watson
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Mount, William Arthur
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Hobhouse, C. E. H (Bristol, E.)
Muntz, Philip A.
Tennant, Harold John
Holland, William Henry

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks., W. R.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Nicholson, William Graham
Thornton, Percy M.
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tollemache, Henry James
Hoult, Joseph
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Houston, Robert Paterson
Parker, Gilbert
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Howard, John (Kent, F'versh'm)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Valentia, Viscount
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Paulton, James Mellor
Walker, Col. William Hall
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pemberton, John S. G.
Warner, Thomas Conrtenay T.
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Penn, John
White, Luke (Yorks., E. R.)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Pierpoint, Robert
Whiteley, George (Yorks., W. R.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Keswick, William
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Pretymann, Ernest George
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell- (Birm.)
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Wills, Sir Frederick
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Purvis, Robert

Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks., E. R.)
Lawson, John Grant
Randles, John S.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Rentoul, James Alexander
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Ridley, Hon. M W. (Stalybridge)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Bill reported, without amendment; read the third time, and passed.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), further considered.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon):

The clause which I am about to move the omission of is not precisely the same clause as it was in the Bill originally before the House. It differs in two respects. In the first place, it differs in the mode in which the law will operate, and in the second place there is a sub-section which was not in the original Bill. With regard to the former clause, there is no doubt that the clause as it stands now is a distinct improvement upon the clause originally before the House, especially in regard to one particular point where it lays down definite rules and hours, instead of leaving the matter to the Secretary of State. The other change in the clause refers to the exclusion of religious and charitable institutions. Now the clause as it stands is not so much an alteration in the law as that it makes the law plainer and more easily enforceable, and therefore I am bound to say it is regrettable that it should be omitted; but I am bound to consider the whole subject-matter of the Bill itself, and having regard to the numerous classes of persons who are going to derive great advantage from the general provisions of the Bill, I certainly regard with the greatest dissatisfaction any circumstances likely to imperil the chances of the Bill by reason of a clause dealing with a particular point in the Bill. What is the position of matters with regard to this clause? There was great opposition to it. As it stood in Grand Committee there was a subsection of the clause dealing with religious and charitable institutions bringing them to a certain extent within the four

corners of the Bill, but making a special provision with regard to inspection altogether different to the inspection to which other laundries have to be subjected. But as it frequently happens in many proposals for a compromise, these proposals of mine pleased neither one side or the other. It is commonly understood that the opposition to my original proposal came entirely from hon. Members representing Ireland, but that is not the case by any means. I received many more representations upon this matter from religious institutions in this country, who alleged that the proposals of the Bill if carried into effect would destroy the discipline which is absolutely necessary, having regard to the class of persons usually found in these institutions. So that the objection taken to the clause in Committee made it perfectly plain to me that the only course to pursue if I wished to secure the Bill was to leave the law as I found it with regard to these religious and charitable institutions, and the conclusion which I came to was practically the same conclusion which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife came to when he had to deal with the same matter. The right hon. Gentleman in his Bill of 1895 proposed that these institutions should be subject to the same conditions as ordinary laundries, but he was driven out of his position by the same considerations which ultimately drove me out of the position I took up, namely, that to sacrifice the great advantages of the proposed alteration in the law made by the remainder of the Bill because of this particular point was not a course which commended itself to him; and so I felt I was driven to take this course for the same consideration precisely as that which actuated the right hon. Member for East Fife when he was dealing with the same question. Therefore I accepted the same sub-section as he not only accepted, but I believe moved in the 1895 Bill. I was driven to accept the same words: they are the words of the existing law. The position by my acceptance of this Amendment was not satisfactory to many members of the Committee, and in the result the omission of this clause was moved by an hon. Gentleman, one of the Members for Glasgow, and advocated and supported by voice and by vote by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean, by the hon. Member for Berwickshire, by the hon. Member for Leicester, by the hon. Member for Battersea, and by all those who have been most prominent in their desire to see a reform in the law with regard to laundries. The Amendment was not carried at the time, because I desired to take advantage of the time between then and now to see if it was not possible by consultation to arrive at some form of words which, although they would not give everything desired, would give some satisfaction, and enable us to retain the clause in the Bill. Now I have failed in my attempt. It has been said by some that if I had tried to find some form of words, I should have probably succeeded. All I can say is that no one has tried harder than I have to find a form of words, and I have been unable to find one, and I am face to face with this situation. We are within, I hope, a few days of the prorogation of Parliament, and I find the Notice Paper full of Amendments upon this particular clause. I need hardly point out to the House the practical impossibility of carrying this Bill if we have to deal with and dispose of all those Amendments. Now what would be the effect of the acceptance of this motion for the omission

of this clause? It will leave, with another Amendment I shall have to propose subsequently in the schedule, the whole of the laundries in precisely the same position as they are now. It is true that the law will retain the exemption to which I have referred, but it is said that this will be tolerable if the law remains as it is, but intolerable if the law is strengthened and tightened and if its operation makes the position of outside laundries more difficult than at present while retaining the present immunity for religious and charitable laundries. Well, it must not be supposed that, if the House accepts the Amendment which I propose, this matter is going to be lost sight of. I hope at no distant period we may be able to propose Amendments in the laundry section of the Act, and that we may arrive by inquiry and consultation, when time is permitted, at some agreement which, though it does not give all which some of my friends desire, will meet some of the objections raised on the one side and on the other, and by which possibly a solution may be found.

It is said that under the existing provisions of the law there are many bogus institutions, and it has been suggested that something might have been put into the Bill which would have least have enabled the Home Office to deal effectively with those who claim exemption under the existing law but who do not deserve and have no proper pretention to claim such exemption. I have thought of and tried to devise some words which might be inserted in the Bill which would give the Home Office further power to deal with these objectionable institutions, but I can find no form of words which would not have the effect of limiting the power of the Home Secretary rather than extending it. There is no doubt that the power of the Home Secretary in this matter is practically unlimited, because, if there is any reason to suppose that the institutions claiming this exemption are not bona fide institutions, there is nothing to prevent the inspector demanding admission to any of these institutions, and if it is not what it pretends to be, and admission is refused, to take it before a court of law and make it prove it is entitled to the exemption claimed. No effort on my part will be wanting to see that the protection of this special exemption is not taken advantage of by these special institutions who have

no right to avail themselves of it. I can assure the House I am as anxious as they to deal with this matter in a proper way. Generally, with regard to the provisions of the Act of 1895, although they are not open to such adverse criticisms as hon. Members have directed against them; and the provisions themselves are good; I quite recognise the difficulties of enforcing them, and those I shall endeavour to overcome, and the House must not assume that this matter is going to remain altogether undealt with. I hope it may be possible to deal with it in a manner to give satisfaction without undue delay. The House will see that I have no other course, if I desire to secure the benefit of this Bill the vast number of people who will come under it, than the course I now take in asking the House to support this Amendment. I beg to move the omission of Clause 103.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 55, to leave out Clause 103."; (Mr. Secretary Ritchie.)

Question proposed, "That the words of Clause 103 to the word 'Act,' in page 56,

line 40, inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I have listened with great surprise and disappointment to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman. This Bill professes to be, and I gladly recognise that it is, a Bill for the amendment and consolidation of the law. If the right hon. Gentleman's motion to omit the clause is carried, having regard to this very important branch of factory administration, the Bill will neither amend the law nor will it consolidate it, because you will have the provisions of the existing law retained in force, subject to a very vague undertaking that at some indefinite time it may receive further consideration, and from the point of view of codifying and consolidating the law you will have as ridiculous a position as can be conceived. You will have the all-important section dealing with laundries not even put in the Consolidation Act at all, but only in the Act of 1895.

*MR. RITCHIE: If the right hon. Gentleman will forgive me. I forgot to say that, if the Amendment is carried, an Amendment will be proposed in another place to insert in this Bill the clause as it appeared in the original Consolidation Bill.

MR. ASQUITH: If it is inserted in another place, what is going to happen then? Is it to be cut out in the shape of Lords' Amendments, while other Amendments in respect of laundries are to be put in? I do not see, from the point of view of saving time, that much is to be gained by that course. But the matter is very much more serious. When I introduced the Bill in 1895 it contained a clause dealing with laundries which, although not the same in form, was similar in substance to the clause in the present Bill; but owing to the strenuous opposition I encountered, and to the fact that I had not the advantage of a great and permanent majority like the present Government, I was obliged, very much against my will, to whittle it down to the form in which it appears in the statute. The right hon. Gentleman, as I acknowledged at the time when he moved the Second Reading of this Bill, proposed to strengthen the law from the comparatively weak and inoperative form in which I had been compelled to leave it, and his proposal, coupled with the Amendments introduced in Committee upstairs, has produced in the first three sub-sections a code dealing with the regulation of laundries, apart from conventual laundries, which, although perhaps not ideal, is perhaps as strong as public opinion will allow.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): And were agreed to unanimously.

MR. ASQUITH: Yes, because the employers were quite prepared to accept them. Why are all the substantial improvements which this Bill makes to be abandoned? Why are we to abandon all these improvements, which even the laundry owners themselves do not object to, and in which the laundry operatives are directly and vitally interested? Why are we to omit what almost everyone agrees is a desirable and necessary amendment of the law at this stage of the proceedings? The right hon. Gentleman has given one reason only; that unless these beneficial provisions, which did not apply to the excepted laundries, are omitted it would raise the whole hubbub about the conventual laundries. I say it would be a monstrous confession of weakness, and even of

humiliation, on the part of the House of Commons if it threw all these improvements over for fear of the hostility of the excepted laundries. There is no other ground. The right hon. Gentleman's argument is totally inadequate to justify his proposal. The other matter, which was really the only solid ground, was as to the continuance of this class of excepted laundry. I acknowledge that I was the first to agree to it, and why? Because, as the right hon. Gentleman has truly said, it was the lowest price I could pay for carrying the Bill of 1895. But the right hon. Gentleman is not in the position I was. I had no majority independent of my hon. friends below the gangway, and if I had insisted on refusing the demand to have this class of laundries excepted, they had it in their power at once to kill my Bill and destroy the manifold improvements in every class of factory law which that Bill was designed to meet. But the right hon. Gentleman is not in that position. He has got a large majority, which is quite capable of overcoming all the forces arrayed against it, though that majority is not always in perfect working order, especially at this stage of the session. But I do protest that the Government having; for reasons of their own; delayed consideration of the Report stage until the last week of the session, should adopt this kind of coercion to the deliberations of the House, and say that unless we agree to a demand which is not reasonable, and which the Government have the power of resisting, the House must take the responsibility of sacrificing the whole of a valuable piece of legislation. As regards the merits of the case, I say what I said in 1895, that no case has been made out for the exemption of these privileged laundries. I observe that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University has an Amendment which, if carried, would, I believe practically meet the demands of all the religious charities except those connected with one religious community. The proposal is a very reasonable one, and could be perfectly well adapted to those conventual institutions which fall within the category of reformatory institutions. It would give the Home Secretary power to modify the requirements of the Act in their application to institutions of a reformatory character. One of the great objections to the inspection of those laundries had been removed by the appointment of lady inspectors. I cannot help thinking that, under these circumstances, the Government would have found that they had a preponderating body of opinion on both sides of the House if they had adopted such an Amendment. The Government do not dispute any of the propositions I have laid down; but because the Government are afraid that, if at this stage of the session they insist upon doing what they think to be right, they will lose the Bill, the House is asked to omit the clause altogether. I do not think that is a course consistent with the dignity either of the Government or of the House. For my part, I shall offer, and I hope the House will offer, its opposition to the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman.

*MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): I rise with the greatest regret to express my great disappointment with the speech of the Home Secretary. I fear that what has happened this evening, at the end of a long controversy, will be known as the history of a great surrender; and I agree with the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken that there is no justification for it. The motion

of the hon. Member for East Clare in Committee was carried by twenty-nine to twenty-four. I have not the slightest doubt in my mind that if this matter was put to the House on its merits, without reference to passing the Bill or the time of the session, then these twenty-four members of the Committee who voted against the motion of the hon. Member for Clare would have been multiplied certainly ten-fold. Why is it we are called upon this evening to adopt the views of a small minority of the House? The only reason, of course, is the time of the session at which we have arrived. I believe that if we were speaking in May instead of August the proposal would never have been made. It is only because we are a few days before the close of the session that we are called upon to make this very great surrender. I should like to state my position in this matter. I wish to speak not only for myself, but also for a great number of people outside who have favoured me with communications on this very important matter. I have always said, and I say it again, I go with hon. Members from Ireland some way in their objection to the inspection originally proposed. Ordinary inspection of laundries is inappropriate to institutions which are of a reformatory character. It would be impossible, I think, to admit an inspector in the ordinary way into laundries which are connected with institutions chiefly designed for the reformation of persons who have lived dissolute and immoral lives. That is absolutely true, but it is a long step to say that because you object to a particular form of inspection then you must object to all inspection. I cannot adopt that principle, nor do those for whom I speak. They say, and I agree with them, that with regard to a certain number of institutions inspection, and especially inspection by a woman inspector, is desirable; to see whether these institutions are in a proper sanitary condition, and whether the machinery employed is properly protected, and to see that the inmates are not over-worked and under-fed; and the institutions for which I speak welcome such inspection. Why is it hon. Members from Ireland take this non possumus line and say that unless inspectors were excluded altogether they would have nothing to do with the Bill? I think that is an unreasonable attitude, and so far as I am concerned I can be no party to the principle implied. I the more object to it because if there are any abuses the genuine institutions would be glad to see them stopped. But the practical question is: What are we to do? I am afraid that time is against us. If we like to insist; as I should personally desire to do; upon the retention of this clause, we are assured on the highest authority it would involve the sacrifice of the whole of this important Bill. I should be sorry to be responsible for the loss of so important a measure, which affects the welfare of large classes, and especially those classes who are least able to protect themselves. Therefore I think we ought to hesitate very long before we imperil the Bill. I for one cannot take responsibility for its loss, and therefore I must vote for the Amendment of the Home Secretary.

*MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire) said he rose to support the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife upon this important question. As the right hon. Gentleman was aware, he had gone to a deal of trouble and taken a great

deal of time in attempting to arrive at a compromise. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had stated that he regretted having to propose the omission of the clause. In introducing the Bill he had pointed out that the present state of the law was confused and unsatisfactory. Now he claimed that the provisions of the Act of 1895 were good in themselves, but difficult to administer. But what was the use of a good law if it could not be administered? The right hon. Gentleman went on to say that he proposed to apply to Institution laundries the provisions of the Factory Acts. He said the exemption of these laundries from inspection was indefensible, but it was exactly what the right hon. Gentleman now proposed to do; to exempt these laundries from inspection. He would not labour the point that the law as it stood was in an unsatisfactory condition, but as the right hon. Gentleman might say that he had voted in Committee against the clause he now wished retained, he would read to the House a letter which he had received from the National Laundry Trade Protection Association, Limited. That letter would explain and justify his position;

"I gather from the Amendment Paper under the Factory and Workshops Consolidation Bill that the feeling of the House is such that in all probability Clause 103 will not go through, and may be withdrawn by the Home Secretary. I sincerely trust you will be enabled to see your way to vote against its withdrawal. When this Association made the request to you, when the Bill was before the Grand Committee, to propose its withdrawal there was a very strong feeling existing as to the non-acceptance of the Institution Clause and the Cottage Laundry Clause, but on consideration the amended clause as it stands has proved so acceptable to the laundry trade throughout the country that they feel they can safely accept it. I have received from all parts of the country information that the clause as amended meets with the entire approval of the trade, as it undoubtedly provides better regulations both from the employers' and the employees' point of view, and although it is some restriction of the hours as they at present exist, yet it is felt that the result will be a great improvement in the class of workers secured for the trade. The opinion therefore, generally, is that the trade would rather have Clause 103 as at present printed in the Bill than the law as it at present stands, which, as you very well know, as a protection for the workers is practically useless, and such that even the Home Office officials feel very great difficulty in effectually administering. I sincerely trust that, on behalf of the laundry trade of the kingdom, you will not fail to strongly represent these views when the Bill is before the House of Commons."

The laundry trade objected to the action of the right hon. Gentleman. He had supported the omission of the clause in the past because of this request, but now that the demand and the desire for the omission of the clause had been removed he was justified in adhering to the wishes of those who advised him upon this matter. He wished to know why this clause was to be omitted. It was clear it was not for the benefit of the trade, because the trade dissented from it. The real reason was to avoid the opportunity of discussing the very large question of the exemption of the religious institutions. The statement by the hon. Member for East Clare in the press was a temperate statement from the point

of view of Ireland in this matter. It might be urged that nothing could be said against the convent laundries of Ireland, but a great deal of fault had justly been found with the convent laundries in France. Great scandals had been brought to light in connection with these laundries owing to an application to them of the law; and he desired to know what guarantee the House had that like institutions in this country were not being carried on in an equally disadvantageous way as were those in France. There was no guarantee, and if there was any great eagerness to avoid inspection, such keenness to avoid inspection must inevitably give rise to the suspicion that there was something to conceal. The greater the keenness the greater the suspicion that must arise. What happened in France? He would quote from the report of M. Laporte, the divisional inspector of the first district for the year 1886. That gentleman said;

"To-day I will cite particularly the orphanage of the Good Shepherd, where children from seven to eight years old work from 5 a.m. till 4 p.m., having only one hour of instruction after the day's labour."

He further said;

"There has been brought to my notice a convent where little girls of four years old have to hem with the greatest care half a dozen house-cloths each, i.e., to make about nine or ten yards."

In his report for the year 1887, M. Giroud, divisional inspector, expressed himself in the following terms on the subject of the establishment entitled "The Good Shepherd," at Cholet;

"This establishment, which I have twice visited with its staff of seventy sisters and novices, living on the proceeds of the work done there, unites all the characteristics of an industrial enterprise... They receive at the Good Shepherd little girls from the age of four years; they make these miserable children work the same number of hours as young girls of sixteen to twenty-one." The same inspector expresses himself also on the subject of "The Good Shepherd" of Poitiers;

"The staff employed in this establishment is composed of forty-six children from four to twelve years old, thirty-three from twelve to fifteen, and thirty from sixteen to twenty-one: that is, seventy-nine children from four to sixteen years old, and thirty young girls. The length of the work is the same for the children of four as for the young girls. Three of the sisters, not certificated, hold a class for the youngest children for three-quarters of an hour a day."

When he read that report he thought it his duty to make inquiries as to whether such practices were still going on. He ascertained from the annual Reports on the application during 1899 of the laws regulating work that 4,429 breaches of the law had taken place in industrial religious establishments. Of these 924 related to the duration of work. They had no knowledge or guarantee that similar abuses were not now going on in similar institutions here, and that great hardships were not being suffered by young children. It would be to the advantage of those institutions themselves that they should be placed under inspection. The convents of the Good Shepherd may be subject to precisely the same abuses in England as in France. He would point out to the

House what happened in Sheffield only four years ago. He wished to quote this instance in reply to the hon. Member for East Clare, who had stated that it was quite easy for the girls to come and go in these institutions;

"Two girls, named Maggie Gaffey, aged fifteen, and Minnie Hober, aged sixteen, made their escape from the convent of the Good Shepherd at midnight last night. They dropped twenty feet from a window on the fourth storey to the roof of another building, and then scaled the convent walls, from which they descended to the street. Hober sprained both her ankles, and the girls, being unable to run away, were arrested. The girls tell stories of starvation, hard work, and cruel treatment, and threaten to kill themselves if they are sent back."

MR. DILLON asked for the authority for this statement.

*MR. TENNANT replied that it appeared in a paragraph in the Sheffield Independent.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Slandering a religious community on the authority of a newspaper paragraph!

MR. DILLON said the hon. Member for Berwickshire had brought a very terrible charge, which was not in the official reports. He was very sorry to have to interrupt the hon. Member, but this was a very horrible charge with which they had been called upon to deal, and he wished to know what authority this charge was based upon.

*MR. TENNANT said he did not think he could be accused of slandering anybody. The statements in the paragraph had, he understood, never been disputed.

MR. DILLON said this was a very horrible charge, and it was important they should know who was the author of it.

*MR. TENNANT repeated that the paragraph appeared in the Sheffield Independent, and it was circulated by a society of which Mr. Abbott, of Gray's Inn Place, was the secretary.

MR. DILLON asked if the hon. Gentleman could say, of his own knowledge, that this was a genuine paragraph, or was it only a leaflet sent round broadcast.

*MR. TENNANT said his point was that, even if the case were untrue, it was surely one for inquiry. There was grave suspicion that such a case did take place, and it was of immense importance, as well from the point of view of the public generally as of the inmates of such homes, that that suspicion should be arrested. The other cases which he had quoted were all official, and if he had read something which he ought not to have read he offered his apologies to the House. The managers of similar homes in connection with the Church of England had expressed, not only their willingness, but their desire for inspection under the Home Office, and he saw no reason why other homes of a religious character should not come under the same inspection. He had received many influential letters supporting his view upon this question. The Archbishop of Canterbury was strongly in favour of inspection. He had received a letter from Miss Ella Pease in regard to the Morpeth Home of Industry in which she says;

"I have heard from three members of the 'Morpeth Home of Industry' Committee, and they are all strongly in favour of homes and institutions such as this being put under the Factory Acts. The other member who is in Norway at the present

moment agrees with us, I know. So I can say all the managers of the home are unanimous on the subject. We have all felt how difficult it is to prevent matrons from overpressing girls, even when their committees do all they can to prevent it, and when, as with us, there is plenty of money. I know, however, one or two institutions where there is not much money, and where the committees are at fault as well as the matrons, and a terrible lot of overwork goes on, and until there are women inspectors nothing will stop this continuing."

He had received amongst other letters from Mrs. Creighton, and from the wives of the Bishops of Chichester, Carlisle, York, Winchester, Exeter, Southwell, and Salisbury, all approving of the employment of a Government lady inspector, and expressing themselves strongly in favour of the inspection of these laundries.

With regard to competition with other laundries, surely that was an important point to consider. It was absurd to say that there was no competition in the face of the large income which some of these institutions derived from, their laundries. Even if the public had to subscribe to these charitable institutions the competition was equally unfair. He could not understand all this opposition to inspection, and if there was anything to conceal they wished to know what it was. If there was nothing to conceal, then he contended that these institutions would not suffer, but gain, by inspection. He asked the House not to agree to the motion, because on the one hand we should be doing a grave economic injustice, and on the other we should be abandoning one of our most solemn responsibilities.

*MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Bright-side) said he had been asked hundreds of questions on all sorts of matters in the course of the two elections he had fought in Sheffield, and had there been anything in the story quoted by the hon. Member who had just spoken he felt sure he must have heard of it. On the general question, however, the position was very unsatisfactory. He was afraid that an impression would be created that those institutions had something to conceal, whereas, as a matter of fact, they had not. It would be impossible to apply to those institutions the identical clauses of the Factory Acts which applied to ordinary business establishments, but difficulties such as that would have been fully met by the Amendment of his right hon. friend the Member for Oxford University, and he could not help hoping that his Amendment would yet be accepted, and that in all cases there would be a special lady visitor enjoying the confidence of the managers of such institutions.

MR. LEAMY (Kildare, N.) said he frankly admitted at the outset the right of those hon. Gentlemen who were against the exclusion of convent laundries from the Bill to challenge those who said they should be excluded to give their reasons for so thinking. He desired to approach this question as fairly and moderately as he could. He did not regard it as a Catholic or an Irish question.

He regarded it from a different point of view altogether. Before coming to the reasons for excluding these laundries from the Bill, he desired to meet one or two statements which had been made against convents and nuns. One of these was that the nuns shirked inquiry because they had something to conceal. This was a subject on which the Irish Members were competent to speak. They knew all about the working of these

institutions in Ireland, and the nuns, so far from being desirous to conceal, only welcomed visitors to the convent to see it and everything connected with it. There was not a day passed when ladies did not visit the convents and see the girls who were under the charge of the nuns. Not a Sunday or a holiday passed when ladies with their daughters did not visit the institutions and gave concerts to the inmates. There was hardly one of the Nationalist Members who had not a relative a nun, and they would be the most dishonest men in the world if they allowed their friends to remain in these institutions if there was anything wrong. The idea of secrecy, or that there was anything to conceal, was utterly absurd. The objection of the nuns to inspection was that they believed, rightly or wrongly, that the interference of an inspector between them and the girls under their charge would weaken the authority which it was necessary for them to exercise if they were to succeed with the great work they had in hand. It was said that the nuns might treat the girls badly. It was said that in some cases such girls had been treated badly. He would point out that it was the aim and object of the nuns to induce the girls to come into the convent. These girls came from a life in which they had been absolutely unrestrained. Their life was completely revolutionised, they were subjected to discipline, and they had prayer and work. The nuns had learned from sad experience that if the girls went out after being a short time in the convent they descended to the abyss from which they had been taken. The nuns believed that they were actually responsible to Christ for the care of the girls, and they did their utmost to prevent them straying again. If the girls were underfed or overworked they would be discontented, and they would

go out of the convents. There was no limit to the solicitude, devotion, and affection of the nuns. It was esteemed a miracle if a fallen woman turned round and altered her life, but that work of reform was being carried out week after week in the Irish convents. He asked the House not to weaken the hands of those by whom this miracle was being wrought. When the Member for East Fife was speaking he remembered the time when the Irish Members kept him in office. During that period there was some beneficent work done for the English working classes with the help of the Irish Members, and it was not fair to bring the charge against them that they were desirous of injuring this Bill. What was the object of this legislation? Was it to ensure that these girls were contented? Had ever any complaints been made by these girls in the convents? The nuns had no control over them except the consciousness of the girls in the devotion and affection of the nuns and their desire to make them happy. He did not wish to push this too far, but one of the difficulties was that the nuns had no desire to be exposed to the public. They wished to work quietly, but not secretly. It should be remembered that the convents in Dublin were inspected yearly by Archbishop Walsh; then there were the hospital inspectors, and ladies were constantly going in to visit them. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary that if he were in Dublin to-morrow and went into one of these convents he would be welcomed, and the mother would have pleasure in showing him the institution, provided that he did not go as an inspector but as a private gentleman. They were not afraid of inspection; the nuns were not afraid of

inspection so far as their work was concerned; but he did ask that the Legislature would not interfere with the work of the nuns who, day after day and night after night, bestowed constant care, anxiety, and affection on these miserable creatures. He knew that some of these poor girls were the victims of men's passions, and some of their own folly; but could there be any more beautiful or touching sight than that of these women, who had been in the convent since they were only ten or eleven years of age, taking to their hearts women from the streets who came to them for help. He could not conceive of anyone not respecting a beautiful and holy charity like that. He appealed to the House not to make this a Catholic or Irish question. He was not pleading for the nuns, but for the poor girls under their charge.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.) said he did not wish to say a word which would offend the feelings of the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken under a sense of very deep religious conviction. He was one of those representatives, who, he believed, were a great majority of the House, that were in favour of no clause at all rather than the clause as it stood in the Bill. But he would prefer still more a clause containing requirements for inspection all round. He believed there was no class of work which more demanded sanitary inspection than laundry work, and he, for one, was at a loss to understand the extraordinary opposition to what seemed to him a fair proposal that all laundries should be inspected. If laundries under the control of the different convents carried on their work in a proper sanitary way, without overworking the inmates by long, illegal hours, then in the name of common sense why should they object to fair inspection? How could it be possible to interfere with the proper discipline of the convents if women inspectors were to go round from time to time and inspect them? If there was nothing to conceal, as the hon. Gentleman opposite asserted, why, in the name of common sense, should they try to conceal it? [Laughter from the Irish benches.] He saw that an Irish way of stating a case appealed to hon. Members opposite. He was afraid that this was a concession made to members of the Committee who were members of the Roman Catholic Church; but it was time that the Government came to realise that there were other susceptibilities, quite as sincere as those of the members of the Roman Catholic Church, to be considered.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): said, as an agricultural Member, he did not pretend to know anything of convents, but he did know a great deal about charitable institutions. He had been glad to hear the firm and straightforward tone which the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had taken in Committee upstairs in regard to the exemption of religious institutions, and he had been more than disappointed that the right hon. Gentleman had hauled down the Union Jack that evening. The great majority of charitable institutions were well managed, and invited inspection to show to the world how they were carried on; in fact, they asked that the black sheep among them should be dropped out. They knew from parallel cases that abuses existed. The Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Women had a large number of laundries, and they asked for inspection, and they should like that the clause about exemption should be dropped out. He could not conceive why other institutions should not hold the same views. He could not help thinking that, if institutions were afraid of

being inspected, there must be something wrong. The mere fact that exemption for certain institutions had been so strongly sustained created a certain amount of suspicion in his own mind that there must be something wrong. It was the right of all the working women of this country to be put in exactly the same position, and he hoped the Home Secretary would reconsider his decision in regard to the Amendment. Nobody was more anxious to get away for a holiday than he was, but what about these poor women who never got any holidays at all? Why could they not give up a few days holidays in order to do good to these poor women? He earnestly hoped that the House would get rid of the exemption.

MR. RENSRAW (Renfrewshire, W.) said that the objections he felt to the clause which the Home Secretary proposed to omit from the Bill were grounded on the changes which had been made in the clause since it was originally introduced by the Government. When first introduced it contained two proposals. In the first place it provided that the Secretary of State should have power to regulate the hours in which work could be carried on in the trade laundries; and, in the second place, provision was made by which the Secretary of State was to have power to inspect at times the conventual, the charitable, institutions in which laundry work was carried on. Both these proposals had been changed during the progress of the Bill through Grand Committee. The hon. Member for Berwickshire, who had made what he considered a somewhat unfair speech with reference to the conventual side of the question, introduced in the early part of the clause a new provision doing away with the Secretary of State's power to regulate the hours, and establishing a system of fixed hours. At the instance of the hon. Member for Clare there was reinstated in the clause the precise words which had been enacted, with the assent of the right hon. Member for East Fife, in 1895. The right hon. Gentleman when he accepted that said that he did so under circumstances of great pressure. All those who were affected by factory legislation regretted that this measure had been introduced so late in the session; but they recognised that if the Home Secretary was to save his Bill it was necessary for him to make concessions where concessions were demanded. The Home Secretary proposed to take out the clause under discussion and re-enact the clause of 1895. That clause was only passed six years ago, and having regard to the enormous changes effected; some of them good and some of them not very admirable; in the provisions of this great Bill, that clause of 1895 might be allowed a little longer trial. He would remind the House that this Bill was intended to codify and simplify the whole of the Factory Laws in one measure, and as a manufacturer, expressing the views and opinions of many other manufacturers, he said that their opinion was not particularly strong in regard to the inspection of conventual institutions. What they were anxious about was to have the whole of the Factory Laws embraced in one statute, so that they could see at a glance, as it were, how their business was to be carried on. He hoped that the motion of the right hon. Gentleman would be accepted by the House. He did not plead for the conventual or charitable institutions, but what he wanted to press on the House was that, whether they accepted this clause or went back to the clause of 1895, it was perfectly clear that they

had to exempt the conventual and charitable institutions because no fresh conditions could be imposed. Following on what had been said by the hon. Member for Berwickshire, he might say that he had received a letter from a very large trade laundry firm in the neighbourhood of Paisley. It was dated 31st July, and was from A. Bell and Sons, Limited, and he would read the exact words in order that the House might realise the strong view held in regard to this matter;

"As to charitable institutions, we cannot understand why the Irish Members should be allowed to sway the decision of a strong Government. Institution laundries, with buildings and plant provided by private or public benefaction, and often subsidised by public subscriptions, compete with other laundries on an unjust footing; and when allowed to work any number of hours and under no restrictions the injustice is intensified."

Having regard to the position of this Bill, its importance, and the impossibility of everybody getting his own way, he thought they should take the line of least resistance, and strike out the amended clause, and re-insert in the schedule the clause in the Act of 1895.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said the question which the House would have to decide was whether they should take an amendment of the law embodied in Sub-clauses 1, 2, and 3, which the Home Secretary had declared to be valuable, and against which hon. Members had not a single word to say.

MR. SPEAKER: It would not be in order to reserve the Amendment on Sub-section 4. If the House decide in favour of the Amendment now before it, the whole clause must go.

MR. M'KENNA said that the only argument used by the Home Secretary and the hon. Member for Renfrewshire was that Sub-clauses 1, 2, and 3 would impose further restrictions on the laundries which would increase the cost of labour and production. He thought that was a wholly wrong view, as was shown by the experience of the Factories Acts. These sub-clauses did not impose any new restrictions on employers. What they would do would be to put the employment by bad employers in

the same position as employment by good employers; and there would be no increase of cost of labour and production. It was the opinion of many laundry employers that these sub-clauses would be good for the laundries themselves. The letter which the hon. Member for Renfrewshire read raised no objection to the sub-clauses; the objection was to the exemption of the conventual laundries, which would apply fully as much to the Act of 1895 as it would do in the clause under discussion. The organised employers had declared themselves in favour of these restrictions, and in face of that they could not believe that they would increase the cost of production. No reason had been shown why what was admitted to be a valuable improvement of the law should not be accepted. The Home Secretary proposed to drop the three first sub-sections of the clause, because he was afraid that on the 4th he might be driven by the compact which he had made with the Irish Members;

*MR. RITCHIE: I absolutely deny that there has been any compact.

MR. M'KENNA said he was extremely sorry to have used a word that was in any sense offensive, and he frankly withdrew the observation. Although there was no

compact, or anything in the nature of a compact, the hon. Gentlemen representing Irish constituencies had expressed their feelings as to Sub-section 4 with such great strength that the Home Secretary no doubt understood that unless he acceded to their views his measure would meet with considerable opposition.

*MR. RITCHIE: What I mean, and said, was that if this clause, as it stands, remains in the Bill, I feel perfectly certain that it will be utterly impossible to pass the measure at all. This clause would not therefore come into operation at all. So the hon. Gentleman's argument falls entirely to the ground.

MR. M'KENNA: What an extraordinary statement to come from the Home Secretary, who is a member of the Government which has forced measure after measure through the House without Amendment by the use of the closure!

*MR. RITCHIE: Not a Bill with 163 clauses.

MR. M'KENNA said that they had already reached the 103rd clause, and there was such a thing as the block closure, to which the Government could have resorted, and which would have enabled the right hon. Gentleman to carry through the Bill if he had pleased. As a matter of fact, the Amendments on the Paper were so few that he would have had no difficulty in so doing. The right hon. Gentleman was taking ground which was wholly inconsistent with the past experience of the Government. As they knew only too well, the Government had used their powers as a relentless Juggernaut to override the forms and privileges of the House, and now, forsooth, when they had the chance of passing a measure; not to grant doles, or to secure the dominance of the clerical party in the schools; they found themselves reluctant to use those methods they had invariably employed on previous occasions! The explanation of the right hon. Gentleman did not mend his case in the least. He had an opportunity of making a valuable Amendment of the law, which he rejected at the bidding of the smallest of the three sections of the House. The right hon. Gentleman had wasted his opportunity and sacrificed his immense majority, and an almost unparalleled opportunity for doing something to settle a vexed question, because, forsooth, it would take from his holidays half a day or a day. He deeply regretted that the right hon. Gentleman should have moved this Amendment.

SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow College): said that in his belief, notwithstanding the lecture to the Home Secretary given by the hon. Gentleman opposite, the proposal made by the right hon. Gentleman to omit the clause altogether was the only way to escape at this stage out of the difficulty.

Suppose that the suggestion of the hon. Member for North Monmouth had been taken to keep the clause as it stood, the first thing the hon. Members from Ireland would have done would have been to crowd the Order Paper with Amendments, and no advance could possibly

have been made, so that a Bill of the greatest value would have been destroyed.

He was not prepared to run that risk. The Bill as it stood was a monument of surrender of the Government where surrender was not necessary. He was very much surprised when the hon. Member spoke of the compact made by the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill with the Irish Members. The compact which he made was the compact which gentleman crossing Blackheath made with the gentlemen of the road who demanded their money or their life. In all seriousness, although

he thought the course proposed by the Government was the wisest in all the circumstances, he maintained that what had happened in the Standing Committee was unworthy of the House of Commons, and hardly to be described by a word less strong than cowardly on the part of a strong Government.

MR. DILLON: I do not think the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has been just to the Irish party in regard to this Bill. We could have killed this Bill at any moment if we had wished. It is a very complicated measure, and nobody knows better than the Home Secretary that what I say is true. But throughout we abstained, and not only that, but during the proceedings in Committee upstairs we consistently assisted him in carrying this Bill, and assisted the Radical party in improving the Bill, and I am not quite sure that the tone adopted by some of the Radical party, after all these days during which we steadily voted for the improvement of the Bill, is either fair or generous. The hon. Member for North Monmouthshire tried to induce inexperienced Members of the House to imagine that we were voting on the question whether the whole clause should stand part of the Bill or not. That is only a technical point. The question now is whether the clause stand part of the Bill or not, and it is on that issue that the opinion of the House is going to be taken. I pass on without commenting upon the observation of the hon. Member as to the power of the Government to override the will of the smallest section of the House. It is rather new to us to hear from the Radical party that we are such a contemptible section of the House.

It is certainly a somewhat surprising experience to hear a Member of the Radical party inviting the Government to put in force closure by compartments in order to shut up the Irish party. But I pass from these observations, which are difficult to take seriously, and I come to the serious speech of an hon. Member opposite who has taken an active part in connection with this Bill. He expressed some doubt as to the value of the changes, and at all events stated that he would prefer to omit the whole clause, as it stands, rather than accept it with the exemption of the charitable institutions.

MR. RENSCHAW: What I conveyed was that the clause is now so changed that I would prefer it should be omitted, because I disapprove of the advantage which it would give in competition.

MR. DILLON: I understand the hon. Member's position. It is that inasmuch as the restrictions by this Bill have been largely increased in stringency, that the severity of competition would be greatly increased by the exemptions. Well, the hon. Member below the gangway demolished that by saying that the restrictions did not in the slightest interfere with competition. Where, therefore, is the doctrine which is one of the main arguments, and the very argument of the hon. Gentleman opposite; the argument, namely, of undue competition? Why, then, is the communication from the Associated Laundries brought forward by the hon. Member for Berwickshire?

MR. TENNANT: Does the hon. Member deny that there is competition?

MR. DILLON: No; but the hon. Member for North Monmouthshire does.

MR. M'KENNA: I deny that the increased restrictions under the Factory laws cause any additional expense.

MR. DILLON: So that it makes no difference. Where then, if there is no increased cost, does the undue competition come in? The whole thing is ridiculous. I dwell on this argument of unfair competition suggested by the hon. Member for Renfrewshire, because I consider it to be the only serious argument that has been put forward against our views. I could not help contrasting the tone of his argument with that of other hon. Members opposite. He abstained from a single insulting reference to the Irish conventual institutions which do laundry work. The same remark may be made of the Home Secretary, who conducted the Bill upstairs with extraordinary skill and patience. The hon. Gentleman went on to say that these institutions subject the trade laundries to unfair competition because the plant is supplied by public subscription. I admit that there is some slight weight in the argument from that point of view, but what can be done with these poor homeless, houseless creatures to whom these institutions offer a refuge when all others are closed against them? Are you prepared to turn these people away and let them become the hopeless victims of the evils of society? Are you going to deny them the right to work in these institutions and obtain there a refuge from the cruelty and the awful lives to which they are exposed? Surely no man in this House is prepared to stand up and say that he would shut the doors of hope and mercy on these poor outcasts. What remedy then remains in the way of competition? You must only trust to the good sense of those who conduct these institutions, whether Catholic nuns or Protestant sisters; and as regards the Catholic institutions I may say that the nuns charge higher prices for the work done in order to avoid as far as possible competing unfairly with ordinary laundries.

I will try to be as moderate as I can in dealing with the statements of the hon. Member for Berwickshire, though I must admit that his speech was such as should make the Irish blood boil in my veins. I remember that, many years ago, I travelled all the way from here to Berwickshire to assist the hon. Member in his election; but in all my experience I never listened to a more cruel, a more wounding, or a more unjustifiable charge than that which was levelled by the hon. Member against comparatively defenceless ladies, or a charge that was based on so utterly flimsy a foundation. What did the hon. Member say? Without mentioning his authority, he charged, in the basest possible way, that five or six years ago two unfortunate girls escaped from one of these institutions by jumping from the window of a fourth storey, I think he said, on to the roof of another house, and that when they were picked up by the police they said they would commit suicide rather than go back. I asked him on what ground he based that charge. He comes before the House of Commons to endanger a great Bill, and he selects as the ground for the charge a suspicion of horrible ill-treatment of these girls, and, knowing the gravity of the charge and the feelings of passion to which it would give rise, yet he bases that charge on a cutting from a newspaper referring to some incident alleged to have taken place years ago in Sheffield. He gave no details or particulars in support of the charge, and when challenged on the point he could not verify what he said, and did not even know whether the newspaper cutting was

a genuine one or not. I now ask with confidence; I ask our friends and our political opponents; is that the conduct an English gentleman and a Member of this House ought to stoop to? I know something, and my friends around me know something, of the lives led by these convent ladies; women who have turned their backs on all that makes life dear to the ordinary human being, and who devote their whole lives, without hope of reward, to one of the most painful, most difficult, and distressing occupations anyone in this world could undertake, whose convents in Ireland are the objects of admiration and sympathy of everyone acquainted with their work and record, no matter what his religious belief may be, and I have known thousands with no religious beliefs at all who have admired them just as much. Against the ladies in charge of these institutions a breath of calumny was never uttered, and no charge was ever made against their fair name and fame for the last twenty years since I entered public life in this country. But now it remains for a Liberal Member of Parliament to make the charge in this House, and on what grounds? On the contemptible basis of a cutting from the Sheffield Independent he makes a charge which is practically an indictment of all the Catholic convents in the country. What is the work these ladies are engaged in? I say that in the whole annals of the Christian Church there is no greater or more difficult work of charity than that in which these ladies are engaged. The doors of their convents are thrown open to the wreckage of human society, and to my knowledge the poor girls, the victims of the conditions of society, who enter these doors, are welcomed, not as hired servants, but as members of one and the same family. And when the hon. Member talks about girls escaping from these convents he does not understand what he is saying, because there is no need for them to escape. The doors are open to them to come or go. The nuns have no legal right to detain them if they do not choose to stay. They come in from the streets when all the world has shut them out and denied them both refuge and sympathy. When they tire of the convent they leave, sometimes to return to their evil courses, but when they again return are they denied forgiveness by the nuns? No; they come again and again, and every time they come they are welcomed. These are the ladies who the hon. Member insinuates are selfish and capable of sweating and ill-treating the poor creatures who seek their aid. I will not deal with what the hon. Member said about the French convents. The shameful charges made against them by some newspapers in this country I believe to be base, contemptible, and lying charges. The hon. Member was ashamed to give the whole catalogue of the charges. I will mention one of them. In the scandalous circulars sent round I find it stated that the French nuns kept these girls working hard and sold their work to the rich prostitutes of Paris.

MR. TENNANT: I was not in the least ashamed of stating what I believed to be a fact. All I said was that certain things had occurred which were proved to have occurred in the official reports, and that we had no knowledge that similar things might not occur again. That was my argument.

MR. DILLON: The hon. Member did not give a single particular or detail in support of his charge against the French convents. But that is not the question with which we have to deal. I do not attach any weight to these

charges, and as uttered against the convents of France I do not believe them. I am surprised that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Oxford University gives the weight of his authority to the misconception that we are asking for the exemption of Catholic institutions because they are Catholic. Nothing was further from the truth or more at variance with the facts. I have heard repeated charges that we are striving to shelter establishments where young children are employed. What are the facts? All the convents in Ireland to which children are sent under the Industrial Schools Acts are inspected by Government inspectors. In my own constituency in East Mayo there are two large convents, and in connection with one of them an important woollen factory is carried on. Both are inspected by Government inspectors, and the nuns never dream of objecting. As a matter of fact, half the convents in Ireland are thus inspected, and therefore I will ask hon. Members to dismiss from their minds the idea; which I believe has been deliberately circulated by people who know it to be false; that we are asking for the exemption of Catholic convents as such. We are asking exemption for a certain class of institutions in which, on account of the character of the inmates, inspection would interfere with discipline. We are assured by those experienced in the working of these institutions that the intrusion of the inspector; and I say it frankly, I think the female inspector is the worst; would be detrimental to the discipline of these institutions. It was said that the whole thing could be remedied by substituting the female for the male inspector. Well, I had a letter the other day from the superioress of one of these institutions, in which she said, "For God's sake save us from inspection if you can, but if we are to be inspected at all, let us have a male Government inspector." We are assured that the enormous difficulty of maintaining discipline in these institutions would be vastly increased by a system of hard and fast inspection, and for that reason alone we claim this exemption. I hold in my hand a communication I received some time ago from the Association of Reformatory and Refuge Unions of the United Kingdom in which laundry work is carried on. It is signed by no less than 150 representatives of these institutions, of which I believe not more than twenty are Catholic, and in that communication they say that if the factory rules were introduced, the object for which these homes were founded would be entirely defeated. These Protestant institutions most of them appeal to us for help, and I myself have received many letters begging me to persevere and save them from the intrusion of inspection. That is the first ground on which we claim the exemption of these institutions. The inmates of these institutions are as free to leave them if they wish as any Member of this House is to leave this Chamber to-night. The discipline which is maintained is the discipline of a private family; that is, by affection and influence and not by fear of punishment or fear of restraint. Everybody knows that the girls, owing to the unfortunate circumstances of their lives, are extremely unwilling to subject themselves to outside inspection. It is cruel to force it upon them. The whole conditions of life are entirely different to what prevail in outside places. When they are sick they are not dismissed. Many of them are unwell coming into the convents, and have to be subjected to a long course of medical treatment. They have no home to go to, and they are all

treated as members of the one family, and if they are at any time invalidated they are attended to and treated within the convent. The work they perform, although no doubt it is an assistance towards maintaining the institution, is mainly intended as a means of distracting the minds and occupying the time of the inmates. These are the grounds, and the only grounds, upon which we claim this exemption.

Now let me turn for a moment to what happened. Hon. Members of the Liberal party to-night protest in the loudest possible manner against the action of the Home Secretary in sacrificing this valuable clause. Hon. Members came forward and declared that the conduct of the Government in throwing over this clause was nothing short of an outrage. I think these gentlemen are guilty of most extraordinary consistency. We are told by some of the Members behind the Home Secretary that his action is cowardly, and some said, "It is a contract with the Irish Members." I should like to put before hon. Members opposite for their consideration some facts that will induce them to withdraw that statement. In the first place, there is no compromise. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary acted perfectly straight. He, of course, as any right hon. Member in charge of a Bill would, inquired and negotiated with a view to adjust matters and bring about an understanding. Having failed to bring about an understanding to which everybody could assent, he put the motion on the Paper which he has moved to-night, the course he now took, but when Liberal Members are so indignant with the right hon. Gentleman for this "base surrender," as they describe it, to Irish Members, I beg of them to remember the action of their own party in 1895. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife declared that he agreed to accept the Amendment excepting conventual and charitable Protestant laundries in 1895 because he had not a majority to carry his original proposition. Hon. Members on the Conservative side were in opposition in those days, and here is the record of the division by which these identical words in reference to convent laundries inserted in the Grand Committee in the present Bill were carried in 1895. The motion was made to insert the words exempting the conventual laundries from inspection by Mr. Secretary Asquith, and it was carried by thirty-eight votes to ten. Let me read the names of some of those who voted in the majority for the same words which are denounced as a base and cowardly surrender to the Irish party; Mr. Allinson, Mr. Gerald Balfour, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir James Fergusson, Mr. Hayes Fisher, Sir John Gorst, Mr. Heneage, Sir William Houldsworth; all members of the Tory party;

SIR J. STIRLING-MAXWELL: They are all now members of the Government.

MR. DILLON: That is a very stupid point, and it is not a fact. Sir James Fergusson is not a member of the Government. I do not know whether Sir John Gorst would be considered a member of the Government. Sir William Houldsworth is not a member of the Government. Conservatives in 1895 joined in forcing this view upon the Government, and I am astonished to hear the views of some of the Tory party to-night. The Government to-day have nothing to be ashamed of in this matter. Their action is not a "base surrender." It is a reasonable concession to a body of people who have been of enormous service to humanity, and whose feelings and opinions are entitled to a

due and fair consideration. Whatever the future prospect may be; and I may say the Home Secretary was most anxious to meet everybody; so long as the discipline of those institutions is not broken or interfered with, I venture to say that the Home Secretary and the present Tory Government have nothing to be ashamed of in this transaction. There has been no surrender. There has been a fair exchange of opinion, a square fight upon the merits of the case, and, for my part, I thank the Home Secretary for the action he has taken to-night, although I regret that the whole clause will be lost to the Bill. That is not due to the action of the Irish party. It is the fault of some men; I cast no blame, nor make any question of their sincerity; who are so narrow-minded or misled in their opinion that they are prepared to lose the clause and wreck the whole Bill rather than let these conventual and charitable institutions conduct their own work. Sir, in dealing with great measures like this, in which the interests of millions of the working classes are concerned, it is a narrow, bigoted, and stupid policy to risk a fight on so great and beneficent a measure for the sake of breaking in the doors of a few convents, against which no man, except the hon. Member for Berwickshire, dared to utter a word, and against which I challenge any Member of this House to bring a well-founded Complaint.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley): The hon. Member who has just spoken attacked my hon. friend on apparently no stronger foundation than a circular letter sent by unknown people to every Member of the House through this morning's post. Many of us listened with interest to the powerful and eloquent speech of the

hon. Member for some justification of the position which he and his colleagues have taken up, and which they have forced on the Government. The root of the matter is that laundries attached to religious institutions claim that they should not be subject to the inspection of the Government factory inspector. All the time that this matter was being discussed in the Standing Committee upstairs, and during the whole of the debate this evening, I listened with attention for a single logical argument which would show that there was any substantial reason against inspection by a Government inspector of institutions of this kind. In my opinion the logic undoubtedly lies in the direction of showing that institutions of an industrial character, whether attached to religious denominations or not, if they carry on trade processes, may be, in certain circumstances, used unfairly towards their employees, and should therefore be subject to inspection. That is the view which many hon. Members who intend, as I intend, to support the Government to-night, take on this question.

The history of the question is very short. The Bill originally provided for the inspection of all laundries. Then an hon. Gentleman opposite moved to exempt laundries attached to religious institutions, and the Government accepted that proposal. Then the laundry trade outside the religious institutions were up in arms, and claimed that they were justified in fearing that competition would press unduly upon them if one class of laundries was subject to Government inspection and another class was not. The last and final stage in the history of this clause is that the House is now asked to leave out not only laundries attached to religious institutions, but laundries of an ordinary character. The

question which the House has to determine on this, one of the last nights of the session, is whether all laundries shall go free or whether we shall lose this Bill altogether. That, and that alone, is the question. It seems to be a matter of expediency which, in all the circumstances, justifies the action of the Government. I was sorry to hear my hon. friend apply such an epithet as "cowardly" to the Government, and in particular to the right hon. Gentleman, who has conducted this Bill both in the Grand Committee upstairs and in this House with consummate skill. It is not cowardly to give way when one cannot avoid giving way for the purpose of securing benefit to the people generally. The contrast between the proceedings upstairs and the debate to-night; especially on the part of hon. Members opposite representing English constituencies; is that, while in Committee no party feeling or prejudice was shown, I regret to find to-night that the difficult circumstances of the case have been made the instrument of party warfare. ["Oh, oh!"] That is the view which many on this side hold, if it is not held by the hon. Gentleman who interrupts. I do not know if he heard the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife, but never did he or anyone attempt more thoroughly to make party capital out of a subject which all parties in the House recognise is for the welfare of the workers. The omission of this clause is a most regrettable circumstance, but it is less regrettable than the loss of the whole Bill. It is better to lose the clause than the Bill, because the loss of the Bill would be a loss to all workers throughout the country. It is a Bill consolidating and codifying the whole of the laws relating to factories, a Bill which gives sanitary conditions and prevents overcrowding, and gives fences to dangerous machinery, and many other matters, including the bringing of the dangers of railway sidings within the purview of the House. I should hope that no hon. Gentleman, for the sake of party capital, or for the sake of a religious prejudice, would stop the progress of such a Bill as this.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea): thought it was to be regretted that the House had been compelled to listen to such a speech as had been delivered this evening by the hon. Member for Berwickshire. He had followed the debates in 1895 and 1901 upon this subject through nearly all the stages, and he had never known a question discussed more fairly and freely, or a question where so much consideration had been given one to another as upon this question, both in the debate in 1895 and

this evening, with the exception, of the speech he referred to. He knew of no question which had been discussed more free from religious feelings, and he thought the speech to which he had referred was a mistake. It was not intended to be offensive, but it was offensive owing to the allegation made against a particular convent in Sheffield, which he trusted, if inquiry were made, would prove to be utterly unfounded. Hon. Members on the Irish benches would admit that he had consistently and persistently taken a contrary view to that which they held upon this particular point. He had taken a view free from religious bigotry, and had discussed the question from the point of view of citizenship and the protection of the State to everybody, whether Jews or Roman Catholics, Protestants or Freethinkers. He took the simple ground that, as the greater

embraced the less, so every institution charitable, industrial, competitive, or religious, ought to comply with the common sense of most, and accept such sanitary and medical inspection as the law said should be carried out. He thought, considering the increase of these religious and philanthropic institutions, the time had come when these people should no longer be exempted from those standards of inspection that other people would have to conform to if they were in the free air of competitive private enterprises. It was upon broad political, industrial, and social grounds that he took this view. He desired to remind the Irish representatives that the exigencies of political warfare and party strife frequently gave one of the parties in the House a parliamentary advantage which some people envied, but which carried with it great responsibilities. The position of the Irish party to-night was similar to that which they occupied in 1895, when they held the balance of power. He differed from the hon. Member for East Mayo upon the history of this question. He knew, and the hon. Member for East Mayo ought to know, if he did not, and would be, he believed, the first to admit, that when in 1895 the Factory Act was before the Grand Committee on

Trade, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife was absolutely in the hands of the Irish Members. He was so anxious to get his Bill through that he was absolutely dependent on the Irish party, and that was the true reason why the words of the clause then adopted were accepted. Then they came to 1901. The Government had a nominal majority of 140, and were confronted with a mere nominal Opposition of less than 140, the Irish Members holding the balance of power on this Factory Bill as much as in 1891. He would ask Irish Members whether, on an industrial point of great magnitude, affecting millions of people in their own country, as well as in England, Scotland, and Wales, it was wise, in their own permanent interest, to play the rôle of Shylock, and to exact the entire pound of flesh, and in so doing perhaps permanently damage their own cause. They might win the exemption of conventual laundries, but that victory might lead, when political circumstances were less favourable to them than at present, to a demand for an amendment of the Laundry Acts altogether, under circumstances which they would be unable to resist, and they would have to submit to conditions perhaps worse than if they now adopted the view of the right hon. Member for Oxford University, or accepted the omission of Sub-clause 4. This Bill considerably improved the condition of scores of thousands of men, women, and young persons in private laundries apart from religious institutions. The motion of the Home Secretary meant that for an indefinite period, owing to the peculiar circumstances of the exemption of religious institutions, laundry workers, than whom there was not a more over-worked, more underpaid, more badly treated, and worse organised body of people in this country; these people were to be put outside the operation of those excellent reforms in the Laundry Act simply because a few religious laundries were to be exempt. In this case the Home Secretary had gone further than the Irish Members wanted. There ought to be some means by which the Magdalen Homes might be excluded without excluding hundreds of other institutions which might not be so well-managed as these homes. The Home Secretary had been negligent, or

he might have found words to meet the difficulty. The "God's own Garden" case was an instance of how an impostor had imposed upon public charity for an apparently good object. He did not believe the Magdalen Homes or the Church of England Refuge Homes were capable of such things, but the factory reports showed that irregularities took place in some of these laundries, where the inmates worked under insanitary conditions, and the managers of these institutions were not looked after in the same way as those employers who came under the Factory Act. If the Amendment were carried it would simply leave the inspection of laundries alone for years to come, and would perpetuate suspicion of good laundries, and place the best of them under a ban of religious bigotry and prejudice which they might at once escape from by submitting to that reasonable inspection which many of the lady superiors did not object to. Competition did not do anyone any harm, but if one section of laundries was to be exempted from the clause, those laundries would have the advantage of those not exempted, to the damage of the outside laundries. Private enterprise would be handicapped, and girls would have to be kept for longer hours on low wages and under insanitary conditions because the conventual and other laundries had been exempted. Parliament had no right to subject these girls to worse conditions than at present, but the exemption of these religious laundries would undoubtedly have that effect. In many cases it was poverty that led to prostitution, and, anxious as he was to rescue the fallen, he was not willing to grease the path down which virtuous women would fall. He had not a word to say against the way in which many of the religious institutions were carried on, and he did not impugn the motives of Irish Members to whom he was grateful for their assistance on labour questions, but he appealed to Irish Members not to persist in the course they had adopted on the present occasion. If they persisted they would win, but victory under such circumstances would be worse than defeat, and he believed that before two years were over abuses and irregularities would spring up in other institutions besides those now exempted, so that public opinion

would be compelled to place every laundry, whether religious or not, under a common standard of sanitary law, factory inspection, and medical regulation. Because he appreciated what the Irish Members had done for labour; and he had tried to reciprocate their action in that respect; he regretted their attitude on the present occasion.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I do not wish to say a word against the earnestness or genuineness of the speech to which we have just listened, but I really must say in regard to the hon. Member who made it, and also in regard to the hon. Member for Berwickshire and the late Home Secretary, that they have all spoken to-night, and intend to vote, precisely in the opposite direction from that in which they spoke and voted, not merely in 1895, but a few days ago in the Grand Committee. The hon. Member who has just sat down and the hon. Member for Berwickshire both voted for the Grand Committee on the exact Amendment which is now before the House, although I except the late Home Secretary in that respect.

MR. JOHN BURNS said that on the Second Reading of the Bill of 1895 and in the

Grand Committee he had expressed the same views as he had that night.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman will refer to the records of the Grand Committee, I think he will see that this actual question was put and that he voted for it. I do not wish to press that point, but I do think that the recollection of these very recent utterances and decisions on the part of hon. Gentlemen should moderate the fervour of their advocacy on this occasion. I do not, in the very few remarks I intend to make, propose to deal with the necessity of inspection in these philanthropic institutions. My own instincts and inclinations are on the whole in favour of that publicity which comes from inspection. But, speaking of a great many very excellent institutions which are outside this debate altogether, I know that very good people sometimes do very bad things. I certainly do not mean to lay down the proposition that in the case of an institution which is genuinely conducted, upon philanthropic principles, by self-denying persons who have no selfish aim, and whose whole object is to benefit their fellow-creatures, those high motives are always or even necessarily a sufficient protection against abuses. Abuses sometimes creep into any institution, whatever its character and motive, from which all publicity is excluded. But I do not think that is the question before us. The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife, the late Home Secretary, have given us a version of what occurred in 1895 and compared it with what we propose to do in 1901. They have drawn the comparison in such a way as to be very much to their advantage and very much to our disadvantage. For the life of me I cannot understand in what the distinction consists. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife, when he was at the Home Office in 1895, brought in a much shorter Bill than this, in which he dealt with factory legislation. In that Bill he introduced a clause dealing with laundries. When he came face to face with the parliamentary situation he found that he had to choose between his clause and his Bill. Having to make that choice, he, in my opinion, behaved with common sense. He gave up his clause and he kept his Bill. We have practically the same choice before us, and, that being so, I think we shall follow the same course. How does the right hon. Gentleman try to draw a distinction between the case of 1895 and 1901? He says: "In 1895 I was bound hand and foot to the Irish Members. We could not command a majority in the Committee or the House without the help of the Irish Members. I gave way. What else could you expect me to do? I had to do it." [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Or go out.] I admit there was that difference. I think it is a new doctrine that office was so very important, and everybody knows that it is not a case of office with the present Government. We could drop our Bill without the question of office being affected in the smallest degree. The injury would not be to Government or the Government majority, but to the working classes of this country.

MR. ASQUITH: It is not a question of office at all. It is a question of the Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not suggest for a moment that the right hon. Gentleman has any unwholesome craving for office, and, that being so, where is the choice between us? If we choose the clause we must drop the Bill. I presume the

argument is this. In 1895, if the Government had had to keep the clause, they would have dropped the Bill. That is exactly the position here. It is a delusion to suppose that because there is no chance of a Government defeat on the Third Reading of this Bill that conclusively shows that if the Government perseveres, as it is called, with the Bill, the Bill would not be lost. The Bill is not merely a great amending Bill, but a great consolidation Bill. It is a Bill of 160 clauses, and let us as men of common sense remember that Bills of 160 clauses cannot be passed through this House under our present rules, or under any rules at all resembling them, except by something in the nature of general consent. I remember an interesting experience of my own connected with a Bill which was, I think, even longer than the present Bill; a Bill dealing with local government in Scotland. I think the original measure had over 200 clauses. Two gentlemen alone on the opposite side of the House concerned themselves with that measure. The Bill was passed, but in the process we dropped at least 100 clauses. It is only by that kind of mutual concession which brings unanimity that Bills on this scale can be passed. It would have been very desirable in some respects, I think, if the Government could have introduced the Bill without touching upon this controversial point, but I think it would have been impossible. At all events, it would not have been right, because there might have been a chance of arriving at a compromise. At one time I thought there was a good chance of a compromise, but that chance has been dissipated, and we find ourselves face to face with a Bill on 99–100ths of which there is general agreement, but on the 1–100th of which there is profound, bitter, implacable dissent. A Government which under those circumstances, dealing with a consolidation Bill, did not

try to arrive at some general agreement, would be absolutely unworthy of the responsibility thrown upon them.

My hon. friend the Member for the College Division of Glasgow, who made an able and interesting speech just now, introduced in the closing sentences of his remarks the epithet "cowardly," which he applied, I think, to my right hon. friend, and, I suppose, to the Government of which my right hon. friend is a member. Epithets like "cowardly" should be used, I venture to say, in the most sparing manner even of those from whom you profoundly dissent. They should never be used of those with whom you habitually agree. That is a canon of parliamentary manners which we who have reached middle life have no difficulty in maintaining, and which my hon. friend, with his enviable youth will, I am sure, easily be able to acquire. But really, in this matter, there is no case of courage or cowardice. The position is perfectly plain to every man with the smallest knowledge in this House. If you try to pass this Bill by agreement, a great measure of consolidation and amendment will be embodied in the law of the land. If you do not try to pass this Bill by agreement, you will not pass it at all. That is plain common sense. I absolutely refuse to admit the argument that we are bound to vote for every clause and every sub-clause, and that, rather than give way on a single point, the whole great measure should perish. It would be the height of imprudence on the part of any Government to try to push through a measure of this character on such a principle. It may be that there should be

a separate Bill, after proper investigation, dealing with this particular industry. But if you try to embody in a consolidation Bill subjects upon which no agreement is possible, upon which the profoundest feelings are stirred, you will never pass a consolidation Bill at all; you will never be able to deal with a measure on this scale, and legislation will suffer accordingly. I venture to say that of all the many difficulties which we have to contend with in this House in carrying out the legislative work entrusted to us, the greatest difficulty is to know how to deal with Bills involving an immense number of provisions. The mere work of consolidation has been stopped for four or five years by the action of one of my friends on this side of the House. There is no difficulty whatever on the part of any Member to stop that work if he chooses. The result is that we are bound in introducing a measure of this kind to have regard to the inevitable conditions which we cannot stamp upon or overcome by a mere effort of the will, conditions which must regulate our conduct. There is, therefore, no concession of principle in the course we have adopted, and no cause for bringing against us the odious charge of cowardice. We may not have embraced the whole subject within the ambit of our measure, but that cannot be a sufficient reason for accusing the Government of weakness or cowardice, or any other of the charges which have been urged against us this afternoon.

AYES.

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud

Grant, Corrie

Paulton, James Mellor

Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry

Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)

Rickett, J. Compton

Bell, Richard

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Rigg, Richard

Broadhurst, Henry

Haldane, Richard Burdon

Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)

Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)

Harmsworth, R. Leicester

Sinclair, John (Farfarshire)

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Harris, Frederick Leverton

Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants

Burns, John

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-

Strachey, Edward

Caine, William Sproston

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.

Thomas, J. A. (Glamorgan, G'wr

Caldwell, James

Helme, Norval Watson
Thomson, F. W. (Yorks. W. R.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Ure, Alexander
Causton, Richard Knight
Holland, William Henry
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Cawley, Frederick
Horniman, Frederick John
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Channing, Francis Allston
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
White, Luke (Yorks. E. R.)
Colville, John
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Whiteley, George (York. W. R.)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Cremer, William Randal
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Crombie, John William
Lewis, John Herbert
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks. W. R.)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Tennant and Colonel Sandys.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.
Moss, Samuel.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Norman, Henry
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Bathurst, Hon. A. Benjamin
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Big wood, James
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bignold, Arthur
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Ambrose, Robert
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Boland, John
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm
Bagot, Capt. J. FitzRoy
Boyle, James
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Balcarres, Lord
Brassey, Albert
Chapman, Edward
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Bull, William James
Charrington, Spencer
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Clancy, John Joseph
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Cogan, Denis J.
Banbury, Frederick George
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir E. H.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.) said he did not rise to continue the debate upon the merits of this question, but simply to ask the Home Secretary for some explanation of the course the Government were going to pursue after this motion had been carried. He understood that this motion was only the preliminary to other motions which would be made at a future stage of the Bill in this House. He desired to ask the right hon. Gentleman if on the schedules he would

introduce into the Bill the clause from the Act of 1895.

*MR. RITCHIE: I intend to propose an Amendment in one of the schedules which will set up the existing law.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 65; Noes, 237. (Division List No. 469.)

Colomb, Sir John C. Ready

Keswick, William

Pemberton, John S. G.

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.

Penn, John

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Law, Andrew Bonar

Pierpoint, Robert

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge

Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)

Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard

Cranborne, Viscount

Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Crean, Eugene

Lawson, John Grant

Power, Patrick Joseph

Cripps, Charles Alfred

Leamy, Edmund

Pretymann, Ernest George

Crossley, Sir Savile

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Cullinan, J.

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Purvis, Robert

Davenport, W. Bromley-

Llewellyn, Evan Henry

Randles, John S.

Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham

Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)

Reddy, M.

Delany, William

Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Dickson, Charles Scott

Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Redmond, William (Clare)

Dillon, John

Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cumb Penr

Remnant, James Farquharson
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Donelan, Captain A.
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Doogan, P. C.
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lundon, W.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Duffy, William J.
Macdona, John Cumming
Roche, John
Duke, Henry Edward
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Rutherford, John
Elibank, Master of
Maconochie, A. W.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Field, William
M'Cann, James
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
M'Fadden, Edward
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
M'Govern, T.
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)

Fisher, William Hayes
Malcolm, Ian
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Flynn, James Christopher
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Foster, Philip S. (War wick, S. W.)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Gardner, Ernest
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Gilhooly, James
Morgan, David J. (W'lthamstow
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Spear, John Ward
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Mount, William Arthur
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Muntz, Philip A.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Murnaghan, George
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury)
Murphy, John
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Sullivan, Donal
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Groves, James Grimble

Nannetti, Joseph P.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G.) Oxf'd Univ.
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Nicholson, William Graham
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N.
Hain, Edward
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Thornton, Percy M.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd'x
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Tollemache, Henry James
Hammond, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Tully, Jasper
Haslett, Sir James Horner
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Valentia, Viscount
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Doherty, William
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Heath, J. (Staffordsh., N. W.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Henderson, Alexander
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm.
Higginbottom, S. W.
O'Dowd, John
Wills, Sir Frederick
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks. E. R.)
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Hoult, Joseph
O'Malley, William

Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)

Houston, Robert Paterson

O'Mara, James

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Howard, John (Kent, Faversham)

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Hudson, George Bickersteth

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Joyce, Michael

Parker, Gilbert

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

Parkes, Ebenezer

Remaining words added.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE moved to leave out Clause 104, in order to call attention to its wording. He said the object of those who obtained the insertion of this clause was to bring compensation into operation in places from which it was excluded at the present time, but the words in the clause would not be held to bring in compensation, and if the words could be made clearer it ought to be done. In the interests of the industrial classes their position in regard to compensation should be clearly defined.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out Clause 104."; (Sir Charles Dilke.)

Question proposed, "That the words from the word 'the,' to the word 'machines,' in line 14, inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

*MR. RITCHIE said the hon. Member for the Scotland division of Liverpool was the author of the clause, and that hon. Member deserved great credit for the negotiations carried on with the shipping industry, which had secured for those working in the docks the great advantage which they would receive in consequence of the insertion of this clause. He knew the clause was drawn with the idea that it would include them in the Compensation Act, and they were advised that it would have that effect. He did not believe it would be possible to go further in that direction, and he should be disappointed and astonished to find that the eminent gentleman whose advice had been acted upon were wrong and that the right hon. Baronet was right.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said he assumed that the question would be carefully considered. He was grateful to the right hon. Gentleman for the observations he had made.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said that where particular industries, such as docks and railways, were partly drawn within the provisions of the Bill there should be a statement in the Bill indicating what sections did and did not apply to them.

*MR. RITCHIE said he entirely agreed with his hon. friend. The numbers of the clauses must be put in at the very end, when all the Amendments had been

disposed of. He would take care that that should be done in another place.
MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR said he was quite satisfied with that assurance.
Other Amendments made.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 57, line 30, after the word 'factory' to insert the words 'if, in pursuance of the provisions of this Act with reference to regulations for dangerous trades, regulations are made with regard to the process of painting with inflammable paint, such regulations may apply to that process as carried on on board any ship in any dock, harbour, or canal as if the ship were a factory.'";(Mr. Tennant.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. RITCHIE said it would be impossible for him to embody this addition to the clause in the Bill, for the simple reason that it would be converting a ship into a factory for the purpose of the Bill. It would be quite impossible for the Home Office to inspect the ships. The limiting words of the hon. Member were extraordinarily wide. What he proposed to do, if it would satisfy the hon.

Member, was to communicate with the shipping companies on the subject, and to endeavour by some suggestion which he thought the Home Office might usefully make to do away with undue risk in the painting of ships with inflammable paint.

MR. JOHN BURNS said he was sorry that the Home Secretary had not accepted the Amendment of the hon. Member for Berwickshire, because it frequently happened that men were burned in the most serious way by the use of inflammable paint on board ships. He trusted that, failing the acceptance of the Amendment, the Home Secretary would at once, and before going on holidays, direct the attention of the shipping companies to this particular form of accident and ask them to take what steps they could to prevent their recurrence.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR FRANCIS EVANS (Maidstone): moved an Amendment to make the words "any gangway or ladder used by any person employed to load or unload or coal a ship" in Sub-section 2 of Clause

104 apply to any gangway or ladder on either side of the ship. Did the words apply to either side in the section as it now stood?

*MR. RITCHIE: Yes, certainly.

SIR FRANCIS EVANS said he was satisfied with the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE moved the omission in page 58, line 15, of the words "which exceeds thirty feet in height." He said the House ought not to re-enact these words, because they had led to enormous difficulty in cases where there had been litigation.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 58, line 15, to leave out the words which exceeds thirty feet in height.'";(Sir Charles Dilke.)

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Colston, Charles Edw. H. (Athole

Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cranborne, Viscount
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Henderson, Alexander
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Higginbottom, S. W.
Bagot, Capt. J. Fitzroy
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Balcarres, Lord
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hoult, Joseph
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Houston, Robert Paterson
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christen.)
Duke, Henry Edward
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Banbury, Frederick George
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Keswick, William
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Bignold, Arthur
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)

Bigwood, James
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Fisher, William Hayes
Lawson, John Grant
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Brassey, Albert
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Gardner, Ernest
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Line)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
Macdona, John Cumming
Chapman, Edward
Gretton, John
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Charrington, Spencer

Groves, James Gribble
Maconochie, A. W.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Guthrie, Walter Murray
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hain, Edward
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hambro, Charles Eric
Malcolm, Ian
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Middlemore, John T.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. JOHN BURNS, in supporting the Amendment, said they ought to get rid of this ridiculous measurement. It had been universally condemned by the authors of the Bill, the judges, and the Court of Appeal.

*MR. RITCHIE said it was not for him to endeavour in this Bill to deal with matters arising out of the Compensation Acts. He did not think it would be wise to alter the clause so hastily. It would have no effect on the Compensation Act.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE asked whether the Secretary of State was right in saying that the alteration would have no effect on the Compensation Act. If so, his argument on Clause 144 was wrong.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 175; Noes, 124. (Division List No. 470).

Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Remnant, James Farquharson
Spear, John Ward
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Mount, William Arthur
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Thornton, Percy M.
Muntz, Philip A.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Rutherford, John
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Valentia, Viscount
Nicholson, William Graham
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Walker, Col. William Hall
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col Edw. J.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Parker, Gilbert
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Williams, Rt. Hn. J. Powell (Birm
Parkes, Ebenezer
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Wills. Sir Frederick
Pemberton, John S. G.
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks., E. R.)
Pierpoint, Robert
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Pretymann, Ernest George
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
TELLERS FOR AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tyn'sde

Purvis, Robert
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Randles, John S.
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)
Haldane, Richard Burdon
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ambrose, Robert
Hammond, John
O'Dowd, John
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Bell, Richard
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Boland, John
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Malley, William
Boyle, James
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Mara, James
Broadhurst, Henry
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Healy, Timothy Michael
Paulton, James Mellor
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Helme, Norval Watson
Power, Patrick Joseph
Burke, E. Haviland-
Hobhouse, C. H. (Bristol, E.)
Reddy, M.
Caine, William Sproston
Holland, William Henry
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Caldwell, James
Horniman, Frederick John
Redmond, William (Clare)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea

Rickett, J. Compton
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Rigg Richard
Causton, Richard Knight
Joyce, Michael
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Cawley, Frederick
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Roche, John
Channing, Francis Allston
Leamy, Edmund
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Clancy, John Joseph
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Cogan, Denis J.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Colville, John
Lewis, John Herbert
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lough, Thomas
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (Northants)
Crean, Eugene
Lundon, W.
Strachey, Edward
Crombie, John William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Sullivan, Donal
Cullinan, J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Tennant, Harold John
Delany, William
M'Fadden, Edward
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
M'Govern, T.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N.
Dillon, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
Thomson, F. W. (York. W. R.)

Donelan, Captain A.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Tully, Jasper
Doogan, P. C.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport
Ure, Alexander
Duffy, William J.
Moss, Samuel
White, Luke (York. E. R.)
Elibank, Master of
Murnaghan, George
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Murphy, John
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Field, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Flynn, James Christopher
Norman, Henry
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W. R.)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid)
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. John Burns and Mr. Warner.
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. J.
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Grant, Corrie
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
O'Doherty, William

MR. RENSCHAW moved to leave out the word "March" and insert the word "June" in page 59, line 15. Why had this date, and also 1st September, in each year been selected as those on or before which the lists should be sent to the inspector?

Amendment proposed;

"In page 59, line 15, to leave out the word 'March,' and insert the word 'June.'"; (Mr. Renschaw.)

Question proposed, "That the word March' stand part of the Bill."

*MR. RITCHIE said he could not accept the Amendment. He could not say why these dates were chosen, but he had no doubt they were chosen carefully by the gentlemen who had the framing of the Bill.

MR. RENSRAW accepted that statement, and asked leave to withdraw the Amendment. Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. RENSRAW moved an Amendment the effect of which was to secure that the lists should be sent to the district council in which the workmen or contractors were employed instead of to the district council in which the factory or workshop is situate, as provided in the Bill. If that was carried, it would be unnecessary to have Sub-sections 2 and 3.

Another Amendment proposed;

"In page 59, line 19, to leave out the words 'the factory or workshop is situated,' in order to insert the words 'such workmen or contractors are employed.'";(Mr. Renshaw.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. T. M. HEALY asked whether there was to be no such thing as freedom or liberty to any man in regard to this matter. Why should district councils be burdened with all this labour?

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said this was only a question of detail. This Bill would throw a great deal of work on the district councils which used to be done by the Government inspectors, but it was too late now to raise an objection to that.

*MR. RITCHIE pointed to the conditions imposed by the Bill with respect to sanitary arrangements, and stated that the modus operandi proposed in the clause was the only way in which the Act could be properly administered.

*MR. TULLY said the explanation of the right hon. Gentleman did not convey conviction to his mind. He thought the hon. Member for West Renfrewshire was justified in moving the Amendment. He was not in favour of this proposal, which would have the effect of crippling home industries in Ireland. In his opinion those very small industries would be very injuriously affected. If they wished to improve the status of the people of Ireland they could only do it by establishing small industries. One line along which they sought to improve the condition of the people of Ireland was by combining small industries with agricultural pursuits. The object of this clause was to divorce small industrial pursuits from agriculture. One hon. Member who supported this clause said that he wished to wipe out the small industries;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is discussing the whole clause, and that is not in order.

*MR. TULLY said he was only endeavouring to show;

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must not discuss my ruling, and he cannot go on arguing my decision.

*MR. TULLY said that this proposal was expanding the law altogether too far.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) said that what the hon. Member was now proposing was a far more difficult piece of legal machinery than that which was

contained in the Bill. The employer had to send a list of those he employed to the district council. It was extremely difficult to settle what the boundaries of some district councils were, and he thought this proposal would lead to a good deal of confusion.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. T. M. HEALY asked the right hon. Gentleman to give the House some reason for the extraordinary method of book-keeping which it was now proposed should be attached to their district councils. He objected to this additional burden being thrown upon Ireland. For the purpose of enabling the right hon. Gentleman to give some reason he begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 59, line 30, after the word 'council,' to insert the words 'in Great Britain.'";(Mr. T. M. Healy.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said he hoped the Home Secretary would not accept this Amendment. He had had some practical experience of the way in which this work had been carried on. It was the wish of the working men of Dublin that some such clause as this should be carried. He would much sooner have a state of things under which employers had proper workshops, but so long as they had these out-workers they ought not to exempt Ireland from this clause.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid) said he supported the Amendment of his hon. friend. The case referred to by one hon. Member for the City of Dublin did not apply, because Dublin was under a corporation, and the object desired by the hon. Member would be obtained by inserting the words "urban councils." He thought they had every reason to press this Amendment upon the Home Secretary. There was no reason why local bodies should have this impost placed upon them, and he hoped that the Home Secretary would yield to this reasonable Amendment.

*MR. RITCHIE: I do not think it is desirable in the general interests of the community that Ireland should be exempted from this clause. I am inclined to think that hon. Members who have spoken upon this point have greatly exaggerated any expense which will be incurred by this system.

*MR. TULLY said the right hon. Gentleman evidently did not know what was going on in Ireland. He spoke on behalf of the small employer, and he did not see why they should be harassed in Ireland by regulations which were not required. In Ireland, if one of their clerks used his pen a certain number of times more than he had been accustomed to, he at once applied for an increase in his salary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member cannot go into the question of salaries upon this subject.

*MR. TULLY said he was only mentioning this as an illustration;

MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to conform to my ruling.

*MR. TULLY said that one of the reasons why they wished to exempt Ireland was that in the rural districts they did not wish to increase their expenses.

Great Britain was a manufacturing country, and Ireland was not, and;

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member's remarks are not relevant, and I must request him to resume his seat.

*MR. TULLY: I was only;

MR. SPEAKER: I call upon the hon. Member, under the Standing Order, to resume his seat.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he desired to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR said the object of this Amendment was to avoid a multiplicity of registers where one was sufficient. This applied more particularly in the case of dock undertakings. He moved this Amendment on behalf of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board. They had under their charge large numbers of docks, wharves, quays, and boiler sheds. Hitherto it had been the custom of this Board to keep one register, but, according to the provisions of this Bill, every dock, wharf, quay, warehouse, or engine shed was a separate factory, and a separate register had to be kept. The result was that over fifty separate registers would have to be kept by the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board. The object of this Amendment was to enable such boards to keep one register, as hitherto.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 72, line 36, after the word 'observed,' to insert the words 'with the consent of the inspector one general register may be kept for the factories and workshops on one estate within the jurisdiction of such inspector.'";(Mr. Charles M'Arthur.)

*MR. RITCHIE: I can assure the hon. Member that the present practice of keeping one register may be followed in the future in regard to the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board even under this Bill. I agree that that course will be much more convenient.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR: Then I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 72, line 30, to leave out the word 'an,' and insert the word 'the.'";(Mr. Coghill.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'an' stand part of the Bill."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

COLONIST, LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square) said the object of his Amendment was to obtain some, recognition in this clause of the City of Westminster.

Reference was made, in the clause to the City of London, the Common Council, the Metropolitan Boroughs and Borough Councils, and the City of Westminster was not mentioned.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 83, line 27, after the word 'city,' to insert the words 'as regards the city of

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Anstruther, H. T.

Balcarres, Lord

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)

Westminster as references to the council of the city and the city."";(Colonel Legge.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. RITCHIE: I am afraid I cannot accept this Amendment, although I am desirous of recognising to the fullest extent the dignity of the City of Westminster. I could not think of making an exception amongst all the councils in London. The City of London is a very special locality and has always been separately described in Acts of Parliament.

COLONEL LEGGE said he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 83, line 35, after the word 'possess,' to insert the words 'under any general or local Act or any Provisional Order confirmed by Act or otherwise.'";(Mr. Renshaw.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. RITCHIE agreed to accept this Amendment.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said he was very much surprised at the Home Secretary accepting this Amendment.

*MR. RITCHIE: I agree that the words are unnecessary.

MR. CALDWELL: Then why agree to put in those words at all?

*MR. RITCHIE: I have accepted them in order to oblige my hon. friend who represents Glasgow, and I understand that the Corporation of Glasgow desire to have this Amendment inserted. I agree with the hon. Member opposite that the words are quite unnecessary.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 134; Noes, 143. (Division List, No. 471.)

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Homsey)

Greene, Raymond- (Cambs.)

Nicholson, William Graham

Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds)

Gretton, John

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Groves, James Grimble

Parker, Gilbert

Bignold, Arthur

Guthrie, Walter Murray

Parkes, Ebenezer

Blundell, Col. Henry

Hain, Edward

Pemberton, John S. G.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Hambro, Charles Eric
Pierpoint, Robert
Brassey, Albert
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hanbury, Rt Hon. Robert Wm.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Pretymann, Ernest George
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Henderson, Alexander
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Higginbottom, S. W.
Purvis, Robert
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Randles, John S.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Remnant, James Farquharson
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Chapman, Edward
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Charrington, Spencer
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Keswick, William
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
Rutherford, John
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Lawson, John Grant
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Cranborne, Viscount
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Spear, John Ward
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol S.)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Dickson, Charles Scott
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Thornton, Percy M.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Macdonald, John Cumming
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Maconochie, A. W.
Valentia, Viscount
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Fisher, William Hayes
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Williams, Rt. Hn. J. P. (Birm.)
Gardner, Ernest
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Wills, Sir Frederick
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks. E. R.)
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
TELLERS FOR THE AYKS; Mr. Renshaw and Mr. Banbury.
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Mount, William Arthur
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Cullinan, J.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Allen, C. P. (Gloucester, Stroud)
Dalziel, James Henry
Hayden, John Patrick
Ambrose, Robert
Delany, William
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
Healy, Timothy Michael
Balfour. Kenneth R. (Christch.
Dillon, John
Helme, Norval Watson
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Donelan, Captain A.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Bell, Richard
Doogan, P. C.
Holland, William Henry
Big wood, James
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Horniman, Frederick John
Boland, John

Duffy, William J.
Hoult, Joseph
Boyle, James
Duke, Henry Edward
Houston, Robert Paterson
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Elibank, Master of
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Bryce, Right Hon. James
Field, William
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Burns, John
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Joyce, Michael
Caine, William Sproston
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Flynn, James Christopher
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Causton, Richard Knight
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Un.
Leamy, Edmund
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Gilhooly, James
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Channing, Francis Allston
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Clancy, John Joseph
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Cogan, Denis J.
Grant, Corrie
Lewis, John Herbert
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Lough, Thomas
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Haldane, Richard Bunion
Lowther, Rt Hn J W. (Cum. Penr.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Hammond, John

Lundon, W.
Crean, Eugene
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
MacDonnell. Dr. Mark A.
Crombie, John William
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfo'd
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
M'Fadden, Edward
O'Dowd, John
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tyneside
M'Govern, T.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants
M'Kenna, Reginald
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.
Strachey, Edward
Malcolm, Ian
O'Malley, William
Sullivan, Donald
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
O'Mara, James
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Tennant. Harold John
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Moss, Samuel
Reddy, M.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N.
Murnaghan, George
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Tully, Jasper
Murphy, John
Redmond, William (Clare)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Rickett, J. Compton
White, Luke (York. E. R.)
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Roche, John
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Norman, Henry
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, M.)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W. R.)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Broad burst.
O'Doherty, William
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Other Amendments made.

MR. RENSCHAW said his reason for proposing the next Amendment was that whilst in England the position of the medical officer was definitely laid down by statute, that had never been defined in the same way in Scotland. The duty of defining the relative duties of the medical officer and the sanitary inspector was devolved upon the local authority subject to the approval of the Local Government Board.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 85, line 32, after '1897' to insert the words, "Provided that the report referred to in section one hundred and thirty-two of this Act shall be made by either the medical officer of health or the sanitary inspector, as the local authority, subject to the approval of the Local Government Board for Scotland, may direct.";(Mr. Renschaw.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR MICHAEL FOSTER (London University) urged his hon. friend not to press the Amendment. Medical officers of health were specially trained medical men. They were trained in preventive medicine and it was required of each that he should be well acquainted with sanitary matters. On the other hand, sanitary inspectors were a very mixed lot. Some were very good, many were indifferent, and some were bad, and in many cases they were subject to outside influences from which

medical officers

were free. He ventured to think that even in Scotland the medical officer of health was a better person than the sanitary inspector. The medical officer was able to make himself acquainted with all that was necessary to form the report for the Secretary of State. He had to make that report not to the local authority, but to the Secretary of State for the United Kingdom.

MR. CALDWELL expressed the hope that the Government would not accept this Amendment. The local authority had not got jurisdiction with regard to the carrying out of the Factory Acts, and therefore it was desirable that the medical officer should make the report, he alone having the necessary qualifications.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) said the local authority should have the power to decide who should make the report.

MR. JOHN BURNS said it was better that the medical officer should make the report. The duty of making the report to the Home Office should not be devolved on a subordinate officer.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) said they should have an indication what view the Government took of the matter.

MR. RITCHIE said he had not paid very much attention to the Scotch clauses. The intricacies of Scotch law procedure were so great that he confessed he preferred to rely on other people in this matter. He appreciated the motives which had prompted his hon. friend to move the Amendment, but he could not accept it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

MR. T. M. HEALY moved an Amendment having for its object to make the provisions of Part VI. of the Bill with reference to home work applicable only to the urban districts so far as Ireland was concerned. He asked the Home Secretary whether any member for an agricultural constituency had sought to have these provisions applied to the home industries of Ireland. There had been nothing of the kind, but for the sake of an idiotic infatuation for uniformity it was proposed to apply the Act all over the kingdom. He would respectfully say that there were a number of small industries in Ireland which were quite unsuited to have the provisions of the Bill applied to them. He thought these small industries might be carried on in their humble way without interference by this Bill.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 88, line 33, after the word 'same,' to insert the words 'the provisions of Part 6 shall apply to urban districts only.'";(Mr. T. M. Healy.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. RITCHIE: I am afraid I cannot accept the suggestion of the hon. and learned Member. Where there are no instances of this kind the Act will not apply, but where there are I am sure the hon. and learned Gentleman would say that they ought to be conducted under proper sanitary conditions, and that is the whole thing.

MR. O'DOHERTY supported the views expressed by the hon. and learned Member for North Louth. He said he was afraid that the Home Secretary knew very little of

the conditions of life among the small industries of Ireland if he insisted that cottage industries should be carried on under the same conditions as factories and workshops in England. In the debate upon the Address at the beginning of this session he suggested that in any legislation with regard to factories and workshops the carrying out of this Act should be left to the Congested Districts Board. The right hon. Gentleman must know that the Factory Act of 1895 did a great deal towards wiping out small industries in Ireland. A deputation waited upon Sir Matthew White Ridley in the year 1895, requesting him to exempt the shirt-making industry, and they obtained an exemption because it was proved to the satisfaction of the right hon. Gentleman that it would imply an enormous hardship not only upon small industries, but upon the labouring and farming classes. Would the right hon. Gentleman assert that a woman living in a one-roomed cottage in Ireland was to carry on the making of a dozen stockings under the same conditions as a factory in England? He urged the right hon. Gentleman to accept this Amendment, and not place cottage industries in Ireland under another ban.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said that upon this point he should certainly support the Amendment which had been moved by the hon. and learned Member opposite in the interests of the handloom weavers in Ireland.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) thought a little more consideration should be given to the argument submitted by the hon. and learned Member for North Louth. There did not seem to have been any knowledge of the Irish case displayed in the debate, and legislation intended for other places was not always applicable to the small industries in Ireland. At the present time all classes in Ireland were very heavily rated, and if it was enacted that every district should have an inspector, the expense in some of the poorer districts would be grotesque. The entire value of some of the small industries was very trifling, and he thought the House ought to give a little more consideration to this question. If the Home Secretary would express his willingness to look into this matter, perhaps his hon. and learned friend would be satisfied with such a promise.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said that twenty-five years ago he was Chairman of the Royal Commission on Factories, and there was nothing impressed him more than the great importance of not pressing hardly upon petty industries. There were many small districts in Ireland where village industries, such as glove-making, and other trades, were carried on, and where the people engaged in these small trades were engaged in a perfectly healthy occupation. He remembered that plenty of evidence was placed before the Commission to which he had alluded proving that these small industries in Ireland were not suited to the Factory Acts, and he believed that to bring them under the Factory Acts would do more harm than good.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that the case for inspection of these small industries in Ireland had been clearly shown by the factory inspector's report.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that it was the dishonest report of a dishonest inspector.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that he was sorry to hear the hon. and learned Member speak in that way, because the inspector in question was one of the best and ablest in His Majesty's service.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said that the inspection of small industries which had been suggested would crush out many of the petty industries in Ireland, the effect of which would be to drive more of the Irish people to America and to the English towns.

*MR. RITCHIE: I understand that there is some fear on the part of Irish Members that certain small industries in some remote parts of the country are likely to be seriously affected by this provision. I do not see how it is possible to put in words which will exclude those particular industries, which we all desire not to interfere with, and yet will include those industries which we all agree ought to be supervised. The hon. and learned Gentleman has sprung this matter upon me without notice, but, although I cannot make any definite promise, I will certainly consult with my advisers in the course of to-morrow to see whether anything can be done to relieve some hard cases referred to by the hon. and learned Member.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he would be the last person to delay the proceedings after such an offer had been made.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said the hon. and learned Member for North Louth had been allowed to make a very serious accusation against one of the very best inspectors they had got in the service, and he regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had not considered it to be his duty to defend this inspector.

*MR. RITCHIE: I did not hear the name of the inspector mentioned, but I am sure that we have no more straightforward, honest, and able official than the inspector who has been alluded to.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Schedule 1::

An Amendment made.

Schedule 2::

CAPTAIN BALFOUR (Middlesex, Hornsey), in moving the Amendment standing in his name, explained that ornamental fittings in jewellers' windows were those fittings on which watches were hung, and they were made by the same trade which made jewel cases. The makers of these articles worked side by side. Up to November last year the makers of both classes of goods were allowed to work overtime, but at that date the trade was warned that, while they might work overtime at jewel cases, they might not do so at ornamental window fittings. The trade maintained that they were just as much subject to pressure of work at Christmas time with respect to window fittings as fancy boxes and jewel cases. The whole pressure on the trade came ten weeks before Christmas. The manufacturers complained that if their workers were not allowed overtime in making window fittings there would be serious inconvenience to the trade. The women in the trade, about 300 altogether, were perfectly contented as they were. They

worked from eight in the morning to eight at night. They had no grievance as to overtime. He appealed to the Home Secretary to reconsider the request of the jewel case makers.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 93, line 29, after the words 'box making,' to insert the words 'and covering jewellers' ornamental window fittings; or.'";(Captain Balfour.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. RITCHIE said it could not be contended by any stretch of imagination that the manufacture of "jewellers' ornamental window fittings" was a business liable to a sudden press of orders. He really could not see, in any case, how the Amendment could be inserted under this particular sub-section, but he deprecated the addition by Parliament of this industry to those mentioned. In fact, the Secretary of State always had the power, where it was shown that it was required, to allow overtime. He believed that representations had been made with regard to this particular branch of the jewel trade to his predecessor, and he would undertake to look into it, further, but he could not assent to the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Schedule 6::

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham) said the effect of the schedule was that, where there was an electrical installation in a private residence for the purpose of luxury, the place was not a factory within the meaning of this Act, but if such an installation took place in a bank, counting-house, or insurance office, for the comfort and convenience of the clerks, those premises would come under the Act.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 101, line 26, after the word, 'business,' to insert the words 'where the number of persons employed in generating or transforming such electrical energy exceeds four.'";(Mr. Banbury.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

*MR. RITCHIE said he could not accept the Amendment. It seemed to him perfectly clear that if regulations of this kind were required for operations such as were dealt with in the schedule, the fact that the number of persons employed did not exceed four was not a reason for exemption from the provisions of the Bill, which were meant to secure safety to those working in connection with electrical plant. His hon. friend had stated that under the sub-section as it now stood banks in the City could be regarded as factories. That was not the case at all. He assured the hon. Member that no premises such as he had referred to would be inconvenienced by the Bill, but he would introduce words to meet the views of the hon. Member. He had not had the smallest representation made to him that this provision was regarded as an onerous one at all. There might perhaps be a slight amendment made in it, so as to make it quite clear that it would come under the provisions of the Act. He would suggest the addition of the words "or such part of any premises."

MR. T. M. HEALY said he wished to know why the National Telephone Company was to be exempted, and why its premises should not be treated as a factory. They had an enormous number of batteries at some of their establishments, and there must be considerable danger to the young ladies employed there, especially during thunderstorms.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): asked why this should not apply to every private

house which had an electric installation. He understood that the intention was to limit the application of this provision to buildings regarded as factories and productive works. He understood that the purpose of the Bill was to safeguard every place where there was an electric installation. They must have either one thing or the other. The provision must either apply to every place where there was an electric installation or else it must only apply to ordinary factories.

MR. TULLY said that this was a most important question affecting the small industries in Ireland. Ireland was a country of water power, while England used largely coal and steam. He thought that by this definition they would cripple the starting of small industries along the rivers of Ireland, because they would have to submit themselves to harassing restrictions in regard to sanitation and ventilation. For instance, in these small electric lighting works they would not be allowed to employ young persons after four o'clock on Saturday. The right hon. Gentleman had given them a very favourable answer with regard to small home industries, and he hoped he would grant an exemption with regard to small electric works.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford): said he feared that such places as surgeries and dentists' establishments would be factories if this definition was allowed to stand.

MR. TENNANT said the real question was that they wished to make the special rules apply all along the line.

MR. LOUGH said he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would carefully consider the suggestion which had been made.

MR. BANBURY said that if the words which had been mentioned were left out of the clause he would agree to withdraw his Amendment. He wished to know, however, in taking that course, if he would be allowed an opportunity of moving his Amendment again in case the alteration did not meet with his approval.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. BANBURY: Then I will withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Other Amendments made.

Schedule 7::

Amendment proposed;

"In page 102, line 30, after the word twelve,' to insert the words 'section twenty-two.'";(Mr. Secretary Ritchie.)

Question proposed, "That the words 'section twenty-two,' be there inserted."

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): moved as an Amendment to the proposed Amendment, to add after the word "twenty-two" the words "except paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection (3)." He said his object was to omit a certain portion of a clause in the 1895 Act which the Home Secretary proposed to read into this Bill.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment;

"To add after the word 'twenty-two,' the words 'except paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection (3).';(Mr. Macartney.)

Question proposed, "That those words be added to the proposed Amendment."

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked whether the right hon. Gentleman was in order in again

raising the question in regard to laundries which had been decided that evening.

MR. T. M. HEALY: We should have the Amendment read to us, and we would be able to judge.

MR. SPEAKER: I have not had an opportunity of comparing the two, to see whether they are in exactly the same terms.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The words are identical.

MR. MACARTNEY said he did not propose to repeat now what had been stated on the question, whether or not laundries in connection with philanthropic, charitable, and religious societies ought to be brought under the provisions of the Bill, as he himself believed they ought. On the ground that they came into competition with laundries which were run commercially he thought the House should have an opportunity of voting on the distinct issue whether laundries which were run for philanthropic purposes should be excluded from the provisions of the Bill.

*MR. RITCHIE: My hon. friend is really asking the House to reconsider the decision which it arrived at a few hours ago. The whole question was then debated, and the House, by an overwhelming majority, decided that they would not make any alteration in the existing law.

MR. MACARTNEY said that before they took the division alluded to he asked the right hon. Gentleman whether or not this Amendment was going to be moved, and it was largely on account of the reply given that many hon. Members voted as they did.

*MR. RITCHIE: That does not interfere with my argument in the least. What I maintain is that he is asking the House to reverse the decision it arrived at an hour or two ago. The decision of the House must be given effect to; namely, that the law should remain as it is. It is necessary to make provision in the schedule for the revival of the clause in the existing Act of Parliament. I think it would be most unfortunate if we were now to begin again to discuss a question which has been discussed at such great length. I make no complaint about the hon. Member moving his Amendment, but I do hope that the House as a whole will consider that the decision which was arrived at a few hours ago was a decision upon the whole question, and I hope hon. Members will support the Government in their effort to give effect to what was then decided by the House.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON said he was well aware that this was a very disagreeable subject to the Home Secretary. He knew that the only argument that can possibly be adduced in favour of carrying out this special arrangement with regard to laundries was that, if he did not carry it out, they would lose the rest of the Bill. Had it not been for laundries conducted by certain religious orders in Ireland they would never have heard one single objection to this proposal. The Bill as it was passed in the

Grand Committee included all those laundries, and when this question was reached then the difficulty of his right hon. friend at once commenced. He found himself at once confronted by hon. Gentlemen opposite, who objected to any kind of inspection or supervision of any institution over which a Roman Catholic presided. He did not blame them in the least for doing this, because hon.

Gentlemen opposite below the gangway rode in a political chariot with a priest on the box seat, who held the reins, and they had to go where they were driven.

His right hon. friend, knowing the capacity for opposition on those benches, realised that unless he gave way he might lose his Bill. Hon. Gentlemen opposite had a tremendous power in this House, which they used to flatten out his right hon. friend the Home Secretary. They said to him, "If you do not consent to exclude these laundries which are conducted in Ireland by the nuns from the operation of this Bill we have got a power now to prevent you carrying this Bill which we never had before. We have got a power which we can turn upon you if you do not consent to our terms. If you do not consent we will give you a dose of the hon. Member for South Kilkenny; and if we do that, what will happen to your Bill? Why, it will be swept out of the House by a muddy cataract of oratorical blather." The hon. Member for South Kilkenny had "bored" his way to a very distinguished position in this House.

Over every institution over which Roman Catholic priests or nuns had authority the word "taboo" was written up, and hon. Gentlemen opposite were bound to oppose any effort made by the lay authorities to inspect any such institution. He ventured to say that the great majority of hon. Members, whether on this side or the opposite side, would agree with him that all institutions of this kind ought to be inspected. With regard to these laundries, the inspection would be carried out by a female inspector, and the work of the institution would not be interfered with. [An HON. MEMBER: Why had you not the courage of your convictions two hours ago?] This inspection would not bring the inspector in contact with the nuns. As far as interfering with the nuns was concerned, an inspection of the laundries could not cause the slightest inconvenience. It was because hon. Gentlemen opposite were bound to oppose any effort made by any lay authority to inspect institutions which were guided and governed by Roman Catholics that they had offered this fierce opposition and had flattened out his right hon. friend. He was quite aware that the Home Secretary was carrying out a bond he had made with hon. Gentlemen opposite. They had fulfilled their part of the bargain, and it was only the authority of the Leader of the Nationalist party which prevented the Member for South Kilkenny rushing after every legislative hare that was started. When they divided the House upon this question he claimed that every hon. Member who believed in the necessity of equal treatment

AYES.

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)

Haldane, Richard Burdon

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)

Bell, Richard

Harmsworth, R. Leicester

Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)

Broadhurst, Henry

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)

Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)

Helme, Norval Watson

Moss, Samuel

Burdett-Coutts, W.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Holland, William Henry
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Caldwell, James
Horniman, Frederick John
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Tennant, Harold John
Colville, John Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Thomas, J. A. (Glamorgan, G'wer
Crombie, John William
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
White, Luke (Yorks. E. R.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Duffy, William J.
Layland-Barratt, Francis Leigh, Sir Joseph
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
TELLERS FOR THE AYES-Colonel Saunderson and Mr. Macartney.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Grant, Corrie
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Gretton, John
M'Kenna, Reginald
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Boland, John
Colston, Chas. E. W. Athole
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Boyle, James
Cranborne, Viscount
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Brassey, Albert
Crean, Eugene
Ambrose, Robert
Bullard, Sir Harry
Crossley, Sir Savile
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cullinan, J.
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cavendish, Y. C. W. (Derbysh.
Delany, William
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Balcarres, Lord
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Dillon, John
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Donelan, Capt. A.
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r.)
Doogan, P. C.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds
Chapman, Edward
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Banbury, Frederick George
Charrington, Spencer
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Duke, Henry Edward
Bathurst, Hon. A. Benjamin
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Bignold, Arthur
Cogan, Denis J.
Elibank, Master of
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.

of institutions, whether presided over by a Protestant or a Catholic priest, would go into the lobby with him and make a protest against the direction in which the Government seemed inclined to go. They were going to have a Catholic university in Ireland in order to satisfy the demands of the Nationalist party, and now they were asked to make this distinction between societies presided over by Roman Catholic nuns, and for what reason? Simply because those who presided over these institutions would not tolerate any interference from any outside authority.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 51; Noes. 180. (Division List No. 472.)

Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Field, William

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Purvis, Robert

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth

Randles, John S.

Finlay, Sir Robert, Bannatyne

London, W.

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Fisher, William Hayes

Macdona, John dimming

Redmond, William (Clare)

Flavin, Michael Joseph

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

Remnant, James Farquharson

Flynn, James Christopher

Maconochie, A. W.

Renshaw, Charles Bine

Foster, Philip S (Warwick, S. W.

M'Fadden, Edward

Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge

Gardner, Ernest

M'Covert, T.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.

Gilhooly, James

Malcolm, Ian

Robertson, Herbt. (Hackney)

Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

Middlemore, J. Throgmort'n

Rutherford, John

Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Line)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.
Morris, Hon. Martin H. F.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Groves, James Grimble
Morton, A. H. A. (Ueptford)
Smith, A. H. (Hertford, East
Hain, Edward
Murnagban, George
Smith, H C (N'rth'mb., T'neside
Hambro, Charles Erie
Murphy, John
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Hamilton, Rt Hn L'rd G (Midd'x
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Spear, John Ward
Hammond, John
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Nicholson, William Graham
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Sullivan, Donal
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hayden, John Patrick
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Talbot, Rt Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'rarry Mid
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray

Houldsworth, Sir Win. Henry
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Hoult, Joseph
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Tully, Jasper
Howard, John (Kent, Eaversh'm
O'Doherty, William
Valentia, Viscount
Hudson, George Bickersteth
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Joyce, Michael
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Keswick, William
O'Dowd, John
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Larnbton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Williams, Rt. Hn. J. P. (Birm.
Lawson, John Grant
O'Malley, William
Wilson, A. S. (Yorks. E. R.)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Parkes, Ebenezer
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Pemberton, John S. G.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Pierpoint, Robert
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Lowther, Rt Hn J W. (Cum., Pen.
Power, Patrick Joseph

Question, "That the words 'section twenty-two' be there inserted," put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

LIGHT RAILWAYS [SALARY].

Resolution reported.

"That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of a Salary not exceeding £1,000 a year to another of the Commissioners appointed under the provisions of the Light Railways Act, 1896." Resolution agreed to.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

LIGHT RAILWAYS (No. 2) BILL.

"To provide for the payment of another of the Light Railway Commissioners," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time this day, and to be printed. [Bill 294.]

EAST INDIA LOAN (GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY DEBENTURES) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported without Amendment; to be read the third time this day.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Considered in Committee; Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

MARRIAGES LEGALISATION BILL [Lords].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

MR. CALDWELL said this was a Bill to legalise marriages which had taken place in places of worship which had not been consecrated. It was no use for the Government to go on with Bills of this kind. It would be seen from the schedule that marriages had been celebrated in some places which were not consecrated over seventy years ago, and according to this Bill all those marriages would be invalidated. What was the position of those parties? Many of those people were dead, and therefore they could not legalise their marriages at all. It was a common thing to go back thirty years, and even the Home Secretary himself had discovered two cases of this kind since the Bill was brought into the House. That was not a fair way to deal with the statutes of marriages; therefore he should oppose this Bill, because it did not meet the difficulty at all. He hoped they would have some promise from the Government that this matter would be dealt with on proper lines, for there might be hundreds of people whose marriages were illegal by the law of England, and some steps ought to be taken to deal effectively with this question.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) assured the hon. Member that there was no foundation for the objections he had raised, and he hoped they would allow the Bill to pass.

Clauses 5 agreed to.

Schedule;:

MR. CALDWELL said that no one could tell when the date of the consecration was, and there was nothing in the Bill to determine what the period should be. He

would move to leave out of line 35 the words "between the date of consecration of the Church and the passing of this Act."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I presume that the date of the consecration is not known in this case.

MR. CALDWELL said he was surprised that they were asked to pass an Act to legalise a certain thing done between certain dates and yet the Attorney General could not tell them the date, and they had no knowledge of it whatever. They had the dates in all the other cases except this particular one, and he moved that progress be reported until the Attorney General had got the information required in regard to this date.

Committee report progress; to sit again to-morrow.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Read a second time and committed for to-morrow.

LUNACY (IRELAND) [EXPENSES].

Resolution reported.

"That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all the Expenses incurred in relation to Criminal Lunatics under any Act of the present session to amend the Law relating to Lunatics in Ireland."

Resolution agreed to.

LUNACY (IRELAND) BILL [Lords].

Considered in Committee.

An Amendment made.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTONE said he was not sure whether the question would be in order, but he would like to know from the Chief Secretary what was being done in regard to the establishment of a pathological school in Ireland.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover) said he had promised to introduce a permissive clause on this subject. He would put down the terms of the resolution for to-morrow, in order that hon. Members for Ireland might see the words.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the site of this new pathological school be situated in Belfast?

MR. WYNDHAM: When the hon. and learned Member reads the words of the resolution on the Paper he will see whether the subject is controversial or not.

Bill reported, with an Amendment; as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered; Bill read the third time, and passed.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

BURGH SEWERAGE, DRAINAGE AND WATER SUPPLY (SCOTLAND) BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered;;

A Clause (Commencement of Act);brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.

Amendments made.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS' BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), further considered; Amendments made;

Bill read the third time, and passed.

CUSTOMS DUTIES (ISLE OF MAN) BILLS.

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

SOUTH AFRICAN TELEGRAPHS.

Resolved, That the Agreement made the 27th day of July, 1901, between His Majesty's Government, the Governments of Cape Colony and Natal, the British South Africa Company, and the Eastern, and the Eastern and South African Telegraph Companies, for the transmission of telegraph traffic to and from South Africa, be approved.;(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

SUBMARINE TELEGRAPH CONTRACT (ASCENSION AND SIERRA LEONE).

Resolved, That the Agreement made the 22nd day of June, 1901, between His Majesty's Government and the Eastern Telegraph Company. Limited, for the construction, maintenance, and working of a Submarine Cable between Sierra Leone and Ascension, be approved.;(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

COLONIAL ACTS CONFIRMATION BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without Amendment; read the third time, and passed.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 22nd day of July last, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at a quarter after Three of the clock, a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 14th August, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (TRAMWAYS AND STREET WIDENINGS) BILL.

DEVONPORT CORPORATION (GAS) BILL.

SOUTHAMPTON AND WINCHESTER GREAT WESTERN JUNCTION RAILWAY BILL.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered (in pursuance of the Order of the House of 13th August), and agreed to.

PAISLEY DISTRICT TRAMWAYS ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

[UNDER THE PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE: (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.]

Read the third time, and passed, without amendment.

PETITIONS.

BANK HOLIDAYS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Wakefield, against; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Wolverhampton; and Walsgrave-on-Sowe; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL AND ROYAL DECLARATION BILL.

Petitions against, from Bo'ness; Glasgow; Broxburn; and Alloa: to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

TEA AND COFFEE, 1900.

Copy ordered, "of Statement showing the Imports of Tea and Coffee into the principal countries of Europe, the United States, and certain British Colonies, together with Statistical Tables relating thereto for recent years, as far as the particulars can be stated (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 351, of Session 1900.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

HIGHER GRADE SCHOOLS.

Return ordered, "of Statistics of certain Higher Grade Schools conducted by School Boards.";(Sir William Anson.)

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE (DIVISIONS AND QUESTIONS).

Return [presented 13th August] to be printed. [No. 349.]

TAXES AND IMPOSTS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 18th April; Mr. Goddard]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 350.]

TRADE UNION'S.

Copy presented, of Report by the Chief Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade on Trade Unions in 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Copy presented, of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the three months ending 31st March, 1901, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers, Assistant Inspecting Officers, and Sub-Inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Returns of Accidents and Casualties as reported to the Board of Trade by the several Railway Companies in the United Kingdom during the six months ending 30th June, 1901, together with Reports of the Inspecting Officers, Assistant Inspecting Officers, and Sub-Inspectors of the Railway Department to the Board of Trade upon certain Accidents which were inquired into [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS (GENERAL REPORT).

Copy presented, of General Report to the Board of Trade upon the Accidents that have occurred on the Railways of the United Kingdom during the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AFRICA (No. 9, 1901).

Copy presented, of Report by His Majesty's Commissioner on the East Africa Protectorate [by Command]: to lie upon the Table.

BIRTHS, DEATHS, AND MARRIAGES (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Forty-fifth Detailed Annual Report of the Registrar General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland (Abstracts of 1899) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DEATHS FROM STARVATION OR ACCELERATED BY PRIVATION (LONDON).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 11th March; Mr. Talbot]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 351.]

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (EXPENSES).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 28th March; Mr. Armine Wodehouse];

to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 352.]

INTOXICATING LIQUORS (LICENCES REFUSED).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 24th April; Mr. Tomkinson]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 353.]

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER).

Copy presented, of an Order made by the County Council of the County Palatine of Lancaster, re-dividing the Eccles Parliamentary Division into convenient Polling Districts [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND) SCHOOL GRANT.

Return ordered, "showing the amount of the School Grant voted by Parliament for each financial year since 1892–3 (inclusive), and the amount expended yearly out of the Grant under each of the heads specified in the Fourth Schedule of the Irish Education Act, 1892."; (Mr. Wyndham.)

Return presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 354.]

LAND PURCHASE ACTS (IRELAND), 1891 AND 1896.

Return ordered, "showing the Shares of the Counties in the Guarantee Fund, Capitalised; the amount of Loans applied for and the amount sanctioned under the Land Purchase Acts, 1891 and 1896, to 30th April, 1901."; (Mr. Wyndham.)

Return presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 355.]

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Reported, without Amendment, from the Select Committee, with Minutes of Evidence.

Special Report from the Select Committee brought up, and read.

Report and Special Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 356.]

NAVAL WORKS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Wood-bridge) said, as there seems to be a little confusion in the minds of some hon. Members as to the origin and financial history of this Bill, it might be convenient, and would be according to precedent, before moving the Bill to make a general statement as to the progress of naval works and the reasons for the addition to those works which were now proposed. The hon. Gentleman the Member for King's Lynn has complained that the expenditure proposed under the Bill is very much larger than the amount which used to suffice under Vote 10 years ago.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said his principal objection was that the Government proposed to obtain £;27,000,000 by a permanent Act which would remove the expenditure from the control of the House.

MR. PRETYMAN: It is because Vote 10 has been kept for years below the amount at which it ought to have stood in order to keep pace with the increase in the Navy that the House is now asked by this Bill to make up the arrears. From 1876 to 1893 Vote 10 only once just touched £;500,000; it was kept at the one dead level, while during the same period there was a steady increase on the general Navy Vote of between £;3,000,000 and £;5,000,000. Therefore it was not sufficient, starting with Vote 10 some ten or fifteen years after the increase

in the General Vote has taken place, to keep level; you have the arrears to make up. But there are other considerations in addition to the mere making up of arrears in the old proportions which had existed formerly. The new proportion which has arisen of late years is altogether different, because in the old days a first-class battleship such as the "Victory" could go into docks such as we possess, but the House will perhaps be surprised to learn that a first-class destroyer cannot be placed in a dock which would accommodate the "Victory," and when we remember what a small proportion the torpedo-destroyers bear in regard to the general increase in the Navy, it will be seen that the increase in the length and size of the ships necessitated improved dockyard and berth accommodation. Modern cruisers of the "Drake" class are over 500 feet in length, and of the "Cressy" class from 400 feet to 500 feet in length. The battleships are 400 feet in length, and their beam and the shape of their hulls make it impossible for them to be placed in many of the existing docks without large alterations and additions. Another consideration is that in the old days our ships could lie in safety in roadsteads, such as in the Solent or at Spithead, but now the invention of torpedoes has made it necessary that a large proportion of our ships should be enclosed in torpedo safe harbours, and all that has added to the class of work with which this Bill is largely concerned; namely, the provision of defended harbours and docks. The increase in the personnel of the Navy has also to be considered. Up to a few years ago the personnel of the Navy, when in harbour, were accommodated mainly in hulks, but it has now been decided that it is necessary to provide largely for the accommodation of the personnel in barracks on shore. That has entailed a very heavy expenditure of a permanent character, which is also included in this Bill. Then there is the hospital accommodation for the personnel, which was formerly not what it should have been, but which now, owing to the work which has been done, is either in a perfectly satisfactory condition or rapidly approaching it. I think that is a statement which will be received with satisfaction by the House. In order to meet these needs it is evident that heavy expenditure is necessary. My hon. friend behind me stated that this expenditure ought to be met, as it was formerly, by an annual Vote, and not by a Bill.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Not all of it.

*MR. PRETYMAN.: If my hon. friend objects to any particular item of expenditure charged on this Loan Bill I shall be happy to deal with that objection in Committee, but we are now dealing with the broad question of expenditure, and I desire to bring before the House the manner in which the principle of this Bill was first introduced. My hon. friend opposite, who introduced the first Loan Bill with the support of the right hon. Member for West Monmouthshire, was really responsible for this principle, and it may be worth while to recall the fact that the principle upon which this Bill was supported was one, and one only. The right hon. Member for West Monmouthshire said that he considered the justification for a loan, and the true distinction between loans and Votes, was whether the expenditure was permanent or temporary in character. That is the principle involved; that where permanent expenditure is to be incurred it should be by loan, and where annual expenditure is incurred it should be by Vote. The

right hon. Gentleman added that he had always held the doctrine "that you might equalise annual expenditure in respect of public buildings and sites by a well-regulated system of loans." That clearly lays down the principle of a Loan Bill as against an annual Vote. In the discussion which followed, my noble friend the present Secretary of State for India laid down three principles which should attach to a Loan Bill, but which did not attach to that particular Bill. One principle was that it should be clearly stated and specified what was the limit of expenditure on each item which Parliament was asked to sanction; the second was that any sum required should be voted by Parliament as the need arose; and the third was that the time within which the works brought before the House were to be completed should be stated on the original proposal being placed before the House. These three conditions have been fulfilled in the Bill now before the House. In the first instance these Bills were annual, but since 1897 they have been biennial. That is the general history of these Loans Bills. The financial history of these Bills is as follows. Under the Bill of 1895 the total estimated expenditure which the House was asked to sanction was eight and three-quarter millions

and £1,000,000 was asked to be voted on account. Of that sum, at the end of the year 25 per cent., or rather over a quarter of a million, still remained unspent. The really important question which is brought before the House to-day is the total estimated cost which it is asked to sanction, because when the House has given its sanction to the total estimated liability the work is put in hand, contracts are taken, and these contracts cannot afterwards be broken.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Oh, yes.

*MR. PRETYMAN: My hon. friend says "Oh, yes"; but the Admiralty does not break contracts with the facility the hon. Member appears to advocate. Having taken a contract, we are pledged, in ordinary circumstances, to carry that contract through. But the House having pledged itself to a total estimated expenditure, it is more or less bound to vote the sums required as the expenditure is incurred. Therefore, what the House should turn its attention to is any increase in the total estimated expenditure which is now asked for, because, having once sanctioned it, the House has parted to a large extent with its power of control. In 1896 the total estimated cost of the works was increased from eight and three-quarter millions to fourteen millions, and two and three-quarter millions was voted on account. At the end of the year no less than two millions out of that two and three-quarter millions remained unspent. In 1897 the total estimated expenditure was seventeen millions, and another two and three-quarter millions was voted. So little of that sum was expended in the first year that it lasted for two years, and instead of the Bill being renewed in 1898 it was continued until 1899. In 1899 the Bill, which was brought in by the present Secretary to the Treasury, provided for a total estimated expenditure of twenty-three and a half millions, and about three millions was asked for on account, and I am glad to inform the House that out of that three millions only £335,000 remained unspent on 1st April last. Whereas on the first Bill 25 per cent. remained unspent, on the second Bill 75 per cent., and on the third Bill 50 per cent.; on the last Bill only 10 per cent. remained unspent. It

is all spent now, and we have no money left at all. By the present Bill we ask for a total estimated expenditure of twenty-seven and a half millions, an increase of £3,800,000, and we ask for £6,000,000 to be voted on account, of which £5,000,000 is practically expenditure to which the House is already committed on the total estimated liability already incurred. The remaining £1,000,000 is on account of expenditure on the new works which the House is now asked to authorise. From this statement it will be seen that the authority and supervision of Parliament is really very fully maintained. The hon. Gentleman behind me has suggested that Parliament has less control than it has under an annual Vote. I fail to follow that argument, because what authority has Parliament got? The original estimated cost of the work is stated, and no subsequent increase can be incurred without the authority of Parliament. No money can be spent until it has been authorised and voted. A statement is made on the introduction of every Loan Bill, and can also be made annually, as to the amount of money which remains unspent at the end of the period for which it was voted. The time for the completion of the works is stated, and we have to account to the House for any failure in that respect. In addition to that, I am now able, if desired in Committee, in regard to any one of these works, to state the estimated expenditure, not only for the two years which were covered by this Bill, but for either of the years, so the House can ascertain what is the annual as well as the biennial expenditure, so that there is no loss of control because the money is expended in two years instead of one. The charge on this Bill is a charge on the ordinary Works Vote, and when there is no Loans Bill, as will be the case next year, there will be a charge on the ordinary Works Vote, on which any question which hon. Members desire to raise can be raised. Therefore the House really has as full control in every particular, and rather more control, over the works executed under a Loan Bill as over works executed under an ordinary Vote.

Now, having stated to the House shortly the history of the Bill, I will address myself to the Bill itself. With regard to the Bill before the House, I think the House will have gathered from what I have already said that we have made more progress than has previously been the case. I do not take any particular credit to the present Board of Admiralty in that respect; all Boards have equally struggled to spend as much as possible of the money which the House has provided for this particular purpose. That was their duty; and I would prefer to tell the House that there had been over-expenditure rather than that there had been under-expenditure, because we wish to have these works completed and put at the service of the Navy as soon as possible. I am able to report generally that the progress has been good. The details of that progress are shown in the general statement issued by the First Lord of the Admiralty on 1st March last, and progress has continued in the same ratio ever since.

I now come to the particular items included in the Bill. The first item upon which any question arises is that of Gibraltar. That question has agitated the country a good deal in the last few months, and I may remind the House that a very full statement in regard to it, which I think was received with general satisfaction, was made by the First Lord of the Admiralty in another place. I do

not wish to enter into this matter at great length, but I think that there are one or two considerations which have not been fully presented to the House. I would like to call attention, first of all, to the attitude taken up by my hon. friend behind me in 1895. My hon. friend then said a great deal of rubbish had been talked about the danger to which the dock at Gibraltar would be exposed in time of war, but, however open to attack in time of war, the dock would always serve its uses in time of peace. That is an excellent argument. The hon. Member also said it was unlikely we should ever be at war with Spain, but if we were at war with Spain he doubted whether Spain would be able to do damage to the dock at Gibraltar. He added that the danger to the dock in time of war had been enormously exaggerated. If this danger did exist, he would rather have the dock with all its danger than have no dock at all. I merely refer to that, not for the purpose of showing that the hon. Member has no right to change his opinion, but in order to show that the Admiralty had the valuable support of my hon. friend in inaugurating this policy.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: One dock.

*MR. PRETYMAN: My hon. friend draws a fine distinction, which I am unable to follow, between one dock and two or three docks. The needs of the Fleet have to be met, and an argument which applies to one dock would apply to two or three docks. The Committee on which my hon. friend served laid down the proposition that a dock with risk was better than no dock at all. I claim to be entitled to believe that that argument applies to the whole item, provided I can prove that the requirements of the Fleet are not for one dock but for at least three docks. The hon. Member, in his argument to the House, recommended two graving docks and a floating dock, and the Admiralty proposed three graving docks; so the only question between us was as between two graving docks and a floating dock and three graving docks. Any practical engineer who has studied the question will accept this proposition, that it is only wise and prudent to construct a floating dock when it is impossible to make a graving dock, because a graving dock is so greatly superior in all respects to a floating dock. That being so, we have these three docks, and we have the great advantage of having a graving dock instead of a floating dock. My hon. friend, as the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean will remember, when the Bill was first introduced in 1895, and subsequently in 1897, first of all supported the dock, and, secondly, insisted on the necessity of increasing the accommodation.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Yes, and the actual Amendment was moved by the present Minister of Agriculture.

*MR. PRETYMAN: My hon. friend opposite, the late Civil Lord of the Admiralty, then stated that, after the fullest consideration, his naval advisers had advised that the west side of the Rock was on the whole preferable to the east side. That question has again been raised by my hon. friend behind me, and has been very fully discussed. The Committee visited Gibraltar and issued an Interim Report to which my hon. friend assented. In that Interim Report there were two very important reservations, and any engineer would admit that two more important reservations could not be made. Those reservations were as to the cost of the proposed works on the east side of the Rock and as to the time in which

the work could be carried out. No practical man would finally recommend the adoption of any proposal for a great engineering work until he knew the cost of the work and how long it would take to construct it.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: They did recommend it.

*MR. PRETYMAN: The words in the Report were;

"I enclose the replies to the questions which were referred to us, except in regard to the estimated additional cost involved and to the probable time required for the completion of the proposed works on the eastern side."

The questions of cost and time were left open, and, therefore, the Report contained only partial recommendations. The Committee came home in order to obtain evidence on the questions of time and cost, and when they had obtained that evidence the draft of the final Report was drawn up. My hon. friend received a copy of that draft Report for consideration, and it was open to him to suggest alterations in it or to issue a Minority Report. Instead of considering the Report, he preferred, rather theatrically, to leave the Committee, and, like a certain marine animal which retreats in a cloud of ink, he covered his retreat by the suggestion that the Committee, at the dictation of the officials in the Admiralty, had consented to rewrite their Report.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: State what the proposed draft Report was.

*MR. PRETYMAN: I have made a general statement, and that statement I hope the House will accept. That being so. I really think the hon. Member is not entitled to great consideration on this question. He had had the fullest opportunity of laying his views before the Committee and of embodying them in the final Report. He had refused to do so, and the Admiralty had had to deal with the question on the Report of the remaining members of the Committee. In their Report the Committee estimated that this eastern harbour could be constructed for about £5,000,000, in a period of ten years.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: That included the dock also. The harbour was £4,000,000.

*MR. PRETYMAN: My hon. friend, who was much more sanguine, declared himself ready to construct this eastern harbour for £2,000,000. I do not think my hon. friend could do so. Moreover, my hon. friend did not state any period in which he would perform this engineering feat. Now we have gone closely into this matter, and I do not wish to traverse the opinion of the Committee, which was advised by a very eminent engineer, but I say we should be very guarded in accepting this Report as to time and cost, because on the eastern side the rocks are nearly perpendicular and exposed to a thousand miles of drift, and when there is an east wind the swell makes work impossible. A more inaccessible spot it would be difficult to find, and it is fair to assume that the works there would be more expensive and take a longer time to construct. The works at Dover, carried on under favourable conditions in the less exposed Channel, offer the means of comparison. The original estimate was that the works would be completed in 1900, and they are still very far from completion. On the eastern side of Gibraltar the conditions are infinitely more difficult. The length of the mole would be no less than 11,200 ft.; and, though the Committee estimate that it might be constructed in ten years for £5,000,000, I believe if those figures are doubled the estimate would approach nearer to what would prove to be the

actual result. But the Fleet requires accommodation, not in ten or twenty years time, but now; and I think that

a project which requires twenty years for completion cannot be accepted as an alternative to the Admiralty scheme.

On the question of the future, on the question of additional harbour accommodation on the east side of Gibraltar, the fullest investigation is taking place. I do not wish to express any opinion, for a most careful survey has been ordered, and none of the works will be undertaken until we have the Report of that survey. After full consideration of the Report by the naval advisers of the Admiralty, the question will be finally decided. In the Bill it will be seen that there is an additional sum of £213,000 taken for Gibraltar. At Gibraltar there is great congestion of population, and it is impossible to find quarters for dockyard employees. It is therefore absolutely necessary, in order to obtain the requisite personnel to work the establishment being erected there, to provide quarters for the dock yard employees. To provide these quarters a sum approaching £100,000 will be required, and in addition there is the question of the water supply. The water supply is a most important matter at Gibraltar. It is proposed to construct a reservoir on the east side, with pumping machinery, and the water will be distributed by gravitation for dockyard use. Then there are extra coal sheds required on the new mole, and there will be further expenditure for new machinery. These services will make up the increase of £213,000.

Before leaving the question of Gibraltar, I may mention a circumstance which seems to indicate that the hon. Member for King's Lynn in his pamphlet entitled "Gibraltar: A National Danger," has not very carefully considered the position.

There is a picture of Gibraltar taken from the Queen of Spain's Chair, facing the west side of the rock. It is possible to see high land on the coast of Africa. In the picture this is marked with a cross as Algeciras, on Spanish territory, and it is shown there as if it was a point from which Gibraltar might be attacked. But, as I say, that is the African coast.

In regard to the works at Hong Kong, I think the strong strategic reasons for keeping the dockyard on the island have been lost sight of. It was originally proposed to transfer the dockyard to the mainland, Kaulung, when it was supposed that with the space available on the island it would be impossible to provide for the needs of the Fleet. That space was four and three quarter acres, but I am glad to say that by concessions made by the War Office, and reclamations, the extent of the dockyard, when the present works are completed, will be not four and three quarter acres, but thirty-four and a half. Thus there will not only be space for all the works projected, but for the construction of an additional large dock if at a future time it should be required. On that ground we do not see the same necessity for considering the removal to the mainland. The removal has been pressed by the civilian and commercial community, but it appears that the use to which the space is desired to be put to is that of a promenade, and we cannot feel that the needs of the Navy should be subordinated to such a purpose. The Admiralty would be justified in taking up the position that, if the colony provided an equally good and convenient yard in all respects on the

mainland, and provided at their own expense the defences to render it as secure as that on the island, the proposal might be considered. But I do not think they will consider it worth the while of the colony to do that; and, looking at all the conditions, the heavy expense of dredging the shallows off the mainland, the inefficient water supply, the possibility of a railway being made on the mainland, and rendering an attack on the yard more possible; taking all the facts into consideration, and after careful investigation, and seeing that work has been commenced, the contract let, and liabilities to the amount of £150,000 incurred, no sufficient reason is seen for transferring the yard to the mainland.

The next item is for deepening and improving harbour approaches; an increase is asked for on that item. Very heavy expenditure has been incurred, for reasons to which I referred in my preliminary remarks, in enlarging and deepening torpedo-safe harbours. At the main naval stations a very large proportion of the expenditure has been already incurred at Devonport and Portsmouth, and it is now necessary to undertake large works at Chatham. With the increase of their size and draft ships are unable to go up to Chatham except on the highest tides, and so for many days in the year large vessels cannot approach that dockyard and take advantage of the great works there. These conditions are getting worse, the opposite bank of the river being eroded, and the mud is being deposited on the dockyard side. It is necessary to restore the balance by a large groyne. A Committee has sat on the question, and it has been decided to restore the river frontage to the condition of thirty years ago by constructing a groyne. That will be accompanied by a large scheme of dredging, which it is hoped will enable large ships to get up to Chatham at all times.

The next item is the Keyham extension. There the large sum of one million is asked for. That is not in any sense an increase in the cost of the works which the House has already approved. This sum of one million is for a new undertaking, which is an extension of the undertaking already authorised by the House. It may roughly be divided into two parts. The first part is the erection of all the necessary workshops and buildings which are accessories to the yard. They were not provided for in the first instance, because, owing to the great period of time which necessarily would elapse before the completion of that great engineering work, it was recognised that the size and fittings of all these accessories would better be determined when the works were in a more advanced state. The cost of these works is, roughly, half a million. Secondly, owing to the greatly increased length and size of the ships, the Admiralty have found it necessary to appoint a Berthing Committee, which has been seriously considering the question of berthing accommodation. It is found that the present berthing accommodation, if used to the full, is barely sufficient at present, and is rapidly becoming insufficient. In the execution of this great engineering work at Devonport it has become necessary to construct a great coffer dam, which embraced the foreshore for more than 1,800 feet beyond the limit of the present authorised works. It will

be possible by extending the quay within that coffer dam for another 1,800 feet to provide that length of deep water berth-age and quay room, and at the same

time to give access to the great naval barracks which are being there erected. A very great saving, as the House can easily see, will be obtained by carrying out this work, while the present contract actually exists, rather than by allowing the present works to be completed and the coffer dam taken away, because it would then be necessary at no distant date to commence all over again, whereas the contractor now has all his plant on the spot, and we should be able to obtain a much more advantageous contract than at a future date. The berthing accommodation to be provided by this expenditure is absolutely necessary for the needs of the Fleet.

The next item in which there is an increase is that of magazines. No less than £;170,000 of this increase is due to the necessity for constructing a large magazine inside the Bock at Gibraltar. I think my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn will recognise with pleasure that we are in this way doing what we can to secure from any danger from fire all inflammable stores, and anything which can conveniently be put under cover. A Committee has also sat on the question of the provision of magazine accommodation, and various recommendations they have made have been adopted, so that very much larger reserves of ammunition will be kept than previously. That has entailed an enlargement of the scope of the existing magazine accommodation spread over the different stations. Entirely new magazines which are being constructed for the Chatham district, large works which are being undertaken at Priddy's Hard, Portsmouth, and Bull Point, Devonport, and a general increase in the reserve accommodation and works at Gibraltar account for an increase of £;385,000.

I will now pass to the two new items the House is asked to sanction. The first of these is the sum of £;1,000,000 in respect of the breakwater at Malta. That is a very urgent service. The present position is unsatisfactory from two main points of view; first, the harbour at Malta, in proportion to its area, has an extraordinary amount of deep water anchorage, Fully one half, I might say, of the available space where the ships and Fleet should anchor in perfect security is now rendered insecure and practically useless by the fact that the north-easterly wind blows straight into the harbour and raises such a heavy sea that only the inner berths are available for the secure berthing of ships. By a comparatively small expenditure to that which we spend on the general needs of the Navy we shall be able to obtain the use of all the large extent of sheltered water space which is not now available. There is also the self-evident proposition that the present open entrance to the harbour renders it particularly insecure against torpedo attacks, and the House will be aware that there are torpedo stations of other nations scattered in all directions over the Mediterranean. It is very desirable that the central harbour at Malta; the headquarters of the Mediterranean Fleet; should be protected against torpedo attack; and it is, therefore, proposed, on these two main grounds, to erect a great breakwater by means of a long arm starting from the St. Elmo point, which is the western entrance to the harbour, and a shorter arm starting from the eastern side. In addition to these great works it may be found necessary to erect subsidiary works to catch and break up any swell which might enter the harbour between the heads of the

breakwater. I believe the Fleet and the nation will obtain full advantage from the expenditure of this money.

The last, and by no means the least important item is for the provision of coaling appliances for the Navy. The House will not think that this suggestion had been sprung upon them, for in the First Lord's statement on 1st March I find these words;

"It is proposed to include provision for necessary expenditure on improved coaling facilities at naval stations in the Naval Works Bill."

I need hardly insist on the urgent necessity of improving our coaling appliances and facilities, in regard to which, despite the growth of the Navy and the new conditions forced upon us, I may confess there has been no considerable advance for the last twenty years. Naval officers are now of opinion that the next great naval war will be very largely a fight for coal. If that is to be the case, surely it is right that this country, which has been provided by nature with the finest supply of steam coal which exists in any country in the world, should not be found to be less favourably situated than those countries which are not similarly blessed by nature. We have considered how we can best take advantage of the supplies which are available to us, and the problem divides itself naturally into two branches. There are the questions of the supply to home ports and the supply to foreign ports, and the considerations governing these two questions differ. It should be borne in mind that the problem of coal supply is greatly complicated by the question of storage. If a large quantity of coal could be put into a store and locked up till required in time of war, the problem would be comparatively simple; but coal when once removed from the pit deteriorates rapidly, and, owing to that deterioration, any coal which is stored must be turned over, even if under cover, at least once a year. Therefore it will be seen that an enormous additional expense is incurred in the handling of coal. A mercantile firm loading ships would save all that expense, because it would bring the coal direct from the collieries, put it into a barge or a coal depot, and ship it straight off with the vessel requiring it. But if a large reserve is kept at a naval station it must be constantly turned over, for which the necessary appliances must be provided. As regards home ports, this very large current expenditure may, however, to a great extent be avoided. We may look upon the great pits in South Wales as an available reserve store, and by providing direct rail accommodation to the main naval stations, and arranging with the railway companies that in time of war or preparation for war a service of trains should be rapidly run from the pits to the docks, it will be necessary to keep very much smaller stores, and a much less expenditure will be required than if the entire reserve considered necessary for war were kept at the different stations. This problem has been approached from that point of view, and in dealing with the works proposed at Portsmouth, Portland, Devon-port, and on the Medway, which are the great home ports under consideration we are proposing railway access, stations wharves, coal depots, and appliances for tipping the coal on the trucks straight into the ships, a comparatively small amount of storage and sidings, so that on the first hint of any

preparation for war a quantity of coal may be brought down from the pits and stored, which, if not required, can be used up afterwards. Thus the constant current expense of handling the coal into store and out of store will be avoided. When we come to foreign stations, no direct rail access from the pits is possible, and therefore it will be necessary to provide large storage accommodation. Fortunately the expense is somewhat reduced, because at foreign stations very much cheaper manual labour is available for handling coal. The three great foreign stations which are now proposed to be dealt with are Gibraltar, Malta, and Hong Kong, at each of which places a large expenditure is proposed in order to maintain the large storage necessary. I may mention that the annual consumption of coal in the Mediterranean Fleet is no less than 170,000 tons, and that, or a little more, is the amount we propose to keep stored at Malta. It is estimated that in war, if the Channel and Mediterranean Fleets were both engaged in operations, their coal consumption would be no less than 135,000 tons a month, and therefore it will be seen that that provision is by no means too great. As to Hong Kong, a very great difficulty arose on the outbreak of the recent trouble in China owing to there being an insufficient store of coal. It is proposed to erect coal appliances and a station on the mainland of Kau-lung in the situation suggested by the colony for the extension of the dockyard, and to provide for a storage of at least 100,000 tons in that situation.

I need not labour that point further than to say that what we are doing is that which other nations are also undertaking, and I think it will be interesting to the House to hear what is the view of the naval authorities of the United States on this question. In a report of the Bureau of Equipment of the United States Navy which was recently issued, it is stated that the only way in which the Government could be sure of a sufficiency of coal for its ships was for the Government to have its own depots well stocked and furnished with all appliances necessary to transfer the coal to the ships, and that if anything was proved during the Spanish War it was that they could not rely on commercial firms for this service. In carrying out that policy the United States Government have at present actually found the money, and are erecting and equipping no fewer than seven coaling stations in the Pacific alone, the amount stored varying from 20,000 tons to 8,000 and 5,000 tons at the different stations. On the coasts of America itself they are equipping nineteen great coaling stations, and the amount stored at these stations is up to as much as 100,000 tons at one or two of them. It will therefore be seen that a practical people like the Americans have already realised and taken means to meet this necessity; and I do not think we can afford to be behind them in that particular. I regret that there is a necessity for coming to the House and asking for these large sums of money at a time of financial strain, but it is evident to everyone that, however necessary it may be to be economical, we cannot afford to starve the Navy. It must be seen that if these appliances are not provided the enormous expenditure which the country has incurred on ships and men will be of no effect. It would be literally a policy of sinking the ship for the want of a halfpennyworth of coal. Five millions out of the six millions for which the House is asked is

expenditure to which the House is already committed, and the only new sum to be actually voted is a million; and when the House considers the sums already voted for the services of the Navy, and how necessary it is to get the full advantage of that expenditure by providing the necessary appliances in the way of coal, docks, harbours, barracks, or hospitals, it will see that, however reluctant it may be to increase expenditure at this moment, it is expenditure which is absolutely necessary, and which the House is justified in voting. I beg to move.

Motion made, and question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): We have listened with much interest to a very clear and, I think, candid statement from the hon. Member, but before I deal with any of the matters he has mentioned, I wish to call the attention of the House to the serious position in which it finds itself in regard to this Bill.

This is a measure of great Imperial importance, of considerable financial complexity, and involving proposals of considerable magnitude. It calls on the House to sanction the continuance of naval works already begun to the extent of £23,000,000, and to sanction the beginning of new works, not to the extent of £1,000,000, as the hon. Member suggested, but, as I shall directly show, to the extent of £4,000,000. Further, of the old works the House is asked to continue, two, at least, have been challenged on grounds of great gravity. It is a Bill of this kind that the Government, in a session wherein they have had comparatively little to do, in a Parliament which has practically no mandate to do anything at all, ask the House to consider on the 14th August, on a Wednesday afternoon, three days before the prorogation. That is a course of procedure hardly consistent with the respect due from any Government to Parliament. It is the more extraordinary to me when I remember the action taken by the Government in respect to one of the predecessors of this Bill. In 1896 the Naval Works Bill was proposed early in the session, and, under the mistaken plea that it was essential that the measure should be passed before the 31st March, it was forced through the House by the closure, and in another place the Standing Orders were suspended in order that the Bill might be passed through all its stages in one day. My opinion is that this Bill must be lightened, and I shall show how before I sit down.

I will come now, Sir, to the financial provisions of the Bill. The hon. Member for King's Lynn fell into a blunder which I think ought to be acknowledged, because it has misled a great part of the newspaper press of the country. He added the amount called for by the Bill to the total amount of the cost previously authorised, and said that was the total. The mistake consisted in treating as an addition to the sum previously sanctioned that which was only an instalment of that sum. The hon. Member opposite, the Civil Lord, spoke of a balance in hand of £335,000. This is a matter of considerable difficulty, and I confess I do not understand it. According to the Memorandum, the total estimated expenditure to the 31st March, 1903, is £13,521,000 net. That has been provided for to the extent there specified, leaving a balance to be raised of £6,218,618. The amount actually raised by this Bill is only £6,157,000, and the excess is said to represent the amount by which the surplus revenue of 1895-6 proved to be insufficient. I find that two items; the amount raised

by terminable annuities in 1901–2, £;273,382, and this balance of £;61,618;together make the sum of £;335,000. Another curious thing is that in the Schedule the estimated expenditure for the two years now in question is £;6,492,000; the amount provided for by the Bill is £;6,157,000, again leaving a balance of this identical sum of £;335,000.

MR. PRETYMAN: That is perfectly clear. We have £;335,000, and we want £;6,157,000 more.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: But you have raised in this financial year only £;273,382, which, deducted from the amount in hand, makes the balance of £;61,618. As far as I can understand it, that has one meaning;namely, that of the £;335,000 which you had, or say you had, at the beginning of the financial year this balance of £;61,618 was needed to make up the amount that the surplus of 1895–6 was not sufficient to cover.

MR. PRETYMAN: There are two sides to the account: one is the raising of the money, and the other is the expenditure of the money. The statement on page 3 of the Memorandum describes the manner in which the money has been raised, and the statement in the Schedule describes the manner in which the money has been spent. The £;335,000 is in each case the total. If the hon. Member follows the figures he will see that I have dealt with the matter in the proper manner.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The total is £;335,000, a part of which consists of £;61,618, which according to the Memorandum had to be applied to meet an insufficiency five years back, and therefore was not available as part of the expenditure of this financial year. I cannot make anything else out of the fact, and it seems to me that this £;61,618, although the hon. Member says it is part of the balance they had in hand at the beginning of this year, was not spent on current works, but was required to meet an insufficient surplus of five years ago. Therefore, all they have spent on current works this year is £;273,382. If that is so, it has a very important bearing on the control of this House over expenditure.

MR. PRETYMAN: The hon. Member is entirely confusing the questions of the raising and the spending of the money. A large amount may be raised at the end of one year to be spent in the next. He says that the sum of £;273,382 was raise by terminable annuities in 1901–2, and therefore that was the sum spent. That is not so at all. The question of how the money is raised is not one upon which I can enter; that is a question for the Treasury. The question I have to look after is that of how the money is spent, and if the hon. Member looks at the Schedule he will see how the money has been spent. The question of raising the money is a totally different matter, and he has no right to make the deduction he has just done.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I simply asked for information, and perhaps the representative of the Treasury will enlighten me. The inference I draw is that you have not had more to spend in this year than £;273,382. At most you have only had £;335,000. The original intention of the initiators of this policy was that these Bills should be annual Bills, so that the control of Parliament should be an annual control. That object was not secured by fixing a time limit; that was a blunder on the part of the Government of 1896, but there was a

financial limit. Apparently the Admiralty had been continuing these works for four and a half months on an authorised expenditure of no more, at the outside, than £;335,000. If the works had been going on at the rate they should have been, the Admiralty ought to have spent a great deal more than that sum in the time. It is impossible to suppose that the works have slackened. The normal expenditure for four and a half months would be at least £;1,000,000, and I believe that expenditure has been incurred. The difference between that £;1,000,000 and the £;335,000 is expenditure incurred without parliamentary sanction. That is a point which I hope will be answered before the debate closes. This is not the first time the Admiralty has incurred expenditure without parliamentary sanction, and such action means the complete withdrawal of the control of this House over these proposals.

I now come to the actual works, which are of two kinds; the old and the new. About the old works I have very little to say. The hon. Member for King's Lynn will doubtless make his own case against the Admiralty. We on this side have not interfered with that very curious story. We have not accepted the hon. Member's conclusions as true, but after listening to the conclusive reasoning of the Civil Lord to-day, I cannot understand why the First Lord of the Treasury in the debate on the Address bought off the opposition of the hon. Member by the promise of an inquiry. We were unwilling to have Gibraltar discussed in this House, and made no opposition to the proposed inquiry; but the Civil Lord to-day has given sufficient reasons, I think, why an inquiry need never have been held. The inquiry, however, took place, and I am bound to say it was conducted in a manner not fair to the hon. Member for King's Lynn. No sooner was his motion withdrawn than we were informed that there was neither Committee nor Commission, that there would be neither reference nor report, and that any recommendations the persons holding the inquiry might make would not be laid before this House. I say that was playing fast and loose with a great Imperial question.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I should like to say in my own defence that that announcement was made after I had accepted a seat on the Committee under entirely different conditions.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I did not mean to imply anything to the contrary. I was dealing entirely with the conduct of the Admiralty in relation to the House. I was under the same illusion myself. The Admiralty has been most unfortunate in its appointment of Committees, and especially in its calling for Interim Reports. There has been an attempt on the part of those who signed the second Report in this case to show that in a most material point there has been no alteration. In the Parliamentary Paper there is a summary of the two Reports, and the answer to Question No. 4, which is said to be contained in the Interim Report, is this;

"It is recommended that No. 2 Dock should be abandoned, and a larger dock established on the eastern side, but if serious delay is anticipated in constructing the eastern harbour and dock, it is suggested that No. 2 Dock should be completed as originally sanctioned, such completion not obviating the necessity for the eastern harbour and dock."

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The last part of that is not in the Interim Report.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: It is set forth as the official summary of the answer in the Interim Report, and in the fourth column is the phrase "no alteration." The hon. Member for King's Lynn is quite right in saying that the second half of that sentence is not contained in the Interim Report at all. It is a modification of the Interim Report; in other words, it is an alteration which the hon. Member refused to sign. It is astonishing that that statement should be made, and that it should be further emphasised by the remark that there has been no alteration in that respect.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD FORSTER, Belfast, W.) made a remark which was inaudible in the press gallery.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Then I will not pursue that matter further. As to the survey to which the hon. Member has referred, I do not think it will have any important effect. With regard to Hong Kong, I understand that the reasons which formerly operated against Kau-lung have disappeared. Without challenging the hon. Member's argument with regard to the strategic question, I would ask whether the work at Hong Kong has so far advanced that it cannot now be altered. At Gibraltar it is impossible, but I do not know whether there is anything to make it impossible to remove the establishment from Hong Kong to Kau-lung, in which case possibly there would be no need for a dock at all.

MR. PRETYMAN: I stated that we had incurred liabilities to the extent of £150,000, that the contract was let, and that the whole expenditure would be about £1,250,000.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I have also been informed that it was possible to make a very advantageous bargain with the colony over the site on which the present establishment is built. If that is so, the matter might be worth considering. I now pass to the new works. The hon. Member stated that only £1,000,000 was asked for new works;

MR. PRETYMAN: What I said was that the sum asked to be voted for the next two years in respect of new works was £1,000,000.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The Memorandum deals with two items which are said to be new works; the Malta breakwater, and the improved coaling facilities. The point I wish to make is that what are called "revised estimates" are really for new works not previously sanctioned by the House, so that the Memorandum at first sight conveys a misleading impression. I do not intend to discuss the new works at this stage, notwithstanding the detailed explanation given by the hon.

Member. What I wish the House to bear in mind is that we are being asked at this period of the session to sanction new works of great importance to the extent of £4,000,000. These works cannot possibly be urgent, and urgency is the only plea on which they could be pressed at this time. If they had been urgent they would have been proposed earlier in the session, and by delaying the Bill until now the Government have put themselves out of court. If the House of Commons is to exercise any deliberate judgment on this question there must be full discussion not only of points connected

with old works, but also of these new works, ten or eleven in number. Is it

reasonable to suppose that any such discussion can now take place? It is impossible that it should be, and it would be indecent to use the powers of the House to force a decision without such adequate discussion. I venture to think that a way out of the difficulty has been shown by my hon. friend the Member for West Islington, who has put the following motion on the Paper;

"That this House declines to sanction at this late period of the session new works of the magnitude and cost proposed under the Bill."

Well, Sir, if my hon. friend proposes that Amendment, I shall be compelled to support him unless we get from the representative of the Admiralty an assurance that they will be willing to take this Bill as a mere continuation Bill dealing with the existing works, and that they will leave out the new items when we come to Committee, and will not ask the House to assent, at this stage of the session, to new works. If the Government does that, it will lighten the Bill and shorten the discussion, and the Government will get their Bill without any straining of the rights and privileges of this House, and there will be no difficulty in doing so, because they can bring in a new Bill for the new works next session. If they will not do that I shall feel, for the first time, driven into an attitude of opposition to a Bill the policy of which I had the honour of being the first to introduce into this House.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): The Amendment my hon. friend has alluded to, and which I now rise to move, has been carefully considered. I feel that it would be hopeless to ask the House to reject altogether the proposals involved in this Bill, for the simple reason that the Bill in many respects only carries on works that we have already sanctioned, and as we have sanctioned the Votes, it would be ridiculous to vote against the works being carried on. This Amendment, however, represents the minimum of my policy with regard to this Bill. I would like the House to realise that it is being drawn gradually on by eloquent statements like that of the hon. Gentleman

who introduced the Bill to adopt a policy far in advance of the policy which has been pursued by the House for many years. The old policy was to provide in the Estimates of the year for all works to be carried out in that year. These Bills are a succession of conspiracies against that policy, and the effect of them will be to destroy that policy unless the House objects. The hon. Gentleman, as all his predecessors have done in regard to these Bills, tried to justify the Loans Bills, but there is no justification for them. There have been occasional Loans Bills, but the best one which I can take as an illustration is that which was taken in 1890 for barracks. The proposal is that if there are permanent works to be done, a Vote may be taken for those works, but that does not render it necessary that a Bill should come every year. Take the Barrack Loan of 1890. In that case a large sum was taken to spend over a series of years. It has not been all spent yet. When the Naval Works Bill of 1895 was introduced, the country thought the loan was of a somewhat similar character, that is to say, that it was desired to take for the Navy a considerable amount of money for new works indispensable to the Fleet. It is stated to-day that that Bill was intended to be an annual one. But for what purpose? For the purpose of the House being able to look into the expenditure, and watch and criticise it; and that we

might see how this large sum was spent; that it was spent properly, and generally that the House might keep its eye on the proceedings. That was the policy, and in that spirit I accept it, but the result has been that these annual Bills have been the excuse for a policy of the utmost extravagance. As the hon. Member said, the chief point now is as to the new works to be taken under the Bill. In my opinion sufficient explanation has not been given with regard to the million which is taken for new works under this Bill. I wish I could convey to the House the mischief of that million. The million which is asked for to-day may involve the House in an expenditure of £;15,000,000. MR. PRETYMAN The whole amount is only £;3,800,000.

MR. LOUGH: Then I challenge the hon. Member. Does not this Vote include new works at various coaling stations? How and where will you be able to draw the line? It is not a million that we are voting, but £;3,800,000, and that is not the full sum for that elaborate policy of fitting up the coaling stations, and if that policy is to be adopted it is not even £;3,800,000 that we are voting, it may be £;10,000,000 or £;15,000,000 on that point alone. That is a sufficient illustration of what we are doing, and a sufficient justification for the action taken up by my hon. friend with regard to this Bill. The objection I raise is that it is a policy of extravagance. The whole amount asked for on the Bill of 1895, of which this Bill we are told is a continuation, was £;8,500,000; the next year it was £;14,000,000; in 1897 it was £;17,300,000; the next Bill asked for £;23,636,000; and to-day we are asked for £;27,500,000, so that in every case there have been large items of new expenditure, which in itself breeds further extravagance in future years. In 1895 there was a policy with regard to Gibraltar; in that year we had the large amount sanctioned for Gibraltar of £;1,500,000; the amount to-day is roughly £;5,000,000, and if I understand the hon. Gentleman rightly, he said those works would cost £;10,000,000. MR. PRETYMAN: I said it had been estimated by the Committee to cost £;5,000,000, and it might cost £;10,000,000. I did not refer in any way to the existing items.

MR. LOUGH: My point is that the item since 1895 has grown from £;1,000,000 to £;5,000,000, and that if this policy is adopted we may ultimately have to expend £;10,000,000. It is evident that the policy we are pursuing is one of great extravagance. We have greatly exceeded the ordinary Estimates, and these annual discussions upon these Bills have led us into spending a great deal more than we spent at first. It may be asked, "Must not you make your provision for your Navy and have your docks and ports in order?" Yes, but, Sir, we have a Vote for the special purpose, Vote 10. And at the very period when we are making this large additional expenditure, Vote 10 has been doubled. In Vote 10 we find a growing amount for the purposes which you put in this Bill. The Bill is another Estimate; a bad example of the vicious principle we are gradually carrying into the finance of the country. My hon. friend said this was an opportune time to introduce such a principle as this. It is inopportune, because it is the end of the session. If the Government continue to introduce important Bills in the last week of the session the arrangements of all Members of Parliament will have to be altered, because this week is crowded with most

important matters. But, apart from its being the last week in the session, this is a most inconvenient time to introduce an extravagant Bill of this class, because of the heavy financial obligations the country has had to deal with this year. We have had to deal with Estimates on the heaviest scale, the most gigantic the country has ever had to deal with, and now, after all the difficulties into which we have been plunged, the House is asked to spend £13,000,000 in two years, which means £6,500,000 additional Estimates during the year. I do not know whether the House realises the injury this is doing to the most important industries of this country. We have not got the money to spend in this way. A million and a quarter a week is being spent on the war. Does anybody realise what such extravagant proposals as are placed before the House to-day take out of the pockets of the people of this country? Such proposals were never laid before the House at a more inopportune time than the present.

The chief point of my Amendment is with regard to the new commitments. I anticipate the answer we shall get. We shall be told that we must go on not only with the old works, but the new commitments. There is not the slightest necessity. Look at the expenditure at Malta; that is, I think, under all the circumstances, one of the most astonishing proposals ever laid before the House. We are already spending a million and a quarter on dock expansion; let us finish that expenditure on the dock, and see how that looks before we spend this million on the breakwater. That is a most important thing to consider when we remember the condition of affairs in Malta; at the present moment Malta is seething with discontent, brought to the front by over-taxation, and yet we proceed to spend two and a half millions on a harbour before their eyes, but we cannot find time to alter the state of things under which they suffer. With regard to the great extension of works at Devonport, we are told that 1,800 feet of new quay is to be built, at the cost of a million.

MR. PRETYMAN: I said half a million; a million is to be spent on the works at Devonport, but only half a million of that is for the new quay.

MR. LOUGH: Why can we not leave them over for a little while? Is this the time, in the middle of August, at the close of a laborious session, when we should go searching about for places in which recklessly to spend a million of money as if it was of no consequence whatever? No case can be made out against our point that these new works should be left over. Let us look at the proposals when we meet next session, when we know the probable amount of the expenditure on the war, and when we should have time to examine the matters thoroughly. At Gibraltar, for instance, there has been a steady increase of expenditure. The hon. Member made a plausible case for the coaling stations, but it was also an appalling case. This expenditure will extend a great deal further than would appear from any one of the items at present. The hon. Member told us that railways would have to be laid down, new quays erected, and expenditure of the most extravagant character incurred. If we begin this sort of work in an empire so widespread as ours the expenditure will not end at £1,000,000 or any amount like it. Be content with what you have under Vote 10 and leave this great policy of new facilities and so on for six or twelve months. The basis of my argument

is that we have reached a time when some economies must be effected. The whole tone of the hon. Member's speech was one of buoyancy. He spoke as on behalf of a country which did not care what it spent, and as though everything was going well. But everything is not

going well. National securities are seriously depressed, and there is considerable difficulty in raising the loans which the Government find necessary. It is absolutely necessary for some steps to be taken in the direction of economy. Our trade, the wages of workmen, and the volume of our exports are declining. Surely these are considerations which might make the House realise that it is not a moment to plunge into new extravagances. The example of America has been quoted. America is buying our railways, and has bought some of our steamship companies. They are making great profits in America, because they are attending to industrial pursuits and because they have given a blow to the bad spirit of Imperialism which exercised a great deal of influence a few years ago. Therefore, America can afford it, and she has got her war over. We cannot afford it, and we have not got our war over, and this is a most inopportune moment to plunge into outlay of this kind. The most important word on this matter that we have had was spoken by the Prime Minister recently. He said;

"Maxims of economy must be disturbed by those great storms which sweep across the political horizon."

He was alluding to the war, but there has been no political or other storm in connection with the question we are now considering. It was in a time of absolute peace that this policy of extravagance was started, and it has been carried on ever since. There was no storm; there was nothing but bad judgment on the part of the Admiralty. The Prime Minister went on to say;

"The feeling of the public was in favour of a pacific policy, but the state of opinion has passed away."

I do not think it has. I think the feeling of this country is more strongly in favour of a pacific policy to-day than at any time during the last fifty years.

The public does not see its way at the moment to withhold its support from the Government, because it thinks the interests of the country are at stake, but it is in favour of a pacific policy, and would bless the name of the statesman who would establish peace and promote a policy of economy.

† See Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. xcvi. page 1226.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member will not be in order in reading a speech delivered in the House of Lords, and answering it paragraph by paragraph.

MR. LOUGH: I was only going to say that the last words were;

"The tide has turned, and who are we that should attempt to stem the tide?"

I can find no tide in these matters. There are two or three Members below the gangway who are almost as responsible as the Government for this policy of extravagance. We find in this House men who have clamoured for greater outlay on every possible occasion; even this year, when we have Naval Estimates amounting to £30,000,000, there was one hon. Member opposite, and, I am sorry to say, one on this side, who asked for Supplementary Estimates. To-day we have them, for we are practically dealing with Supplementary Estimates amounting to £3,250,000,

and I think there never was an occasion on which this House should receive those Supplementary Estimates with greater reluctance. I beg to move.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House declines to sanction at this late period of the session new works of the magnitude and cost proposed under the Bill.'";(Mr. Lough.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I must congratulate my hon. friend on having given the House a clear and lucid speech, fully explaining and completely justifying this Naval Works Bill. With regard to the action of the hon. Member for King's Lynn, I think the House and the country look upon that as a closed matter. There are one or two general observations, made by the mover of the Amendment, with which I entirely agree. It is most undesirable that Bills, whether for naval or military works, involving considerable expenditure, some of it new, should be brought forward so late in the session. The blame does not rest with the Admiralty

in this case, but with the arrangements necessarily made by the Cabinet. I am not saying that under the circumstances of the session it could have been avoided, but it certainly is undesirable. But the Amendment of the hon. Member for Islington is entirely wide of the mark. His speech was really a denunciation of any expenditure at all at the present time. When you are to do what is necessary for the defence of the Empire he does not say. His Amendment asks the House to refuse to sanction the new expenditure. The fact is that with the exception of the Malta breakwater and the coaling facilities there is no new expenditure at all, the remainder of the Bill being to enable the Admiralty to fulfil the obligation already put upon them by the House. The better course, therefore, for the hon. Member to have pursued would have been in Committee to move the omission of those two items. The hon. Member hopelessly confused coaling stations and coaling facilities. He spoke of the vast growth of expenditure for coaling stations. The present proposal has nothing at all to do with the growth of the cost of coaling stations. All that is proposed as a new work is to increase the facilities for putting on board ships coal at ports already in existence, and I cordially congratulate the Admiralty on having at last done that which was really essential and had been too long delayed. The great Napoleon said that an army marched on its belly, and it may certainly be said that a fleet moves on its coal, and the extreme necessity of facilitating the process of filling His Majesty's ships with coal is one to which too great importance cannot be attached.

With regard to the Malta breakwater everybody knows that the conditions produced by torpedo destroyers are such that you must give protection to your Fleet and rest to your men by using breakwaters and closing the harbours, so as to obviate the constant worry and risk arising from liability to damage from torpedo-destroyers. The entire speech of the hon. Member was really an argument in favour of stopping the whole proceedings, involving the postponement to an indefinite date or the abandonment of works now in progress, and that this House

would never agree to.

After all, the total amount of expenditure to be incurred within the next three years for these two new works is only £550,000. The hon. Gentleman says we ought to stop this expenditure, because, although the United States can afford it, we cannot. That statement needs no comment from me. I have always advocated recognition of this fact, that if we compare the resources of the United States with the resources of the United Kingdom we are nearing the time when there may be much force in the argument of the hon. Member. That time is not yet, but it is coming. I cannot admit that whatever the United States can afford, or is likely to be able to afford, cannot be balanced, and more than balanced, by the resources of the British Empire. I will not go further than that. I wish to say a few words with reference to the policy connected with docks and barracks. I hope the Admiralty will be cautious in the future with regard to the multiplication of docks abroad. I think it is necessary that in this matter it should be distinctly clear what our policy is with regard to these docks. Of course, we all know they are to put ships into, to be repaired; but how much repair? My view is that with regard to the docks at such places as Malta and Gibraltar they might be used to clean a ship's bottom or to patch her up below the water-line or elsewhere, sufficiently to enable her to come home. I do not believe that you can, without great loss of time and money, go in for any considerable repairs at such docks. If there were an action in the Mediterranean, I do not believe you could contemplate restoring a ship damaged in action at these docks to any greater extent than to enable her to come home. And for this reason. There is the question of labour, the question of machinery and shops, and all the appliances necessary to restore a ship to really effective action to be considered. Therefore, I hope that that will be borne in mind by the Admiralty when they are considering any further extension of docks abroad. In Australia, where we could develop the natural resources of the hinterland, so that docks shall be self-supporting, and thereby obviate the necessity of dragging all kinds of material across the sea for the repair of ships, I would be in favour of considerable dock facilities being provided. At present everything necessary for the repair of a ship has to be brought from the United Kingdom, and there are no self-sustaining places abroad. Therefore, I would ask the Admiralty to consider whether, in reference to this dock question, they may not possibly be inclined to go a little too far.

The other point to which I wish to refer is the question of naval barracks. I entirely agree with the necessity for naval barracks. Nothing in my experience or remembrance strikes me so much as the entire change of naval opinion with reference to this question. I remember, when I raised this question forty years ago, I was assailed on all sides. The Admiralty are wiser now, and have adopted a system of naval barracks at the ports; but that is not the point. Do not let us exaggerate the amount of accommodation necessary at these barracks. I think my hon. friend will find that in a great number of these naval barracks hardly anyone is in them at night. The practice is to deal with the men as if they were in a ship in harbour, and to give them liberty for the night. If we turn to the

parent establishment at Whale Island, I think we will find that very few men remain in the bar-racks at night. I do not assert this as a fact because I have not been there at night, but I think it will be found to be accurate. If it is to be the rule that the men are to be treated in the barracks as if they were on ship in harbour, I think we ought to modify our expenditure in that direction. I trust it is sufficient for me to call attention to the fact, as an element of serious consideration. If the practice is as I have stated, it will not be necessary to provide accommodation for more than half the number of men that will occupy the barracks during the day. I trust my hon. friend will look into this matter. I again congratulate him on his clear statement, and I also congratulate the Admiralty on their two new works, which are most desirable and most necessary; I mean the million that is to be spent on the breakwater at Malta and the million that is to be spent in increasing the coaling facilities of the Navy.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Every year the introduction of these Estimates makes the position of our country a graver and a sadder one. From the joint of view of the Empire they may contain a great deal that is necessary, but the system under which they are introduced practically denies any advantage whatever to our country from His Majesty's Navy, though we are compelled to contribute to this enormous and bloated expenditure. I am sometimes appalled when I think what the future taxation of our country will be. In addition to that you have introduced a new system, which is wholly unjust, and which has been adopted for the purpose of promoting this annual bloated expenditure. I really do not know where parliamentary economists or Irishmen will be if this system is allowed to continue. What makes the matter infinitely worse is that these Bills, which are now recognised very properly as the most important Bills of the session, are introduced in thin and jaded Houses, when the bulk of the Members are away; and worse still, these Bills do make charges, not by way of taxation, but by way of loan. That is a most insidious and unjust and indefensible method of raising money. Formerly a Member of Parliament had some security that when he saw the Estimates of the year he had before him, in black and white, some idea of the charges that were to be put upon the country. But now this system had grown up, which was initiated by a Liberal Government, under which we actually do not know where we stand. We have now a proposal before us involving twenty-seven millions, to be borrowed by way of loan. One would think that these loans were never to be paid back. Ministers say, "Oh, it is only a loan"; but who will have to repay them? We will have to repay our share. One of the most valuable Returns ever presented to Parliament was presented last year upon the motion of the hon. Member for Great Yarmouth. We hear a great deal of the loyalty of the Empire and the advantages to Ireland of its connection with the Empire. The Return of the hon. and gallant Baronet is a most pregnant Return. What support do the great self-governing colonies give to the maintenance of the Navy as compared with Ireland? The Return issued on 6th December, 1900, showed that at the time when this Empire was supposed to be reeling under the shock of the South African War, when it was threatened with foreign menace, when we were told that the Empire was being run by Australian bushmen and scrub-whackers from New Zealand,

we find our great self-governing colonies; each of them gold-producing; now being honoured by a visit from the future heir to the throne and his amiable consort; that these great self-governing colonies, which are the glory of the Empire and the brightest diadems in the Crown, only make a contribution of £124,000, while a million is demanded from unhappy Ireland. The hon. and gallant Gentleman, himself an Irish landlord, permits, without protest, this new system to be established, and does not even make the reasonable demand that if we have to pay this immense sum some proportion of it should be spent in our country.

SIR JOHN COLOMB: I do not think this is the time or place or occasion for doing so; but I have taken every possible opportunity of expressing the strong feeling I entertain that the colonies should contribute to the expense of the Navy.

*MR. T. M. HEALY: There never is a proper opportunity for an Irish Conservative to say a word for his country. When an Irish Conservative is supposed to say a word in regard to the naval expenditure of the country it is at election times, when there is a contest going on in the city of Derry or Belfast. When the hon. Member for West Belfast was brought into the Admiralty we were all given to understand by reading the loyalist papers in Belfast and in Derry that a new era of naval expenditure and of naval dockyard extension was going to open in our country. I forget the name of the distinguished loyalist, the son of an Irish peer, who went down to Derry on the occasion of a vacancy in that city two years ago, and promised in solemn terms that if he were returned for the city dockyards and shipbuilding yards, equal to those at Portsmouth or elsewhere in the south of England, would be established in the city of Derry. That Conservative son of a peer was returned; the first time a Conservative had been elected for Derry for many years; but there were no dockyards and no shipbuilding yards. The hon. Member for West Belfast has got his place in the Ministry, and we look at the barren total of expenditure in Belfast which has been the result of the hon. Gentleman's admission to the Ministry, or in the city of Derry by the adoption by the city of Derry of a Conservative Member. The mere result that we have got for these great changes in the political situation in Ireland is £450 for a zymotic hospital at Highbowline! The great naval policy of His Majesty's Government for the benefit of Ireland is that some poor seamen, I suppose, will get a little extra gruel or broth at Highbowline. When you compare the expenditure in this country and what we hear at other times of the great strategic value of Ireland to England and its enormous importance, the thing is a farce. According to the Prime Minister we must not allow a naval plant to be set up in Ireland from the fear that some foreign ship would anchor in the neighbourhood of Ireland. Why, one British ship in the harbour of Dublin or the harbour of Galway could, with the enormous range of modern guns, practically sweep the country from end to end. I want to know, if Ireland is of so much importance to England for strategic purposes, how this shower of gold is to be poured from the purse of the Exchequer on Hong Kong, Wei-hai-wei, Honolulu, and Simonstown (two and a half millions are to be spent on the latter alone), on Villetta, etc., while the one place which gets no benefit is this little island of Ireland, which is so

large a contributor to the British Exchequer. Of course it would be the same if I were discussing the Military Works Bill, although I admit that, on account of the military system, there may be shown some little military expenditure in Ireland. But as to the naval expenditure year after year, which we are asked to contemplate and to contribute to, our country gets practically in return as much as would run the establishment of an ordinary merchant in the City of London.

The men who

make these projects and make up these estimates live in London and think of their own country. I am not blaming them, but attacking the system. They are anxious that the wealth derived from the three kingdoms should go for the benefit of England alone. There is the case of Gibraltar. The hon. Member for King's Lynn says that you have built a dock or a harbour at the wrong side. He is an Englishman. You are Englishmen. What security have we that our money is going on the wrong or the right side? We have to stand by and see our money taken from our depleted country, while we know that not one fraction of benefit is derived by us from this method of taxation. Then there is "Gibraltar Commercial Mole, £;669,000." Why, if we ask for a boat-slip at Tramore, or that a harbour should be dredged out, or that a pier should be erected at Ballycotton we are refused it, while this sum of £;669,000 is to be spent on a commercial mole at Gibraltar.

MR. PRETYMAN: If the hon. and learned Gentleman looks at the schedule he will see that the colony pays for that itself.

MR. T. M. HEALY: It is only to pay four-sevenths of the cost.

MR. PRETYMAN: But the remainder is to be spent for naval station purposes.

MR. T. M. HEALY: But why should we provide three-sevenths of the cost of this commercial mole at Gibraltar? These people are largely Spaniards, and with all my love for Spain I decline to contribute the money of Ireland, which we need so much ourselves, for the benefit of Spaniards. We want to dredge our harbours before making harbours and moles for the people of Gibraltar. The fact is there is not in the Ministry one man who ever looks on Ireland from the point of view of a shepherd, who pretends to take an interest in Ireland. Their hands are too full of all kinds of petty details to enable them to traverse the country with the eye of a friend, or of a father of his country, and to provide for her interests. There is no one charged with that mission in the country, while His Majesty's magnificent Civil Service have their eyes and ears open in every portion of the world except on that impoverished portion of the Empire from which you draw so large a tribute in the way of expenditure. If this had been an isolated Bill I would not have opposed it, and I could quite understand that an expenditure of ten, fifteen, or twenty millions might be necessary on a sudden emergency when the Empire has to be protected and cared for. But what do we find? We find that this is not the mushroom of a single session, but has become a method, a portion of the parliamentary constitution, and that year after year, in response to the clamour of;I do not want to say anything disrespectful to the Navy League, because I do not know any of the gentlemen on it;but in response to the clamour of the particular Services;even if you know that you are getting value for your money, which I doubt;these bloated Estimates

are continued. There is a very significant note by the Minister for Agriculture showing how the expenditure is controlled. The right hon. Gentleman, when he was at the Treasury, had to address a remonstrance to the Navy Department because they had made an error of a quarter of a million in an Estimate, and had not the decency to communicate to the Treasury that they were making an additional demand on the Treasury for that amount.

*MR. SPEAKER: I remind the hon. Member that the Naval Works Bill is under discussion, and that debate on the control of the Treasury over the Navy is not pertinent to the subject before the House.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I do not wish to pursue the subject. My point is that you have established a system which is growing beyond the control of Parliament, and that, in my judgment, it is a vicious system. You have begun a system of compartment Estimates which should be presented in the Supplemental and Annual Estimates of the year. Knowing the importance of the Navy to England, I can well understand that the naval experts; who appear to me to be like the daughter of the horse-leech, always asking for more; press their views on the Government, and that the Govern-men are reluctant to resist their constantly growing demands for increased expenditure. But I would ask this, who was it set this policy going; who has turned European seas into practically a lake for naval manœuvres? It is the policy of England which has done it. It is you who have driven Russia, France, and Germany and all the maritime Powers of the world to enlarge and increase their armaments; and with all your increased armaments you have not yet made up your mind as to whom you are going to fight. This is a sad thing to the representatives of a poor country like Ireland. Year after year you expend tens of thousands of pounds on your armaments, and some new invention comes along which renders the whole expenditure waste and alters the whole system of defence. That is what we hear from day to day in regard to the French submarines; if you are to believe half the stories you hear. Opposing as I do the entire system, doubtful as I am of the entire policy, I do say that the country from which you draw a large portion of your annual expenditure is entitled to something like decent and fair consideration when this expenditure has to be made. We have got none of it. In passing this Bill we see millions dangled before our eyes for the benefit of Hong Kong, Honolulu, Wei-hai-wei, Gibraltar, Malta, and Simons Town, and we demand that we should get a portion as our share.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I think the ground on which this Amendment stands is not a good ground. If it be necessary to have this expenditure for the purposes of national defence; it is true that it has been introduced late, very late, and it would have been very much better to have introduced it earlier; but if this expenditure is required, any time is good enough for it. My objection to the Bill is based on very different lines. It is, first of all, that this Bill is an elaboration and exaggeration of an entirely new policy entered upon without adequate inquiry as to its effects; and, secondly, that the Bill represents an extremely unfortunate method of asking for money from the House. The proper method is an annual Vote.

The great objection to this method which has been adopted was frankly stated by

the hon. and gallant Member who introduced the Bill, who said that when once the House has agreed to a Bill like this, which sanctions an expenditure of £27,500,000, the House has parted with its control over the expenditure of the money, and that, having sanctioned it, it would be absurd not to provide it. The hon. and gallant Member justifies the Bill by saying that for many years the Government have not taken sufficient sums for Votes in Supply for these works. That is what I complain of. My point is that if you want money for works you should take it by Votes. I do not say that no Bill of this kind should ever be introduced. It, should, however, be a very occasional Bill. But this Bill is a repeated Bill, first annually, and then biennially. My grave objection to this enormous expenditure is that there has been nothing like an inquiry into the policy that underlies it. In 1860, when it was proposed to fortify the dockyards, Lord Palmerston appointed a strong Committee, which held an investigation, made inquiries, and presented a Report. Only twelve millions was then involved, but the Bill before the House now involves an expenditure of £27,500,000, and it is becoming more. With no inquiry as in 1860, I can feel no confidence in the Admiralty sufficient to justify me or the House in leaving it alone with the vicious Works Department, which overshadows the whole of the rest of the Admiralty. Every year blunders and mistakes have been committed by them. There was the Alderney breakwater, which had afterwards to be blown up, and the remains were washed away by the sea. There was the Ordnance Department; there were the Spithead forts, which were not a success. There is scarcely a department with which we had spent money on works of this kind with which gigantic mistakes have not been committed. The principle underlying the policy of this Bill is that we are beginning to believe in bricks and mortar more than in ships and men. It used to be said that;

"Britannia needs no bulwarks,

No towers along the steep.

Her march is on the ocean wave.

Her home is on the deep,"

But apparently her home is now either in barracks or in a battleship tied up to a wall of concrete blocks. As to the bulwarks, we want six millions for towers over sea. The bottom of the whole of his new brick-and-mortar policy was the torpedo panic. No doubt the torpedo is a horrible invention, and it has been increased in efficiency and its range has been increased from 400 to 3,000 yards. The Admiralty, however, are not adopting the right method of protecting His Majesty's ships from torpedoes. What torpedo-boats can do other torpedo-boats can reply to. The proper defence against the torpedo is to be at sea and going at a good speed. So if ships are in harbour they should be protected by a stream of torpedo-destroyers. There is nothing so demoralising to ships and crews as keeping them in a safe harbour. Lord St. Vincent once said that "lying at anchor in the Tagus would make cowards of us all." Are the Admiralty sure that keeping battleships in harbour will not make cowards of their crews? The qualities of the British sailor and officer are such that they would be inclined to desert closed harbours and get to sea, which I believe to be their true defence.

In my belief enormous mistakes have been made already in regard to this policy, but in no place have the mistakes of the Admiralty been so great as at Gibraltar. In 1895 it was proposed to make a single dock to extend the existing mole, and to construct a detached mole and a commercial mole at Gibraltar. The total cost of the scheme was to be £1,500,000. The hon. and gallant Gentleman quoted my opinion, which I held then, as I do now, that under the circumstances it was better to have a dock with risks than no dock at all. But the hon. and gallant Gentleman did not quote me fully. When Mr. (now Viscount) Goschen proposed that instead of one dock there should be three, with a large enclosed area, and raised the expenditure from £1,500,000 to £1,500,000, I denounced it as a waste of public money, and I so denounce it now. Even the 1895 scheme was one which at the time I should have felt hesitation in agreeing to had I known then all that I know now. The House will excuse me if I dwell for a moment on the real nature of the problem connected with the works at Gibraltar. The place is an enormously important strategic station for our Fleet. I do not believe that Wei-hai-wei and Bombay are important strategic stations. I believe Ceylon, Singapore, Malta, and Gibraltar are. The strategic importance of Gibraltar absolutely cannot be exaggerated. The whole Mediterranean holds to it; in some respects, the Channel itself. Then let us consider the situation stated, not by myself, but by every expert. It is that unless we are at peace with France and Spain our works on the western side of Gibraltar are absolutely untenable; while on the eastern side we have an opportunity of making works which are not, theoretically, exempt from being fired at, but which, practically, are so safe that we are told by one of the greatest gunnery experts that not one shot in a thousand would hit works there. By creating on the western side of Gibraltar and adding to it these vulnerable works; docks, storehouses, and workshops; Gibraltar has been made a source, not of strength, but of weakness. It has been admitted that if the western side is to be defended, it must be by an army of 30,000 or 40,000 men sent out from England to occupy the Spanish shores whence it would be attacked. What does that mean? That Gibraltar is no longer capable of protecting itself independently of any army, and that it can only defend itself under three conditions; that France is friendly to us, also Spain, and that we must have an army of 30,000 or 40,000 men. It is quite true that there is a chain of fortresses along the northern frontier to protect it from an attack by France; but in the present temper of Spain, made worse as it has been by things that have been said and done in this country that had better have been avoided; not by me, for, on the contrary, in my small way I have done what I could to remove an evil impression; in the present temper of Spain and the dislike of England that exists among all the Latin races, friendly action could not be relied upon. It is quite certain; it was avowed to me by a Spaniard of some consideration; that Spain would not resist France taking possession of the Spanish railways and running down their troops to attack Gibraltar from the land side. This weakness at Gibraltar is a weakness which tells even more in time of peace than in time of war, because in time of peace plans and bargains are being made against us; and when any foreign country or

combination of foreign countries comes to the consideration of this weak spot at Gibraltar with this enormous portion of toasted cheese outside the rat trap for every rat to nibble at; that will tell against us. It becomes an element in the calculation against us instead of for us. My hon. and gallant friend drew a picture of the levanter on the east side of the Rock, and gave that as a reason why the works should not be constructed there; but will he be prepared to learn that Admiral Rawson has testified that the levanter is worse on the west than on the east side, That evidence was confirmed by other authorities, and local knowledge shows that neither wind nor sea comes home on the east side, except upon the flat at Europa Point. The wind breaks against the high rocks and forms a cushion, but never forms a sea. Another delusion that the water is too deep for works has been dispelled. The Committee estimated the cost at £;4,000,000, and I believe it would be much less; and an experienced contractor told me that he would undertake to make the harbour on the east side for two millions. Certainly I do not think my hon. and gallant friend is justified in doubling the estimate of the expert Committee. The expert Committee said that it would cost £;4,000,000; my hon. and gallant friend said it would cost £;10,000,000; the expert Committee said it could be made in ten years, he said that it would take twenty years. My complaint is that the Government have known the facts for years, but never would accept them. I have not discovered the facts contained in his statement; they have been before the Government in the most formal and authoritative manner for years. In 1894 Colonel Buckle, R.E., in a report to the Governor of Gibraltar said;

"With an enemy on the hills to the northwest of Gibraltar the western bay and face of Gibraltar; and that constitutes the whole town, anchorage, and dockyard; would be untenable. It is absolutely necessary to make a harbour on the eastern side. It should be done quickly if England is to have a safe naval base in the vicinity."

Then on 1st May, 1900, General Sir J. Ardagh wrote that;

"the change caused by the increased range of artillery has not yet been realised or provided against. The whole of the Rock, except the Mediterranean fide, is within range of attack by land."

On 28th December, 1900, Sir R. Bid-dulph, Governor of Gibraltar, wrote;

"The danger to which the west front, harbour, and dockyard are exposed is inadequately provided for."

On 4th February, 1901, Major-General Slade, Commander of the Artillery at Gibraltar, and Colonel J. M. Lewis said;

"that the west side was a tempting objective for an enemy's attack."

These are the foremost military authorities. Then it was said by them that in order to hold Gibraltar under present conditions there was only one possible means, and that was to land a separate army of all arms from England to hold the shores from Tarifa to the East Beach; a country 600 square miles in extent. "If, under present conditions, you do not hold the camps you cannot hold Gibraltar."

That Report was made on the 4th of February, 1901, and confirmed the same month by General Sir George White, who said that the fire from an enemy's guns would be paralysing; but he dwelt even more strongly on the difficulty, if not

impossibility, of dismounting the enemy's guns on shore.

I think I have made out my case; not on my own authority, but from official reports; that the western side of Gibraltar is untenable. My hon. and gallant friend criticised the photograph contained in my pamphlet, but I think he has confused the localities somewhat. The positions are correctly marked, the end of the dock being under Monkey's Cave. There is a consensus of expert opinion to justify my assertion that the western side of Gibraltar is untenable, and much more evidence would be found in the pigeon-holes of the Admiralty, the War Office, and the Foreign Office. A memorandum given to me showed the reasons that had influenced the Admiralty in favour of the western side. It was desired to have a harbour closed against torpedo attack. That I do not think a proper defence; but, whether it is so or not, that closed harbour exists, and I do not propose to interfere with it, and that reason may be dismissed. Then it was said the east side did not offer immunity from artillery fire; but expert opinion was that not one shell in a thousand would probably reach the works, while the Committee reported that the danger on the west was fourteen times as great. Of course it was from the land that the danger of attack arose, and the Admiralty reasons for thinking the works safer and better placed on the west seem to me altogether inadequate. I have quoted authorities, and these are confirmed by the unanimous Report of the Gibraltar Committee after the fullest inquiry and utmost efforts to obtain full acquaintance with the whole problem. The Committee reported unanimously that No. 2 Dock on the western side should be abandoned, that a third of the workshops should be abandoned, and that all the storehouses on the western side should be abandoned. It also recommended that a harbour with a dock should be built on the eastern side. As to the building of that harbour, we said it was imperative and absolutely necessary, and very strong language was used in regard to it in the unanimous Report. Then there came the intermediate proposal to which I refused to agree, but the final and non-unanimous was practically the same as the original Report. It also recommended that No. 2 Dock should be abandoned, with the proviso, amounting to nothing, that if any very serious delay was likely to occur before the completion of the harbour and dock on the eastern side No. 2 dock should be continued. It also recommended that one-third of the workshops and also the storehouses should be abandoned. It recommended the harbour on the eastern side, called it a necessity, and said it was of the utmost importance. Therefore, practically, the unanimous interim and non-unanimous final Reports recommended broadly the same thing. Every Report known to me, and I think all are known; unless perhaps there be Reports at the Foreign Office, of which I have a shrewd suspicion; every Report and every authority is agreed as to the danger of the western side of Gibraltar, and the absolute necessity of building a harbour on the eastern side. In the face of all this what did the Government do? On 27th June last they announced that they were going to continue and complete the bulk of the work contemplated on the western side of the Rock, including No. 2 Dock, and that, as to the eastern side, they were about to institute careful surveys, and would then consider whether they would spend money on it or on some other

service. They have gone even further now, for they are going now to increase the expenditure on the dangerous western side. There is a considerable sum down for work on the western side, thereby increasing its danger and accessibility.

MR. PRETYMAN: A large part of the expenditure has reference to the suggestion of the hon. Member and others as to the eastern side. The reservoir is to be on the eastern side, and the quarters for the dockyard staff are to be built on the north face of the Rock.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Where are the magazines to be?

MR. PRETYMAN: Inside the Rock.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Has not the hon. and gallant Gentleman absolutely given away his case? He is putting the reservoir on the eastern side, where it would be safe; that is, where the dock and harbour should be; and he is going to put the magazines inside the Rock. Pro tanto the statement of the hon. and gallant Gentleman is an admission that the Report and authorities I have cited to the effect that the western side is the dangerous side are accurate, because he has not put the water or the magazines there. On the 27th June the First Lord of the Admiralty told us that he had received the Report of this Gibraltar Commission. The House has seen a portion of that Report, it has seen an eviscerated edition of it, but the House has not seen; and I do not say it was possible that it should see; the very grave and serious reasons which actuated the Commission in making their Report. But the Government has seen those reasons. The First Lord knew them, yet what happened? The First Lord went down to the House of Lords and told the House of Lords, forsooth, that he had decided against this Commission, composed of the best soldier, the best sailor, the best engineer, and the worst Member of Parliament. On what sort of evidence was that decision based? First of all, that he was not quite sure what the eastern harbour would cost, and, secondly, that when he went to Gibraltar he had the advantage of meeting Mr. Stevens, the master attendant, who told him that he disapproved of the whole scheme. Mr. Stevens is one of the most able and excellent men of his class. He is the pilot who takes the vessels in and out of the mole; but he has never had it as his business to deal with politics or strategy; nor did he have before him any of the information put before the Commission. It is little less than ridiculous, therefore, for the First Lord of the Admiralty to make Mr. Stevens a court of appeal against a Commission composed of the members I have mentioned. Now, I frankly confess that I have arrived at the conviction that the Government always meant, whatever the Report of the Commission might be, to refuse to take any action; that they always meant to take precisely the course they have taken; to go on with the western works and to consider *sine die* about the eastern works. That opinion has grown on me. From the very first I observed that the First Lord absolutely refused to suspend any works on the western side. What he said was, "I will consider whether it is a blunder to make the works on the western side; but meantime I shall go on with them. If it is not a blunder it will be all right." There is another point I wish to state, and that is that from the first to the last of this whole Gibraltar business; I am only saying now behind the First Lord's back what I have told him to his face; I have not been treated with that candour and good faith which I had a right to expect. The

House shall judge. The House will remember my motion of the 25th of February, which I subsequently withdrew on the promise of the right hon. Gentleman. A few days before that motion came on I was privately approached, and asked whether if an inquiry were granted I would join it myself. I naturally wrote to the First Lord of the Admiralty, and said that before consenting to join the inquiry I should like to know what sort of an inquiry it would be. The answer was;and I have it in his own handwriting;that it would be a Committee of three, or if I joined it of four, that the reference of the Committee was still to draw, and that the Committee would report to the Admiralty, who would retain the right to publish the Report or not. Observe there was to be a reference, there was to be a Committee, and there was to be a Report. On that letter, I withdrew my motion and agreed to join the Committee, and I felt very grateful to the Government. Then the whole thing suddenly changed. What was my amazement, three days after I withdrew my motion, when the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House got up in this House and said that there was neither to be a Commission nor a Committee, that there was to be no reference and no Report. The House will understand that I then began to contract fears as to the result of the whole thing. I addressed another letter to the First Lord of the Admiralty pointing out the extreme danger of so amorphous a body not arriving at any settled conclusions, and of not being able to enforce them. I said that in this new state of things I must reserve my right at a given moment to make a full and ample statement to the House of Commons. That statement I am now making. Again, when the Committee returned to London a strange thing happened. On the 13th June last I said "The Committee came possibly under official influence." That was not correct. I now say it came certainly and undoubtedly not only under official influence, but under official orders. I say that distinctly, and I will tell the House what I mean. At our meeting on the 27th of April in London, it was decided that we should call certain engineers and contractors to give evidence with reference to contracts. Admiral Rawson, although it was not a Committee and had no chairman, acted as a sort of leader, and his secretary did all the writing. When we met on May 2nd he informed the Committee that he had seen the First Lord of the Admiralty, that the First Lord held that the question of contracts was not before us, and that consequently we were not to call engineers or contractors as witnesses. I call that exercising official influence, and interfering with the action of the Commission in its own way of doing its own work. We had arranged to call certain witnesses, but "No," says the First Lord, "you are not to call them." The First Lord is, in an Admiral's opinion, above and beyond this world, and Admiral Rawson had no choice but to obey. But that is not all. On 3rd May we debated the question of storehouses, and a difference of recollection afterwards arose between Admiral Rawson and myself as to what had occurred, and I thereupon appealed to the shorthand writer's notes. Admiral Rawson said he should like to give me the shorthand writer's notes, but he could not give them without the consent of the First Lord of the Admiralty. The First Lord refused his consent;that I call official interference;and to this day I am still refused the shorthand notes of my own proceedings. Consequently I am entirely debarred from

ascertaining whether Admiral Rawson or myself was right in our recollection, as that could only be verified by these notes. When it came to a question of verification I had undoubtedly a right to the record of the proceedings in which I had taken a part.

Now I come to the draft Report. My hon. and gallant friend spoke of my rejection of that Report as if it were an act of temper on my part. No, Sir, it was an act of policy. The original Report was to abandon No. 2 Dock, to abandon a third of the workshops, and all the storehouses on the western side, and to build a harbour and dock on the eastern side. The draft Report submitted to me was, "Do not abandon No. 2 Dock; go on and complete it; partly continue the storehouses, and abandon a third of the workshops. The essential difference was this: that whereas in the unanimous Report it was recommended that No. 2 Dock should be abandoned, the draft Report recommended that it should be completed. I have always held and have said in this House that the great mistake in connection with these

Gibraltar works was made by Lord Goschen. It was his exaggeration of the works and his refusal to listen to arguments against them that has brought about this great danger. After we had returned home it was proposed to me that I should sign this sentence: "Lord Goschen was quite right in increasing the works in 1896." I was not prepared to whitewash Lord Goschen. I think he was at the bottom of most of the mischief, and I hold that he made one of the greatest mistakes possible. My hon. and gallant friend says I should have remained on the Committee and signed a Minority Report. What would have happened? I said to myself, "I shall be outvoted, and if I make a Minority Report it will not naturally have the same importance as the Majority Report. But if I resign what will happen will be that the other members will probably reconsider this proposed draft Report, and, as sailors say, 'walk it back.'" That is exactly what happened. When I did resign, the Committee apparently reconsidered their Report, and so altered it back again as to make it very nearly approach what the original Report was.

I am drawing my incontinently long remarks to a close. I am extremely sorry to bring these personal matters forward. It has become rather a personal matter, but its importance does not lie in the personalities imported into it. It lies in this: that His Majesty's Government have never dealt with complete candour in this matter. In my belief, after the First Lord of the Admiralty had become convinced of the dangers of the western side and of the necessity of making a harbour on the eastern side; as I think he must have been by all the Reports I have quoted; he was weaned back and lost his faith, perhaps by the action of that overweening Works Department, and withdrew from the resolution he had made. One word before I finish. I have said that the Committee came under official influence and orders. That I have proved. But let it not be supposed that I suggest that that official influence was used in order to induce the Committee to alter their Report. That I do not say. I have shown, I submit, that both official influence and official orders were used, but

I by no means say that they went so far as to induce the Commissioners to alter their Report, and, in fact, in the end they did not materially alter it. The

final Report was very much the same as that agreed to at Gibraltar. Although, so far as I know, every one of the competent military authorities agree with me in the views I have taken about Gibraltar, I am perfectly well aware there are men opposed to me. I believe that the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean is opposed to me, and I saw a statement a little time ago that Lord Charles Beresford did not agree with me, and Mr. Stevens is also opposed to me. I am sorry for that, but I still believe that I am right, and the reason I believe I am right is that the more I examine into this matter the more I see that only one opinion is entertained by competent military authorities regarding it. I can assure the House I have given much time and trouble to this matter, because I felt that it was of the greatest national importance. But if it were a matter of importance when I took it up, it is of far greater importance and significance now. My right hon. friend I am sure knows; if he does not know I will venture to assert it now in the face of the House; that not once or twice, but many times during the last two years certain Powers of Europe have come together with the suggestion of a combination against this country. I assert that. I know not what the course of events may be during the next few months, nor what further temptations or further opportunity may again tempt the same or other Powers to come together with the proposal of combined action against this country. Into their calculations Gibraltar must enter, and Gibraltar will enter into the survey of the question as an element, as I have said, not of strength, as it should, but of weakness against us. That would result in the creation, I fear, of serious times and possibly of serious danger to this country. If it were the case that Gibraltar was important when its defences were reported on in 1894 by Captain Buckle, in 1900 by Sir John Ardagh, in 1900 by Sir R. Biddulph, in 1891 by Major-General Slade, and again in 1901 by Sir George White; if it was important to us then that we should lose no time in strengthening our position in Gibraltar, it is far more important now. I have conducted this business with many imperfections and shortcomings, but I have done my best. Again and again I have gone to the Government with reference to this very serious and important question before taking any steps in this House, and it was only because I had been unable to get any satisfaction from the Government that I was at last compelled to take public action. I feel, whatever this House may decide, that at least I have done my duty, and I only hope that the Government, before it is too late, will take such action as will restore Gibraltar to the position it ought to hold.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): At this time of the year we ought to try to be as short as we possibly can. The real question before the House this afternoon is what course we are to take on the Bill which has been presented to us by the Government. I shall have a word to say with regard to Gibraltar later on, but my reference will be very brief indeed, because I think the arguments put before us ought not to affect the vote we are to give on this Bill. I quite admit that if we want to carp and make small criticisms, even criticisms of some importance, but which do not go to the root of the matter, ground may be found for voting against the Second Reading. I admit that the Bill

is very late. It ought to have been introduced earlier by the Government, and possibly the management of business may have been productive of its lateness. But I was sorry to hear my hon. friend the Member for Dundee mention that as a ground why the official Opposition is going to oppose the Bill to-day. It seems to me that is an entirely insufficient argument for voting against the Bill, and if lateness only can be alleged it is not proper to take that course.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The reason why I made that suggestion was because of the new works.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Malta is one of the largest items. Is my hon. friend prepared to take the responsibility of voting against the work at Malta, and of saying that his opinion and the opinion of laymen like ourselves ought to prevail against the opinion of the advisers of the Admiralty? That seems to me to be a most dangerous argument. It strikes at the very root of Bills of this kind, and not only against the Bill, but against the Works Vote. The hon. Member for West Islington has well-known views on this subject, which we all respect. Some of us think that he is wrong, and that he has not got to the root of the matter. He said just now in moving his Amendment that each of these Bills was a conspiracy.

MR. LOUGH: I think the right hon. Baronet ought to read the sentence. I did not intend anything like that. I meant a conspiracy of extravagance.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Then it is a conspiracy of extravagance which the hon. Member for Dundee inaugurated, because the first of those Bills was his. The starting of the system was by the hon. Member, and so far as the question of amount is concerned, this Bill is less important than previous Bills, because the new items are smaller. I said there were many points which might be urged against the Bill, if we wished to take small points of criticism. We ought to have been told how much is to be spent in the present year under this Bill and the Military Works Bill. We have had no estimate of that. I agree with my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Yarmouth; these are not his words, but this is their effect; that there is in all these Bills certain evidence of the absence of a directing mind in the two great Departments responsible for these measures, and an absence of evidence that the Committee of Defence of the Cabinet has really considered these questions; but, unless we can adequately criticise the particular items from that point of view, I do not think that that is a sufficient reason for voting against the Bill. What are the criticisms in detail which have been directed against the items in this measure? The hon. Member for King's Lynn says that the money which is to be spent in Hong Kong ought to have been spent on the mainland. There, I thought, there was a certain amount of doubt in the mind of the Civil Lord of the Admiralty. I confess I did not quite understand the grounds on which he said the whole reserve of coal was to be placed on the mainland. It seems to me that his argument that it would be difficult to defend a naval establishment on the mainland was a reason for not placing the reserve depot of coal there. I am told that there is to be combination on the Second Reading of this Bill by Members holding very different views. Some hon. Members intend to vote against the Second Reading, because the Bill is late, and some on grounds of economy, like the hon. Member for West

Islington, and the Irish and Welsh Members, will vote against it because of their special views as to where the money ought to be spent. We all understand the views of the Irish Members, who object to all expenditure of this kind. But the views put forward by the hon. Member who spoke for them this afternoon, and the views put forward by Welsh and Scotch Members, are wholly untenable. It is impossible to contend that in the naval expenditure of this country we select Pembroke because it is in Wales, or some other particular station because it is in Ireland; and it is a curious fact that the point which the Welsh Members have in view is caused by the very fact that the Navy prefers Irish bases, and the Military Works Bill is largely concerned with the establishment of an important base in Ireland. That policy is continued in the present Bill, but these points ought not to weigh with the House of Commons. I would ask hon. Members why money is expended on Simon's Bay or at Hong Kong. It goes to Simon's Bay because it is our naval base at the Cape, and on the route to India and Australia in time of war. Money goes to Hong Kong because that is our base for fighting preparations in the Far East. All these local considerations are unworthy of the attention of the House. The hon. Member for King's Lynn delivered a very powerful speech. His speeches always are powerful, and make a very considerable impression on those who hear them. I am sure that some hon. Members will vote against this Bill because, basing themselves on the authority of my hon. friend, they will believe that, if a

mistake has been made in one particular case, they are right in assuming that this expenditure is of a wasteful kind. The hon. Member for King's Lynn seems to me to have changed his ground since he first took up the question of Gibraltar. I was very much interested in the question, because I got up a deputation to Lord Rosebery on the subject in 1893 or 1894, and I was one of those who very strongly pressed the creation of docks in Gibraltar at that time. At that time the hon. Member was a strong partisan of the creation of one dock, and when I heard his right hon. friend and colleague the present President of the Board of Agriculture propose "docks" in the plural I confess I thought he was acting in collusion with the hon. Member, but it appears that I was wrong. At all events, the hon. Member was at that time a strong partisan of a dock at Gibraltar. When he wrote his pamphlet and made his first speech on the subject his allegation was that the circumstances had wholly changed. He alleges now that political circumstances had grown grave, but what he then alleged was that the purely military and technical circumstances had changed. That I was prepared to deny. His ground was that the Boer war had shown the invisibility and mobility of modern ordnance.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: It was not the military situation which had changed, but the knowledge of the capacity of modern ordnance.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I am certain that the Admiralty were aware of all the facts from the first. They were discussed at the private deputation to Lord Rosebery, and at a conference which many Members of this House had with the advisers of the Government after the deputation. The only new point which is even alleged by any person who knows the details is that, although we knew that 9-inch guns would be invisible and mobile, and that the docks would be under easy fire from

guns which possibly could not be easily located, we thought that such guns would require beds of concrete which would take six months to prepare. It is not so.

That is the only new fact. There-fore

the House must discuss the question from the point of view that the military circumstances have not changed by reason of what has occurred in South Africa.

As regards the political situation, it is a very difficult matter to discuss.

The Government cannot discuss it, and even private Members are only able to discuss it with the greatest possible reserve. It is obvious that in the event of a general war Spain would think twice before joining our enemies. Spain would be likely not only to be neutral, but to defend her neutrality. She has nothing to gain by joining our enemies, because if she made Gibraltar untenable for us Spain would not be able to gain possession of it herself. There are other obvious considerations which would make it unlikely that Spain would join our enemies for the purpose of attacking Gibraltar, or open her country for the purpose of allowing the passage of an army hostile to us.

The hon. Member for West Islington objects to all this expenditure; he wants to reduce it. The hon. Member for King's Lynn wishes to greatly increase it. How much does the hon. Member for King's Lynn say could be saved on the west side of Gibraltar? As I understood him, his underlying impression is that very little money indeed would be saved on the western side, but enormous expenditure would be incurred on the eastern side. It is quite possible that the hon. Member or King's Lynn might tempt me to follow him in recommending expenditure on the eastern side, but he would not have the support of the hon. Member for West Islington, because he objects to all expenditure on new works, and I am inclined to agree with the Government that the expenditure on the eastern side would be very heavy indeed. I do not say that it should not be undertaken. I am very sensible of the importance of Gibraltar as a naval base. I believe it to be essential for the Mediterranean Fleet, but I cannot join with the hon. Member for King's Lynn in minimising the expenditure an establishment upon the east side would involve. He estimates it can be done for less than half the amount estimated by the responsible advisers of the Government. My hon. friend said that a mole could be

erected on the eastern side because the seas are not heavy on that side. I know something of the Mediterranean coast. A cushion of air does not prevent breakers striking on the shore and moving great rocks. I know the shore of Gibraltar, and I believe the expenditure on the eastern side would be very great. I can congratulate the hon. Member for West Islington in having obtained the hon. Member for King's Lynn as a recruit against this Bill. Those who will oppose the Bill will oppose it on varying grounds indeed, but I want to ask the House to consider that this is expenditure which the advisers of the Admiralty think necessary for the safety of the Fleet. All the opponents of the Bill, with the exception of the Irish Members, favour naval as contrasted with military expenditure. We are all agreed that the present expenditure of the country is enormously great, but the expenditure in this Bill is mainly for things which are necessary to a mobile fleet. It is not to be expended in mere "bricks and mortar," but in docks and coaling facilities which our Fleet absolutely needs. I

confess I have not heard any argument advanced which should lead the House to disapprove of the Bill.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I cannot help thinking that, at all events as far as the advocacy of this Bill is concerned, the speech to which we have just listened and the very able statement of my hon. friend in introducing the Second Reading of the Bill, are really quite adequate. Although I feel a little tempted to take up some of the points in the debate, I can resist that temptation because it is most desirable that the House should, if possible, come to a decision on the Bill. I quite admit that the matter has derived unexpected importance since the Opposition have officially informed us that they are opposed to the new works in the Bill.

[Opposition cries of "No!"] The representative of the Admiralty under the Liberal Government said so, and there was nothing in his speech to suggest that he had departed from the usual practice, which is that the ex-representative of a Department represents

the views of his colleagues on the subjects with which that Department is concerned. When I heard the hon. and learned Gentleman I supposed that he gave the opinions of those who sit with him on the bench. As long as it is clear that he did not I am content, and I hope that the House will now take a division.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) said he agreed with the First Lord of the Treasury that, in view of other business, it was desirable to take a division on this Bill, and he therefore did not propose for a moment to stand between the House and the division; but he could not allow a division to be taken without entering a protest against the expenditure proposed in the Bill. He felt bound to protest against money being spent on Gibraltar when paltry sums were refused to Ireland for the purpose of enabling the people there to earn a livelihood.

What took place on the previous day? He himself waited on the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, asking for a grant of a few thousand pounds for the improvement of the Liscannor Harbour with a view to permitting the development of an important industry; a large quarry which had been acquired by some Liverpool gentlemen, who declared that if the harbour were put into a condition to accommodate fair sized ships they could treble the output of the quarries and give three times as much employment as at present to the people in the locality. He was sympathetically listened to by the right hon. Gentleman, but the only consolation he got was the information that at present no public funds were available for the purpose, and that when some could be set free the claims of the harbour would be considered. Now he did appeal to the First Lord of the Treasury whether, if he were in a position like himself, he would not strongly protest against millions upon millions being voted for works at Gibraltar, while it was impossible to get only a few thousand pounds to meet the crying necessities of one of the poorest parts of Ireland. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would devote a few moments to considering the claims of Liscannor Harbour in the county of Clare.

Question put.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Grant, Corrie
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Balcarres, Lord
Hain, Edward.
Nicholson, William Graham
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Midd'x)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt William
Parkes, Ebenezer
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford)
Penn, John
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Pretymann, Ernest George
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Haslett, Sir James Homer

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Bignold, Arthur
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Purvis, Robert
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Randles, John S.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Heaton, John Henniker
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Brassey, Albert
Helme, Norval Watson
Reid, James (Greenock)
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Higginbottom, S. W.
Remnant, James Farquharson
Bull, William James
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Rentoul, James Alexander
Bullard, Sir Harry
Holland, William Henry
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Rigg, Richard
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Horniman, Frederick John
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Rutherford, John
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor
Hoult, Joseph
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wore'r
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)

Chapman, Edward
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Spear, John Ward
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Law, Andrew Bonar
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Lawson, John Grant
Strachey, Edward
Colville, John
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Tennant, Harold John
Crombie, John William
Levy, Maurice
Thornton, Percy M.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray
Dickson, Charles Scott
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Dike, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Valentia, Viscount
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Duke, Henry Edward
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powel (Birm.
Elibank, Master of
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks., E. R.)
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Macdona, John Cumming
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Maconochie, A. W.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
M'Kenna, Reginald
Yoxall, James Henry
Fisher, William Hayes
Majendie, James A. H.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Malcolm, Ian
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Maxwell, Rt. Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Boland, John
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Boyle, James

Burke, E. Haviland-
Bell, Richard
Broadhurst, Henry
Caldwell, James
The House divided:;Ayes, 178; Noes, 82. (Division List No 473.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leamy, Edmund
O'Malley, William
Causton, Richard Knight
Lewis, John Herbert
O'Mara, James
Cawley, Frederick
Lloyd-George, David
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Channing, Francis Allston
Lundon, W.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Clancy, John Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Reddy, M.
Cogan, Denis J.
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, William (Clare)
Crean, Eugene
M'Govern, T.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Cremer, William Randal
Moss, Samuel
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Cullinan, J.
Murnaghan, George
Roche, John
Delany, William
Murphy, John
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Dillon, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Donelan, Captain A.
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, J. (Louth, South)

Sullivan, Donal
Duffy, William J.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Field, William
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Tully, Jasper
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Ure, Alexander
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Hammond, John
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
O'Doherty, William
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Lough and Mr. Henry J. Wilson.
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Dowd, John
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Main Question put, and agreed to.
Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

MILITARY WORKS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton), in moving the Second Reading of the Military Works Bill, said he thought that, in the circumstances in which he was placed, it would be best to reserve anything he had to say until he had heard the criticisms which might be made upon the measure. He might, however, take that opportunity of answering a question addressed to him some little time ago by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean and say that the whole of the money taken under this Bill in respect of defence works was for the defence of those stations which, in the opinion of the Army and Navy, it was to their interest to defend, and was

not taken for the defence of the country presuming that an actual invasion had taken place.

SIR CHARLES DILKE: It is mainly for naval bases.

LORD STANLEY replied that that was so.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER (Walsall) said it would be somewhat of a reflection on their vigilance if they did not ask for some explanation of a Bill of that importance introduced at so late a period of the session. The House were asked to vote six millions of money; a sum very similar to that involved in the Bill which had just been read a second time. He was bound to express his great regret that the Bill was not introduced at the same time as the Army Estimates, because they would then have known earlier in the session what was the total amount of military expenditure to which the House was committed for the present year. It had been stated by one of the highest financial authorities of the country; Lord Welby; that the expenditure contemplated under this Bill was military expenditure in every sense of the word, and that consequently they ought to add on to the amount already voted on the Army Estimates the sum involved in this Bill. He would like to remind the House that, irrespective of the £58,000,000 voted for the purposes of the war in South Africa and China, they had passed Army Estimates for £29,685,000. This Bill involved an expenditure of £6,352,500, so that the total military expenditure to

which this country was committed for the present year for peace Estimates alone was £36,037,500. This was the third of these Military Works Bills which had been brought in of late years. The first was in 1897, and made provision for military works to the extent of £5,458,000; in 1899 another four millions were voted, and the aggregate total under those two Acts and the present Bill was £15,810,000. In addition to this enormous sum, there had been spent the sum of £4,100,000 under the Barracks Act. So that, in the five years, since 1897, they had spent £4,000,000 a year upon these military works. He wished to ask a question which he thought was very relevant to the Bill. He could not understand why, looking at the unexpended balances, they should be asked for any money at all. According to the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General laid before the Committee of which he had the honour to be chairman, there was an unexpended balance of £7,646,000 in regard to military expenditure, and, if that were so, he desired to ask why this Bill was necessary at all. What had become of these seven millions, and why were they not used for the purposes of the present Bill? He desired to ask, too, for an explanation of the item of £460,000 for the provision of barracks on Salisbury Plain, in view of the statement of the Secretary of State for War that there was not the least intention of creating a second Aldershot there or of erecting a great number of permanent barracks on the Plain. What, then, was the meaning of this enormous sum for barracks? He thought they were also entitled to some explanation of the astonishing item of £80,000 for barracks at Windsor. He recollected perfectly well when both the barracks there were rebuilt, and surely they could not now be in such a state as to require an expenditure of £80,000 on them now. Even if it were so he would ask the House to consider was it probable that so much would be spent in the

current year on one military station. It was extremely improbable, and the House was entitled to know, therefore, why such a large sum was now asked for. One other point he would like to raise. Had the Financial Secretary included in the Estimate

any provision for cubicles for soldiers? He quite recognised the wish to get a better class of recruits, which could probably be done if their sleeping accommodation were improved. He therefore sincerely hoped that some portion of the projected enormous outlay would go to provide cubicles.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said he had known for some time that Salisbury Plain was to be converted into a big camp like Aldershot, but he would like to know why many other places were to be treated in a similar manner. Wooden huts were being put up at Aldershot, Kildare, Lichfield, Salisbury, and Shorncliffe, and he submitted that that was not a convenient method of housing the troops. The huts put up in the days of the Crimean War had proved productive of the greatest possible discomfort to the troops, and he believed that we had already far more of them than could be occupied. He remembered in connection with some erected at Shorncliffe Camp that the men occupying them last winter were up to their knees in mud and water because the site was not properly drained, and he trusted that the authorities would at least take care that a similar state of things should not recur. He rose mainly to ask what was being done in regard to the provision of ranges. He was told the other day, in answer to a question, that five new ranges had been opened this year and only one or two closed. He thought that, considering the feeling throughout the country, and the unanimous agreement as to the necessity for more ranges, the War Office had during the last three years been most lax in its efforts in the direction of providing ranges in all the districts where there was a large number of troops. It was a mistake to give our attention to defensive works and neglect the training of our people in shooting. Until we provided ranges, however, our people could not learn to shoot. He might instance the case of Lichfield. There was a large military depot there, and a considerable number of troops, Regulars and Volunteers, in the district yet they had to be sent a long distance by train for shooting practice every year, the money expended on their fares being far more than sufficient to provide the interest of the capital sum that would be required for the acquirement of a range on the spot. He hoped the War Office would make an effort to obtain more ranges all over the country. He blamed the Government for bringing in this Bill, affecting £;6,000,000 of new works, at so late a period of the session, when half the Members had started for their holidays.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB agreed with the last speaker as to the undesirableness of bringing in such an important Bill at so late a period of the session, but he did not think the War Office was altogether responsible for that. The difficulty of discussing a measure like that was very great indeed, but he would not keep the House very long, as he did not think it possible to discuss the policy underlying the Bill. Let him take the first item for defence works. The figures for these totalled £;2,870,000. A million of that was voted under the Works Act of 1899. A principle was thereby established, against which he wished once more

to protest. A new departure was made then when the House was asked to provide a million of money blindfold for defensive works. In the course of the debate he was told the money was required for works and not for armaments, and he wished now to say that there was no record in the parliamentary history of this country for voting large sums of money for defence works in this way. This year another three-quarters of a million was to be added. He wished to ask his noble friend whether he would give the House any information as to how and where this money was to be spent.

LORD STANLEY: No.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB said his opinion was that the Government had opened the door in a manner detrimental to the interests of the House and to its safety. This question of defence works could only be determined by the main principles of our policy of defence. Perhaps his hon. friend would give an assurance that no part of the million already voted, and of the £;750,000 now proposed, would be expended upon anything but sea faces at great ports.

LORD STANLEY said he had already stated that the money for defence purposes was voted simply and solely for the defence of those harbours which, in the opinion of the naval and military authorities, it was absolutely necessary to defend.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB said he was very sorry he was not in the House when the statement was made. This was done, it seemed, by the joint action of the naval and military authorities. Was it the naval authorities who demanded, for naval reasons, that more money should be spent on the sea faces of the different ports? He knew exactly what the procedure was. A particular department of the War Office had to deal solely with the question of fortifications and works; it was its duty to make plans, and then imagine all possibilities of attack, and it therefore demanded the construction of works to meet such possibilities; but nothing had occurred to increase the probabilities of ships attacking ports. The tendency of modern times and modern artillery was more and more reducing the probability of attack by ships upon fixed positions. He was glad to hear that this money would only be spent on works for sea faces, but he thought the House were really entitled to more information, as they were increasing the Army Vote in a way which could not be justified on any principle. Passing to the question of barrack expenditure, he said that since the last great army reform we had spent under this head a total of over seventeen millions. In 1872 the House approved a loan of £;3,500,000 for the purpose of building barracks at certain points to meet the exigencies of the mobilisation scheme then existing. He did not know whether the whole of that sum had yet been expended. But our army system had since been completely changed. In 1890 a Barracks Act was passed sanctioning an outlay of £;4,100,000, and in 1897 there was a further Vote of £;2,989,000; and in 1899 £;2,770,000 was granted, thus giving a total, including the sum of £;4,207,000 now asked for, of £;17,566,000. Many of the barracks were not now occupied. Rates and taxes were being paid, and it would be far cheaper to sell them, and thus provide money for the new ones now required, He objected to the course which was being followed in this matter, as indicating a policy of military defence against invasion. The

War Office had got into a panic about many hundred thousand foreign troops marching about England, and they unnecessarily exaggerated the dangers, He was sorry to note the tendency to create permanent barracks at our great camps of instruction. He believed in distributing the troops over the country. It was not only an expensive policy, but an unwise policy, for the popularity of the army would be affected if the opportunities for seeing it were diminished. The people, in fact, liked to see the soldiers. Finally, he wished to protest against the pursuance of a policy which the House had never had an opportunity of fully discussing.

MR. LOUGH hoped that the hon. and gallant Member would support by his vote the opinions to which he had just given expression.

SIR JOHN COLOMB: No, there are items in the Bill which I approve, and I cannot, therefore, vote against it.

MR. LOUGH said the position of the hon. and gallant Member was perfectly logical, but he would like to point out that he also approved some of the items in the Bill, but he held it to be the duty of the legitimate opposition to vote against a Bill which it was contended was based on wrong principles. He did not propose to occupy much time in moving the rejection of the Bill, because many of the arguments on which he relied had already been submitted to the House, and it was not necessary for him to repeat them. With regard to the Naval Works Bill which had just been disposed of, he wished to say he was not entirely against it; he only divided against it on principle,

because he thought it contained extravagant proposals. He desired now to point out to the House the difficulty of the position in which they were placed. The Naval Works Bill asked for a sum of £;0,100,000, and many of his hon. friends objected to criticism on naval expenditure, although they held that military outlay stood on a different footing. This Military Works Bill asked for £;6,350,000, and it was a noteworthy fact that immediately money was voted for the Navy, the military authorities followed suit and asked for even more money for the Army. It was a great pity they were asked for this money at so late a period of the session. He would submit one point to his right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton as a great financial expert. As had been pointed out by the hon. and gallant Member who last spoke, the great fault of the Bill was that it asked for a large sum of money for the building of barracks when two-thirds of the amount voted for the same purpose years ago were still unexpended. In 1890 £;4,400,000 were voted for the building of barracks, and that amount had not yet been completely expended. In 1897 and 1899 £;5,759,000 were voted for the same purpose, of which only £;1,900,000 had been expended. The War Office had, therefore, in hand £;4,000,000 for barracks over and above what was asked for that purpose in this Bill. That day the Government were asking for a further £;4,207,000. Surely they might well pause before sanctioning such an expenditure as that. Barracks were constantly becoming unsuitable; and it was desirable, therefore, that they should not go too far in advance of the requirements of the country in this respect. They ought to hesitate before sanctioning any further expenditure. Some of the proposed items of outlay were undoubtedly very questionable. Egypt appeared in the Bill for the first time,

and £164,000 was asked for for barracks there. Why should we spend money there? We got nothing out of that country, and if Egypt benefited by the services of our skilful financial administrators, surely the least she could do was to make the necessary provision for the housing of our troops. The hon. and gallant Member for Great Yarmouth had condemned the tendency to build big barracks in certain centres instead of distributing the troops in isolated districts. But the policy of concentration apparently was being departed from in that Bill. Barracks were to be built at several places in Ireland; at Cavan, Belturbet, and Enniskillen, for instance. He did not believe in the clamours for the expenditure of public money in Ireland. It was not always productive of benefit to the people. Again, barracks were being built in the West Indies. A good deal was being said about the new proposal, but he would like to obtain some information as to what had happened with regard to the old proposals for the erection of barracks, and also what had become of the seven millions odd still unexpended. The second portion of the Bill dealt with defence works. Here, again, there was a large amount of money unexpended, and in this matter hon. Members were in an extraordinary position. The works were kept a profound secret. In 1897 £2,150,000 was voted, and of that £620,000 remained unspent. Surely the House ought to inquire what had been done with the money already voted before they went on to vote more money. What, for instance, had been done in the direction of providing for the defence of London? Was any money now being asked for that purpose?

LORD STANLEY: Not a single penny is being taken except for the defence of sea faces.

MR. LOUGH said they ought to have been told what had been done with the money already voted. The only reasonable demand in the Bill seemed to him to be that for rifle ranges. More money was wanted for that purpose. Why, then, was not a small Bill passed dealing with that matter alone? Nothing good had been said about the Bill, and for the reasons he had given he begged to move that it be read a second time that day three months.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day three months.'"; (Mr. Lough.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire) thought there was a good deal of truth in some of the complaints made by his hon. friend. The Government seemed to have gone out of their way to put those who were desirous to support them on matters of this kind in a very difficult position. He was always loth to refuse to vote money which the responsible Government of the day declared was necessary for the support of the policy of the country, and accordingly he voted for the Naval Works Bill, although he was not satisfied with everything in it. In regard to this Bill, however, he was in a still more difficult position. He did not like to refuse money demanded for the military policy of the Government. He would, however, be glad to know what were the reasons for the excessive want of information from which the House suffered. It could not be for the sake of secrecy, because it was notorious that every foreign Government knew what was

being done in matters of this sort a very short time after they had been put in hand. There was the question of policy to be considered, whether money was being wasted which might be employed more profitably in other ways. He quite recognised the difficulties of the position in which the Government were placed. It might be that by their misfortune; he would not say their fault; the Government had had to bring forward this Bill at a time when it could hardly be discussed, but it was unfortunate that they could not give the House information as to the nature and objects of the expenditure. He thought that those who systematically voted with the Government of the day in these matters whenever they could had been placed in a very difficult position. He found it very difficult to differ from the Government when they said they required a large sum for the military defence of the country, but he thought they ought to have selected for making their proposals some time of the year when there would have been an opportunity of discussing them. He thought they were entitled to a more complete statement than they had had from His Majesty's Ministers on the present occasion.

MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, E.) asked for information on the subject of rifle ranges. The head "Rifle Ranges" was divided into three subheads, artillery and rifle ranges, training grounds, and half a million for mobilisation and store rooms. Now several hon. Members would be glad to know what money had already been expended under the Military Works Act, 1899. A sum of £40,000 was voted for ranges; how much of that remained unexpended? He hoped that the noble Lord would see that the money now asked for was spread fairly all over the country and not laid out in one particular district, and he would like to point out that the absence of good ranges had a very bad effect on recruiting for the rifle Volunteers.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) challenged the doctrine that they ought not lightly to accept the serious responsibility of narrowly criticising and rejecting the Estimates made by experts. If the House agreed to spend money whenever an expert came and demanded a million for this, and another million for that, the result would be; and indeed was in this case; alarming. He challenged the previous Bill brought before the House two years ago, and compared the amount asked for then with the money spent for the same purposes by other great military Powers. Since that time this country had added something like thirty millions to the annual expenditure on the Navy and Army. There had been already voted for the Navy thirty-seven millions, and for the Army very nearly thirty millions. Now the House was asked to vote another six and a half millions. Taking the money which had been spent on the Army in India, that meant that our military forces would cost this year, apart from the war, £90,500,000. That was an alarming state of things. There were experts in every walk of life, and whenever they were called in they always advised the spending of more money in some shape or form. We were now annually leaving the thing in the hands of experts. The result was that we were increasing our military expenditure to a perilous extent, even to a wealthy country like this. The total military expenditure this year, including this Bill and the war, was 160 millions. Was it not time that the problem was faced? Some time or other this expenditure must be stopped. No country could stand it. In France they were

spending forty millions on the Army and the Navy, and their army was vastly superior to ours, though, of course, their navy was inferior. But their expenditure had been stationary for the last few years, whereas our own had leaped up from forty to ninety millions. The voluntary system did not make all the difference, for the pay only meant about ten millions. How was it that the great military Powers of Europe were able to turn out much more effective military machines for something like half the price we paid for a less effective machine? At the present moment, when our military experts had failed so disastrously in all their estimates in regard to South Africa, it was quite time the ordinary layman should apply his common sense to the problem.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): The military and naval expenditure for the year has been voted by Parliament, and is embodied in the Appropriation Bill, and can be discussed when that Bill comes before the House. By the Bill now before the House we are not voting money in one sense, but are authorising the borrowing of money. The money which was voted out of the Estimates is raised for the services of the year and expended in the year. By this Bill we are not voting £;6,000,000 to be spent this year. I do not quarrel with the principle of the Bill. I think it would be unfair and improvident to construct buildings, such as barracks, which will last for forty or fifty years, and to charge one year with the whole of the capital expenditure. The policy deliberately adopted some years ago was that the sum required for these permanent works should be borrowed, and that the repayment of that sum should be spread over a limited period of years in the shape of terminable annuities. There have been two developments of this policy. By the Act of 1890 the House practically authorised a loan of £;4,100,000 for barracks, and up to 31st March in the present year that sum has been spent within £;100,000. The expenditure for the present year is £;70,000, and the expenditure for the year 1901–2 is £;45,000. That absorbs the whole of the £;4,100,000. It is this year proposed to raise for barracks alone £;4,200,000, and in the Estimate which was circulated with the Bill that sum was increased to £;5,759,000. I suppose that in that item is included the completion of the large camps. At all events, whether we have £;5,000,000 or between £;5,000,000 and £;6,000,000 for barracks in this Bill, the sum which is proposed to be spent this year was £;850,000; and I wish to know why the Government want to borrow five and three-quarter millions to provide for an expenditure which is only estimated at something like a million. Then we have the statement of the Auditor and Controller General, which shows that there is in respect of these works a balance of upwards of £;7,000,000 of unexpended money. Therefore there is a large sum yet unexpended, which would provide for these works without authorising any money to be raised at all. I do not agree with what the hon. Member who has just sat down said about experts. The expenditure of this country is not regulated by experts. This sum is fixed, not by experts, but by the responsible Government of the country. A great many demands are ruthlessly rejected, and then there is a court of appeal; the Treasury; which deals with these matters.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I was simply alluding to a statement previously made in regard

to the opinion of experts.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: The expenditure of the country is not regulated by experts.

The responsible Government of the day come down to this House and request a certain sum of money for a certain purpose, and that money is voted in a Bill.

But this Bill differentiates itself from former Bills, because large sums of money which have been voted have not been spent, and evidently the Government do not intend to spend the amount set forth in the Bill. I do not wish to prolong the debate, but

I desire the noble Lord to give some explanation why he is raising this large sum of money when he does not contemplate spending more than a million, or less, this year. I wish also to protest against such a Bill being brought in at this period of the session. Moreover, I do think that the House of Commons ought to have the items set forth in the Schedule.

LORD STANLEY: I will endeavour to answer as far as I can the questions which the right hon. Gentleman has put to me. He first mentioned the Loan of 1890; but I ought to have stated that that loan was practically entirely expended. With regard to the loans of 1897 and 1899, the total of which came roughly to £9,500,000, when the War Office asks for a loan and specifies the objects for which it is required we are bound to take the full amount of money which will be required for these objects. It would be hardly justifiable for us to ask to be allowed to undertake certain work without letting the House and the country know the full amount for which they would be liable if they sanctioned it.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E): Yes, but you do not ask for a loan; you only state a liability.

LORD STANLEY: We ask for a loan, but we do not draw the money until it is required. We state that in the lapse of so much time the total amount will have to be asked for to complete the work sanctioned. When a tender is accepted and a contract entered into, although the money is not actually paid away, there is an obligation to the contractor for its payment. The expenditure authorised, to which the right hon. Gentleman alluded, will be in excess of what appeared on the Paper. Out of the £9,489,000 about £5,800,000 has actually been allotted to the contractors; that is, for contracts which have been entered into and for which the War Office is liable to that amount. That leaves a large sum over, which will be allocated in a short time. The money expended in the next financial year will be greater than appears on the Paper, but before many months are over, the War Office will have bound themselves down by contract to an expenditure nearly, if not quite, equal to the loans authorised in 1897 and 1899. The War Department is now asking for a fresh loan for fresh works, and the amount asked for is the amount considered necessary to complete them. We have asked for such money as we expected to allocate by contract before it is necessary to come to the House again. The defence works at certain ports and coaling stations, which the hon. Member for Yarmouth opposed, are not the idea of one man, but were undertaken on the advice of naval and military experts. The War Office are bound to accept their judgment, and for the safety of the Fleet, as our first line of defence, the defence of our coaling stations is of vital importance. I do not agree with the hon. Member for Great

Yarmouth that any yachtsman could find out what our defences are to be. But if the amount to be spent on a particular port or coaling station were specified, it would be easy to guess the amount of armament that would be put in. I do not think foreign Powers, much less persons less anxious to find out the details are really conversant with the strength of the defence works at our ports and coaling stations. I do not think this is a time to go into specific cases, but the House having voted a certain number of men it is the business of the War Office to see that these men are completely and properly housed. The barracks of 1872 have been talked about, but nobody could say that in 1901 any class in the population is satisfied with such comfort as was provided thirty years ago. The whole way of living has improved, and I am perfectly certain that the House and the country are not unwilling that our soldiers should share in the advantages modern science provides. If there are barracks that are unused, as is alleged by the hon. and gallant Member for Great Yarmouth, I quite agree that they should be got rid of, but I do not know of such and will be quite ready to go into that question with him later. It would be seen there was an item in the Bill of £;230,000 for rifle ranges. For this purpose the Department have expended, or allotted for expenditure, every penny received up to now, and this amount of £;230,000 will be expended upon new ranges. I do not think the House would wish for details as to the position of these ranges. The instant it becomes known that land for the purpose is required, that land goes up to a fictitious value. Owing to the long range of rifles some ranges had to be closed, others have been found, and others are still under arrangement, the purchases not being complete. The sum mentioned I hope will be expended satisfactorily for the Regular and Auxiliary services; and with a desire to meet the wishes of Volunteers, I ask the House to give the Bill a Second Reading, undertaking to give any information desired upon any item in the schedule at a later stage.

MR. DILLON said that the noble Lord might be correct in his statement of the system under which these amounts were raised, but it was wholly different to that which was followed in the Naval Works Act. The noble Lord said that for military works the Government took power to borrow, in every instance, all the money for the completion of the works in the schedule, and the result was an accumulation of unspent balances. In relation to naval works the system of finance was totally different and more correct. It was true that when a Bill was introduced, although the total estimated liability in respect to, the new works to be undertaken was stated, only such borrowing powers were asked for as would cover the sum likely to be spent in the interval before the introduction of another Bill, which, in no instance, was to be less than two years. Some explanation should be given of this difference of system, and also why for military works there was not the information given which would be found in connection with the naval proposals. In the Military Works Bill there were columns in blank; so different from the Naval Works Bill. What was the meaning of keeping these columns in blank? The information ought to be given in every instance, just as fully as in the schedule of the Naval Works Bill. There was no reason for not doing so except the slipshod, slapdash methods of the War

Office. He

had always opposed this method of obtaining money for naval and military works, and in a speech recently delivered by the highest authority on finance, a speech so remarkable that the Prime Minister requested him to get it published in full, Lord Welby dwelt strongly on the great evils and dangers arising from this system of getting large sums of money for military and naval works by Acts instead of through the Estimates. The Secretary of State for War had stated that when money was voted in the Estimates, unexpended balances had to be surrendered at the end of the financial year. That, to his mind, was one of the strongest reasons why money should be voted on the Estimates and not by Bill; and the fact that the War Office now asked for six millions to carry on military works, when they had unexpended balances amounting to nearly £7,000,000, was an illustration of the wisdom of the old system of procedure that unexpended balances should be surrendered. Therefore, he thought that argument recoiled on the person using it. He had never heard a single argument from a financial point of view in justification of these Bills. They were forced on Ministers by the permanent officials. When he argued the question in 1899 the then Under Secretary of State for War said that the reason why those Bills were necessary was that they found year after year by long experience that their Estimates were ruthlessly cut down through fear of the Committee of Supply, and that they were obliged to take refuge in that system of Bills. The natural inference from that statement was that the object of those Bills was to enable the War Office and the Admiralty to frame their Estimates on a more extravagant scale. He was of opinion that the relaxation of the wholesome fear of Committee of Supply was resulting in a monstrous increase in the Estimates. Money was now flowing like a river for those Military and Naval Works Bills. They commenced a few years ago with five or six millions, and now they amounted to £27,000,000 for the Navy and £13,000,000 or £14,000,000 for the Army. The rate was increasing, and they had every reason to anticipate that the country would be landed in greater and ever-increasing liabilities. He was confirmed in his opinion that that method of getting money was entirely vicious. One other argument was used by the Secretary of State for War. He stated that one reason why it was necessary to make those Acts extend over a long period of years was that it was necessary to make fresh contracts in connection with those great works; and that it sometimes happened that, just as they were ready to make a contract, the House of Commons was not conveniently placed for voting the money. The right hon. Gentleman said that no contract would be entered into unless the House voted the money; but that was a dictum which, it appeared, now belonged to the last century. They had had cases recently in which they were told that contracts had been signed and delivered and the works commenced before the House of Commons heard of the Vote at all. That showed how rapid progress could be when once a step in a particular direction was taken. Progress was also rapid in another direction. To his mind one of the chief objections to the Bill was the period at which it was introduced. That was little short of a scandal, but the House of Commons was getting accustomed to measures which two or three years ago no Minister would dare to propose. No Minister until the present

session would have dreamt of submitting a Military or a Naval Works Bill concerning a large sum of money at the end of the session. The last Bill but one was introduced on 21st January, 1897, but the resolution on which the present Bill was based was introduced at two o'clock in the morning only a few days ago. When they challenged it they were told it was a purely formal resolution, and that the proper time to debate it was on the Second Reading of the Bill. He ventured to challenge that statement, for on no previous occasion had Army or Naval Works Bills been introduced on resolutions without a long detailed statement being given by the Minister in charge. In 1897 and in 1899 the present Chief Secretary for Ireland, then Under Secretary for War, in introducing the resolutions on which the Bills of those years were founded, made a long detailed statement, and the present was the first occasion on which such a Bill had been introduced into the House of Commons without a full explanation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I admit that I am speaking from memory, but I think the hon. Gentleman will find that, although his statement may be accurate as regards Military Works Bills, it is not accurate as regards Naval Works Bills.

MR. DILLON said it was absurd for the right hon. Gentleman to contend that a mere formal statement was sufficient when long and detailed statements were made and debated on the two previous Bills. What he attached importance to was that the Bill of 1897 was introduced on the 21st January and passed early in March. The Government insisted that it should be passed before the end of the financial year, and should be treated as part of the finances of the year. The Bill of 1899 was introduced on the 22nd June, and the resolution was debated at considerable length. The Second Reading was taken early in July, and the Bill was passed through all its stages at a comparatively early period of the session. The present Bill was brought down to the level of the Indian Budget, and although they were called upon to vote £12,000,000 it was treated almost as a matter of course. The Bill was dumped down on the Wednesday after the Appropriation Bill had been introduced, when anything like real discussion was absolutely impossible. If anything were needed to justify and enforce the warning of Lord Welby those facts would justify it. He regarded the system as most vicious, and when the Chancellor of the Exchequer went about the country appealing to all and sundry to come to his aid to support a policy of economy he would suggest to him that, as a first step in that direction, the system of piling enormous burdens of debt on the country by means of loans should be abandoned, and that the old practice should be resumed; namely, that money required should be voted in Committee of Supply. The noble Lord stated that nothing had been spent from the last Works Bill on the defences of London. They voted large sums of money, in spite of repeated protests, two or three years ago for the defences of London. A more preposterous or absurd proposal never emanated from the brain of even an expert, and that was saying a great deal. The then Secretary of State for War quoted Napoleon as an unanswerable authority that the defences of London were most urgent, and that if London were not hedged round by a chain of fortified posts it would be in great danger. The noble Lord now said that no money had been expended on the defences of London. He wished to

know how much money had been wasted in that mad project altogether. Was London at that moment surrounded by a chain of fortified posts? One of the precedents quoted for that expenditure was the Defence Bill introduced by Lord Palmerston, but it was now admitted that every penny spent under that Bill was absolutely wasted, that the forts were the laughing-stock of the world, and that they were absolutely worthless. He ventured to say that many years would not have elapsed before experts showed that £;4 out of every £;5 spent in military defence works had been wasted. Because he thought that a great deal of the money would be absolutely wasted, because they had been denied information, and because the system involved was thoroughly vicious he was strongly opposed to the Bill.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said he would like to be informed before he cast his vote what contracts had been entered into in regard to this expenditure. It was merely blinding the House to say, as the noble Lord did, that no building would be undertaken unless it could be completed within the sum of money limited in the Act, and he thought there was good ground for complaint at the failure of the Financial Secretary to the War Office to fulfil now the promise he made when he brought in the resolution on which the Bill was founded to afford the House an opportunity of discussing the details. They had no information on which to base such a discussion. The excuse put forward was that it was not desirable to allow foreign Governments to learn what was being done in the matter of defence works. But when he was in garrison at Gibraltar it was a common

joke that the only persons to whom information was inaccessible as to the objects with which the War Office were planning the fortifications at the top of the rock were the officers of the garrison. Any common loafer who chose to take service as a mule-driver or other humble labourer might wander all over the works, and all the information was accessible to him unchallenged, but an officer was immediately stopped by the sentry. The consequence was that any foreign Government could introduce any of their emissaries to take stock of the works, provided only he assumed the garb of a workman, and he had no doubt this had been done hundreds of times. The only persons in ignorance of the plans of the Government were the officers of the British Army and the Members of the House of Commons, and it was perfectly absurd to suggest that foreign Governments could not get the information if they so desired. This Bill certainly contained a little more information than some of the previous Bills.

The noble Lord had told them that no money was to be spent in connection with these works which would provide accommodation for the troops to be raised under the scheme of the Secretary for War. But he found that under Sub-head F a sum of £;697,000 was taken for barracks for additional troops. Were these not the new troops to be raised under the Army scheme?

LORD STANLEY: No; they are the troops voted in 1899, for whom no barrack accommodation was provided.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said he would like information as to where this money was to be expended.

LORD STANLEY: The accommodation is to be provided by building new barracks and altering old ones. It surely is a matter of indifference, so far

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Bignod, Arthur
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Bigwood, James
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Arnold Forster, Hugh O.
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Brassey, Albert
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. Hicks
Bull, William James
Balcarres, Lord
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Bullard, Sir Harry

as the taxpayer is concerned, where the works are to be carried out.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said the provision for new married quarters at sundry stations seemed to point that the new garrison battalions were to be a source of serious expense to the country. He confessed that in view of the increasing permanent expenditure imposed upon the nation by these two Bills;neither of which had they been able adequately to discuss;he should feel it his duty to vote against the Second Reading of this Bill, which contained proposals that appeared to him both unnecessary and undesirable.

MR. T. M. HEALY denied the suggestion of the noble Lord that it was a matter of indifference to the taxpayers where the money was spent. What would Ireland get out of the Bill? It was said that hitherto she had got value for her taxes. Now, the total proposed expenditure was £;6,352,000 and the whole Irish Expenditure was £;286,000. Scotland got £;380,000, but, still more astonishing, Bermuda, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Mauritius, Singapore, and other places abroad got half a million of money. For a gentleman in the position of the noble Lord to tell Irish Members and the country which had given the Empire their best soldiers that it was immaterial where their money was spent was the most astonishing doctrine he ever heard. If it was a matter of indifference to the taxpayers where the money was spent, then he should suggest that as the total expenditure of the country was £;100,000,000, the whole of it should be spent in his own constituency.

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 162; Noes, 83. (Division List No. 474.)

Burdett-Coutts, W.

Helme, Norval Watson
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Caldwell, James
Henderson, Alexander
Parkes, Ebenezer
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Paulton, James Mellor
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)
Penn, John
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Holland, William Henry
Pierpoint, Robert
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Horniman, Frederick John
Purvis, Robert
Chapman, Edward
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Randles, John S.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Hoult, Joseph
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Houston, Robert Paterson
Reid, James (Greenock)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Rentoul, James Alexander
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Keswick, William

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Cranborne, Viscount
Lambton. Hon. Frederick W.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Crombie, John William
Law, Andrew Bonar
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Lawson, John Grant
Rutherford, John
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Duke, Henry Edward
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Elibank, Master of
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Spear, John Ward
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Lucas, Reginald' J. (Portsmouth
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Macdona, John Cumming
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Fisher, William Hayes
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Maconochie, A. W.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Tennant, Harold John
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Majendie, James A. H.
Thornton, Percy M.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Malcolm, Ian
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir HE (Wigt'n
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Middlemore, John T.
Valentia, Viscount
Colliding, Edward Alfred
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Walker, Col. William Hall
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Moore, William (Antrim, N)
Williams, Rt. Hon. J. P.- (Birm.)
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York. E. R.)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Morgan, David (Walthamstow
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Hain, Edward
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Midd'x
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Yoxall, James Henry
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Haslett, Sir James Horner

Nicholson, William Graham
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork. N. E.)
Dillon, John
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Donelan, Captain A.
M'Fadden, Edward
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Doogan, P. C.
M'Govern, T.
Bell, Richard
Field, William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarth'n
Boland, John
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Moss, Samuel
Boyle, James
Flynn, James Christopher
Murnaghan, George
Broadhurst, Henry
Gilhooly, James
Murphy, John
Brown, G. M. (Edinburgh)
Grant, Corrie
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Hammond, John
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Cawley, Frederick
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Channing, Francis Allston
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
Clancy, John Joseph
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Cogan, Denis J.
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)

Colville, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Joyce, Michael
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Crean, Eugene
Leamy, Edmund
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Cremer, William Randal
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Cullinan, J.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
O'Dowd, John
Dalziel, James Henry
Levy, Maurice
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Delany, William
Lundon, W.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
O'Malley, William
Roche, John
Ure, Alexander
O'Mara, James
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Power, Patrick Joseph
Spencer, Rt. Hn C. R. (Northants
Wilson, Henry J. (Yorks., W. R.)
Reddy, M.
Sullivan, Donal
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Lough and Mr. Herbert Lewis.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gower
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Tully, Jasper
Main Question put, and agreed to.
Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.
VALUATION (IRELAND) BILL.
[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): In moving the Second Reading of this Bill I wish to explain that its object is to relieve Belfast from a situation in which there might be no rates, no voters, and no jurors. In the opinion of the Government the Bill could be held to raise questions which are larger than the immediate difficulty in Belfast. The method of valuation in Ireland differs altogether from the method of valuation which obtains in this country. The original valuation was based on what is known as Griffith's Valuation. It being felt that there should be a revaluation of Ireland, a clause was introduced in the Act of 1898 enabling one to take place. Belfast and Dublin asked for a revaluation, and the consequence was that the rate which was struck at Belfast was subsequently declared to be invalid. The action of the Commissioner has been challenged, and appeals have been lodged against the assessment at which he has arrived. It would be most improper on the part of the Government to intervene in any way so as to give, as it were, directions to the court before whom the question may be argued. But though the question of law is sub judice it is not thought that the House should be debarred altogether from considering the larger issue which in the opinion of the Government has been raised. There is a novelty in the effect of the valuation laws in Ireland. That novelty has resulted in an increase of rates altogether outside any estimate formed by the inhabitants and Corporation of Belfast, and a new element has been introduced. The valuation of licences has been assessed in another manner than that which obtained before. Indirectly the result is a considerable remission made by Belfast to the Imperial Exchequer. The Government propose to appoint next January a Select Committee to consider the method of valuation in Ireland, and the terms of reference to that Committee will be as wide as possible. Such a Committee will be able to go into the whole question of the method by which Ireland is valued, and may afford a chance of improving the old system based on an Act passed fifty years ago which contains many obsolete provisions. I am quite sure hon. Members will accept that statement from me as making it certain that the Government intend to deal with this matter in this way. This subject has been pressed upon me very urgently not only by hon. Members opposite, but from all quarters of Ireland, and I make this statement in order that there may be some outward and visible sign of the policy we intend to pursue, and when we come to the Committee stage I shall move an Amendment to suspend the operation of revaluation for two years. I believe that it could not come into operation even if that Amendment were not moved, but at the same time I shall move the Amendment in order to show that the Government have some regard to this matter. If these brief remarks make the subject clear, I have nothing to add. The only other Amendment is one which will dissipate any doubts as to the status of voters and jurors in Belfast. I hope the Bill may now be read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed. "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said that he had a motion upon the Paper to reject the Second Reading of this Bill. It was a most singular thing that the City of Belfast created more trouble in this House than any other part of Ireland; but

thanks to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, it would not now be necessary to move that Amendment. So far as he was concerned, speaking for the Catholic population of Belfast, he was quite content with the statement which had been made, and he should not now move the motion which stood in his name.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on the position he had taken up. He thought that he had gone a long way out of his course in bringing in this Bill this session; at the same time he thought he would have to go a little further than he had gone. The people of Belfast had at the present time something like 12,000 appeals from the valuation of Mr. Commissioner Barton. The right hon. Gentleman would see, if he looked at the Estimates, that the people of Belfast had had to pay or would have to pay for this valuation a contribution in aid of the Government of many thousands of pounds, in addition to the £;400 a year which the City of Belfast had to pay in the ordinary way. Now that the Government admitted that this valuation was to be hung up for two years, and that the House was to have a Select Committee to inquire into the matter, it would be a monstrous thing under those circumstances to allow these 12,000 law suits to go on. It would be an intolerable state of affairs and would plunge Belfast into a very swamp of litigation, and there was the fact that this system, which was to be hung up for two years, might result in a fresh method of valuation altogether. He hoped in these remarks he had the support of the hon. Members for Belfast, and that they would join in the appeal he made that, in mercy to their constituents, these 12,000 law suits should be knocked upon the head until two years had elapsed. He thought the Bill was defective, but he understood that the right hon. Gentleman intended to propose an Amendment to make it effective. He would support that Amendment when it was moved. He thought the Government had acted fairly in this matter, but at the same time he pointed out that the citizens of Belfast had had no value for the £;400 or £;500 which they had spent on the annual revision. That question had not been given effect to in the Bill, and consequently the city would lose ratings to the extent of £;10,000. The Bill had become a non-contentious matter, but he thought, nevertheless, that the grievances which he had pointed out should be considered, and that some provision should be made for them under the Bill.

SIR JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.) hoped that in the Committee stage an Amendment would be moved to bring the rating up to date, so that the parties concerned should not pay more than their fair share and that the rate might be able to be struck at once. He cordially agreed that there should be no further litigation, and that the Bill should now be read a second time.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1::

*THE CHAIRMAN: The Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for East Waterford cannot come in in the place at which it appears upon the Paper. If the hon. Member will alter the phraseology of it, I think he could bring it in at line 10 after the word "at," or else he could move it as a new clause.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.), on behalf of Mr. Crean (Cork, S. E.), formally moved; "In page 1, lines 10 and 11, to leave out 'not exceeding one hundred pounds,' and insert 'of fifty pounds, and for any subsequent offence to a line of one hundred pounds.'"

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the clause."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) said that if this Amendment were accepted it would defeat altogether the object the hon. Member had in moving it. The Bill provided that any violation of the bye-laws rendered the offender subject to a penalty not exceeding £100. The effect of this Amendment would be to deprive the magistrate of all discretion and fix £100 as the minimum fine to be inflicted for offences, whether grave or venial. The imposition of penalties was against the views of present days, and the only effect would be that the magistrates, were they compelled to inflict a large penalty, would not convict. He thought it would be far better to leave the Bill as it was, and therefore he could not accept the Amendment.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. ATKINSON said the object of the Amendment that he now proposed to move was to give power to inflict a penalty not only upon the master of a vessel which committed the offence, but also upon the owner of that vessel. It frequently happened that nothing could be obtained from the captain of a trawler who was not a man of substance, and under the Bill as it stood they could not get at that trawler.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 28, to leave out sub-section (3), and insert the following sub-section:;(3) The court before whom a person is convicted under this Act may by the order provide that, if the fine imposed upon him is not paid within eight days after the conviction, one-half thereof shall be paid by and may be recovered under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts from such owner as aforesaid, and that, in default of payment by the person convicted of the remainder of the said fine within a further period of eight days, the same may be recovered from him under the said Acts.";

MR. T. M. HEALY asked what happened supposing the owner lived in England.

MR. ATKINSON: We have provided for that by means of substituted service.

MR. MORRIS (Galway) suggested that the words "the owner" should be substituted for "him" in line 7, so that it should read "that the same may be recovered from the owner under the said Act."

MR. ATKINSON thought the alteration unnecessary, as it was evident from the context that the word "him" referred to the person convicted.

Amendment agreed to.

Other Amendments made.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.) said he desired to amend his proposed new sub-section

by substitution in line 3 thereof of the words "the skipper" for the word "registration."

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 13, at end, to insert '(6) In addition to any other penalty or penalties that may be imposed by the court on the conviction of any person under this section, the court may make an order suspending the certificate of the skipper of the vessel on which such person was when the offence was committed for any-period not exceeding six months.'";(Captain Donelan.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. ATKINSON hoped the Amendment would not be pressed, and pointed out that hitherto there had not been any provision by which the certificate of a skipper could be suspended without the concurrence of the Board of Trade.

MR. T. M. HEALY suggested that the clerk to the petty sessions should send a copy of the conviction to the Board of Trade, leaving it to the Board to suspend the master's certificate if they thought fit. There was always the difficulty that the magistrates might fine a man £;1 or £;100, and it would be a very severe thing

if the certificate was suspended in addition. They did not want a man to be punished twice for the same offence. At the same time, they had been so worried all over Ireland by these trawlers that if it was proposed to guillotine them he would cheerfully vote for it.

MR. ATKINSON said the penalties to be imposed under this Bill were so much more severe than at present existed, and so much more effective machinery was provided for their recovery, that he did not think the Amendment of the hon. Member was necessary.

CAPTAIN DONELAN mentioned that his Amendment had the approval of the Vice-President of the Board of Agriculture in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM said there were great objections to making the penalties more drastic at so late a period of the session. There were Members of the House interested on behalf of the owners of these vessels who would have been present had they thought there was any possibility of the Government accepting this Amendment. In any case, he had scruples against going further than was originally intended at a time when some of the parties interested were away, without any idea of the matter coming on.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) thought the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman were perfectly reasonable. While he agreed with the Amendment on its merits, he would suggest that under the circumstances it should not be persevered with. The Bill originally met with great opposition from the owners of the trawlers, but they had been brought to agree to the Bill in its present form, and it was only reasonable that the Amendment should not be pressed.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 1 and remaining clauses agreed to.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said he had no desire to interfere with the passage of the Bill this session, but unless more drastic machinery was provided for the enforcement of the Act it would be useless. A sufficient number of gunboats were required to watch the shores, and if the Government would accept

the principle of his Amendment he would modify the wording in any way to meet their wishes. He moved.

New clause proposed;

"From and after the passing of this Act there shall be detailed, for special service from time to time for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of the Fisheries (Ireland) Acts, 1842 to 1898, and of this Act, six gunboats or other steam vessels which shall act for such purpose under such regulations as may be prescribed by His Majesty's Lords of the Admiralty if such gunboats or other vessels are provided by them, or by the Department if same are provided by such Department.";(Mr. Field.)

MR. ATKINSON said it was open to the Board to negotiate with the Admiralty for the assistance of gunboats, but it was altogether irrational to pass an Act to make it imperative on the Admiralty, no matter what other demands there might be, to maintain six gunboats at all times for this purpose.

MR. FIELD asked in what way it was proposed to make the Bill effective. The Congested Districts Board had a vessel doing a certain amount of work in this direction, but it could not be contended that one vessel was sufficient to watch all the coasts of Ireland. It was because of the absence of any provision in the Bill to ensure the enforcement of its provisions that he had placed his Amendment on the paper. The whole of the fishing grounds of Ireland were being destroyed by these trawlers, and Members were entitled to some assurance that the Act would be made a reality.

MR. POWER thought the proposed new clause was more reasonable than might at first sight appear. From the time the Act of 1889 was passed until last autumn there had not been a single Government boat supplied to enforce the bye-laws under the Act, although the First Lord of the Treasury promised that every protection should be given. The authorities in Scotland had three boats of their own, in addition to which three boats were supplied by the Government, but Ireland could not get any at all. The Government, for eleven long years, had neglected their duty, and had allowed the Irish fisheries to remain unprotected, and some assurance ought to be given that there should be no such remissness in the future.

MR. WYNDHAM assured the hon. Member that the Irish Government would leave no stone unturned to make the Act effective, but the proposed clause could not be accepted without some arrangement having been previously come to with the Admiralty. If hon. Members desired to elicit from the Government a promise that the Act should be effectively administered, he could only say that he was as anxious to secure that object as any hon. Member opposite.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that under the Naval Works Bill something like £23,000,000 were to be voted, from which Ireland would get no benefit whatever. Perhaps it would waken the Admiralty up a bit if the Irish Members discussed that Bill for a few hours on the next day in order to impress upon the Department that at any rate the equivalent of, say, £100,000 in the shape of a gun-boat should be granted to Ireland in return for her share of the enormous expenditure on the Navy.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that feeling on this matter was very strong, and it was

absolutely necessary that some steps should be taken to assist those who were endeavouring to protect the coasts. He suggested that the Chief Secretary and the Board of Agriculture should consult with the Admiralty and see whether something could not be done in that direction. The question might be made the subject of a long and important debate, but inasmuch as he desired the Bill; although an altogether inadequate measure; to pass, he deprecated any serious discussion on this occasion. If the right hon. Gentleman would promise that after the passage of the Bill he would endeavour to obtain from the Admiralty some better terms, doubtless the hon. Member would withdraw his Amendment.

MR. WYNDHAM promised, in conjunction with the Vice-President, to approach the Admiralty to see whether some assistance could be obtained.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. POWER moved a new clause [not appearing on the Notice Paper] the object of which was to prohibit steam or other trawling within three miles of low water mark. He reminded the House that exactly the same thing happened in 1889 as was happening now. A Bill was introduced prohibiting steam trawlers on the coasts of Scotland. The objection of the Irish Members was admitted by the then Chief Secretary to be perfectly reasonable, but he gave ample assurances that, though the trawlers would be driven off the Scottish coast, the Irish fisheries should not suffer in the least. With that assurance the Bill was allowed to pass. A few weeks later a Bill was introduced prohibiting steam trawling on the Irish coasts, but giving the Commissioners of Irish Fisheries the power of admitting trawlers to various waters. The Bill went as far as passing its Committee stage, and then, for some unexplained reason, the measure was recommitted and its whole scope changed. Trawling was allowed everywhere on the Irish coasts, but the Commissioners were given power to prohibit it at various places. In the hope that the measure would afford some little protection it was allowed to pass, and ever since the matter had been in a most unsatisfactory condition. What was the use of bye-laws? The trawlers coming over from Scotland did not know where the bye-laws commenced or where they ended, and the result was that trawlers simply threw their nets wherever they liked. It was an absolutely imaginary line, because the trawlers came in and swept up the lines of the fishermen. If a general law were made it would be easier to police and protect these waters. At present these trawlers had this excuse, "If you legislate by bye-laws how are we to know what the bye-laws are?" They dropped their nets wherever they wished and did infinite harm. Where bye-laws were made and were known the trawlers went round a cape or promontory until it was dark, when they returned to the fishing grounds and did a lot of harm. If the Government adopted the principle of their original Bill, which was introduced in compliance with the promise made by the First Lord, and prohibited trawling all along the coasts, giving to the Commissioners power to say where it might be carried on, he ventured to say they would do a great deal to improve the fishing industry. He was sorry to say that the pledge which the First Lord gave when the Irish Members allowed the Scotch Bill to pass had not been kept in the letter or the spirit, for trawlers from the Scotch coast were doing a great deal of injury to

the Irish fisheries. The Irish Members asked that the law, which was generally enforced on the Scotch coast, should be enforced with regard to the Irish coast. MR. ATKINSON said the clause which the hon. Member proposed was identical in terms with one of the sections of the Scotch Act of 1889. The principle of the Scotch Act was that it absolutely prohibited fishing within the territorial limit of three miles, or within certain points indicated in the schedule, and the Act gave power to the Commissioners to exempt certain portions of the area included within the statutory provision. The Irish Act proceeded on an entirely different principle, namely, it enabled the Commissioners to prohibit fishing within certain areas by the passing of bye-laws. The Irish Act prohibited steam trawling within three miles of low-water mark on any part of the coast of Ireland, or within the waters of any other defined area specified in the bye-laws. There had been a recent decision of the Irish courts whereby it was established, as against trawlers coming from a foreign country, that the Irish Commissioners might extend the area of prohibition outside and beyond the three mile limit. The hon. Member's clause would entirely destroy that.

MR. POWER: No, I think not.

MR. ATKINSON: At the present moment there were bye-laws in existence protecting the fishing grounds outside the three-mile limit. Experts informed the Government that all round the coasts of Ireland there were most valuable fishing grounds outside the three-miles limit, and if they passed the proposed clause they would simply invite trawlers who would come and fish with impunity in these waters. The clause was absolutely unnecessary. He did not see what benefit it would be if the hon. Member got statutory prohibition within the three-mile limit when the powers at present in existence enabled the Commissioners to prohibit fishing by trawlers both within and beyond that limit. The hon. Member had asked how trawlers were to know what bye-laws were in force on the Irish coast. If they chose to transgress the bye-laws they became liable to penalties, and it was their business to know the law. It would be no excuse for any master or owner when brought before a court to plead ignorance of the law. The bye-laws were published in the Gazette, and it was their duty to inform themselves where they could fish off the coast of Ireland. The prohibition of trawling outside the three-mile limit was already secured in a better way by the bye-laws passed from time to time by the Commissioners than it could be by the hon. Member's clause. He asked the hon. Gentleman not to jeopardise the Bill by pressing the Amendment.

MR. T. M. HEALY said they proposed to leave the Act of 1889 untouched. Under that Act the Commissioners had power to make bye-laws with respect to the extra-territorial waters. How the Amendment could affect the powers under that Act he failed to see. All these questions of making laws came to the question of enforcement. Supposing they made a law that night stating that any trawling whatever would be illegal, the law would not be worth the paper it was written on unless they had the means of enforcing it. The vessels lay outside the three-mile limit until it was dark, and then they came into the fishing grounds. There was nobody to watch them. The coast-guard had no means of coping with the trawlers. There were Government vessels at Hong Kong and Singapore, but there

was no means whatever of catching the trawlers. He sympathised in this matter with his hon. friend, and believed the Attorney General was entirely wrong.

MR. BIGNOLD (Wick Burghs) said he could assure the hon. and learned Member that they in Scotland were far worse off than the fishermen in Ireland in regard to the invasion of territorial waters by tramp trawlers.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR appealed to the House to bring the debate to a close. The Chief Secretary had promised, and he entirely endorsed the words of his right hon. friend, that the Irish Office would do its best to see that the police would do their work and that the Act was carried into operation. There was therefore nothing to be gained by a prolongation of the debate.

MR. JOHN REDMOND confessed that he was somewhat humiliated at the manner in which the Irish Members were obliged to transact business in regard to Irish Bills, although he did not desire to go into the question at that moment. He recognised that they were in the position that they must take this Bill as it stood, or be prepared to see it sacrificed; and therefore he was in favour of the Bill as it stood, notwithstanding all its shortcomings. Under the circumstances in which they were placed, humiliating as they were, some doubt was raised in his mind as to whether it would not have been better to sacrifice this small boon rather than lend himself to this system of legislation. He was almost tempted to regret that he had promised to facilitate the passage of this Bill, for it was humiliating that they could not discuss these matters with some little freedom. At the same time, having given the assurance that we would facilitate the passage of the Bill, he made an appeal to his friends to allow the Bill to pass, and he asked the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Waterford to withdraw his Amendment, and not to divide the House.

MR. POWER said that he felt very strongly on this point, and he believed that he had made out a very good case, and that the policing of the waters would be very much simplified by the adoption of the Amendment. However, we would be the very last persons in the world to put his hon. friend in an awkward position, if he had come to some understanding with the Leader of the House, by taking any action by which that engagement should not be carried out. Under these circumstances, though he felt strongly that he had a good case, he begged leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill reported; as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged; Bill withdrawn.

LUNACY (IRELAND) BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered.

New Clause;

"The committees for any two or more distinct lunatic asylums may agree to unite in providing and maintaining a laboratory for pathological research in connection with insanity and nervous diseases, and may defray the expenses incurred in pursuance of an agreement under this section by contributions from the funds at their disposal for the maintenance of their respective asylums.";(Mr. Wyndham.)

Brought up and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the clause be now read a second time."

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid) said he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not press this clause.

MR. WYNDHAM said he would be sorry not to press it. He had brought it forward at the instance of an important deputation of the representatives of the officers of the Irish asylums. The scientific reputation of the Irish lunatic asylums deservedly stood high, and he would be sorry that anything should be done to lower it.

MR. DILLON said he trusted that this Amendment would not be lost. He felt confident that the vast majority of the Irish Members were in favour of it. It simply put the Irish local bodies in the same position as the English and Scotch local bodies.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he was in favour of the new clause, although he could see that there was a great deal to be said on the other side. He, however, wished to propose an Amendment on the clause that after the word "may," in the first line, there be inserted "with the consent of the county council." That would give the county councils the most ample power to check undue extravagance. If the clause were read a second time, he would move that Amendment.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.) said that the asylum committees were appointed by the county councils, and if the committees spent the money of the ratepayers recklessly in providing these pathological laboratories they could be checked by the county councils.

MR. MURNAGHAN said the hon. Gentleman was quite mistaken in saying that the county councils had any control over the asylum committees. He had good reason to oppose the Amendment, coming as it did at the last moment, when he was under the impression that it was not to be moved. From his own experience he could say that the expenses in connection with lunacy had increased in his own county 30 per cent. during the last few years and were still growing, and the burdens were getting so high that they were becoming intolerable. The right hon. Gentleman would not be keeping faith with the House if he allowed this sort of thing to go on, and he trusted that he would not press his Amendment.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.) thought it was necessary for two or three lunatic asylums to join together to establish a laboratory for pathological research in connection with insanity and nervous diseases, and therefore he supported the Amendment of the Chief Secretary.

MR. CREAN thought that every public board in Ireland would oppose this Amendment. Young men would be anxious to get these appointments, and the result would be that they would be learning their business while getting a salary all the time. What he advocated was the power to erect laboratories in the several colleges so as to avoid sending their young doctors over to England and Scotland or abroad to study insanity and nervous diseases.

MR. JOHN REDMOND thought the right hon. Gentleman would be wise to stand by the Amendment. His own feeling was in favour of it, and, so far as he could make out, the opinion of his colleagues, with the exception of his hon. friend the

Member for Mid Tyrone, was almost unanimously in favour of it.

Question put, and agreed to.

New clause read a second time.

Amendment made to the proposed new clause;

"By inserting after the word 'may,' in line 1, the words with the consent of the councils of the counties affected.";(Mr. T. M. Healy.)

Clause, as amended, added.

Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND.) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2;;

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said he had a small Amendment to move, which he hoped the Chief Secretary would accept. It was to omit in line 16 "one farthing" in order to insert "an eighth of a 1d." Where small sums had to be levied, it was very inconvenient that no rate less than a farthing could be levied. In his own constituency £;50 had to be raised in order to pay £;3, and the balance of the money had been hung up ever since. He thought an eighth of a 1d. would meet the necessities of many cases.

Amendment proposed.;

"In page 1, line 16, to omit the words 'one farthing' in order to insert 'an eighth of a 1d.'"(Mr. Tully.)

Question proposed, "That the words 'one farthing' stand part of the clause."

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) said he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would not accept the Amendment. Its effect would be to increase the expense of collection, and it would be impossible to collect the rate at all in many parts of Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM said that he believed the clause met with universal acceptance and hoped the hon. Member would not insist on his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Clause 3;;

MR. TULLY moved to strike out "one year" in order to substitute "five years." He thought it was reasonable that the option should extend over a period of five years. If small bodies had a longer period in which to decide, the clause might be used more extensively. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would accept the Amendment, as it would give increased opportunities to local bodies to take advantage of the benefit of the section.

Amendment proposed;

"In line 5, to omit 'one year' in order to insert five years.";(Mr. Tully.)

Question proposed, "That the words 'one year' stand part of the clause."

MR. T. M. HEALY said that the clause was a very curious instance of the effect of the flight of time. Two years ago the Government strongly opposed a similar proposal which he himself had moved. Now, two years later, they proposed it themselves.

MR. WYNDHAM said that on the general ground he had mentioned he hoped the hon. Gentleman would not persist in his Amendment. The Bill as it stood had been generally accepted.

MR. CLANCY said he desired to repeat one or two observations which he had made on the Local Government Vote the other night, which the right hon. Gentleman heard, but did not answer at the time. The County Council of Dublin were entirely opposed to the clause, and for his part he sympathised with them. He had no desire to obstruct the passage of the Bill, but he desired to put before the right hon. Gentleman the views of the county council. There were nine urban districts in the county of Dublin, and therefore the matter was of the very gravest importance. Those urban districts, when they became urban sanitary districts, made certain bargains with the county of Dublin. They kept those bargains as long as ever the grand jury lasted, but the moment the grand jury was abolished and the county council substituted they wanted to break through their bargains. Where a township was created more than fifteen years ago he entirely agreed that it should have the right to revise its arrangements, but a township created less than fifteen years ago ought not to be allowed to break the bargain it deliberately made. If the right hon. Gentleman would give him an assurance that the Local Government Board would not do what they stated they intended to do, namely, make the order without local inquiry, he would not persist in the motion which he intended to make, namely, that a clause be omitted. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that under Clause 71 of the Local Government

Act the Local Government Board was authorised to make a readjustment of the financial relations existing between townships and the county council, but only after a public inquiry had been held. No public inquiry had been held in the case of Dublin, and if the right hon. Gentleman would give him an assurance that it would be held before the order was made he would not proceed.

MR. WYNDHAM said his information was that the clause was generally acceptable throughout Ireland. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman asked him for an undertaking that the Local Government Board should hold an inquiry, presumably only when an inquiry was asked for by one or other of the parties. He was quite willing to give that undertaking, and certainly thought that an inquiry ought to be held.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill reported without amendment; read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee) considered.

MR. TULLY said he had come to an agreement with the promoters of the Bill under which the Amendment he now moved would be accepted, while others of which he had given notice would not be moved.

A Clause;(Messengers of Licencees);(Mr. Tully);brought up, and read the first and second time, and amended, by leaving out from the word "liquors" to the end of the proposed clause.

Clause, as amended, added.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 9, after the word 'purchaser,' to insert the words 'or between the hour of twelve noon and two p.m., or half-past six to half-past eight p.m., to the bona fide

messenger of a parent, guardian, or employer, in whose house, flat, tenement, or premises, dinner, supper, or other similar meal is then presumably being served, either for such parent, guardian, or employer, or his family or household, or his guests,"";(Mr. James Hope.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire) said the hon. Member had set a good example in saying nothing in favour of the Amendment, and perhaps he ought to say nothing against it. He would, however, point out that in Committee when this matter was considered, the proposal was defeated by thirty-four to six. Such exceptions as to hours would make the Bill nugatory, because these were just the hours at which children were sent for liquor.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said that no doubt there were those who looked upon a man who thought beer a justifiable and popular drink as an absurd person. Yet it was the habit of a large number of our countrymen to drink beer with their meals, and they had only members of their family to fetch it. There were persons who looked upon the drinking of beer as a scandal and a sin, and the introduction of this Bill was largely due to them. It was called "intoxicating liquor" in the Bill, but there was beer of which a man could not take enough to intoxicate. Some people did not require to send their children for beer, because they kept it in the house, but in other cases there was nobody to send except the wife or the children. Hon. Members did not seem to realise what an invasion of the liberties of the working classes of this country it was that they should not be able to send one of their family for beer. He represented a working class constituency in Manchester, where there were small streets inhabited by poor people, who had to do the best they could, and there was nobody to send for beer except the, children. Hundreds of young people could be seen in the streets with jugs of beer. There was nothing to be ashamed of in that, and nothing wrong in it.

He did not think there was any shame in standing up for a practice like that, which had gone on from time immemorial. It was all very well for the promoters of the Bill to try to ram their ideas down the throats of the working classes, but he believed there would be great resentment in regard to this measure from one end of the country to the other. It would cause a revulsion of feeling against temperance, which he valued as highly as any of the promoters of this Bill. The immemorial custom of getting beer brought home by one of the family was to be created into a crime. The thing was so ludicrous that if he had not great respect for the promoters of the Bill he would really think it was a grim joke. He would support the Amendment.

MR. BELL (Derby) said he should like to say a few words in reply to the right hon. Baronet who had just spoken with regard to the amount of dinner-time drinking among the working classes. He ventured to say, from his own experience, that for every working man who had his pint or half-pint of beer for his dinner there were a hundred who did not. It was a habit among the few, and a large

proportion of that few would be perfectly willing to sacrifice their half-pint of beer to dinner if there were no other convenient means of getting it than by sending their children for it; and if the passing of this Bill would tend to the bringing up of a better class of children than we had before, by removing them from the contaminating influence of the public-house, he for one should be satisfied. He, unfortunately, knew too many instances; he might almost say thousands of instances; in which the demoralisation of the homes of members of the working classes had been initiated by and was consequent upon the sending of children to the public-house for beer; and not only for beer, but for spirits also. He dared say hon. Members in this House on both sides knew there were some cases in which it was the habit of mothers to send their children for drink during the absence of the fathers, and that these women, as a consequence, sank to low depths of degradation. It had been the means of breaking up many a working man's home. He did not wish to delay the House with a long speech, but speaking for the working class of the country; or, at any rate, for the enormous section of the better part of them; he could say, without disrespect to any portion, that the superior class would be prepared to make a sacrifice, if by its means they could secure the uplifting of their own order. He trusted that after this discussion, and after the lengthy debate which took place in the Grand Committee, the House would reject the Amendment, and would refuse to assent to any proposal of the kind.

Question put, and negatived.

SIR J. FERGUSSON moved an Amendment to substitute for the words "intoxicating liquor" in the clause the words "ardent spirits." He felt strongly that it was a great hardship and injustice to prevent the humble people of this country from procuring the national drink of beer in the only way in which most of them could get it. It seemed to him that they were not acting in the interests of morality or temperance, because if a father could not get beer at home he would go to the public house and stop there. If beer should not be sent for by a member of the family, it was much more objectionable that spirits should be obtained by the sending of children for it. Beer was not always an intoxicating liquor, although it got that name from the promoters of the Bill. In 1878 he was chairman of a Royal Commission which dealt with a branch of the licensing laws, namely, grocers' licences in Scotland, and there was a considerable volume of evidence given them that it was a practice in Scotland, and he believed it was the case in Ireland, for mothers to send their children to the grocer's for spirits in cups, and to get the whisky put down in their bills as tea. This Bill would deal with that practice, which nobody would say was a wholesome one; but he maintained that no evil would result from beer being sold to children if it was clear that that liquor was to be consumed by the family. It was an absurdity to say that any harm would result from selling small beer to children in open vessels.

It had been put forward as one of the crying evils of the sale of small beer to children in open vessels that they sipped it as they went home; but he should imagine that if they sipped too much they would get well boxed when they went

home, and that was a sufficient precaution against the practice. He had drunk beer since he was a boy, and now that he approached seventy he could say that a moderate use of beer was not injurious after twelve years of age, although that might be the case with spirits. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 9, to leave out the words 'intoxicating liquor,' and insert the words 'ardent spirits.';(Sir James Fergusson.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

MR. CROMBIE said he was very glad the promoters of the Bill had the approval of the right hon. and gallant Member in regard to half the measure. By the first clause of the Bill the Act that prevented the sale of beer to children on the premises was repealed, and if the Amendment now proposed were carried a publican would be able;he did not say he would;to sell liquor to a child of three or four years of age. [Cries of "Oh."] He repeated he did not say a publican would do it, but there would be no law to prevent it.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.) moved. "In page 1, line 10, to leave out 'fourteen' and insert 'thirteen.'" He contended that it would be a great hardship in the rural districts if they were not allowed to send their children for the family beer.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 10, to leave out the word 'fourteen' and insert the word 'thirteen,';instead thereof.";(Mr. Patrick White.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'fourteen' stand part of the Bill."

MR. CROMBIE said that the age in the Bill originally was sixteen years, and it was in deference to the opposition shown to the measure that the age was reduced to fourteen years. There were good reasons why the age should remain at fourteen years.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. CLANCY, in moving the next Amendment, said he was thoroughly in favour of the principle of the Bill, and in moving this Amendment he had no desire to kill it. He thought the case of Ireland as distinguished from that of England was misunderstood by the promoters. In England it was generally the case that in all the large towns, and even villages, the places where intoxicating liquor was sold were public-houses pure and simple. In Ireland it was completely different. Outside the large towns he did not suppose there were twenty houses which sold liquor alone; they also sold groceries, draperies, etc. That system existed also to a large extent even in the large cities. The result of his inquiries was that out of 800 public-houses in Dublin there were only eighty public-houses pure and simple, such as they found in every part of London. The object of this Bill was twofold. First, it was to prevent children going into public-houses. In England the Bill would be effective, but in Ireland it would fail, because they could not prevent the children going into the shops where they sold beer and spirits, because they sold there also groceries and drapery. To prevent children going into these shops would be to inflict disabilities on the people of Ireland such

as were not imposed on the people of England. The second object of the Bill was to prevent children sipping the drink as they went home. He confessed his abhorrence of the practice of learning children to become drunkards was too sincerely felt to induce him to offer any opposition to a measure which would prevent it; but the Bill, as amended, by the words "corked and sealed vessels" effectually prevented anything of the kind. So long as the liquor was taken away in corked and sealed vessels it was absolutely impossible for a boy or girl to sip the liquor on the way home. Why

then put a limitation on the amount of liquor to be sold in a corked and sealed vessel? In the first place, it was rather ridiculous, from a temperance point of view, to say that a man who wanted liquor should not have it unless he purchased a pint; more, perhaps, than he wanted. The Bill thus encouraged a person to take more than he required, which certainly from a temperance point of view was not a satisfactory state of things. Again, this particular limitation might be made in Ireland the means of harassing every Nationalist publican in the country. Three-fourths of the publicans in Ireland were Nationalists, and the result would be that, when there was a time of stress or struggle between the Government and the people, all the forces of the administration would be directed towards harassing the publicans. The House could easily imagine a policeman having his eye on what he considered a disloyal publican, and opening a parcel in order to ascertain whether a child was carrying home a pint, or less than a pint, of whisky. If the Bill could be made effective without that limitation, which would cause very considerable annoyance, it seemed to him it would be wise to omit it.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out from the word 'vessels' to the word 'for,' in line 13."; (Mr. Clancy.)

Question proposed, "That the words 'in quantities not less than one reputed' stand part of the Bill."

MR. CROMBIE said that the object of the Bill was to take away every pretext for sending a child to a public-house at all, and as the Bill went up to the Grand Committee it fulfilled that object. The case of Ireland was very fully stated before the Committee, and it was proposed that under certain circumstances a child might be sent to fetch liquor in a closed vessel. That was only carried by a majority of one in the Committee, and the Committee limited the evil that would result from it by putting in the restriction as to quantity. If a child could be sent to fetch liquor in any quantity it would only be necessary to put even a glass of whisky into a bottle and cork it up to fulfil the law.

Therefore he hoped that the House would retain the small safeguard restricting the quantity. They had done everything they could to meet the case of those who supported the Amendment, even to such an extent that some thought the Bill was now worthless.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.) opposed the Amendment. If the police wished to harass publicans in Ireland they would have the power to do it whether the Amendment was inserted or not. As long as a child was allowed at all to go to a public-house the police could harass the publican. The way to prevent that was to exclude Ireland from the Bill altogether. His contention was that they should

not sacrifice a measure which would do incalculable good for an Amendment of this kind. Moreover, the publicans of Ireland had not said a word against the Bill. All the expressions of opinion he had heard from publicans were entirely in favour of it. There was a memorial presented to the House in favour of the Bill signed by some of the most eminent men in Ireland, including thirty-two archbishops and bishops; the bulk of the Irish party voted in favour of it; and after it had gone through all its intricate stages in the Grand Committee and in the House, it now came back all battered and torn, thanks to the energy of the hon. Member for South Leitrim. In his opinion the Amendment was another attempt to drive a bullet through the Bill, and he would oppose it.

MR. TULLY said he desired to support the Amendment. He admired the sincerity and the enthusiasm of his hon. friend, but his speech was not sufficiently logical to justify the position he had taken up.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY said they were entirely in favour of this Bill, and he had a memorial signed by almost every eminent person in Ireland in favour of it, but thanks to the energies of the hon. Member for South Leitrim it had been entirely altered in Committee, and he for one should repudiate it and vote against the motion.

MR. TULLY said of course every greedy publican was in favour of the Bill, and many were against him for the action he had taken. The principle of the Act had been put into operation in Liverpool for the last three years. There the magistrates prevented liquor being sold to children under thirteen years.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The question before the House is whether liquor shall be sold in a less quantity than a pint. The hon. Member must speak to the Amendment.

MR. TULLY said he would confine himself to the pint. The original proposal was to insert "one quart," but after a protracted discussion they obtained concession of "one reputed pint." The hon. Member for Dublin wished to have the "pint" struck out and "quart" inserted. He looked upon this Bill as the mere ghost of the one that was sent to the Upper House. He did not think much would be gained one way or the other by this Amendment, because in his opinion the Bill was now practically dead, but he would support it nevertheless.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. TULLY said that the Amendment which he now proposed to move was part of the compact which the promoters had made with him. He thought the clause as it stood was a very wide one, and the reason for its being made so wide was that it was the wish of the promoters to bring clubs within the purview of the Act. He was entirely in favour of such an idea, but the form of words which was used was not the form which would carry out that object. The words "places where intoxicating liquors are Sold, delivered, or distributed." had a very wide meaning, and he wanted to insert in that sentence the word "habitually" in places where intoxicating liquors were habitually sold. It was the practice of farmers in Ireland, especially at the harvest time, to employ a number of extra men, and they would get in a barrel of beer to distribute to those men while they were at work, and it would be hard if under this Act a child could not go into her father's barn and draw the beer which was to be

distributed among the men. It was never intended that this Bill should cover such a case as that, and therefore, in order to qualify the phrase in the Bill, he begged to move the Amendment standing in his, name.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 18, after the second word 'or,' to insert the word 'habitually.'";(Mr. Tully.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'habitually' be there inserted."

MR. CROMBIE said that this clause was not put in at the instance of the promoters of the Bill, but at the instance of the representatives of the trade. The question was fully discussed upstairs; it was a complicated legal point which he was not competent to discuss, but in the opinion of some eminent legal gentlemen on the Committee the introduction of the word "habitually" might do harm, and therefore he could not accept the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Bright-side) said that the Bill had now a new principle which it did not contain when it was read a first time or when it was before the Committee. In the original Bill only the publican was to be penalised. As the Bill now came before the House, both the publican who supplied the child and the person who sent the child were to be penalised. The parent was to be penalised for what? For doing nothing either criminal or wrong. It might be said that by sending a child to fetch beer from a public-house the child was exposed to temptation. That might be true, but it was not the business of the State to attempt to instruct parents how to bring up their children. If they accepted such a principle as this

nobody could say where it would stop. It was a new and a dangerous principle, and one which, if it came into operation, would be deeply and bitterly resented by the working classes. He begged to move the Amendment standing in his name.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 21, after the word 'penalties,' to insert the words 'nothing in this section shall apply to any sale or delivery made in compliance with a particular and specific written order, signed by the parent or guardian of the person to whom the liquor is sold or delivered.'";(Mr. James Hope.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. T. M. HEALY expressed surprise that the hon. Member, who was a representative of the greatest Catholic family in this country, should have moved such an Amendment as this. None of the Irish Members, no matter how strong they might be on the side of the brewers, had ventured to move such a degrading and loathsome Amendment.

*MR. SPEAKER: Those are not words which should be applied to the Amendment of any hon. Member.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he should be sorry to say any thing against the House as a whole on a matter of this kind, but he did think they were entitled to make a protest, in view of the charges made against some of his hon. friends, that it was the representative of an English Catholic family who moved such an abominable Amendment.

Question put, and negatived.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 28, after the word 'other,' to insert the word 'solid.'";(Dr. Thompson.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'solid' be there inserted."

MR. CROMBIE said he had no objection to the Amendment, but if the hon. Member objected;

MR. TULLY said Members had gone away believing that the Bill would be carried in its present form. The understanding had hitherto been adhered to, and if it was departed from on the matter of sealing-wax a very large question would be opened.

DR. THOMPSON pointed out that he had moved the Amendment after consultation with the hon. Member himself.

MR. TULLY said that was before any arrangement had been come to.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 1, to leave out from the word 'with' to the word 'withdrawn,' in line 3, inclusive."";(Dr. Thompson.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the, Bill."

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

MR. O'DOHERTY, who had on the Paper a motion for the rejection of the Bill, appealed to the Government not to take the Bill at that hour.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) pointed out that the Bill had already been postponed two or three times, and a period of the session had now been reached at which it was necessary that some progress should be made with the measure. He understood the objection of the hon. Member to be to one particular measure to be continued by the Bill.

Whatever might be the decision of the House with regard to that particular measure, the whole

Bill could not be thrown out, and the Second Reading must under any circumstances be obtained. He therefore suggested that the hon. Member could more properly raise his point by moving in Committee to omit the particular measure to which he had objection.

MR. O'DOHERTY thought the point of the hon. Member a very fair one, and intimated that he would raise the question in Committee.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time and committed for to-morrow.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clauses 1 to 6 agreed to.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said that the only Act under which the Treasury Commissioners could advance money for public works in Ireland was an Act of William, dated 1831, and that Act limited the power of the Commissioners to advancing at 4 per cent. for twenty-five years. Quite recently the Treasury had accepted only 2½ per cent. for certain loans in England, and he desired to move the clause of which he had given notice in order that the example of more recent times might be followed in regard to Ireland.

New clause;

"Notwithstanding anything in The Public Works (Ireland) Act, 1831, or any Act amending the same to the contrary, any advance by the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, under such Acts for the extension and promotion of public works in Ireland, including railways, may be made at such rate of interest not less than three per centum and for such period and upon such terms and conditions as subject to the approval of the Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury may be determined by the said Commissioners of Public Works.";(Mr. Flynn.)

Brought up, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed. "That the clause be read a second time."

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said that on behalf of the Treasury he could not accept the responsibility the hon. Member proposed to place upon them. The loans at less than 4 per cent. were almost exclusively loans on the guarantee of local rates, and even those, in the present state of the money market, and with the conditions under which the money was raised, had to be, at the very lowest, at 3¼ per cent., and for longer terms of years 3½ or 3¾ per cent. The cases the hon. Member had in mind were certain Irish railways, made primarily as business concerns for profit, and not at all for similar purposes to those for which loans were granted on the guarantee of local rates. The one exception was in regard to the Light Railways Act. The amount set aside for light railways in this country was a limited sum, and it was for the purpose of developing agricultural districts which had been in great difficulties, and in whose development there was a national interest. The case the hon. Member had privately brought under his notice was receiving consideration, but it was on an entirely different footing. It was the case of a railway built rather for excursion traffic than anything else, and its difficulties were not altogether foreign to bad or unsuccessful management in the past. He hoped the Amendment would not be pressed.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that, although in one afternoon they voted £23,000,000 for the Navy and £20,000,000 for the Army, the Treasury would not agree to this proposal, which had for its object the enabling of a small railway in the South of Ireland to obtain cheap borrowing terms. He would be loyal to Singapore or Hong Kong, but he had great difficulty in being loyal to an Irish money lender, even though he came from London. £2,000,000 were to be lent at 3 per cent. to people living in places discovered yesterday in order that they might send their telegrams cheaply by the Pacific cable, but to a paying country like Ireland, discovered 3,000 years ago and from which England obtained £10,000,000 a year

in taxes, not a penny would be given, or if any money was lent interest at the rate of 4 or 5 per cent. was insisted on. Only countries the natives of which word waist-bands appealed to the Government. It seemed to him that a waist-band was the sole link which bound the colonies to the mother country. He thought that, seeing that money was now so cheap, when the policy of the Colonial Secretary had brought Consols down from 113 to about 92, it was only reasonable to expect that the small and humble proposal of the hon. Member should have been accepted. SIR JAMES HASLETT said that many Members would be glad if the Financial Secretary could see his way to reconsider his decision in this case. He was afraid that in times past loans had been made to Ireland and had had to be written off, but he hoped the credit of that country was now in a more satisfactory condition.

MR. FLYNN said he did not wish to put the House to the trouble of a division, but he hoped the Financial Secretary would take into account the case he had brought before his notice.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN Said he would very carefully consider the representations which had been

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Chapman, Edward

Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Clare, Octavius Leigh

Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G. (Midd'x

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Cog hill, Douglas Harry

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Harmsworth, R. Leicester

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Cranborne, Viscount

Haslett, Sir James Homer

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Crombie, John William

Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-

Balcarres, Lord

Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)

Heaton, John Henniker

Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r

Dickson, Charles Scott

Helder, Augustus

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

Helme, Norval Watson

Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christen.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Henderson, Alexander
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Higginbottom, S. W.
Bignold, Arthur
Duke, Henry Edward
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Broadhurst, Henry
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Horniman, Frederick John
Caldwell, James
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Hoult, Joseph
Causton, Richard Knight
Gardner, Ernest
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Cordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Lawson, John Grant
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Chamberlain J. Austen (Worc'r
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
made to him, but he wished it to be distinctly understood that he made no
bargain that the terms already offered in regard to repayment or interest should
be reduced.
Motion and clause, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill reported without amendment; to be read the third time to-morrow.

ROYAL TITLES BILL [Lords].

Order for the Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. DILLON desired, on behalf of the Nationalist Members, to record a final protest against the Bill. The measure was unnecessary and uncalled for, and had been forced on the colonies by the Colonial Office. He regarded it merely as another move in the Imperialistic game, which had already brought so much ruin and sorrow in its train, and he should certainly divide the House against the Third Reading.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 133; Noes, 53. (Division List No. 475.)

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Moss, Samuel

Smith, James Parker (Lanad)

Levy, Maurice

Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)

Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)

Lewis, John Herbert

Murray, Col. W. (Bath)

Spear, John Ward

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Parkes, Ebenezer

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Lough, Thomas

Pretymann, Ernest George

Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ-

Lowther, Rt. Hn. J W (Cum. Penr.

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Purvis, Robert

Tennant, Harold John

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Randles, John S.

Thomas, J A. (Glamorgan Gower

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth

Reid, James (Greenock)

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison

Remnant, James Farquharson

Tritton, Charles Ernest

Macdona, John Cumming

Rentoul, James Alexander
Ure, Alexander
McIver, David (Liverpool)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalyb'dge
Valentia, Viscount
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Majendie, James A. H.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Williams, Rt. Hn J. Powell- (Birm
Malcolm, Ian
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Middlemore, John T.
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Rutherford, John
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (I. of Wight
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Hayes Fisher.
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Sinclair, John (Forfarshire)
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Hammond, John
O'Dowd, John
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Boyle, James
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William
Campbell, John (Armagh S.)
Leamy, Edmund

O'Mara, James
Channing, Francis Allston
London, W.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Clancy, John Joseph
M'Fadden, Edward
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Govern, T.
Reddy, M.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Crean, Eugene
Murnaghan, George
Roche, John
Cullinan, J.
Murphy, John
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Delany, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sullivan, Donal
Dillon, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Tully, Jasper
Doogan, P. C.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Duffy, William J.
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York. W. R.)
Field, William
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Doherty, William
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Bill read the third time, and passed, without amendment.
LIGHT RAILWAYS (No. 2) BILL.
[SECOND READING].
Order for Second Reading read.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."
MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said the object of the Bill was to extend the

operation of the Light Railways Act. The Light Railways Act had not been used for the benefit of agricultural districts, as was intended by Parliament, but had been taken advantage of by speculators, who had obtained permission from the Board of Trade to construct tramways

on very easy conditions. The Act had not been administered in the spirit in which Parliament intended. It had only benefited big railway companies and promoters of tramway companies. He begged to move that the Bill be read that day three months. He would withdraw his opposition to the Bill if he received a promise from the President of the Board of Trade that the proposed additional Commissioner to be appointed under the Bill at £1,000 a year would only be appointed for a year, and that the whole subject would then be reconsidered.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out from the word 'now' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'upon this day three months.'";(Mr. O'Mara.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-on-Trent) said he would second the rejection of the Bill. The Light Railways Act had not been worked in the way Parliament intended. The Commissioners had done their work badly, and he did not think they should have any salary at all. The Act had been worked in a way that was never intended. He approved of the object for which it was originally brought in, namely, to assist the agricultural districts.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) asked the President of the Board of Trade why this Bill should be necessary. He thought they had got rid of the Light Railways Bill till next year. Why was another Commissioner to be appointed at the salary proposed in the Bill?

MR. T. M. HEALY said those who were in favour of municipalisation, if they understood their true interest, should have supported the President of the Board of Trade. He thought the right hon. Gentleman had been subjected to some needless criticism by those who had not taken an intelligent view of the question. He could say for himself that, if the President of the Board of Trade could show any reason for giving this money he would not oppose it. They had recently had a visit of American capitalists. He believed that American capital was likely to do an enormous amount of good in Ireland, but was it because of the visit of these American millionaires that work of the Light Railways

Commission was to be increased?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central) said he did not think it necessary to make a defence of the policy of the administration of the Light Railways Act in Ireland. That Act had been successful beyond expectation, and had led to an immense increase of enterprise in this country. He wished to say a few words as to the reasons why this comparatively small proposal had been made. The work under the Act had been much greater than was anticipated, and of the three Commissioners appointed under the original Act only one was paid, Lord Jersey, who had been Chairman for five years, and Mr. Gerald FitzGerald being

unpaid. Mr. FitzGerald had resigned, having found that he could no longer continue his services, and it became necessary to appoint another Commissioner

in his place. Having regard to the extent and arduous character of the work, he thought the House would see that they could hardly find a successor to Mr. FitzGerald without paying a salary. It was necessary to appoint a qualified successor, and it was hoped that such would be found at a salary of £1,000. The Act would be continued for a year, after which he hoped the whole matter would be dealt with in a broader and more comprehensive spirit.

MR. COGHILL asked why the right hon. Gentleman had withdrawn the first Bill.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Simply and solely because it would have given rise to a large amount of discussion.

*MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said there were several large questions connected with this Bill into which he would gladly have entered, but this was not the occasion to discuss them. As the President of the Board of Trade had said, something must be done, because the Act must go on. He should like to join the President of the Board of Trade in stating that the work of the Commission had been done at a very small cost to the country. Men of ability and experience had given a great deal of time to it, and the country was in particular much indebted to Lord Jersey for his assiduous and very valuable services as chairman. He thought that the request of the Government for a salary for another Commission was reasonable, although he did not know whether it would be possible to get a man of Mr. FitzGerald's experience and ability for a salary of £1,000 a year. It was certainly very desirable that the Government should bring in a Bill early next session, for there were a great many outstanding questions to be considered. One point which gave rise to difficulty was that the light railways should be made on the highways as proposed in the original Bill. His opinion always had been that they ought to be made on highways rather than across country; and it was in the hope that this would be largely done that he had brought in the original

Light Railways Bill of 1895. But he was the last person to desire that the power of using highways, which in his belief already existed, should be used to deprive local authorities of the power of acquiring tramways which they possessed under the Tramways Acts. It did not, however, follow that the purchase provisions in regard to tramways should in their existing form be necessarily applicable to light railways, and particularly to light railways worked by electricity, in which the initial cost was heavy, but in some way or other he conceived that the powers and rights of the local authorities ought to be safeguarded. He suggested that when the promised Bill was brought in early next session a Select Committee might be appointed to consider on what principle the terms should be fixed for the purchase of the undertakings by local authorities.

MR. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.) said he did not wish to say one word against the Light Railway Commissioners. They had done their work exceedingly well at a comparatively small cost. But if this Bill was to be the means of perpetuating the Light Railways Act in its present form he would be strongly opposed to it. His experience had been that the great hulk of the Orders made under the Light Railways Act might have been more properly called Tramway Orders. He did not think that the President of the Board of Trade could point to more than two or three cases where Light Railways had been made within the provisions of the

Light Railways Act. They were almost exclusively tramways.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I must say the debate is drifting from the subject matter of the Bill. A discussion of the administration of the Light Railways Act will be out of order.

MR. MOSS said his reason for opposing the Bill was because he had been given to understand by the observations of the right hon. Gentleman that, unless this Bill was passed, the Light Railways Act was likely to come to an end and that there would not be a Commission to carry on the Act. For his part he should not be sorry to see it discontinued

because the Act had been carried out so differently from what had been intended. He hoped that some Bill would be introduced next year to amend the Act so that the old Tramways Act should not be evaded.

O'DOHERTY said that what they wanted to know was who the man was to be appointed to this position. He had introduced early in the session a short measure dealing with light railways in his own county.

*MR. SPEAKER: That does not arise on this Bill.

MR. O'DOHERTY said he was only about to point out that the Bill was an extension of the Tramways Act of 1860. He would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to inform the House who was the gentleman about to be appointed. Was he a man conversant with the Tramways Acts and the Light Railways Act of 1896, and was he an engineer, or a railway manager, or an ex-railway manager.

MR. F. W. WILSON (Norfolk, Mid) said that the Light Railways Act in his part of the country had hitherto been used for a number of abortive projects by which money was lost. He did not think light railways would develop until permission were given for them to run along the highways.

MR. O'MARA said that in view of the pledge given by the President of the Board of Trade, that the whole matter would be revised, he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed for to-morrow.

EAST INDIA LOAN (GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY DEBENTURES) BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

MARRIAGES LEGALISATION BILL [Lords].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) asked what date would be inserted in the schedule.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said he had made inquiries and found that the 1st of January, 1828, would be a safe date. He hoped that would meet the views of the hon. Member.

Amendment proposed;

"In schedule, line 25, to insert '1st of January, 1828, or.'"

Agreed to.

Bill reported, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered To-morrow.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. T. M. HEALY asked how long the House would be kept sitting.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said that the strain on the House was very great, but he understood it was for the general convenience that they should adjourn on Saturday.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS BILL.

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed.

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL [Lords].

Considered in Committee, and reported without Amendment.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. T. M. HEALY said they were entitled to know what the Bill was for.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said the object of the Bill was to fulfil the obligations of this country under the Brussels Conference.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS REGULATION BILL [Lords].

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order for Committee be discharged and the Bill withdrawn."

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said the Bill was only opposed very mildly by one Member, and he would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to proceed with it.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that the Bill was very strongly opposed, and that it was unfair to suggest that such a contentious measure should be proceeded with at that hour.

Question put, and agreed to.

BERWICKSHIRE COUNTY TOWN BILL [Lords].

Order for Third Reading read.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he would suggest that the Order be discharged and the Bill withdrawn. It was very contentious, and as far as he was concerned he would fight it on every occasion.

Third Reading deferred till to-morrow.

GREENWICH HOSPITAL.

Resolved, That the Statement of the Estimated Income and Expenditure of Greenwich Hospital and Travers' Foundation for the year 1901–2 be approved.:(Mr. Pretyma.)

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered. Amendments made; Bill read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 22nd day of July last, Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes before Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 15th August, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

CITY AND BRIXTON RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, with an Amendment.

WATFORD AND DISTRICT TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

Read the, third time, and passed, without amendment.

AMENDMENT OF STANDING ORDERS.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHEK, Cumberland, Penrith): In moving the Amendments which stand in my name on the Paper I need only explain that they are all drafting Amendments, save one to Standing Order 153, which proposes to enable tramway companies, like railway companies, to raise one-third of their capital by borrowing. At present tramway companies can raise only one-fourth of their capital by borrowing, but Committees of this House have been recently allowing them to raise one-third, and it is now felt that the time has arrived when they should be placed in the same position as railway companies. Power, however, is reserved to the Select Committee to refuse this right in any case if they consider it necessary. I do not think there are any other Amendments which require any explanation, and I shall be obliged to the House if it will pass them as they stand on the Paper.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) claimed the right to say a few words on this matter. Here they had a long series of motions dealing with private business. He did not propose to take advantage of the forms of the House to divide on them, but he did desire to call attention to the accusation readily made against the Irish Members that they desired to bring the House into contempt by an abuse of its forms. If that were true, here was an opportunity for taking half a hundred divisions, under the forms of the House, but they allowed it to go by, as they allowed to go by endless opportunities afforded by private business for what was called obstruction.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.) said he heard with great satisfaction the hon. Member's repudiation of the charge that he and his colleagues desired to bring the House into contempt. But, if such charges were made, they were due to statements by colleagues of the hon. Member, one of whom, at any rate, had publicly avowed that it was the intention of the Irish party to degrade the House of Commons until such time as Home Rule were granted.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I deny that.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Oh, yes, it was said.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said the right hon. Gentleman had evidently made what was for him an unusual appearance at the time of private business in order to add fuel to the campaign against the Irish Members which was started at Blenheim. He was glad his hon. friend the Member for Waterford had repudiated the charge of bringing the House into contempt which had been laid at the doors of the Irish Members. For his part, he would never engage in any proceedings of the kind, simply because he did not think they would advance the interests of Ireland. If, when the Colonial Secretary brought his political career to a close, and began to write his last will and testament, the Irish Members were still in the House of Commons; which he sincerely trusted would not be the case; the right hon. Gentleman would find them in the same force and in the same strength as they had been when they were in alliance with himself. With regard to the proposed alterations of the Standing Orders, he only wished to observe that he was sorry that the Chairman of Ways and Means and the

Lords Chairman had not taken advantage of the opportunity and of the feeling which undoubtedly existed to really improve the Standing Orders, and put them into a more workmanlike shape. It was admitted the other day by the Lords Chairman that there was necessity for further improvement and revision, and he certainly had hoped that something would have been done to provide something in the nature of a digest of the Orders.

MR. J. W. LOWTHER said the suggestion of the hon. Member was well worth considering, and he would consult with his noble friend, but he was very doubtful if the House would be content to leave the matter in their hands. It might be desirable to appoint a Committee to deal with the matter.

The Resolution amending the Standing Orders was put and agreed to, and it was ordered that it be a Standing Order of the House.

PETITION.

BLAIR, WILLIAM.

Petition of William Blair, for inquiry into his case; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS ACTS. 1894 AND 1896.

Copies presented, of Four Orders relating to the Foreign Animals Wharves at Deptford and Cardiff [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

HIGHER GRADE SCHOOLS.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th August; Sir William Anson]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 357.]

SHIPPING CASUALTIES (1899–1900).

Copy presented, of Abstract of the Returns of Shipping Casualties which occurred on or near the Coasts, or in Rivers and Harbours, of the United Kingdom from the 1st July, 1899, to 30th June, 1900; and of the Returns of Shipping Casualties to British Vessels elsewhere than on or near the Coasts, or in Rivers and Harbours, of the United Kingdom, and to Foreign Vessels on or near the Coasts, or in Rivers and Harbours, of British Possessions Abroad, &c., with Charts and Appendices [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

GERMAN TARIFF.

Copy presented, of Translation of the proposed new German Customs Tariff, with comparison, as far as possible, of the Rates of Customs Duty contained in the proposed Tariff with the Rates at present in force on Imports into Germany from the United Kingdom [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

FOREIGN IMPORT DUTIES.

Copy presented, of Statement of the Rates of Import Duties levied in European Countries, in the United States, and in Japan upon the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LONDON (EQUALISATION OF RATES) ACT, 1894.

[ACCOUNTS UNDER SECTION 1 (7) OF THE ACT.]

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 13th August; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 358.]

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Report No. 329 (Malta, Annual Report for 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA.

Copy presented, of Proclamation issued by Lord Kitchener, as Administrator of the Transvaal, on 1st July, 1901, respecting payments under contracts to purchase or lease land or mining rights, &c., entered into prior to the war [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIES (COLONIAL ACTS, ROYAL ASSENT).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 14th May, 1900; Sir Charles Dilke]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY RATIONS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed to Inquire into the Question of Navy Rations, &c. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Copy presented, of additional and amending General Orders for the Regulation of Proceedings under and in pursuance of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 359.]

BENEFICES ACT, 1898.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address, 6th August; Lord Hugh Cecil]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 360.]

Nature of Service.

Number landed.

Killed.

Died of wounds.

Died from disease.

Total deaths.

Wounded.

Approximate number of days ashore.

Officers.

Men.

Officers.

Men.

Officers.

Men.

Officers.

Men.

Officers.

Men.

Officers.

Men

Legations at Peking

Seymour's Relief Column

Defence of Tientsin

Tientsin Relief Force

Bombardment of Taku Forts by "Algerine," "Phoenix," "Fame," "Whiting"

Various duties at Taku, Tong ku, and T'sien Ho

Totals

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (County of Wilts).;Return relative thereto [ordered 9th August; Mr. Griffith Boscawen]; to be printed. [No. 361.]

EARLY CLOSING OF SHOPS.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a Copy of the Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on Early Closing of Shops, with the proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, &c.;(Mr. Secretary Ritchie.)

BETTING.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to communicate to this House a Copy of the Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships on Betting, with the Proceedings of the Committee, Minutes of Evidence, &c.;(Mr. Attorney General.)

NAVAL FORCES (CHINA).

Return ordered, "showing the strength of the Naval Force employed in operations on shore and afloat in China, and Casualties incurred, during 1900, in the following form;;

SUMMARY, DISTINGUISHING VARIOUS BRANCHES.

Number landed.

Killed.

Died of Wounds.

Died from disease.

Total deaths.

Wounded.

Officers.

Men.

Officers.

Men.

Officers.

Men.

Officers.

Men.

Officers.

Men.

Officers.

Men.

Royal Navy

Executive

Engineer

Civil

Royal Marine Artillery

Royal Marine Light Infantry

Totals

;(Sir John Golomb.)

PERSONAL PROPERTY (CONTRIBUTIONS TO LOCAL TAXATION ABROAD).

Address for "Return setting out the system under which Personal Property is made to contribute towards Local Taxation by means of a local Income Tax or local Death Duty in the following Countries: France, Germany. Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Holland, United States of America, and in all British self-governing Colonies and the Channel Islands.";(Mr. Strachey.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA;CUSTOMS AND TRADE REGULATIONS IN THE NEW COLONIES.

SIR JOHN ROLLESTON (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of the termination of the war in South Africa, and of the establishment of settled government in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, it is intended that the manufacturers of foreign countries shall have equal opportunities for trade with those of the United Kingdom.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.):

The consideration of the customs tariffs has not yet been taken in hand, but it is not the intention of His Majesty's Government to adopt any system of protective discrimination against foreign goods.

BOER PRISONERS AT ST. HELENA;CASE OF GODEFROY.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the case of the killing of Godefroy at St. Helena, an investigation before a coroner was demanded by the Boer prisoners, which demand was refused; and, if so, can he state why it was refused; whether, at the military inquiry which did take place, the friends of Godefroy were represented, and whether his representatives were allowed to cross-examine the military witnesses; whether the committee of Boer prisoners who communicated with the Governor in reference to this incident have sent in any statement; and, if so, whether such statement was considered by the court which conducted the inquiry; and whether he will allow the Member for East Mayo to have access to any correspondence which has passed between the camp committee, the Governor, and the President of the Court in reference to the shooting of Godefroy, and to the official record of the proceedings of the court.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The Report called for has not yet arrived. I am not, therefore, in a position to answer the question.

MR. DILLON: I give notice to the noble Lord that I shall on the Appropriation Bill demand an explanation of the unaccountable delay in the production of this Report.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): What about your new colonial cables?

DORDRECHT EXECUTIONS;COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE OF BURGHERS.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he has now obtained information, as promised, from South Africa and if he can communicate to the House what were the exceptional circumstances connected with the compulsion of British colonists to witness the execution of their countrymen at Dordrecht; who gave the order for such compulsion, if it was sanctioned by the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa, and, if not, whether the officer responsible for it has been punished; whether these colonists were convicted criminals or prisoners, under what penalty did they attend, and what object was

gained by such compulsion; and if he cannot give the desired information at present, can he state when such will be forthcoming, and if the practice is in the meantime to continue, pending information being given to this House.

LORD STANLEY: The Report may be expected within the next fortnight. The further point raised in the last paragraph was dealt with in my replies on Friday last to the questions put by the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire.

MR. PIRIE: If the Report arrives during the recess will the noble Lord have it circulated among Members?

LORD STANLEY: I cannot answer that without notice.

VLAKFONTEIN.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office, in reference to the despatch of General Dixoh on the battle of Vlakfontein, whether the sworn evidence mentioned by Lord Kitchener in reference to the alleged killing of British wounded has come to hand.

See page 272.

LORD STANLEY: No, it has not yet been received.

MR. DILLON: But Lord Kitchener refers to the affidavits as having been sent.

LORD STANLEY: He said he would send them, and he has told us he was sending them, but they have not yet been received.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Is Lord Kitchener waiting for the rising of the House?

LORD STANLEY: No; he is awaiting the arrival of the Report.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Will the noble Lord say is there any truth in the rumour of Lord Kitchener's return?

[No answer was given.]

CONCENTRATION CAMPS;HOWICK CAMP.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that in the prison camps at Howick, in South Africa, an account is kept of all rations and clothing issued to each individual in the camp and debited against them; whether the same system is carried out in the other camps throughout South Africa; whether in keeping these accounts any allowance is made for the property of the individuals which has been destroyed or confiscated by the British troops, and whether any distinction is made between voluntary refugees and prisoners who have been brought to the camp by force and are detained there against their will.

LORD STANLEY: Lord Kitchener's Report on the refugee camps in Natal has not yet arrived, so that I am not in a position to answer the question. I apprehend that the Report refers to the usual ration returns which are kept in every Government establishment where rations are issued.

POSITIONS OF BRITISH TROOPS.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he will lay upon the Table of the House maps of South Africa coloured to show the districts in effective occupation of the British troops on 1st July, 1900, 1st January, 1901, and 1st July, 1901, respectively.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. It is an unvarying rule not to publish, during a campaign, maps which indicate the positions of British troops in the field.

ARREST OF A GERMAN WAR CORRESPONDENT.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that Herr Meyerbach, a war correspondent in South Africa for the Berlin Tagblatt, has been arrested by the English authorities as a spy and is about to be tried by court-martial at Middelburg; and whether any communication has been received from the Government of the German Empire, of which Herr Meyerbach is a subject, with reference to his arrest and approaching trial.

I beg also to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that Herr Meyerbach, who has acted as war correspondent in South Africa for the Berlin Tagblatt, has been arrested by the English authorities on suspicion of being a spy, and is to be tried by court-martial at Middelburg; whether he will be given the assistance of legal advisers in his defence; and, having regard to the fact that he is a subject of the German Empire, will he be allowed to communicate with the German Consul.

LORD STANLEY: In reply to these questions, I have no information on the matter alluded to, and no communication has been received from the German Government.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will the noble Lord send for information?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir.

ROYAL GARRISON REGIMENTS.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state what progress has been made in the formation of the Royal Garrison Regiments, and what is the present position and station of the several battalions.

LORD STANLEY: The first battalion is at Malta and numbers 989 all ranks, the second is at Gibraltar and numbers 1,035 all ranks, and the third is being raised at Warley and numbers 910 all ranks.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS IN IRELAND.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he has received from the Dublin Trades Council a resolution pointing out the desirability of having samples of articles required by the War Department, and sent by Irish contractors, examined at Arbour Hill Receiving Depot instead of at Woolwich, and asking that workshops attached to military barracks should be more largely established in Ireland; and whether he can see his way to complying with this resolution.

LORD STANLEY: This resolution was received, and a reply was sent on the 15th July expressing the inability of the Secretary of State for War to comply with it, as the stores required were not large enough to justify the creation of any local factory.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): Is the noble Lord aware that the Commander-in-Chief in Ireland recommended the purchase in Ireland of goods obtainable there?

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware of that.

MR. NANNETTI: Perhaps, then, the noble Lord will look at the evidence given by the right hon. the Commander-in-Chief in Ireland before the War Office Organisation Committee.

SEATON LINKS. ABERDEEN.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether there is any intention on the part of the War Office to take steps with a view to the placing of a military camp on Seaton Links, near Aberdeen.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir; there is no such intention.

ARMY LIST AND ARMY RANK.

*COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether, seeing that the official Army List, published in accordance "with the provisions of the Army Act, 1881, Section 163 (d), is under the Act evidence of the status and rank of the officers therein mentioned, he can explain why Lieutenant-colonels of the Reserve of Officers, with rank of colonel in the Army, are deprived of their Army rank on recall to service.

LORD STANLEY: The Army List under the Army Act, Section 163 (d), is evidence of the status and rank of the officers therein mentioned, and the Reserve officers are also shown therein, with the commissions they held when on the active list. On the recall of a Reserve officer to service he is dealt with under the King's regulations.

MILITARY WORKS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he can state what was the amount expended, under the Military Works Acts of 1897 and 1899, on defence works, barracks, ranges, and staff and contingencies respectively, from the 1st April, 1900, to the 31st March, 1901; what is the estimated expenditure under those headings for the current year; and what is the total amount in respect of which contracts have been entered into under the Military Works Acts of 1897 and 1899.

LORD STANLEY: The accounts are not fully made up to 31st March, 1901, but the following is the approximate expenditure from 1st April, 1900, to 31st March, 1901: Defences, £400,000; barracks, £500,000; ranges, etc., £250,000; staff, etc., £50,000. The estimated expenditure for the current year will be found in Command Paper No. 518 of 1901, but I have reason to hope that we shall make more progress than was anticipated, in which case the expenditure will be larger. The total amount authorised up to date for which contracts have been made is £5,691,670, but contracts involving a large amount are now under consideration, and will probably be accepted within the next month or so.

CHINA; REWARDS FOR NAVAL FORCES.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state what steps are being taken with regard to the issue of medals and clasps to the naval force employed in China during the recent operations; and whether he can give an assurance that the recipients of such medals and clasps will have the same treatment extended to them with respect to the presentation thereof as has lately been accorded to those who have served in the South African War.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The preparation of the medals and clasps for the naval forces in the recent operations in China will be proceeded with as rapidly as possible. I can give no

assurance with regard to the presentation of the medals and clasps, as the matter is one which must depend on the pleasure of the King.

GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY COMPANY'S ANNUITIES.

*MR. J. E. GORDON (Elgin and Nairn): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is now prepared to publish the manner of calculating the rate of interest used in connection with the amount of Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company's annuities; whether it was identical with the process employed when the Indian Government terminated the lease and repaid the capital of the Scinde and Eastern Bengal Railway Companies; and, if not, what cause there was for altering the precedents of the past twenty years.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The Secretary of State has no knowledge of the manner in which the rate of interest was calculated by the Governors of the Bank of England in any of the cases mentioned.

*MR. J. E. GORDON: Is the noble Lord not aware that a clause in the Scinde Railway Act, 1886, declares that "whereas the rate of interest to be used in calculating the said annuity has been ascertained in accordance with the provision…. And such annuity has accordingly been calculated and created by the Secretary of State"?

[No answer was returned.]

MR. J. E. GORDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he is prepared to accept the method and details of the recent Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company's repayment as precedents governing the approaching repayment in 1905 and 1907 of the capital of the Bombay Railway Company and the Madras Railway Company.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The procedure to be adopted, if the Government purchase by annuity, will be that which is prescribed by the contract, namely, a reference to the Governor or Deputy-Governor of the Bank of England to decide the rate of interest which shall govern the annuity. But, as I have often before stated, I have no cognisance of, or authority over, the method or details by or upon which the Governor or Deputy Governor of the Bank may arrive at the determination upon the point referred to them.

MR. J. E. GORDON: I beg to give notice that I shall bring this matter before the House to-morrow.

INDIA OFFICE AUDITORSHIP.

MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can state the present salaries for the auditor of the India Office and of his deputy; whether those salaries have been recently increased, and, if so, when and on what grounds; what is the total cost of the auditor's department, and what relation that cost bears to the amount to be audited; what is the total number of queries raised by the auditor in the last five years, and what is the total sum involved in those queries.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The salaries of the auditor and of his assistant are respectively £1,200 and £800, rising to £1,000. They were increased to these amounts in February, 1900, on the ground of the importance of the duties performed, and with due regard to the salaries paid for services of similar

importance elsewhere. The total cost of the auditor's department, which was created by Act of Parliament, is about £7,000 a year; the sums which he has to audit amount to nearly eighty millions sterling annually. The total number of queries raised by the auditor during the last five years is 1,270; but this fact gives no indication whatever of the extent or importance of the duties performed by him.

CANTONMENT OF RANGOON.

MR. KESWICK (Surrey, Epsom): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the Public Works Department in Burma is insisting on taking over houses belonging to private owners in the Cantonment of Rangoon without paying the full and fair value of the buildings; and whether he will have the matter inquired into, and by arbitration or otherwise have the real value of the houses ascertained.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have no information on the subject to which this question refers, but I will make inquiry.

JAMAICA LAWS; FLOGGING.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to Law No. 21 of 1901, passed by the Jamaica Legislature on 4th July, Article 2 of which empowers the Jamaica Agricultural Society and any affiliated society to appoint constables for the arrest of persons suspected of petty larceny, who, under Article 3, may be imprisoned on evidence not necessarily on oath; on whom Article 4 throws the burden of proving their innocence; and who, in the event of conviction of a first offence, may, and on subsequent conviction must, under Article 7, in addition to or in lieu of imprisonment, be subjected to flogging with a cat-o'-nine-tails, with not more than eighteen stripes if under the age of sixteen, or thirty-six stripes if over that age; and whether he will advise the disallowance of this law by His Majesty.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The law in question has not yet been received; when it comes it will be most carefully scrutinised. To judge from the reports in the local newspapers, the provisions quoted by the right hon. Member are not correct, and the law contains a suspending clause, so that it does not come into operation until His Majesty's assent has been given.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I have read the Act.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have not seen the Act. I have only read the local newspapers, so that I am not in a position to say whether the statements in the right hon. Gentleman's question are correct or not.

MALTA.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the petition presented on the 13th instant from the elected members of the Council of Government of Malta, urging that a Commission be appointed to inquire into the system of Government in Malta, the language question, and the question of taxes; whether he is aware that a representative meeting has lately been held in Malta which expressed its condemnation of the despatch dated 30th July; and whether a Commission will be granted in accordance with the petition of the elected representatives of the

Maltese people.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: (1) I have no information with regard to the petition in question. (2) Yes. (3) No, Sir, I do not propose that a Commission be granted to inquire into the system of government in Malta.

MR. PLYNN (Cork, N.) asked whether it was intended to continue the government of Malta by Order in Council exclusively.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: When necessary, yes.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Has the right hon. Gentleman received any information in reference to the reports that the British flag has been hauled down in Malta and that injury has

been done to the statue of Her late Majesty.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no information as to either of those incidents, except what I have seen in the newspapers. No official information has come to me.

CAIRO FOX HUNTING INCIDENT.

SIR CHARLES CAYZER (Barrow-in-Furness): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he is aware that Mr. Wilfrid Blunt's Bedouin servants, three of whom were recently punished for assaulting officers of 11th Hussars, near Cairo, some time previously, by Mr. Blunt's directions, flogged two Greeks who went into his enclosure until they were insensible; and what steps, if any, were taken in this matter.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): His Majesty's Government have no information of the incident mentioned. They understand that at the trial of the men accused of assaulting the British officers, the defendant's counsel mentioned that he had himself witnessed a case where two Italians who had trespassed on Mr. Blunt's property were bound and severely beaten in Mr. Blunt's presence. If the facts were as stated it was clearly for the sufferers to complain to the authorities or take legal remedies. It is not known whether they did so.

NEW GERMAN TARIFF.

MR. CROMBIE (Kineardineshire): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been directed to the proposal which the German Government are about to submit to the Reichstag raising the duties on English imports, and whether any steps are being taken by the English Government in the matter.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Copies of the proposed new German Customs Tariff have been received at the Foreign Office, and a statement has been prepared at the Board of Trade comparing the present and proposed rates, but I understand that the proposed tariff is still in the hands of the Tariff Committee of the Bundesrath, who will probably not report to that body till the end of the year. The matter is actively engaging the attention of the Commercial Intelligence Committee of the Board of Trade, who are I believe taking steps to consult the principal chambers of commerce.

NICARAGUA CANAL;CLAYTON-BULWER TREATY.

MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state what is the present position of the

negotiations between His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States for the establishment of an inter-oceanic waterway between the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans; whether there has been any reply to Lord Lansdowne's despatch of 22nd February, 1901; and whether the provisions of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty are still in force.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: There has been no formal reply to Lord Lansdowne's despatch of 22nd February, but unofficial communications between His Majesty's Government and the Government of the United States have taken place through Lord Pauncefote, who is at present in this country. The Clayton-Bulwer Treaty is still in force.

COAL EXPORT DUTY; REMISSIONS.

SIR THEODORE DOXFORD (Sunderland): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, as it is the intention of the Treasury to remit the coal export duty on all coal shipped this year under pre-Budget contracts, an approximate date can be given for returning the amounts paid on such contracts, and for passing the balances of contracts exempt from duty if shipped by the end of the year; and whether, if an approximate date for the latter cannot be given, the Treasury can issue regulations to avoid the loss to merchants by the payment of duty on account of pre-Budget contracts.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The remission, as I have already stated, can only apply to contracts fulfilling the conditions which I stated to the House on 25th of June. I cannot give an approximate date for all repayments in such cases; but much has been repaid already, and the Customs hope that all uncontroversial cases may be disposed of by 30th September next. In this, and in the completion of the work of passing the balances of contracts that are to be shipped duty free, much will depend on the degree in which contractors help the Customs by promptly and accurately furnishing cover contracts, and in arranging them so as to indicate the selling contracts to which the cover contracts respectively relate. The Board of Customs are using every exertion to hasten the work, especially in the case of the smaller and apparently needier merchants.

BOOKMAKERS IN GUERNSEY.

MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Hohnfirth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that some twenty or more betting bookmakers calling themselves turf accountants have transferred their business from Holland to Guernsey, where it is not illegal, as in England, to receive money on deposit for betting purposes, and that the advertisements of these bookmakers appear in English newspapers; and whether he can take any steps to promote the assimilation of the law in the Channel Islands to that which exists in England, so as to diminish the temptation to betting in this country.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I will bring this question to the notice of the authorities in the Channel Islands.

HACKNEY UNION; NURSE BEATTY.

MR. BULL (Hammersmith): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that the guardians of the Hackney Union decline to produce the papers under which they detained Nurse Beatty as a lunatic; and

will he, having regard to Section 82 of 32 Vict., c. 5, direct them to do so.

*MR. RITCHIE: I have no knowledge

of the papers referred to, not have I any authority to give directions to the guardians of the poor. I presume the reference is to Section 82 of the Lunacy Act, 1890.

BOLTON LICENSING CASE.

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is now in possession of further information in regard to the proceedings at the quarter sessions for Bolton, on 12th July, in the case of the Standard Arms beer-house; and whether, in view of the facts of that case, he will take steps to insure the observance by the justices of Bolton of the provisions of Section 158 (1) of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882.

*MR. RITCHIE: I am informed, as the result of inquiries, that the borough magistrates, although present and giving assistance as to the facts of the case, took no part in the decision of the court and did not act as justices within the enactment referred to. In view of that enactment, however, I cannot help regarding it as unfortunate that they took any part at all in the proceedings.

FISHERY DISPUTES OFF CULLERCOATS.

MR. HARRIS (Tynemouth): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received information concerning the attacks that have recently been made on the open sea and in the mouth of the River Tyne on fishing boats returning to Cullercoats by a steam tug and other boats belonging to a Mr. Ewen, and whether he is aware that the fishing coble "Harold" returning from fishing was run into and almost sunk, that her sails and fishing nets were seized, and the men on board were in peril of their lives; whether it has been brought to his knowledge that the fishermen of Culler-coats are now obliged to arm themselves for their own protection; and what steps he proposes to take to prevent a recurrence of these attacks.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The Board of Trade were informed by the Admiralty on the 7th instant that, owing to the salmon fishery disputes off the mouth of the Tyne arising out of a claim to private fishing rights, two gunboats had been despatched to the locality. The Board have asked the Admiralty for further particulars.

DISCIPLINE ON MERCHANT SHIPS;THE "MAB."

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his Department has received any report respecting the imprisonment of the firemen of the steamship "Mab," at the Canadian port Rimouski; whether he is aware that these men refused to work, coal being part cargo to be shifted in the bunkers after one o'clock on Saturday afternoon; and that, although it is the custom on British ships for the firemen to cease work in port at one clock on Saturday afternoon, the master put the men in irons, and kept them lying on deck seven hours; and, seeing that this master has had trouble with his men on board other British vessels, whether he will cause inquiry to be made with regard to the treatment of the firemen of the "Mab" by the master.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Notice of the hon. Member's question was the first intimation I received of the case to which he refers. From inquiries I have made

it appears that five firemen of the "Mab" refused duty and became violent, one even attempting to throw the master overboard. They were put in irons until the arrival of the police. In the district magistrate's court at Rimouski the men were convicted. One was sent to prison for eight days, and all forfeited two days pay. A counter charge was brought against the master by the firemen, but was dismissed. The Board of Trade have nothing recorded against the master.

THE "LOUISIANA."

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has yet received any report with regard to the condition of the steamship "Louisiana," when she sailed from Quebec on her last voyage; whether he is aware that when this vessel last left Quebec the master was compelled to jettison a portion of the deck cargo; whether he will ascertain from the master how many standard of deals were jettisoned; whether it is the intention of the Board of Trade to ask the owners of this vessel to award compensation to the seamen who were imprisoned for refusing to proceed in the ship on the ground that she was unseaworthy; and whether the Board of Trade intends to take proceedings under the Merchant Shipping Act against the owners for sending this vessel to sea in an unseaworthy condition.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, I have not yet received any report from Quebec with regard to the case of the "Louisiana." The owners, however, inform me that when the vessel left that port no portion of the cargo was jettisoned, but that certain deck cargo was discharged in port in order to remedy a list, after which a certificate of seaworthiness (of which I have seen a copy) was granted by the local authorities. As it appears that the seamen who were imprisoned refused to proceed to sea after the "Louisiana" was declared to be in a seaworthy condition, and as she was not sent to sea unseaworthy, the case does not appear to me to be one either for compensation or prosecution.

MR. JOYCE: Arising out of the answers to these and various other questions relating to shipping matters, may I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether a Departmental Committee will inquire carefully into these questions?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, I do not think I can appoint a Departmental Committee to inquire into these matters.

MR. JOYCE: What Committee has the right hon. Gentleman decided to appoint?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Notice must be given of that question.

ORIENT LINE; CONDUCT OF STOKERS; DISCHARGE CERTIFICATES.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will request the Orient Steam Navigation Company to state the names of their vessels on which the stokers were drunken and mutinous, and the dates of the occurrences; whether the company prosecuted the stokers for the offences they are alleged to have committed; whether, on the discharge of these stokers, they gave them certificates of discharge, declining to report with regard to character; and whether they will state the names of their vessels on which they state they have sustained heavy losses, and the dates, in consequence of the wholesale desertion of their crews.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have referred this question to the Orient Steam Navigation Company, who inform me that they do not feel called upon to supply the

information for which the hon. Member asks.

SHIP BALLASTING.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the Circular to surveying officers dealing with the under-ballasting of ships of the mercantile marine, which was promised more than four months ago, has been issued, whether he can state its terms, and whether any ships, and, if so, how many have been detained since the issue of the Circular on account of being unsafe through want of sufficient ballast.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Circular to which the hon. Member refers was issued to the survey staff of the Board of Trade in March last. It is to the effect that if a vessel is in such trim as to be unsafe, the master is to be warned, and if no steps are taken to remedy the fault, the ship is to be detained. No vessel has been detained since the issue of the Circular on account of being unsafe through want of sufficient ballast.

PATENT LAWS.

MR. JOSEPH LAWRENCE (Monmouth Boroughs): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether

his attention has been called to the conditions existing between this country and Germany and France in respect of the Patent Laws, and whether the Government will in the next session of Parliament take steps to assimilate the law of this country to that prevailing in the countries named; and can he state what steps, if any, the Government intend to take to carry into effect any of the recommendations contained in the Report, dated January of this year, of the Board of Trade Committee on the working of the Patent Acts.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I understand the first part of my hon. friend's question refers in particular to the forfeiture of patents for non-working which is provided for by the law in France and Germany. The proposal to introduce a similar condition in this country was considered by the Board of Trade Committee, but was rejected by them in favour of other proposals having a similar object. With respect to the last part of the question, the Bill which passed this House yesterday was intended to give effect to one recommendation of the Committee; the other recommendations are under consideration. I may say that I hope it may be found possible to deal with the amendment of the Patent Laws before very long, but I am not in a position at present to give any pledge on the subject.

COMMUNICABILITY OF TUBERCULOSIS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he has received a letter from the Glasgow Fleshers Trade Association, consisting of 1,200 members of wholesale and retail meat traders, cattle salesmen, and farmers, supporting the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the communicability of tuberculosis from animals to man; and whether the Government have yet determined upon the appointment of such a Commission.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): Perhaps I may be allowed to answer this question. I have received the letter referred to by the hon. Member. The appointment of a Royal Commission is still under the consideration of the Government.

MR. FIELD: Is there any hope of the question being immediately settled?

MR. LONG: Yes, Sir; I think it will be settled very speedily.

CHATHAM GRAVEYARDS.

MR. H. J. WILSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware of the condition of two graveyards at Chatham, where coffins are open to public view, tombstones broken, and rubbish of all kinds deposited; and will he state who is responsible for this state of things.

MR. WALTER LONG: Perhaps I may be allowed to answer this question. My attention has been drawn to the alleged condition of the graveyards referred to, and I am making inquiries on the subject.

RATES ON PEABODY BUILDINGS.

MR. CAUSTON (Southwark): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the Peabody Trustees have refused the offer of the Southwark Borough Council of 12½ per cent. for collecting the rates direct from the tenants in their buildings in the Blackfriars Road, although they undertake the same work in their other buildings in Southwark for 10 per cent.; whether he is aware that by this arrangement the tenants, many of whom are poor, suffer inconvenience and loss, the allowance made by the Trustees being less than the tenants are called upon to pay; and whether the Local Government Board can take steps to put in force the former system under which the rates were collected direct from the landlord.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am aware that the Peabody Trustees, in conjunction with other owners of tenement property in Southwark, have declined to assent to a reduction by the borough council to 12½ per cent. in the allowance hitherto made to them in consequence of their paying the rates instead of the occupiers, and doing so whether the tenements were occupied or not. The whole of the tenants in the Blackfriars Road Buildings have agreed to pay the rates, and in consideration of their having to make these payments the Trustees have reduced the weekly rents to the extent as near as possible of the amount of the present rates, less 15 per cent. The Local Government Board have no power to take action for the purpose referred to in the last paragraph of the question. The responsibility for what has occurred must rest with the borough council.

MR. CAUSTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the rearrangement tells against the tenants and in favour of the Trustees?

MR. WALTER LONG: No, no. When owners of property compound for rates they pay them on all the tenements whether occupied or not.

MR. CAUSTON: If I can satisfy the right hon. Gentleman that it is so, has the Local Government Board any power to interfere?

MR. WALTER LONG: The hon. Gentleman cannot possibly satisfy me of that. I am thoroughly conversant with the law. Besides, I have no power to interfere. The hon. Gentleman must address himself to the borough council.

SMALL-POX IN LONDON.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state how many cases of small-pox were treated at the Metropolitan smallpox hospitals in each of the years 1898, 1899, and

1900; how many of those cases bore vaccination marks and how many were unvaccinated; how many of the fatal cases in each year were vaccinated persons, and how many were unvaccinated; and how many cases were certified by medical men to be cases of small-pox and subsequently turned out to be not so suffering; and what steps he proposes to take to prevent such erroneous certification in the future.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am informed that the number of cases of smallpox treated at the hospitals of the Metropolitan Asylums Board in the years 1898, 1899, and 1900 was five, eighteen, and sixty-six respectively. The number of cases which bore evidence of vaccination

in each of these years was five, fifteen, and forty-nine. There were no deaths in 1898; in 1899 there were three deaths, all of them vaccinated cases; and in 1900 there were also three deaths, only one of which was a case bearing evidence of vaccination. The number of persons wrongly certified by medical men to be suffering from small-pox in these years was thirty-one, eighteen, and thirty respectively. I have no authority to take any steps as suggested in the second paragraph of the question.

ADULTERATED BUTTER.

MR. MOORE (Antrim, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if his attention has been drawn to the decision of the English King's Bench Division affirming the conviction of Messrs, Pearks, Gunstone and Co., trading as Pearkes' Stores, for selling butter containing a large percentage of milk or water artificially introduced; and seeing that frequent complaints against this practice on the part of this firm have been made, can he state what steps the Board of Agriculture propose to take to prevent a continuance of the offence; is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the same firm was yesterday, at Wolverhampton fined £36 for an identical offence?

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): Yes. Until the local authorities have failed to carry out the duty imposed upon them of prosecuting in cases of this kind, and have been declared in default, the Board of Agriculture cannot itself take proceedings. If the local authorities should fail in their duty as I do not think is probable, the Board will not hesitate to undertake it for them. Meanwhile our inspectors will communicate with the local authority in all places and they are numerous, when we know that there are branches of this or other firms selling a similar product, advising them of the legal decision just given, and of the necessity for giving effect to it.

AGRICULTURAL RETURNS.

MR. F. W. WILSON (Norfolk, Mid): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is aware that the latest agricultural returns account for only 86 per cent. of the measured area of Great Britain; and if the details can be given in the next Report of the 14 per cent. of land at present unaccounted for as non-agricultural, but which includes the increasing acreage used as garden plots and recreation grounds.

*MR. HANBURY: The agricultural returns for 1901 have already been collected. The gradual increase of the non-agricultural area is, of course, due to the increase of buildings, roads, public recreation grounds, allotments under one acre,

railways, parade grounds, &c.; and to ascertain the precise area of land used for each of these purposes would involve a long and costly investigation. A Return was issued in 1895 showing the number and extent of holdings of one acre and under; and there has been no great change since then.

IMPORTS OF CANADIAN CATTLE.

MR. CROMBIE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he will grant a Return showing the quantity and value of Canadian cattle imported alive, slaughtered at port of landing, and dead meat, in the several years from 1890 to 1900.

*MR. HANBURY: I hardly think that a printed Return is necessary, but I shall be glad to furnish the hon. Member with all the particulars he asks for, so far as we have the information.

MILK STANDARD.

MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he intends to adopt any of the recommendations of the Departmental Committee besides those referring to a milk standard, and especially whether he intends to take any steps for ensuring that the addition of separated milk to whole milk can be detected.

*MR. HANBURY: We are preparing circular letters to the local authorities calling their attention to the recommendations of the Committee with regard to the adulteration of cream with gelatine or other substances, and to the administration of the Food and Drugs Acts "generally, with the object of protecting the vendor whose milk is proved to be genuine though below the regulation limit, and of preventing milk being reduced to that limit if naturally above it. The suggestion of the hon. Member for earmarking separated milk by the addition of some innocuous substance is one which could not be carried into effect without further legislation. We also propose to direct the attention of local authorities to the desirability of a uniform procedure as to sampling and analysing the milk taken for examination, and to indicate what such procedure should be. The labelling of condensed milk would require further legislation. We have already made arrangements by which the vessels used in the testing of milk can be officially standardised at the National Physical Laboratory.

THE POST OFFICE AND THE NATIONAL TELEPHONE COMPANY.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether an agreement has been arrived at within the last few days between the Government and the National Telephone Company, and whether he will give the purport of the arrangement, if any, concluded.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I have nothing to add to the answer I gave to a similar question a few days ago.

POST OFFICE; LINESMEN'S AND MECHANICS' CLAIM TO STRIPES.

MR. PLATT-HIGGINS (Salford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is now in a position to announce the result of the inquiry promised five months ago in reference to the giving of

merit stripes to unestablished linesmen and mechanics.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has carefully considered the question and is not prepared to sanction the extension of the privilege of wearing good conduct stripes to unestablished servants of the Department beyond the limits laid down in accordance with the recommendation of the Tweed-mouth Committee in 1897.

† See page 287.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

MR. WILLIAM JONES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state what is the total cost of the Auditor General's Department, and what relation that cost bears to the total sum audited.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The cost of the Comptroller and Auditor General's Department for 1899–1900, including pensions and expenditure on its behalf by the Stationery Office, Office of Works, and Post Office, was £;80,786. The amount of expenditure in 1899–1900 on account of Voted Loan and Consolidated Fund Services which was audited by the Department was upwards of £;123,000,000. The Department also audited numerous non-voted accounts, such as the National Debt Commissioners' Accounts, the Supreme Court Fund Accounts, etc., etc., as to which figures cannot be furnished without considerable difficulty and delay.

PARCELS POST DELAYS.

MR. LEAMY (Kildare, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the delays on the part of the Post Office in delivering parcels though they are marked perishable and immediate; whether he is aware that such parcels are sometimes not delivered, and whether he will consider the advisability of enabling any sender of a parcel to obtain a receipt as is now done with registered letters.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Member will give particulars of any parcels which have been delayed in their transmission by post or have not been delivered, the Postmaster General will cause inquiry to be made on the subject. In the case of a delayed parcel the label or the address portion of the cover should, if possible, be forwarded to the Post Office. With regard to the other point referred to in the question, the hon. Member seems to be under a misapprehension. As stated in paragraph 8, on page 8 of the Post Office Guide, a certificate of the posting of a parcel can be obtained at any post office.

CORONATION CEREMONY.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if it has been proposed to remove the screen below the organ in Westminster Abbey in view of the coronation ceremony.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I understand that at the Coronation Committee a question was asked as to whether it was feasible to remove the screen temporarily, but no proposal was made, and the question was not discussed.

THE WIDENING OF PICCADILLY.

LORD BALCARRES: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if the widening of

Piccadilly has been already begun.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper::

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-on-Trent): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he is aware that the congestion of traffic in Piccadilly takes place only for a few hours on a few days in the year; and whether, before any part of the Green Park is taken away, he will first try the effect of removing the cab stand and cab shelter from Piccadilly.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket): To ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he will consent to remark the effect upon traffic of removing the pavement upon the south side of Piccadilly before cutting down trees in the Green Park to widen Piccadilly.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The answer to my noble friend is in the negative. I am now in communication with the County Council on this matter, and in the meantime all work will be stopped. My hon. friend the Member for Stoke says "that the block only takes place for a few hours on a few days in the year," but I would say that my own experience, as well as that of traffic experts, differs entirely from this; whilst the removal of the cab stand and shelter would in no way abate the congestion at Hamilton Place, which it is the chief object of the scheme to relieve. My hon. friend the Member for Stowmarket can hardly have seen the effect of his suggestion, which would cause the removal of all the trees now on the pavement, the majority of which will be saved under the County Council scheme, while the relief given to the traffic at Hamilton Place would be infinitesimal.

MR. MALCOLM asked what was the use of widening Piccadilly for the purpose of traffic if they still left the trees on the south side.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: It is proposed in the scheme of the County Council that the greater number of the trees shall stand on refuges in the centre.

LORD BALCARRES: Will the First Commissioner receive a deputation on the subject?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I shall be glad to receive a deputation of any Members of the House to-morrow to explain the scheme to them.

DUMBARTON DISTURBANCES.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been called to the fact that, whilst the Rev. W. W. Mickimmin, Newry, Ireland, was addressing an open-air meeting in Dumbarton on the evening of Wednesday, 3rd July, a publican threw over him and others the contents of a bucket containing porter or some other liquor; whether, seeing that the Rev. Mr. Mickimmin lodged a complaint at the burgh police office, Dumbarton, against the offender, he can explain why no prosecution has followed.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I have inquired into the circumstances of this case. The reverend gentleman, who is a temperance lecturer and an Orangeman, persisted in holding a meeting in front of the publican's house, who is a Catholic, and made use of very insulting language in reference to the publican and his wife. His proceedings, which were renewed on a subsequent occasion, caused great obstruction and nearly entailed a dangerous riot. In the course of the second address the publican threw a bucket of beer and porter over him. Counter charges were lodged

of assault and of obstruction. After consideration, Crown counsel directed that no proceedings should be taken on either charge. I think this decision was right. The reverend gentleman recovered a sum of 30s. in a civil action for damage to his clothes.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the Lord Advocate endeavour to instil a little of this common sense into the Irish Executive?

MR. CALDWELL: Then am I to understand that the sheriff decided both the civil and the criminal cases?

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The sheriff decided that, although damage was done, it was not a case for a criminal prosecution.

MR. CALDWELL: But was not an assault actually committed?

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Well, it was a case of practical proselytism.

ALLOTMENTS IN THE HIGHLANDS.

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, if he can state why the applications for allotments from residents in the parishes of Dunnet, Latheron, Thurso, and Wick, Caithness, under Section 26 of the Local Government Act, were refused.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Local Government Board are informed that in the parishes of Dunnet and Wick land for allotments could not be obtained by voluntary agreement, and in the parishes of Latheron and Thurso ground could only be had to a limited extent. The parish councils of Dunnet and Wick were of opinion that the expense of putting the compulsory clauses of the Local Government Act, 1894, into force were too great, and accordingly no action was taken. In Wick the applicants did not press their applications on hearing that compulsory steps would have to be taken.

PRESTATYN BOARD SCHOOL.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware the Board of Education has directed the building of a new Board school at Prestatyn, that the new buildings of the national school afford accommodation for 247 children, and the old buildings for 158; and that the total estimated child population of the district of school age is only 210, and the average attendance at the national and board schools only 105; and whether the Board of Education will reconsider their decision.

MR. GEORGE KENYON (Denbigh): May I also ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that the Board of Education have recently ordered a new board school to be erected at Prestatyn, Flintshire; and, seeing that there are already three schools in this parish, the population of which is only 1,200, and that there is accommodation in the national school alone for 247 children, can he state what is the object of erecting a new school in addition to those already existing.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The Board of Education has not directed the building of a new school at Prestatyn, but the matter is still under its consideration. I am told the hon. Member's figures cannot be accepted as accurate.

MR. GEORGE KENYON: Has the right hon. Gentleman any intention of ascertaining the opinions of the ratepayers?

SIR J. GORST: The usual course will be taken. No order will be made unless there is a deficiency of school accommodation, and that will be ascertained in the customary manner.

QUEEN'S ISLAND, BELFAST.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state what measures of a permanent character the Government intend to adopt to preserve the public peace in the future in the Queen's Island, Belfast.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Thanks largely to the energy and discretion of the Lord Mayor of Belfast, the measures taken by the Government, in consultation with him and other local authorities, have had satisfactory results. With respect to future arrangements of a permanent character, I am afraid I must defer making any statement in the matter until I have had the opportunity, during the recess, of a conference personally with the Lord Mayor and others who are best qualified to advise.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I hope I am not to understand that because for the moment the riots have ceased the right hon. Gentleman will take time to deal with this matter. Experience shows that these riots crop up at most unexpected moments.

MR. WYNDHAM: I did not mean to convey that impression.

DISCHARGE OF CATHOLIC WORKMEN IN BELFAST.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that a number of Roman Catholic coopers in the employment of the Anglo-American Oil Company, in Belfast, have been discharged from their employment on the ground that the company was no longer able to afford them any protection from attacks by workmen of other religions; and can he state what steps he intends to take in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The question, which only appeared on the Paper this morning, has been referred to the Commissioner of Police at Belfast for report. Perhaps the hon. Member will be good enough to repeat the question to-morrow.

KILLCLOONEY ESTATE.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will make a further statement in reference to the sale of the Killclooney tenants.

MR. WYNDHAM: For the reason stated by me on Thursday last, I am not yet in a position to make a further statement in reference to this matter.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY; COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say when the Return relating to compensation for injuries to members of the Royal Irish Constabulary is likely to be distributed to Members.

MR. WYNDHAM: The preparation of this Return entails an examination of the police records extending over a period of twenty years. Every effort will be made to expedite the completion of the Return, but I am afraid it cannot be ready for distribution under a month or six months.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY FUND.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will state the amount of the Constabulary Force Fund on its division into benefit and reward branches in 1883, the total amount contributed to the benefit branch by compulsory deductions from officers and men from the 18th June, 1883, to the end of 1900, and the amount disbursed to members of the force, their widows and orphans, during the same period.

MR. WYNDHAM: At the request of my right hon. friend I will reply to this question. The date of the division of the fund into benefit and reward branches was the 1st April, 1891, not 18th June, 1883. The balance to the credit of the benefit branch on the 1st April, 1891, was £297,749 4s. 7d. The contributions to this branch, since that date, amount to £105,809 4s. 6d.; the disbursements from the same branch from the same date to £132,682 5s. 10d. The reward branch was opened without any balance on the division of the fund in April, 1891.

DR. WALSH AND THE IRISH EDUCATION BOARD.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieu-
† See page 63.

tenant of Ireland whether a second memorandum has been issued by the Board of National Education in Ireland in reference to the recent resignation of the most rev. Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin, and whether he will lay upon the Table a copy of this second memorandum, together with copies of the minutes of all further proceedings of the Board with reference to this matter and the documents mentioned therein.

MR. WYNDHAM: I must explain that when replying on August 8th, † the further minutes of the Board had not been brought to my notice; nor, owing to pressure of work, have I even yet had an opportunity of studying them. The hon. Member's question was before the Commissioners at their meeting held on Tuesday last, when it was decided that there was no objection to lay upon the Table of the House a copy of a second memorandum which was considered at the Board's meeting on 30th July in connection with the resignation of Archbishop Walsh, together with copies of the minutes of all further proceedings of the Board with reference to this matter. Steps will be taken to present these Papers to Parliament accordingly before the prorogation.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN THE MILL-STREET UNION.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork, Mid.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an agricultural labourer named Michael Mahony applied for a cottage on the farm of a man named Noonan, at Coolinary, in connection with the improvement scheme recently promoted by the Millstreet Rural District Council; that although Mahony and his father before him had, worked on this farm for forty years, Mahony was evicted by Noonan from the insanitary dwelling he occupied immediately after he had sent in his representation paper for a cottage; and that at the sworn inquiry the occupier represented that Mahony was an evicted tenant, and that consequently his application was reported on unfavourably by the Local Government Board inspector; is he aware that on the circumstances being subsequently
† See page 61.

placed before the Local Government Board they modified their order, and sanctioned the erection of the cottage provided a written consent was given by the occupier; has such consent been given; and, having regard to the provisions of the Labourers Acts, where cottages are proved to be necessary, can he explain why an order was made for the consent of the occupier to be obtained.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are generally as stated. The Board could not consent to compulsory powers for acquiring a portion of the farm in question as a site for a cottage for Mahony without the consent of the occupier. But, if such consent were given, the Board would not object to the inclusion of the cottage in the Provisional Order. The rural council has been so informed, but so far no reply has been received. If the site is not included in the Provisional Order it will be open to the council to accept Mahony as a tenant for a cottage on some other site.

IRISH TOWN TENANTS;PERPETUITY OF TENURE.

MR. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the present state of the law respecting tenants in towns in Ireland, he will consider the advisability of introducing into Parliament next session a Bill which would secure to such tenants perpetuity of tenure, compensation for improvements effected, the right of free sale of created interests, the fixing of fair rents, and which would provide machinery for facilitating sale and purchase as between landlord and tenant.

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot give any undertaking such as is suggested in this question.

IRISH MACKEREL INDUSTRY.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what price per hundred (126) did the Congested Districts Board obtain for mackerel during the years 1899, 1900, and 1901, respectively, whether

the contract for purchase of fish during these years was given to one buyer or divided among several, was the contract price fixed for the entire year in each case, and was the contract advertised and open to competition, and, if not, can he explain why it was not so offered.

MR. WYNDHAM: The prices varied at different periods of the years mentioned, and I am communicating details to the hon. Member. In 1899 the contract was given to one firm; in 1900 to two firms; and in 1901 to one firm. Every year circulars are sent to all fish buyers known to the Board, and an agreement is made with the firm offering the best terms for the fishermen. Tenders are not advertised for, but the arrangement made differs little from open competition.

MR. FLYNN: Is it not desirable to advertise for these tenders?

MR. WYNDHAM: I will consider that point.

IRISH WEST COAST FISHERIES.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a number of fish buyers intimated their desire to assemble at Arran, Cleggan, Blacksod, and other places during the mackerel season for the purpose of buying fish from the boats under the management of the Congested Districts Board, but found no opportunity of purchase owing to the

fact that the boats are tied to a certain contractor at fixed prices, and will the Board change this system in future seasons so as to open these fishing stations to competing buyers with a view to obtain higher prices for the fishermen.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; the facts are as stated in the first paragraph. The arrangement referred to was made by the Board in order that the fishermen should be guaranteed a good price throughout the season.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state on what duty or duties are the steamers of the Congested Districts Board engaged, and, in view of the prices now obtained for fish on the west coast, whether the Board will utilise these steamers for conveying fish to suitable markets during the mackerel season.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is but one steamer at the disposal of the Board. It is usually employed in carrying fish barrels, timber, cement, fishing nets and gear. It also occasionally conveys members of the Board on tours of inspection, and at other times is employed in the work of protecting the fisheries. It is not intended to utilise her in carrying fresh fish.

THE O'BRIEN ESTATE.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that three years ago the tenants on the O'Brien estate, in the townlands of Corglass and Cornakelly, signed agreements to purchase their holdings at sixteen years of the rental, can he state were these agreements lodged with the Land Commission, and, if so, what is the cause of the delay in carrying out the sale.

MR. WYNDHAM: No agreements to purchase in the case of this estate have been lodged in the Land Commission.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT INQUIRIES IN COUNTY CAVAN; MAJOR FAIR.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state (1) on what grounds Major Fair was selected to hold the inquiry into the proposed amalgamation of Granard Union, (2) whether he is aware that, since his appointment as inspector of this Union, Major Fair has persistently found fault with the management by the guardians, (3) whether any report was received by the Local Government Board from him advising the Board to add the question of amalgamation to that of separating the five Cavan divisions from the Granard Union, (and 4) whether some opportunity will be afforded to those who oppose the amalgamation of placing their views before the Local Government Board before a decision is come to.

MR. WYNDHAM: Major Fair was selected as being the inspector of the district comprising this union. He has from time to time reported adversely on the management of the union by the guardians, but the Board consider that these reports were fully justified by the facts. The Board considered it desirable that the inquiry held should embrace also the proposal of the Cavan County Council to alter the union by adding a portion of it to the Cavan Union. The answer to the last inquiry is in the affirmative.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Does the right hon. Gentleman think it fair to have the inquiry conducted by the very inspector who has several times reported adversely against

this union?

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Is it not Major Fair's desire to wipe out this union?

[No answer was returned.]

DESECRATION IN DONAGHMORE CHURCHYARD.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a memorial wreath placed by the Irish National Foresters upon the grave of John Martin, at Donaghmore Churchyard, has been destroyed, and what steps the police have taken to bring the persons who committed this act to justice.

MR. WYNDHAM: The wreath was removed from the grave and the glass case enclosing the wreath was destroyed. The grave was not, however, injured. The police are making every effort to trace the offenders.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Is it a fact that part of the wreath was hung outside the door of the Protestant clergyman's house, presumably as a protest against his allowing the demonstration in the graveyard?

MR. WYNDHAM: I was not aware of that.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTONE (Belfast, S.): How about the Union Jack being hauled down at the instance of the Irish National Foresters?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the question on the Paper.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: This is a case of desecrating a graveyard, and not a question of the Union Jack.

EMIGRATION FROM IRELAND.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the number of emigrants who left Queenstown and Moville respectively for the States or the Colonies during the months of May, June, and July, 1901, and the number for the corresponding months of last year.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of emigrants who left Queenstown and Moville in May, June, and July, 1901, were 7,911 and 1,121 respectively. In the same period of 1900 the numbers were 11,165 and 1,119 respectively; a reduction in the former period as compared with the latter of 26 per cent.

IRISH UNION AMALGAMATION.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an opinion exists amongst the boards of guardians in Ireland that amalgamation of unions would be conducive to saving of the rates, and whether he will inquire the opinion of the Local Government Board inspectors on this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The general question of the amalgamation of unions is engaging the attention of the Board, and the opinions of the inspectors will be ascertained and considered.

TRUCK ACT PROSECUTIONS IN IRELAND.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on 14th December, 1897, at the Ardara Petty Sessions, county Donegal, fines amounting to £40, together with £4 costs of the prosecution,

were inflicted under the Truck Acts in the case of *Deane v. Boyle*; that by a ruling of the High Court in the case of *Squire v. Sweeney* this decision of the magistrates at the Ardara Petty Sessions was found to be illegal, and in consequence the £;40 fines were remitted, and repaid to the defendant on 11th March, 1901; and that an application to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, on 2nd April, 1901, for the £;4 costs of prosecution inflicted on the defendant, was refused on the ground that the Lords Justices in remitting the fines imposed upon the defendant made no order respecting the costs; can he explain why the Irish Executive did not make an order for the remittance of these costs as well as of the fines, seeing that the costs were part of the penalties inflicted, and will steps be taken to secure the repayment to the defendant of the £;4 costs of prosecution.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is no legal power in the Executive to order a remission of the costs in this case.

LIMERICK POOR RATE COLLECTORS.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that poor rate collectors in the county of Limerick are required by the Local Government Board to execute a new bond with the county council, one of the clauses of which obliges the collectors at the end of each year to assume as a private debt any uncollected item of rates; can he state what is the necessity for the same in view of the fact that since the passing of the Local Government Act they executed a bond giving the necessary security; and will he direct the Local Government Board not to require the collectors to enter into this second bond.

MR. WYNDHAM: The question is based on a misapprehension. Under the County Poor Rate Collectors No. 2 Order a collector may be required by his council to enter into a bond to lodge, by a given date, the entire amount included in his warrant, whether collected or not. The form of the bond is not prescribed, but is submitted to the Local Government Board for approval as each case arises. Where a collector lodges the full amount of his warrant, and has not collected certain items of rate, he can only recover these items as private debts, and consequently cannot distrain for them under his warrant. The Order was framed at the request of certain county councils, and has been very generally adopted by the councils in preference to the No. 1 Order, under which a collector only lodges rates actually collected by him.

IRISH AGRICULTURAL BOARD'S REPORT.

MR. MOORE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the Report of the Agricultural Board, Ireland, for the year ending 31st March, 1901, may be expected before the rising of Parliament, and if there is any reason for the delay in its publication; if he can state the aggregate amount of the grants made by the Board in respect of agricultural purposes during the year ending 31st March to the counties of Antrim, Down, Derry, and Armagh, and also for like purposes the aggregate to the province of Connaught, and also the aggregate amounts raised or guaranteed locally in those counties for such purposes, and also in the province of Connaught.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Report is rapidly approaching completion; the greater part of it is in the press, but it cannot be issued before the prorogation. This fact will not, however, prevent its publication during the recess. The delay, which is unavoidable, is incidental to the issue of the first Report of an important Department of the State. The aggregate amount of the agricultural grants made by the Department, conditionally, in the past year to the four counties named was £;1,973, and to the province of Connaught £;1,660. The local contributions guaranteed from the rates amount to £;1,008 in the case of the four counties mentioned, and to £;2,800 in the case of Connaught.

ROAD MAINTENANCE IN ARMAGH.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the county surveyor of Armagh keeps great part of the roads of that county in his own hands; that dissatisfaction prevails in consequence of the state of repair of these portions; and that two bridges are at present undergoing repair, so that access to Cullyhanna church and graveyard is rendered practically impossible; whether he will undertake to procure an account of the way in which the money has been spent on these roads; and whether he will instruct the Local Government Board to send an engineer to inspect them and report on them with a view to their improvement.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board has no information on the first paragraph, and no complaint has been made to the Board in the matter. In the event of a formal complaint being made by a rural district council, that the county council has failed to keep the roads in proper repair, an appeal would lie to the Board under Section 82 (3) of the Local Government Act, 1898. The Board has no power to take action such as suggested in the second and third paragraphs.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: Is it pot the fact that where direct labour has been employed in the south of Ireland under the surveyor it has given the greatest satisfaction?

MR. WYNDHAM: I believe it has in most cases.

MONAGHAN ASSISTANT COUNTY SURVEYORS.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at a special meeting of the County Council of Monaghan it was resolved that deputies should be appointed to the assistant county surveyors, by which the duties of the assistant county surveyors would not be increased from the time of the Grand Jury; whether he can state if the County Council of Monaghan appoint deputies to the assistant county surveyors, the Local Government Board will allow the salaries to remain at £;80 per annum, as was paid to the assistant county surveyors during the time of the Grand Jury.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. I am advised that it would not be competent for the county council to appoint deputies to the assistant surveyors otherwise than in cases of illness or incapacity.

HOUSE VALUATIONS IN KERRY.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland

whether he has received a copy of a resolution unanimously passed by the Kerry County Council on the 8th instant, which states that the valuations of houses have been raised from £;8 to £;20, and from £;8 to £;26, and also from £;2 to £;11; whether he will make inquiries into these statements; and whether he can state under what rules the Commissioner of Valuation acts in deciding that valuation on small improvements shall be increased by 300 to 500 per cent.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Commissioner of Valuation informs me that valuations in Kerry were made on the same basis and under the same rules as all other valuations in Ireland. When cases are brought before the Commissioner by the local authorities a revision of the valuation on the principles laid down in the Valuation Acts is made. A deduction of some 30 per cent. is given in Kerry to make the new valuations relative to the old. In every case there is an appeal to quarter sessions.

MR. FLAVIN: Can the right hon. Gentleman say how it is these increases have been made on old buildings, as stated in the question?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir; if the parties concerned are dissatisfied with the interpretation placed on the law by the Commissioner, there is a judicial appeal against his decision.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the case was taken before the county court judge, who upset the Commissioner's valuation, but that the Commissioner then appealed to a higher court and got the county court judge's decision upset?

MR. WYNDHAM: I was not aware of that.

In reply to a further question by Mr. T. M. HEALY;

MR. WYNDHAM said the Select Committee, the appointment of which he promised when introducing the Valuation Bill, would inquire fully into all these matters.

MR. FLAVIN: Will the right hon. Gentleman allow the Kerry County Council to appoint an independent valuer?

MR. WYNDHAM: I can in no way interfere in the matter or impugn the judicial acts of the Commissioner.

CLERKS TO IRISH CLERKS OF THE CROWN AND PEACE.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, under the 9th section of the County Officers and Courts (Ireland) Act, 1877, providing that clerks in the offices of Clerks of the Crown and Peace should hold office during the pleasure of the Lord Chancellor, any, and, if so, how many appointments have been made; whether any clerks employed in such offices have been dismissed without the sanction of the Lord Chancellor; and, if so, can he explain why they were deprived of the security of tenure afforded by that section.

MR. WYNDHAM: Only two clerks have been appointed under the provisions of the 9th section of the Act referred to. One of these gentlemen retired some time ago and the other is still in office.

CAPPAMORE NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHER.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain why the teacher of Cappamore National School, county Limerick, though he was classed second division of first

class under the old rules, and has given thirty-five years service, and the attendance of whose school is sufficient to warrant payment of first grade salary, has his salary now fixed at £;2 less than the initial salary of his grade; and whether steps will be taken to give him, not only the initial salary of his grade, but also some portion of the increments to which his long service entitles him.

MR. WYNDHAM: The average income of this teacher for the three years ended 31st March, 1900, slightly exceeded £;128, and his consolidated salary was fixed provisionally at £;129. First class and first grade are not identical, as appears to be assumed in the question. The triennial increments of continued good service salary are introduced under the new system of payments for service rendered after 1st April, 1900.

LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEMES AT CURE.

MR. SHEEHAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has now considered the correspondence which has been brought under his notice relative to the application of William Kelly for a labourer's cottage on the lands of Garravaugh-Inches, in the electoral division of Carrigrohanebeg, Cork Rural District Council; and, having regard to the fact that it was supported by the landlord of the proposed site and by the district councillor for the division, and in view of the nature of the opposition of the occupiers, the Ballincollig Powder Mills Company, and of the rejection by the Local Government Board inspector of Kelly's representation paper, will he recommend a reconsideration of this man's application with a view to his getting a labourer's cottage.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have considered the correspondence which the hon. Member has been good enough to send me. The Provisional Order in respect of the eight cottages sanctioned was issued on the 9th instant. It will, of course, be open to the Rural District Council to allocate one of these cottages to Kelly, if he is considered an agricultural labourer in urgent need of a sanitary dwelling; or, if the cottages have all been appropriated, the council may propose to build a cottage for him on another site when a fresh scheme is being formulated.

MR. SHEEHAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this inspector's decisions have over and over again caused a great deal of dissatisfaction?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

IRISH ASYLUM TRADE WARDERS.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that trade warders in Irish asylums have to go on duty in the divisions after their ordinary day's work at their trade is finished; and will he, with a view to the protection of the health of the warders, and to prevent discontent, give such directions as will prevent the continuance of this system.

MR. WYNDHAM: This is a matter entirely within the control of the committees of management of district asylums, and I have no power to give such directions as are suggestion.

MR. FIELD: Will the right hon. Gentleman use his influence to have carried out the suggestion contained in the question?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no power to do that. We are often criticised for interfering with the work of local bodies, and where I have no power to act I do not intend to attempt it.

DIRECT LABOUR ON IRISH ROADS.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what steps must be taken by the county and district councils in Ireland to enable them to put in operation the Provisional Order legalising direct labour on the roads on the 1st day of April next.

MR. WYNDHAM: The steps to be taken by county and district councils will be fully set forth in a circular letter to these bodies which is now in course of preparation, and will shortly be issued. A copy of this circular will be sent to the hon. Member.

KERRY LAND APPEALS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that cases have been listed for hearing in the Land Courts in Kerry for over two years; can he explain the cause of the delay; and will he take steps to prevent the worry and expense to the farmers which this delay causes.

MR. WYNDHAM: A sitting of the Sub-Commission for the hearing of 126 cases from the Kerry district, in which the originating notices were served prior to 31st March, 1900, was held at Cahirciveen on the 18th June last. The inspection of the holdings in these cases will be resumed by the assistant commissioners immediately after the vacation. A further list for the county Kerry will shortly be issued.

FORESTRY IN IRELAND.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in view of the interest taken all over Ireland in the question of re-forestation, will he, with a view of promoting this object, advise the Department of Agriculture to supply young trees of different species to occupiers and owners of land in Ireland free of cost on condition that such trees are properly planted.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have more than once stated that the Department hopes, in due time, to take up the work of re-forestation in conjunction with the county councils. The councils are empowered to include provision for tree planting operations in the schemes they are promoting under the Act of 1899, and these schemes, if approved, will be subsidised by the Department. The Department is not prepared, however, to take the action suggested in the question, as it is precluded from applying its funds to schemes in respect of which aid is not locally guaranteed.

PROCLAIMED MEETING IN GALWAY.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that a public meeting, summoned in the ordinary way, at a place called Cahererin, Athenry, county Galway, for Sunday last, was sought to be suppressed by the local district inspector; can he state whether a proclamation was issued on the occasion forbidding the meeting; and whether the police are entitled to exercise

the power of suppressing meetings at their own will throughout the country.

MR. WYNDHAM: The meeting referred to was announced to be held at Monatigue, and as the police had good reasons for believing that the object of the meeting was to intimidate the occupier of a particular holding, the Government decided that the meeting should not be permitted at this place. The promoters were warned to this effect. No proclamation was issued, as none was necessary. A meeting, which was not interfered with, was held elsewhere.

MR. DUFFY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a large number of tenants in this locality wished to prevent the sale by the Land Commission of a grazing farm over their heads to a big grazier?

MR. WYNDHAM: They could have taken no step more likely to defeat their object than to hold an intimidatory meeting in the neighbourhood.

MR. DUFFY: What other remedy had they?

AGRARIAN DISTURBANCES IN SLIGO.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the proceedings of Ballymote (county Sligo) Petty Sessions, held on 8th August, when charges arising out of alleged agrarian disturbances which were brought by the police against John Gilmartin, Vice-Chairman of the Sligo District Council, were heard and the cases dismissed by the court; and whether he will insist on being supplied by the police authorities with accurate information in matters of this kind in future.

MR. WYNDHAM: The case against Mr. Gilmartin was heard before a bench consisting of two resident magistrates and seven justices of the peace, four of whom are not in the habit of attending at Ballymote Petty Sessions. The evidence given fully sustained the charge preferred against Mr. Gilmartin, but a majority of the bench decided upon dismissing the case. I have no reason whatever, in view of the decision in this case, to question the accuracy of the information supplied to me by the police.

MR. O'DOWD: Was not the only offence charged against Mr. Gilmartin that he had a party at his house?

SERGEANT SHERIDAN'S CONDUCT-CASE OF DANIEL MAGOOHAN.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the result of the inquiries into the case of Daniel Magoohan, of Ballinamore, South Leitrim, who was convicted at the Sligo Winter Assizes on the evidence of a police sergeant, named Sheridan, who has been since dismissed from the Royal Irish Constabulary.

MR. WYNDHAM: Substantial compensation will be awarded to this man.

RABIES IN IRELAND.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, seeing that there have been only two outbreaks of rabies in Ireland during the year 1901, he will consider the advisability of withdrawing the Order preventing dogs crossing and recrossing the Channel.

*MR. HANBURY: The Order does not prevent dogs from crossing the Channel and coming to this country. It imposes certain conditions which, as the last case of rabies only occurred in April last, I do not yet think it safe to modify.

MR. FIELD: The right hon Gentleman has not answered the latter part of my

question. Will he withdraw the restriction on the dogs recrossing?

*MR. HANBURY: There is no restriction on their leaving this country, it is only on their coming into it.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Can the right hon. Gentleman hold out any hope that the restriction will be speedily removed?

*MR. HANBURY: I cannot say speedily. A reasonable period of time must be allowed to elapse to make sure the country is free from disease.

MR. SHEEHAN: In view of the approaching coursing season, will the restrictions be removed for greyhounds?

*MR. HANBURY: Certain exemptions were made and have been taken advantage of. SLIGO HARBOUR LIGHTS.

MR. M'KILLOP (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that petitions signed by shipmasters and others calling for the establishment of lights at Bowmore, a point at the entrance to Sligo Harbour, have been forwarded to the Irish Lights Commissioners, and have been ignored by that body, and, seeing that from want of those lights a steamer with 200 passengers on board failed to enter the harbour during a storm last winter and almost got wrecked, whether he will use his influence with the Commissioners with the view of having these lights established.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: In reply to a similar question put by the hon. Member for South Sligo on Monday last, I stated that the Commissioners of Irish Lights had informed the Board of Trade that they were of opinion that the lights asked for at Bowmore were purely for local benefit, and should not be established at the cost of the general lighthouse fund.

BANTRY BAY FORESHORE.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can explain why the undertaking given by his predecessor in the late Ministry that the Crown would not alienate foreshores without public advertisement has been departed from in the case of the Bantry estate, and whether, as the conveyance was only made in 1898, and would have to be produced in court in the case of any action for trespass, he could see his way to lay it upon the Table or permit its inspection.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: As far as I am aware, no pledge given by my predecessor in the late Ministry has been broken. It is the practice of the Board of Trade to advertise in cases of open sale or lease of foreshore for works public or private. The conveyance to the Bantry trustees was not of this description. It was merely a conveyance to quiet the title of the parties subject to preservation

of public rights. The Bantry trustees held a good adverse title to the Crown. I am informed that the deed which has been enrolled in Ireland is open to inspection on the usual terms.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, in view of the fact that a couple of years before the Crown sold the Bantry foreshore to Mr. Leigh White they replied to an application for permission to build a sandquay by Mr. John McCarthy that no further grant of foreshore would be given for private purposes in Bantry; whether this correspondence and that with Mr.

White can be published, and can he state what is the explanation of the change in the Board's policy.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Board of Trade are unable to trace any record of the sale by them of foreshore to Mr. Leigh White. An application was made in 1896 by Mr. John McCarthy for permission to construct a quay in Bantry Creek, but was refused on the ground that no further encroachments on the creek could be permitted unless undertaken for public purposes. I shall be happy to show the hon. and learned Gentleman a copy of the correspondence with Mr. McCarthy.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Then who was it sold to? Was it to Lord Ardilaun, who is only a trustee of the estate?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I must ask for notice of that.

LOUGH FOYLE LIGHTS.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether representations have been made to the Irish Lights Board as to the necessity for the erection of a gas and bell buoy at the Tuns Banks at the entrance to Lough Foyle from owners and captains of Transatlantic and cross-Channel steamers and others interested in the port of Londonderry; and, with the view of encouraging the use of Lough Foyle as a port of call for Transatlantic steamers, whether the Irish Lights Board intend to give effect to the representations so made, and have the buoy erected.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am informed by the Commissioners of Irish Lights that they have received applications for the substitution of a gas-lighted bell buoy for the buoy at present marking the Tuns Bank, and that the matter is under consideration.

IRISH LADY'S ESTATE IN MADRID.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that in the case of an Irish lady (Miss Mary Teresa Barry) who died in Madrid on the 15th June, 1899, leaving considerable property in that city, a Dublin solicitor, acting for the next of kin, communicated with Sir H. M. Durand, British Ambassador at Madrid, so far back as 29th June last asking for information about the property of the deceased, and subsequently cabled requesting a reply, and offering to defray the expense of procuring the information, and that no reply has yet been given; whether he can say if Sir H. M. Durand received such communications; and, if so, why he did not reply; and will he see that Sir H. M. Durand, or the person whose duty it is to interest himself for the protection of the property of British subjects in Madrid, will give immediate attention to this matter.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Nothing is known at the Foreign Office of the matter to which the hon. Member refers, but Sir H. M. Durand will be communicated with, and requested to report.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Why did you not telegraph to the persons concerned and get an answer direct?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: We shall hear through the ambassador.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I will put the question down again to-morrow.

GOVERNMENT AUDITS IN IRELAND.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, seeing

that officers in the department of the Comptroller and Auditor General are permanently employed auditing public accounts at Devonport Dockyard, and as Dublin is

not much further from London than Devonport, he can say in what respect it would be less convenient to have audit office officials permanently employed in Dublin; and whether this matter will be more fully considered, with a view to giving Ireland a proportionate part of the expenditure under the Exchequer and Audit Vote.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The expense and store accounts of the Navy are examined by officers at the Exchequer and Audit Department stationed at Devonport, Portsmouth, and Chatham, because of the necessity for constant reference to current books and records which could not be spared to send to London. Similarly, certain portions of the Irish accounts, such as public education, General Post Office, and others, are examined periodically in Dublin in order to avoid the inconvenience of transmitting to London the local records necessary for their examination. The ordinary accounts of receipt and expenditure of the Irish Departments, with the necessary supporting vouchers, are forwarded to, and examined at, Somerset House, where the duties of his officers are more conveniently performed under the direct supervision of the Comptroller and Auditor General.

IRISH POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, seeing that the Irish Money Order (Post Office) Accounts are kept in Dublin, he will explain in what respect it would be less convenient to have Irish savings bank and postal order accounts kept also in Dublin.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The chief inconvenience which would arise from keeping Irish Savings Bank accounts in Dublin, while dealing with the English and Scotch accounts in London, would be that there would be trouble and delay in making deposits and withdrawals at post offices in England and Scotland in respect of accounts opened in Ireland, and vice versa. The postal order accounts between the Postmaster General and postmasters in Ireland, like the similar money order accounts, are already kept at Dublin; but, inasmuch as the postal orders circulating in the three kingdoms are of a uniform series, they must all be issued from London, and the paid orders must be finally checked there.

DONEGAL POSTAL SERVICE.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether any rearrangement of the North Donegal (East Innishowen District) postal service has been made, or is in contemplation, consequent upon the extension of the Londonderry and Lough Swilly Railway to Carndonagh and, if so, can he state what the arrangement is; and whether before entering into any new contract for the conveying of the mails by car, tenders will be invited publicly from car owners resident in the district.

I beg also to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether representations have been received by the Post Office authorities on behalf of the inhabitants of Malin Head district, county of

Donegal, requesting him to extend the existing mail car service to that district by arranging for a Sunday service; whether, seeing that the Buncrana and Carndonagh Railway extension is now open to traffic, the mail car service from Derry to Carndonagh will be discontinued and the mails carried in future by the railway, and whether, in placing the new contract for a mail car service from Carndonagh to Malin Head, the Postmaster General will arrange for a Sunday service.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General will cause inquiry to be made respecting the postal service to Carndonagh, Malin Head, and the East Innishowen District (North Donegal), and an answer shall be sent to the hon. Member as soon as possible on the various matters to which he refers.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Can the hon. Gentleman give me an assurance that if this car service is rearranged tenders will be publicly invited from local car owners?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I understood the hon. Member to ask for the abolition of the car service.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Oh, no.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Well, the Postmaster General will inquire into the whole matter.

CAVAN AND MONAGHAN MAILS.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware of the desire of the people of Shercock, county Cavan, and parts of county Monaghan, that the mail cars from Shercock to Carrickmacross should leave the former town in time to catch the 6.13 p.m. train leaving Carrickmacross; and if he will agree to the terms of the memorial received on this matter.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: As explained in a letter addressed to the hon. Member yesterday, the alteration which he suggests in the time fixed for the departure of the mail car from Shercock for Carrickmacross would probably give rise to complaint; and the Postmaster General is not justified, therefore, in sanctioning the change unless evidence is adduced to show that the persons affected are practically unanimous in desiring it.

NORTH KERRY MAILS.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that public inconvenience is being caused to the inhabitants in and around Ballyduff, North Kerry, by the fact that there is no delivery of mails on Sunday; and seeing that the surrounding towns of Lixnaw, Kilflyn, Bally-heigue, and Causeway in the immediate neighbourhood now enjoy the advantage of Sunday delivery of mails, whether he will grant a delivery of mails throughout the district of Ballyduff on Sundays.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General will cause inquiry to be made as to the possibility of establishing a Sunday post to Ballyduff, North Kerry, and the result shall, be communicated to the hon. Member as soon as possible.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that there is no delivery of mails at Asdee, North Kerry, between Saturday, 11 a.m., and the following Monday, 11

a.m.; and, having regard to the consequent inconvenience to the public, whether steps will be taken by the Post Office authorities to remedy this state of affairs by a better and more frequent delivery of the mails.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There is no delivery at Asdee between Saturday morning and Monday morning. The Postmaster General has directed inquiry to be made whether the circumstances admit of the establishment of a Sunday delivery, and will communicate further with the hon. Member when the inquiries are completed.

MR. FLAVIN: Is it not the fact that in some parts of Kerry the mails are not delivered?]

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Within the time stated;yes.

LONDONDERRY RAILWAY STATION.

DR. THOMPSON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if his attention has been called to the existing station accommodation at Londonderry of the Lough Swilly Railway Company; and whether, considering that this company has had handed over to it the two Government railways;namely, to Burton Port and Carndonagh;His Majesty's Government will see that suitable station buildings shall be erected without unnecessary delay at Londonderry.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Londonderry station of the Lough Swilly Company is the property of that Company, and the Board of Works have no jurisdiction enabling them to call for the erection of new buildings, or for the alteration or improvement of existing buildings at it. Their agreements with the Lough Swilly Company in connection

with the Letterkenny, Carndonagh, and Burton Port lines give them no power to interfere in the matter. The existing buildings are not, so far as the Board are aware, dilapidated or in bad repair.

DUBLIN-TIPPERARY MAIL DELAYS.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the delivery of the morning mails in Tipperary, Bansha, and Cahir has, on several occasions recently, been four hours late owing to the mail trains missing connection at the Limerick Junction, and whether he will have such steps taken as will prevent a recurrence of those delays which cause inconvenience to traders and business men generally.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is presumed that the hon. Member refers to the delay of mails leaving Dublin in the morning. The Postmaster General regrets that on several recent occasions these mails have been late in arrival at Tipperary, Bansha, and Cahir, owing to failure of the connection between mail trains at Limerick Junction. The principal cause of the delay has been the very heavy tourist traffic for Ireland by the night mail train from London. The railway company have on several occasions found it necessary to run this train to Holyhead in two parts, and as the mail packet has to await the arrival of the second part, it could not be despatched until considerably after the appointed time. The London and North Western Railway Company have been urged to take all possible measures for ensuring punctuality; and inquiry shall be made whether any arrangement is practicable for reducing the delay in arrival at the places mentioned, when the mail train is despatched late from Dublin.

MR. CULLINAN: Can the Government, which subsidises the company for carrying the mails, insist on punctuality?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Is it not the fact that the Post Office required the morning train to wait forty-five minutes at Kingsbridge, whereas at Limerick Junction it is only kept twenty minutes, and that hence the Waterford and Limerick trains are often compelled to leave before the mail arrives?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN replied that the arrangements made were believed to be for the public convenience.

MR. FLAVIN: Why not compel the company to run a special train from Limerick Junction as they used to?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I must have notice of that.

MR. FLAVIN: Next year.

CAVAN AND LEITRIM RAILWAY COMPANY.

MR. M'GOVERN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, is he aware that the Post Office authorities in the year 1892 offered the Cavan and Leitrim Railway Company parcels rates for the conveyance of the mails over their line of railway; that the weight of the mails carried has increased from 106 cwt. in 1893 to 151 cwt. 3 qrs. in 1900, and that the amount of the subsidy paid by the Post Office to the company for carrying the mails is only £;30; and, seeing that the company, if paid parcels rates, would be entitled to a sum of £;71 17s. 3d. for carrying these mails, will the postal authorities consent to give parcels rates in future, or leave the amount to be paid to the company in future for this service to arbitration.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The circumstances under which the Cavan and Leitrim Railway Company were some years ago offered payment for the conveyance of a few mail bags at parcel rates have already been explained to the hon. Member. There has been an increase in the weight of the mails forwarded over this line since 1893, and the Postmaster General on several occasions has offered to increase the payment for the service from £;30 to £;40 a year. He would, however, not be justified in making any advance upon the latter amount. The hon. Member, as a director of the company, is, of course, aware that it is open to them to appeal to the Railway Commissioners to fix the amount of payment.

IRISH HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state who represents Ireland upon the Historical Manuscripts Commission, and if the representative of Ireland on that Commission has a knowledge of the Irish tongue; and, whether either the Record Commission or the Historical MSS. Commission propose to publish any of the Irish MSS. and State Papers in the Bodleian Library, the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, and the Royal Irish Academy; and if the authorities of any of these institutions have as yet been approached on this subject by either of these Commissions.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) said Ireland was represented on the Historical Manuscripts Commission by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Dublin University (Mr. Lecky). Whether his right hon. friend had knowledge of the Irish tongue he could not say, but he was quite sure the interest of students of Irish history would be safe in his hands. What they

should publish was a matter for the discretion of the Commissioners.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Will the right hon. Gentleman take steps to appoint a gentleman thoroughly acquainted with the Irish language?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the interests of Ireland are quite safe in the hands of the right hon. Gentleman the present member for Dublin University.

IRISH GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will consider the advisability of transferring to the Department of Agriculture in Ireland the control of the work performed in Ireland by the Geological Survey under the direction of the Committee of Council on Education in England.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am advised it is not considered desirable that the survey of the United Kingdom should be conducted by more than one department at the same time.

PERSONAL PROPERTY (CONTRIBUTIONS TO LOCAL TAXATION).

MR. STRACHEY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government will grant the Return relating to personal Property (contributions to Local Taxation), standing on to-day's Paper.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no objection to the Return desired by the hon. Member, but as I am informed that, so far as the colonial information is concerned, much of it is to be found in the evidence published by the Local Taxation Commission, I would suggest that my hon. friend should consult the Secretary to that Royal Commission as to the precise form of the Return.

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE.

MR. CREMER: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the precise terms of the convention agreed to at The Hague Conference, also a list of the countries that took part in the conference; which of the countries there represented have since ratified the convention and appointed representatives upon the tribunal, together with the names of the representatives who have been appointed; and whether the tribunal is now definitely constituted and ready to commence its duties.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The three conventions signed at The Hague; namely (1) relating to arbitration; (2) to the laws and customs of war by land; and (3) to maritime warfare; together with the countries which took part in the conference, will be found in Parliamentary Paper, Miscellaneous, No. 1, 1899 (C9,534). The first mentioned has not yet been ratified by China or Turkey, while the ratifications of the United States, Roumania, and Servia are subject to certain reservations. The second was not signed by Switzerland or China, and has not yet been ratified by the United States, Sweden, Norway, and Turkey. The third has not yet been ratified by China or by Turkey.

If and when these accessions and ratifications are completed, the conventions will again be laid before Parliament in the "Treaty" series. Of the countries represented at the conference, all have appointed representatives at the permanent Court of Arbitration with the exception of China, Greece, Luxemburg, Montenegro, Persia, and Turkey. A list of representatives is annexed. The answer to the last question is in the affirmative.

PRIVILEGE; THE GLOBE NEWSPAPER AND IRISH MEMBERS.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I desire to call the attention of the House, as a matter of privilege, to a very grave and scandalous libel which was published in an evening London newspaper yesterday with reference to a large body of Members of this House. I propose to ask the clerk at the Table to read the passages of which I complain, but perhaps the more convenient course would be; and it is a course which has been followed on many other occasions; if I, in my own way, state the case and incidentally read the passages, and then I will ask that the clerk shall afterwards formally read them at the Table. In bringing this question to the attention of the House, I shall be very brief indeed, and for two reasons. First of all, the matter of which I complain is so gross and so scandalous in its nature that it will require very few words from me to induce the House to declare it a gross breach of its privileges. In the second place I will be brief because it is a matter which concerns the House of Commons far more than my colleagues or myself or any particular Members of this House. So far as the Irish Members are concerned, they have been accustomed; indeed it has been a necessary part of their fate; for many years to read very strong and very abusive attacks upon themselves, their characters, and their conduct in certain portions of the press of this country. These attacks seem to have suddenly developed under distinguished auspices since the declarations made by distinguished persons at Blenheim. Those attacks have been of a very violent character, but I confess that with regard to ninety-nine hundredths of these attacks I pass them by absolutely with the most utter disregard. But they are nothing to be compared with the attacks made upon Irish Members in the years 1879 and 1880, and they are nothing to be compared with the libels which were published in those days with reference to Irish Nationalists in this House. Years have passed over since then, and the Irish Nationalist representation in this House has not suffered by those attacks. Irish representatives are here to-day, and during the years that have intervened since the period I have alluded to I think everyone will acknowledge that the Irish representatives have been able to impress their influence upon the Acts of Parliament passed in this House. So far as ordinary political attacks such as those which were enunciated at Blenheim are concerned, I pass them by with utter disregard, perfectly confident that in the future, and assured in my own mind it will be found that these attacks will have just as little effect in injuring the power of an independent Nationalist party in this House as the attacks which preceded them during the whole of the time since the Union. The question which I desire to bring before the House of Commons is of an entirely different character. I do not complain in the least of the most violent political attacks, and I do not complain of the rancorous and somewhat vulgar attack which was made by the Colonial Secretary at Blenheim. I do not complain of that attack at all. [An IRISH MEMBER: It is characteristic of him.] We know him, and we know his past connection with Irish politics; and we know perfectly well the value of these attacks, and how little reliance is to be placed upon them even for a day or a month.

I pass them by, but I feel bound to call the attention of the House to the article in the Globe newspaper, because it is of an entirely different

character. The accusation in the Globe of yesterday is an accusation of personal corruption in connection with the private Bill legislation of this House. It is a charge of personal corruption not brought against one Member but against eighty Members of this House. An accusation of that character cannot be tolerated by

the House of Commons for a moment if the House is to retain its respect as a national assembly in the eyes of the public, and if the private Bill tribunals, which have been the pride and boast of this Parliament, are to continue to deserve the confidence of the public. Let me now read this article. I will preface my reading of it by saying that it is an article dealing with the Blenheim declarations and dealing with the suggestion in the Blenheim speeches that there ought to be a reduction of the Irish Members. I will not go into that question, because we can fight that matter out when it arises, and it is a question about which I have not the slightest fear or diffidence. This article is headed "Irish Rowdies." I do not pay the slightest attention to a statement of that kind, because I think after the speech of the Colonial Secretary at Blenheim such statements are perfectly natural. I wish to read two or three passages from this article, which is an argument in favour of the reduction of the Irish representation. Here is the first passage which I complain of, and I will only read the particular words which I shall ask the Clerk at the Table to read. The article endeavours to quote the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fifeas having made some declaration in support of the Blenheim policy. I did not see any such declaration from the right hon. Gentleman, and probably to this extent it is a libel upon him. The article goes on to say;

"Mr. Asquith clearly desired to embrace his own colleagues in the dictum. IT is with gratification that the public will recognise in this pronouncement by a man most probably destined to play a large part in the control of his party a clear indication that, for himself, he is at last determined to be done with truckling to the Irish rabble. That he, in common with all the more respectable members of his party, have long held such views in their hearts is a recognised fact. But it required the recent outrageous behaviour of the political mercenaries from the sister isle to wring from him a public admission of his opinions."

The article then goes on to say;

"It is a mistake to suppose that the majority of the Irish party are actuated by any real national aspirations, or that they care in the slightest about the principles they emunciate so loudly. On this side of the St. George's Channel we are so unaccustomed to political corruption that it seldom occurs to us as an explanation of the conduct of our public men. But in Ireland the case is wholly different.

The same spirit, the same motives that have made Tammany a synonym for politiea obliquity, have made the Nationalist party what it is. Many of those connected with it are the very ruck of the population, whose sole object is a pecuniary one; to make as much money by political jobbery and corruption as they can. Anyone who has had any connection with Irish private Bills or corporation contracts and franchises across the water can bear ample testimony to this. It is, therefore, no hardship to Ireland to reduce the number of these parasites on

her national system."

Now, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that this is a direct accusation of personal corruption against eighty Members of this House in connection, amongst other things, which I will pass by, the private Bill legislation of this Parliament, and it is this allegation, of personal corruption in connection with private Bill matters which is put forward here as a reason and as an argument for the reduction of Irish representation. I beg the House to bear that point in mind for this reason. This newspaper this morning has published another article upon this subject, and in the article to-day they make the statement that they never intended to allude to a single Member of this House at all. They state that when they speak of political corruption they speak only of people in Ireland, and that they have no desire to point to Irish Members at all. They are guilty of what I must call something very nearly approaching in substance and in spirit a deliberate falsehood. What they state to-day is this. They proceed to quote the paragraph which I have now read; that is the paragraph speaking about Irish private business, which reads;

"The same spirit, the same motives, that have made Tammany a synonym for political obliquity, have made the Nationalist party what it is. Many of those connected with it are the very ruck of the population, whose sole object is a pecuniary one; to make as much money by political jobbery and corruption as they can. Anyone who has had any connection with Irish private Bills or corporation contracts and franchises across the water can bear ample testimony to this."

They quote that, but they omit to quote the words which I read at the conclusion, which are;

"It is therefore no hardship to Ireland to reduce the number of these parasites on her national system."

To-day in their article they leave those concluding words of the paragraph out of their quotation, and they go on to say;

"How could these words be held to constitute a breach of privilege. It is sufficiently obvious that the reference was not to the House of Commons, but to the Nationalist party in Ireland."

That is an aggravation of the offence instead of being an apology, and it is a most dishonest falsehood. They have deliberately, in quoting the sentence I have complained of, omitted that portion of the sentence which shows directly that it was concerned with Members of this House; namely, the paragraph in which they say, "Therefore the number of these men ought to be reduced." That is the statement which I complain of. I wish to point out that this is not brought against one man, or even against a whole Committee of this House. It is an accusation of personal corruption against eighty Members of the House of Commons, and I say again that an accusation of that kind inflicts a grievous wound upon the honour of this House, and, even more than that, it inflicts a grievous wound upon representative government in every part of the world, if it is allowed to stand. If that statement be in any sense true, if it be not a libel, then it means that your private Bill tribunals, which have been the pride of this House, are corrupt and not to be trusted, and surely I am justified in saying that this is a matter which concerns the House of Commons and Parliament

far more than it concerns my colleagues and myself, or anybody else who is attacked. I will say very little for my own part and on behalf of my colleagues. I leave it now to the House of Commons, and let them do as they like about it. I have not come here to beg the protection of the House of Commons. I am quite ready to meet, and my colleagues are quite ready to meet, any accusation, not only of political treason, such as we constantly hear made against us, but any accusations that may be made of personal corruption or anything else. We absolutely despise them, and we are quite content to rest confident in the goodwill and confidence of our own people in Ireland. We care very little what is said about us in organs of certain public opinion in England, such as the one from which I have quoted. I am not making any abject appeal for my colleagues or myself. I am simply pointing to a grave scandal affecting this House, and it is for you, who are proud of the traditions of this House, and who love its honour and good name, it is for you to take such action as you may think fit. Before I conclude, I want to deal with two other points. If I chose I might very easily answer this attack by making a counter attack upon this paper and those connected with it. For example, the gentleman who is responsible for this paper is a man who appeared in the police court in London and was bound over to keep the peace for six months for an assault upon the police. [An HON. MEMBER: No, that was his son.] I am not speaking of his son, but of the person himself; Mr. Madge; the gentleman who is responsible for this paper. [An HON. MEMBER: He is the manager.] The manager, then, was bound over to keep the peace for six months for an assault upon the police, and this is the gentleman who heads the article which I have quoted "Irish Rowdies." I do not care, however, to develop that point, but I just want before I conclude to allude shortly to some of the precedents. There are so many precedents upon this point that I should not be justified in detaining the House by quoting all of them, or indeed many of them. Over and over again it has been laid down that accusations of this kind, and even far less grave than the one I have quoted, have been held to be grave breaches of the privileges of this House. I will only allude to one case, which is the only one I recollect which deals with precisely the same point which I have raised. The very last occasion when an accusation of corruption in connection with the private Bill legislation of this House was made was in the year 1879. In that year the accusation was of a very vague character, and had only reference to certain members of a particular Committee. A Mr. Grissell made a statement to a solicitor in the city of London to the effect that he could influence and control the decisions of a particular private Bill Committee, which was considering, I think, the project of the Tower Bridge. Then the solicitor asked him to put that statement in writing, and he did so, to the effect that he could influence the decision of members of that Committee; manifestly that is a less direct and wholesale charge against corruption as against Members of this House than the one I have read. But what happened? The question was raised in this House, and Mr. Grissell was ordered to attend. At first he fled from this country, and did not appear for some time. Finally he was brought to the bar of the House, and then he was committed for a long period to Newgate.

In connection with the same case a Mr. Ward, who was a solicitor connected with Mr. Grissell, was charged, not with having done this thing himself, but merely with having cognisance of the fact that Mr. Grissell had given this written undertaking that he could influence the members of this Committee. Even that slight and indirect connection with a charge of corruption against certain Members of this House was held to be so grave that Mr. Ward was brought to the bar of the House and also committed to prison. That is the last case in which anybody has ventured to make a charge of corruption against any Member of this House in connection with the private business of this House. I venture to submit respectfully that the case I have brought forward is far more serious. This charge is brought, not against one individual, but against an entire section of eighty Members, who are accused one and all of personal corruption in connection with this business. In the discussion of the case of Mr. Grissell, Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, whom old Members of the House will remember, was a very weighty authority on these questions, said;

"The only reason why I rise is to say that there was once a Committee, of which I was a member, in which something of the same kind occurred. It was now a good many years ago, and the present Member for Hereford (Mr. Clive) was the chairman. Something appeared in a newspaper article reflecting upon the character of the Chairman of the Committee. The Committee considered the matter and reported it, and the House directed at once that the publisher of the newspaper in which the article appeared should be called to the bar of the House. If I recollect rightly the man was committed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, and afterwards made a humble apology for what had happened." I quote that to show that in the most recent cases, in fact in all recent cases in which charges of this kind were brought against newspapers or other persons, this House took a grave view of the facts. I know that of recent times it has been the custom where technical breaches of the privileges of this House have taken place to pass resolutions declaring that it is a breach, and then leaving the matter where it stood. I respectfully say that in a matter of this gravity to follow such a course would be quite unprecedented, and I venture respectfully to say quite inconsistent with the honour and dignity of this Assembly. I do not desire to say anything more. Here is a charge of wholesale corruption in connection with your Private Bill legislation levelled against eighty Members of this House. In every case before, when such an accusation was made against even the humblest of your Members, the House has taken serious notice of it. It has not merely declared it a breach of privilege, but it has brought the guilty man to the bar, and either censured or demanded an apology from him. Having placed the facts before the House of Commons, I ask whether a less stringent course will now be pursued, because the men attacked are eighty Irish Members, whom you have brought here against their will.

The Globe newspaper of the 14th August, 1901, was handed in, and the passages complained of were read, as follows;

"IRISH ROWDIES.

Mr. Asquith clearly desired to embrace his own colleagues in the dictum. It is with gratification that the public will recognise in this pronouncement; by a

man most probably destined to play a large part in the control of his party, a clear indication that, for himself, he is at last determined to be done with truck ling to the Irish rabble. That he, in common with all the more respectable members of his party, has long held such views in their hearts is a recognised fact. But it required the recent outrageous behaviour of the political mercenaries from the Sister Isle to wring from him a public admission of his opinions.

It is a mistake to suppose that the majority of the Irish party are actuated by any real national aspirations, or that they care in the slightest about the principles they enunciate so loudly. On this side of the St. George's Channel we are so unaccustomed to political corruption that it seldom occurs to 'us as an explanation of the conduct of our public men. But in Ireland the case is wholly different. The same spirit, the same motives, that have made Tammany a synonym for political obliquity have made the Nationalist party what it is. Many of those connected with it

are the very ruck of the population, whose sole object is a pecuniary one; to make as much money by political jobbery and corruption as they can. Anyone who has had any connection with Irish Private Bills or corporation contracts and franchises across the water can bear ample testimony to this. It is, therefore, no hardship to Ireland to reduce the number of these parasites on her national system."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the passages in the article in the Globe newspaper complained of constitute a gross breach of the privileges of this House."; (Mr. John Redmond.)

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I do not think anyone can be surprised that the hon. Member who has made this motion should have brought the matter to the notice of the House, but I am sorry that he has used the opportunity of dealing with a question of a breach of privilege for the purpose of making an attack on my right hon. friend near me and myself in respect of matters which have nothing to do with the breach of privilege; matters which are entirely outside the House, and which, I think, he of all men, belonging to the party he does, ought not to have referred to in this connection: because the hon. Gentleman must be aware that whether the language for which we were responsible, and which I do not think either of us desires to withdraw; whether that language was right or wrong, it was bold of a gentleman and of a party who have certainly shown themselves to be possessed of greater resources in the art of violent vituperation, both in the press and elsewhere, than any other section of public men in this country. But, Sir, I pass from that, which was a parenthesis; an unfortunate parenthesis; and I come to a portion of the hon. Member's remarks which was more germane to the motion, and to which the House will, I am sure, listen with much more sympathy. The hon. Gentleman asks the House to affirm that the words read out at the Table constitute a gross breach of the privileges of the House. I am sure, Sir, that if the interpretation which the hon. Gentleman has put upon them, and which, I suspect, most persons reading the article would put upon them, be correct, there cannot be the smallest

doubt that a breach of the privileges of the House has been committed of a very grave character. The meaning which the hon. Gentleman and most other readers attribute to that article is that it accuses the Irish Members of having been personally responsible for corrupt practices in connection with private Bills. I cannot imagine an accusation more wounding or a more clear breach of our privileges, and I cannot imagine an accusation for which, so far as my knowledge and information extend, there is less substantial foundation. I have been in the sharpest conflict for most years of my political life with hon. Gentlemen opposite. They have said a great many things of me which I think were wholly unjustifiable, and I may have said some things of them which may have passed what they might consider the fair limit of political retort; but I have never accused them of pecuniary corruption. I have never heard that accusation levelled against them in connection with the business of the House, and I will not believe that that accusation has the slightest foundation.

I believe we are all agreed that much less than this would have constituted a gross breach of privilege, and we are face to face now, as we have often been before, with the proper course to be pursued in this House. I have always held, and I have given expression to this view so recently, I think, as within the last week or fortnight, that this House can commit no greater folly than to enter into one of these controversies with the press of this country. The hon. Gentleman has appealed to us, in the interest of our own dignity and honour, to enter into such a controversy. The dignity and honour of the House have never been served by any of these conflicts. Nothing has ever come of them of which we have had reason to be proud, and the pages in our history, a glorious history, which relate to the dealings of this House with the press are not those on which we can look back with the greatest feelings of satisfaction. Let me say further in that connection, that the hon. Gentleman appears to think that the operation of having an editor up to the bar and committing him to prison for the remainder of the session

would in some way clear our fair fame in the eyes of our countrymen and foreign nations, and that something would be done thereby to remove or diminish the venom of the personal aspersion which has been made on the honour of hon. Gentlemen opposite; but it must be obvious to the House that no such happy result can ensue from any exercise of our prerogative in this matter. Of course, if there was a trial before an impartial tribunal, if the editor of the incriminated journal could give his grounds before a judicial tribunal for his accusations, and if those attacked could also state their case, some results such as those desired by hon. Gentlemen opposite and by all of us would undoubtedly ensue. But merely by our votes to bring a man to the bar of this House, to make him apologise or to send him to prison; that clears nobody of anything. It is an exercise of powers which we possess by our immemorial constitution, but it is not a way of sifting a charge, and anything which does not sift a charge cannot really remove it. We are all subject to attacks; seldom, I admit, as gross as the one of which the hon. Gentleman complains; but very few of us, nobody as far as I am aware on this side of the House, have ever thought it worth while to call into play the inherent powers of this House in order to

clear their fair fame. And one reason why they have not thought it worth while is that nothing this House could do would have that desirable result.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that in every case in which an accusation of personal corruption had been made against a Member of this House the course the right hon. Gentleman now denounced had been followed. In the most recent case that course was followed by the advice and on the motion of Sir Stafford Northcote, in 1879.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That case seems to me to be very different in many particulars.

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: It was not so bad.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It did not deal with so many persons. I do not think there is the parallel which the hon. Member supposes between the circumstances of that case and the circumstances of this case. My point is that even in that case nothing was done to clear the fair fame of this House. The fact that this House sent somebody to gaol cleared nobody of an accusation.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said the persons who were guilty of publishing a libel were brought to the bar of the House, were censured by the Speaker, and made a humble apology. In spite of that they were imprisoned. Surely bringing a man before the House and forcing him to apologise for his words was something more in the direction of clearing the fair fame of the House than merely passing an empty resolution and doing nothing more.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Remember that the person incriminated in this case says that he never intended it. It is relevant to the question of what would happen when he was brought to the bar to consider that he says he did not mean to bring the accusation which the hon. Gentleman and I agree in thinking was brought. He would say he did not mean it, of course, because he has already said it.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said the writer quoted the article, but left out the passage in which the accusation was made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not defending the interpretation in to-day's article put upon yesterday's article. I only say he says he did not mean what the hon. Gentleman says he did mean. That is strictly relevant to the consideration of what would occur if this Gentleman were brought up to the bar of the House and interrogated by Mr. Speaker. But that is really not quite the point which I trying to make. A mere act or vote of this House would show that this House regards with indignation the course which it condemns, but that is, in the nature of the case, all that it can do. It shows that we consider that a gross breach of privilege has taken place, it shows that the House is not in sympathy with that breach of privi-

lege; more than that, in the nature of the case, it cannot show. For my part, I am still of opinion that the House gains nothing by these conflicts with the press, not one of which, so far as I know, has occurred for more than a generation. I have to admit that this case does bring to a head a difficulty which has been felt by myself often before, and by other men who have stood at this box, as to what form modern machinery for preserving our privileges should take in face of modern publicity and modern conditions of life. The only arms at our disposal are as antiquated, really, as the crossbow or the blunderbuss. The

only weapons which we use are weapons that were forged in a wholly different state of society, at a time when no proceedings in this House were allowed to be made public, and when no criticism of an action of a Member of Parliament, as a Member of Parliament, was permitted, however true the criticism might be or however light the charge might be that was brought against him. Everything we now do is done in the light of day; every word that we say is reported; the freest criticisms are permitted and encouraged upon the action of parties, upon the action of individuals, upon the action of the House itself, and our only means of protection, in cases where protection is desirable, is this hopelessly antiquated method of bringing the editor, or whoever the offender may be, up to the bar of this House and calling upon him to apologise, and sending him to Newgate or the Clock Tower, not for a term of imprisonment commensurate with his offence, but for a term which is determined by the remaining life of the session.

MR. SWIFT MACNEELL (Donegal, S.): He could be fined.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think that is an even more antiquated method. So far as I am aware, there is no even moderately recent case in which any person has been fined by the action of the House. [An HON. MEMBER: Charles II.] If there be a more recent case than that or not, I would venture to point out that if we have these discussions whenever our privileges are assailed, either in a light manner or a gross manner, by any newspaper, or by private people, I think it is high time that we examined into the matter and considered what steps it behoves the dignity and honour of this House to take in the face of the species of assault which we have had to endure before, and which we shall undoubtedly have to endure in even greater measure as time goes on. Certainly I should myself be perfectly ready to suggest and propose a Select Committee upon this subject, not, of course, this session, but next session, to see whether something cannot be done to introduce order into chaos and to put us into a position of dealing properly, with dignity and on properly ascertained precedents and principles, with cases like this. I personally find myself quite unable to offer any advice to the House except the advice I have steadily offered in other cases where a similar incident has happened, whether the attack has been made upon friends of mine on this bench or upon Gentlemen opposite. That advice is to agree to the resolution that a gross violation of our privileges has been committed, but certainly not to enter into one of those conflicts out of which we cannot hope to come with any increase of that authority and dignity which it should be our first duty to maintain.

*MR. SPEAKER said the question before the House was whether a breach of privilege had been committed, and until that question had been decided no discussion as to what action the House should take could arise.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): What I am about to say, Sir, will be very short, and I hope will conform to your ruling. Perhaps I may be allowed; particularly as for some reason or other my name has been introduced into this scurrilous publication; to associate myself in the most pointed way with what the right hon. Gentleman has said. I believe it is the universal opinion on both sides of this House, independent of party, that there is not one shadow or shade of foundation

for this allegation of personal corruption made against our colleagues from Ireland. It might almost seem insulting that anyone should make publicly such a declaration, but it is forced upon us by the necessities of the case. Nor can I entertain for a moment as having any serious weight or validity the sort of extenuation or apology which appears to have been put forward at a later date by the writer or publisher of this article, to the effect that it did not mean that which it plainly expresses. Everyone, not only from the point of law, but also from the point of common sense, is deemed to intend language in the sense in which it is conveyed to the intelligence of the reader, and anybody who has read this article must admit that it is a charge, of the most open, definite, and unmistakeable kind, of personal corruption against the body of Members from Ireland. That being so, there really is no dispute whatever about the facts of the case. The question is, Can this House, consistently with its traditions and its universal practice, pass it by without notice? I think it cannot. I entirely agree with the right hon. Gentleman that it is most inexpedient for this House to enter into unnecessary controversies on trivial points, which have never resulted in adding either to the dignity of the House or the credit of Parliament. If this were a case which could by any possibility be regarded as of a trivial or trumpery description, I should say it would be entirely unworthy of the dignity of the House to enter into a dispute of that kind, and I should say let us pass it by and take no notice of it. But this case, as the right hon. Gentleman admits, stands in an entirely different category. If there is a case which constitutes a clear and manifest breach of the privileges of this House it is a case in which there is a charge of personal corruption against one Member of this House or a body of its Members. Therefore we must deal with this case on the assumption that we are dealing with as grave a breach of privilege as it is possible for the publisher of a newspaper to be guilty of. That being so, what is the advice which the right hon. Gentleman gives? He says; "Your primitive machinery for dealing with an offender in a case of this kind is so cumbrous and so antiquated that you had better never bring it into operation at all." I agree that the machinery is cumbrous, and that in many cases it is inadequate. But if we are to accept the right hon. Gentleman's argument the law of privilege disappears altogether, and disappears because the machinery which happens to be at the disposal of this House is, in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman; I daresay it is the opinion of a great many of us; inadequate machinery. But so long as the law exists, and so long as the machinery which enforces it exists, it does appear to me that the House is not justified in departing from all its precedents and treating privilege as if it was absolutely non-existent. And I say the House should never be more reluctant to depart from those precedents than when, as in this case, the attack is directed against a body of Members of this House of whom a large majority are in sharp political antagonism with the Government, but are nevertheless entitled to the comity of the House. On these grounds, without transgressing your ruling, Sir, I trust the House without a dissentient voice will pass the resolution of the hon. Member.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said he hardly thought the First Lord of the

Treasury had realised what such a charge affecting private Bill business meant. This House was a court of justice; they called it the High Court of Parliament. He had sat for twenty-one years in the House, but had never sat on a private Bill Committee, though he had witnessed what went on there. Counsel appeared and pleaded before the Committee exactly the same as in any other court, and issues of enormous financial magnitude often depended on the vote of a single Member. Whatever charges of political corruption might be brought, the charge was a far graver one when it was a charge of judicial corruption, because if the Irish Members were politically corrupt, that, after all, only affected their own country, but if they were financially and judicially corrupt, it affected Scotland and England and gigantic commercial issues; it affected the whole business of private Bill Committees, railways, banks, and insurance companies, and it affected every class of business matters of which private Bill Committees had cognisance. There were the facts that they were returned for Irish constituencies and that they were poor men, because he supposed that was really the gravamen of the matter; it was known that the Irish party was a poor party, and if under those circumstances the House allowed its judicial tribunals to be impeached, and for it to be said they could do with Parliament what the humblest police magistrate would not tolerate in his own court, what was to become of the House as a court of justice and as the High Court of Parliament? Take the case of any ordinary magistrate, county court judge, or even an Irish judge. The Irish Members had been in sharp conflict for many years with the Irish judiciary, but had any of his friends ever made a charge of corruption against a single magistrate, county court judge, or superior judge in Ireland? Never! Supposing one of them did so was it possible that the judge might say, "I rely upon my ermine; I pass by your accusation with contempt." And yet the right hon. Gentleman, in regard to a matter which did not affect the Irish Members a tithe as much as it affected the House of Commons and English commercial interests, said of a body of men who had been serving on Committees, "This is a matter to pass by with indifference and contempt." The cunning of the article was this, that it referred to Irish private business, when it was notorious that no Irish Member was ever allowed to serve on a Committee on Irish Bills. They served on English, Scotch, and Welsh private Bills, but, except in the case of a Hybrid Committee, when men were put on admittedly as partisans, they were never allowed to serve on Irish private business. Therefore, the charge of corruption, if it lay at all, had no relation to Irish business, but was in relation to Great Britain and its business. There was a time when Grattan said; "If you pass the Union, Ireland in a few years will send you scoundrels." He did not think that time had yet come, but it would be in the mouth of any libeller to say that it had come if the First Lord of the Treasury in relation to the High Court of Parliament, to his own Parliament, in relation to his own English affairs with which the Irish Members had no concern, but in regard to which they were bound to erye and act as jurors, would not give those jurors the same protection which, in the case of the trial at Sligo in the case of a land grabber, the Irish

Government was the first to provide in order to vindicate the purity of the jury.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester), who rose amidst cries of "Agreed," said this was a matter that affected every Member of the House. There was a widespread impression, even amongst the educated and professional classes, that Members of private Bill Committees were paid for their services. The gravamen of the charge was corruption in connection with private Bill business, and that, in his judgment, constituted the great importance of dealing severely with those responsible for the article in the Globe.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I now beg to move "that the Editor of the Globe newspaper attend this House at Three of the clock to-morrow." I have listened with the greatest possible attention and, to some extent, with sympathy, to the speech of the First Lord of the Treasury. I am the first to admit that the weapons at your command are antiquated and not very effective, and that it would be a wise thing, probably, for this House to inquire into this whole question and see how we could improve our position so as to be able to punish offences of this kind in an adequate fashion. But I cannot agree that you have no means at your disposal; I cannot agree that the bringing of an editor to the bar of this House and compelling him to make a public apology is not some punishment. I do not take the view that it is an adequate punishment, but it is something. I say that this House will stultify itself if, having passed a resolution that this is a gross breach of privilege on the recommendation of the First Lord of the Treasury and so many important Members of this House, it takes no further steps. Admittedly, the offence which has been committed is the most grave breach of privilege which can be devised. I do not want to argue that point over again, but by universal admission it is an offence of the gravest character. I take the view of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife, that it is undignified and ridiculous for the House to invoke the powers attending on breach of privilege in cases of trivial attacks, and I never would dream for a moment in the case of ordinary political attacks, no matter how violent or truculent they might be, of bringing them before the House. But a charge of this kind has always been treated by the House as the most serious offence of all, and I press this on the House of Commons; that even if you cannot inflict what I consider an adequate punishment, you can at any rate show to the world at large that, in passing a resolution of this kind, you are in earnest, and that you are anxious to inflict some sort of punishment on the offender. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife were good enough to give their personal testimony that they did not believe in these accusations. It was not to get these accusations disavowed that I brought the matter forward; but I believe the House of Commons, for its own protection, should take a further step, and that if you stop short now you will lead the public to understand that you pass this resolution with your tongue in your cheek; that you have no serious meaning in passing it. I say that because there is no precedent in all parliamentary history in which a charge of personal corruption

of this kind has been made and the House stopped short at a resolution that it was a breach of privilege. The precedents which I have looked up where no further action was taken refer to cases where there was only an indirect charge of corruption against an individual or a small group of individuals; but there is no precedent where a direct charge was made against an individual or small group of individuals. There is no case in the books where there was a charge of personal corruption such as this when the House did not hesitate to go further. I admit that to enter into a conflict with the newspapers is not, under present conditions, likely to be pleasant. I admit our weapons are old, antiquated, and ineffective, but such as they are, they have always been brought into operation where accusations of this kind have been made. When the right hon. Gentleman spoke about the members of his party not invoking those powers, I take the liberty of reminding him that the very last time when an accusation of personal corruption was brought against Members of this House, Sir Stafford Northcote, who was Leader of the House and Chancellor of the Exchequer, brought it forward, and moved two resolutions; first, that it was a breach of the privilege of Parliament, and, second, that the man guilty of it should be brought to the bar of the House. Eventually the House did make this rusty weapon effective; because the man was sent to prison; he made a most humble apology, and he suffered a good deal, because he was banished from this country for a considerable time in trying to evade the service of the writ of the Speaker. And one of his accomplices against whom the charge only was that he was cognisant of what he was doing was also brought to the bar and sent to prison. I am not moving that the editor of this paper should be sent to prison; probably that would be absurd in view of the fact that if he were to come to the bar to-morrow and were sent to prison he would be released within a day. But it is quite a different thing to bring him here and make him make a public apology. He has been guilty of a gross insult to this House; his article to-day is an aggravation of that offence, and if the House is in earnest, if it really agrees with the Leader of the House that this is a serious case, then the man who committed the offence ought to be brought to the bar of the House and receive the censure of the Speaker, and be compelled to make a public apology to the House. For those reasons I move this motion that the editor of the paper be brought to the bar of the House at three of the clock to-morrow. I confess that my own feeling would be that if the House stops short now; because in this case the accusation has been made against Irish Members, who because they are Irish Members are unpopular, and who notoriously are a poor party and ought to be most carefully protected by this House; we would create a precedent which is not to be found in the annals of Parliament in the past. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Editor and Publisher of the Globe newspaper do attend at the Bar of this House to-morrow, at Three of the clock." (Mr. John Redmond.)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not much to add in point of argument to the speech I delivered just now. In its broad outlines it is not less germane to the question now before us. The hon. and learned Member concluded by claiming special consideration from Members for Ireland in the case of an accusation of the kind

described, partly because they are in a minority, partly because they are unpopular, and partly because they are poor, and I do not deny that his argument has force. I can only say that the advice I have given to the House is that which I should give with regard to any of my friends if they had been similarly charged, and it is the course I should wish the House to pursue if such a charge should be brought against myself. The broad and general grounds on which I give the advice I have stated, and I still think the House would do well to follow it. But I am too old a parliamentary hand not to know that in taking that view I probably have not the majority of the House with me. So far as I can collect the general opinion of the House, it is that in this case, whatever inconvenience may attend on our procedure, whatever the possible ridicule that may attach to its subsequent stages, nevertheless the offence is so gross, and precedents are so clearly in its favour, that this action should be taken. I do not think the precedent mentioned is quite on all fours with the present case, and the whole tendency of the last 150 years has been in the direction of not enforcing the privileges of the House, and I believe that is a wise and wholesome tendency. How far we should go, whether we should allow those privileges to cease, whether we should modify our procedure to meet the changed conditions of modern life, these are questions that may very properly be dealt with next session, but though I have given advice I think the House would do well to adopt, and though I do not take the responsibility of advising the House to take a course which I do not think will redound to its credit, I would recommend that no division should be taken, and that we might as well avoid a public exhibition of our differences.

MR. ASQULTH: I think the right hon. Gentleman does well to yield, even against his own judgment, to what is, I am certain, the preponderating opinion of both sides of the House. I desire to say on behalf of my friends here, in the first place, that in our view it is undesirable that the House should pass a resolution declaring that a breach of privilege has been committed and then do nothing-more. Such an academic declaration of breach of privilege is a mere *brutum fulmen*, whereas if the offence is sufficiently grave the House should be prepared to take the logical and consequential action. Next, as regards this particular case, I do not at all agree that because of the rising of the House this summoning of the offender to the bar to give an apology and to receive the admonition of the Speaker is an idle-ceremony; it is in some sense a punishment of the offence and it may be an effective deterrent against repetition.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): With great diffidence I wish to point out that there is the possibility of the House being placed in a very embarrassing position to-morrow. If the editor makes an apology, that will be all very well, but suppose instead of doing that he should make a highly impertinent speech from the bar, what will the House do then? [Cries of "Oh! Oh!"] It seems to me the House would be placed in a position of difficulty. At an earlier-period of the session the House might reply with a term of imprisonment, but to-morrow the House would be absolutely helpless. [Cries of "No, no," "You can fine him."] By the law of the land any order of the House for imprisonment comes to an end with the prorogation. ["Fine."] I do not know that the House can have recourse to

earlier forms of punishment as applicable, but I find that the House has formerly taken a course dignified and exceedingly effective, and which, I think, would meet the present case, by directing a prosecution for libel. There is a precedent, not a very recent one, for the House has generally adopted the other alternative, but in 1701 there is the record of the House having directed the Attorney General to prosecute William Fuller, who was convicted on a charge of having accused Members of receiving money as bribes from France. This, it appears to me, would be a much more effective remedy for what, no doubt, is a gross and seditious libel, calculated to bring the House of Commons into contempt, and impugning the probity of its Members. I therefore suggest that a prosecution should be directed, not troubling the editor to appear at the bar. ["Oh! oh!"]

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): May I be permitted in a very words few to point out that what the noble Lord has said is hardly germane to the discussion. If the editor should to-morrow refuse to apologise, and should insult the House, it will then be for the House to consider what course should be taken. It is absurd and a waste of time to discuss what the House would proceed to do in a very unlikely eventuality. What we now have to do is to pursue the course pointed out by precedents; what we would do should the editor prove contumacious can be discussed to-morrow.

Question put, and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Youthful Offenders Bill; Factory and Workshops Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill: National Gallery (Purchase of Adjacent Land) Bill; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill: with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to Manchester and Liverpool Electric Express Railway Bill [Lords]; Harrogate Corporation Bill [Lords]: Rugby Water and Improvement Bill [Lords]: without amendment.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Lords' Amendments, to be considered to-morrow and to be printed. [Bill 295.]

A short account of this business (taken from Ralph's History) is given in "The Parliamentary History," Vol. v., page 1336. Fuller's conduct was not voted a breach of privilege; the House passed a resolution declaring him to be "a cheat, a false accuser, and an incorrigible rogue," and Mr. Attorney General was ordered to prosecute him "for his said offences." In the Parliamentary Debates, First Series, Vol. xvi., page 14****, is a speech by Sir Francis Burdett, in which the whole subject of Privilege is elaborately and learnedly examined. "The groundwork of all the privileges of this House" is traced to a law of Canute!;ED.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed "That the Bill be now read a second time."

SOUTH AFRICA; CONDUCT OF THE WAR: PRESENT SITUATION; RECENT PROCLAMATIONS; CONCENTRATION CAMPS; CIVIL ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): We have arrived at this, nearly the very last stage of the session, and have a right to demand from His Majesty's

Government a statement in a distinct and official manner as to the position in regard to the unhappy war which has now been waged for nearly two years. Of that we have received at the end of the two successive sessions different accounts.

In July or August, 1899, we received from the Government the most hopeful representation in reference to the anticipations of war. We were then assured confidently that there was a great probability that war would be avoided, but that view of the case has unfortunately turned out to be entirely unfounded.

What was the account the Government gave us at the end of the session of 1900?

They told us that the war was all but over, and that within a very few weeks of that time the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa would return to England. Upon that the Government appealed to the country, as the authors of a successful war which had come to an end. That was the next stage of the announcements we have received. But no sooner was the Election over than we were told that great reinforcements were necessary for this war, which had practically come to an end, and since that time, for some ten months, the war has been going on with varying fortunes, sometimes with apparent success, sometimes with apparent failure. We get from time to time in the newspapers certain scraps of information, but no connected account of what the course of the war is. We get short telegrams, naturally from the British side, from Lord Kitchener, but on the other side we get no accounts at all. What we want to know, however, is what is the situation of both the belligerent parties. I presume the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa has formed some opinion as to what is the condition of the enemy to which he is opposed; I suppose he has given full information to the Government, and that they have formed some judgment as to what are the prospects of the war and what is its actual condition.

At present we do not even know how many men we have engaged there, we do not know what is the conjecture on the part even of the Commander-in-Chief and High Commissioner as to the forces to which we are opposed. All that we know is that we have an enormous force in the Transvaal, the Orange Free State, in Natal, and in Cape Colony, and that they are still liable from time to time to be occupied and attacked by the enemy. We read of blockhouses being taken, of engagements sometimes adverse to our own forces, we know that large numbers of men have been killed, and wounded, and lost through disease, and we know also that we are spending about £5,000,000 a month on the war which at the end of last session was declared to be at an end. All these are circumstances on which we are entitled to some fuller information than we have yet received, and we ought not at the conclusion of this session, when Parliament can no longer have any means of obtaining knowledge or any control of the matter, to go away without having some more definite account of the condition of the war and its prospects than we have yet received. That is the demand which we ought to press, and all the more because we are apparently in the presence of a new policy. For, unless we are mistaken in all the reports that have reached us through the press, the hope of victory by military operations seems to have been given up in despair, and we are to enter upon a new policy. I hope it is not the policy which the Colonial Secretary the other day dealt with, a most dangerous policy, I thought; I mean the policy of employing savage races and native forces. I do not know that the

right hon. Gentleman indicated that that was the policy of the Government in South Africa; I hope not, but he made a sort of general defence, as I understood, of the employment of savages in warfare. A greater crime than warfare of that description it is impossible to describe. Of all that is recorded against this country in the unhappy war with the people of America at the end of the eighteenth century none left such a stain upon the British name as that. I hope, if there is any question of employing savages in warfare between white races such as that in which we are now engaged that the language of Lord Chatham will be remembered. He said;

"My Lords, who is the man that, in addition to these disgraces and mischiefs to our Army, has dared to authorise, and to associate with our arms, the tomahawk and sealping-knife of the savage, to call into civilised alliance the wild and inhuman savage of the woods, to delegate to the merciless Indian the defence of disputed rights, and to wage the horrors of his barbarous war against our brethren? My Lords, these enormities cry aloud to us to redress and avenge them. Unless thoroughly done away with it will be a stain on the national character; it is a violation of the Constitution; I believe it is against law."

I do not wish to be understood as charging or even suggesting that this is the policy which the Government contemplate. But it is perfectly certain that in the press of this country it has been and is advocated. Language was used not many days ago by the Colonial Secretary to the effect that he saw no reason why native races should not be employed for this purpose, which, I hope, will be entirely disavowed. I trust that any suggestion of the kind will be absolutely repudiated. But there is a policy which we know is being adopted; the policy of proclamation, and it is apparently the one which is to take the place of military operations, which according to all accounts have not been largely successful recently in South Africa. What is the object of reverting to this policy of proclamation, which has not been a happy chapter in this war? We have had forty-one of these proclamations, many of them illegal, all of them futile, and most of them so impolitic that, even if they were legal, they had to be withdrawn. One of the early proclamations was that;

"all the inhabitants of the Orange River Colony after 14 days who shall be found in arms shall be liable to be dealt with as rebels and to suffer in person and property accordingly."

That was to be a sort of closure of the war; on a particular date the guillotine was to descend. It was a declaration inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the laws and customs of war. In June, 1900, you declared that every man found in arms was a rebel, and as such was liable to the death penalty. Almost immediately after that proclamation was issued it had to be withdrawn, and another proclamation was issued;

"that the burghers of the Orange State who were attached to some commando prior to the annexation, and who had been continually in arms against Her Majesty's Government since, should be regarded as prisoners of war."

They always were prisoners of war and not rebels at all, and therefore that proclamation had to be set aside. Then there was the farm-burning proclamation; the houses and farms in the vicinity of the place where the damage

was done were to be destroyed, and the residents in the neighbourhood dealt with under martial law. That was practically revoked by the Order of November 18th. Another proclamation stated that all burghers who had not taken the oath in districts occupied by His Majesty's forces should be regarded as prisoners of war. Men who had never taken arms at all were to be regarded as prisoners of war. That was the most astounding statement, I suppose, ever put into any proclamation. The proclamation further stated;

"that all buildings and structures in which scouts or other forces of the enemy are harboured would be liable to be razed to the ground."

That is apart from the farm-burning proclamation. That means probably the whole of the houses of the Dutch population in these countries. All these proclamations came to nothing at all; there was not even an attempt to put them into operation. It was found to be impossible either in law or policy to defend them; it was shown what a very unwise thing it is in carrying on a contest of this kind to issue such brutal fulmina, which those who issued them did not attempt to enforce, and to which those against whom they were issued paid no attention. That is the history practically of your forty-one proclamations.

Then you perceived that the only thing to do was to betake yourselves, in order to terminate the war, to those military operations which have been conducted undoubtedly with great skill and effect by Lord Kitchener. But now we are reverting again to the policy of proclamation, and we wish that the Government should give us some reason for going back to a course of proceedings which in the past has proved neither creditable nor effective. We have now had a new proclamation. The scope of it is to deprive, on a particular date, those who continue resistance of the rights which belong to belligerents. We have to ask ourselves and to ask the Government whether or not the condition of the contest justifies such action. If a man who has belligerent rights is captured in war, you cannot banish him. As soon as peace is effected you must return him to his own country, just as he was before. Therefore, this proclamation can only be defended on the ground that you have the right to deprive these men of the privileges belonging to them as lawful belligerents, and if there does not exist a condition of things to justify such action; the proclamation is not justifiable. The question of belligerent rights is of the gravest international importance. It is not a mere matter between you and the Boers in South Africa alone. It affects the whole of what I may call the morale of war. There has been in successive centuries and generations a code which has been gradually adopted to mitigate the ferocity of war, and which gives to those engaged in war certain rights, and which secures them when beaten or captured certain forms of protection which are known under the name of belligerent rights. Therefore this is a matter not to be lightly dealt with. It is a matter upon which there has been the most careful and anxious consideration in recent years. It has been debated by the highest authorities with the greatest ability. The Government of Russia invited the Powers to meet in 1874 and 1875 to draw up a code of the rules and customs of war. Anybody who wishes really to get to the bottom of this matter should read the account in the Blue-book containing the whole of the discussions and proposals that were made and the manner in which they were

treated by the Powers of Europe, who were represented at that conference. Russia propounded certain articles upon the subject; and it very early became apparent in the discussion of these articles at the Conference of the Powers that the views entertained by great military Powers, like Russia, Germany, and, more or less, France, were entirely adverse to the views held by the smaller and weaker Powers, who had not the same great armies and organisation as were possessed by such Powers as Russia and Germany, and the consequence was that there arose a very great conflict of opinion in that conference. I cannot weary the House by going into the details at any length, though I think that they are matters of very great importance. But there are some things which I cannot leave unmentioned, impressed as I am with the enormous importance of the question of belligerent rights, which are called in question by this proclamation. As I said just now, the smaller and weaker Powers were opposed to the form of the resolutions which were put forward by the Russian Government. They felt that they were entirely on the side of great battalions, and that the smaller Powers, such as Switzerland, Portugal, Spain, Belgium, and Holland, who had not great armies, would be unjustly oppressed if they were adopted. Let me give an example of one of these rules which is very much to the purpose in the matter involved in this proclamation. One of the proposals was materially altered in the conference in consequence of the opposition of these Powers. The original proposal of the Russian Government ran; "Individuals belonging to the population of a country in which the enemy's power is already established who shall rise in arms against them may be handed over to justice, and are not to be regarded as prisoners of war."

In my opinion that is exactly the situation which is contemplated by the recent proclamation. That proposal was rejected by the conference, and the following was substituted in its place;

"The population of a locality which is not yet occupied by the enemy and which takes up arms for the defence of its country is to be considered as belligerent, and if it is made prisoner is to be treated as prisoner of war."

That was a vindication of the rights of the weaker independent Powers, who remonstrated against the original proposal. The representative of Switzerland speaking for a country which had fought in vindication of its liberty;

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What date is it?

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: This is

1874. The representative of Switzerland pointed out how the entire population of his country rose to defend their independence. He said;

"that if the history of Switzerland be referred to, it will be seen that the entire population of valleys, unorganised and under no chief, rose en masse.

That is a patriotic sentiment which cannot be forbidden. The men who defend their country are not brigands. The Swiss would revolt at such a hypothesis."

That was the position taken up by what I may call the small, free, independent countries who have not at their disposal great battalions. There were other modifications in the proposals of Russia. One which was very important describes the rights of belligerents to be enjoyed, not only by the Regular Army, but by the Militia and Volunteers. I ask the attention of the House to the definition

of the rights of men who do not belong to the Regular Army, and to the conditions which they must fulfil in order to enjoy and maintain belligerent rights. The first condition was that these independent bodies should have at their head someone responsible for his subordinates. It was proposed that they should at the same time be subject to orders from head quarters. That last sentence was struck out because it held to be sufficient if those independent bodies, not acting under authority from any single head, but acting under persons responsible for their subordinates, such as the mayor of a town or other reputable person. Other conditions were that they should have some distinguishing badge, recognisable at a distance; that they should carry arms openly; and that in their operations they should conform to the laws and customs of war. On the proposal of Russia it was agreed that armed bands not complying with these conditions were not to be regarded as possessing the rights of belligerents, and in case of capture were to be proceeded against judicially. The proposal of your proclamation is exactly the proposal which was struck out by the Russian Government in consequence of the general disapproval of it by the Powers of Europe. If you are to proceed against the men in arms in South Africa judicially, how can you banish them by proclamation? You are dealing with belligerents or you are not dealing with belligerents. If you are dealing with belligerents you have no right to banish them. If they are not belligerents you cannot by proclamation banish them. You must proceed against them by some law.

I should like to call the attention of the House to the despatch of Lord Derby, in the Government of Lord Beaconsfield, dated 20th January, 1875, declaring how the British Government meant to deal with these disputed questions as between the Great Powers and the smaller Powers. Lord Derby wrote;

"The careful consideration of the whole matter has convinced Her Majesty's Government that it is their duty firmly to repudiate on the part of Great Britain and her allies in any future war any proposals for altering the principles of international law upon which Her Majesty's Government has hitherto acted, and above all to be a party to any agreement the effect of which would be to facilitate aggressive wars and to paralyse the resistance of an invaded people."

What characteristic is there which the history of this country displays and of which we are more proud than that under the Administration of Lord Palmerston and other Administrations the sympathies of this country have been with the weaker side? In the struggles of Italy, in the struggles of Belgium, in the struggle of the Poles and of Hungary, the feelings and sympathies of this country have been with the weaker side. Now, Sir, I come to the conference at The Hague. There among other questions were considered the laws and customs of war in a revised shape, founded on the original Russian proposals, and there, with considerable modifications, they received a certain assent. I am happy to say that the British representative, Sir John Ardagh, speaking in the same language and acting in the same direction as Lord Derby, proposed;

"That nothing should be considered as tending to diminish the rights which belong to the population of an invaded country to oppose the most energetic

resistance to the invader by every legitimate means."

That proposal was not included in the protocol, because there was a general opinion that that was a sentiment of which all the Powers approved. As a Government we did not become parties to the convention, but what was agreed upon by most of the Powers was this, that the rights and duties of war apply not only to armies, but also to Militia and Volunteer corps fulfilling the following conditions; namely, that they are commanded by a person responsible for their conduct, that they have a fixed distinction recognisable at a distance. that they carry arms openly, and conduct their operations in accordance with the laws and usages of war. That is the effect of the amended resolution which came out of the conference, and that was followed by a second article, which included the population of a territory which has not been occupied who on the enemy's approach have taken up arms to resist and repel the invading troops without having had time to organise themselves according to Article 1.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.):
What about occupation?

*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I am coming to occupation directly, and there the question comes more nearly home. The question is, "What is the occupation which decides the rights as belligerents of the other side?" Now, Sir, I wish to call attention to the "Manual of Military Law," published in 1899 as instructions to Her Majesty's officers and men. There military occupation is most accurately defined. Here we find what military occupation on the part of an invader is; "An invader is stated to be in military occupation of such part of a country as is wholly abandoned by the forces of the enemy."

Can you predicate that of any part of South Africa at the present moment? It goes on;

"The occupation must be real and not nominal. A paper occupation is infinitely more objectionable in its character and effects than a paper blockade."

A paper blockade is a partial blockade of a portion of a coast when you cannot blockade the whole. The manual goes on to state that;

"The true test of military occupation is exclusive possession."

Have you at this moment exclusive possession of the Transvaal or the Orange River Colony? I may, indeed, ask the same question even of Cape Colony.;

"For example";

proceeds the manual;

"the reduction of a fortress which dominates the surrounding country gives military possession of the dominated country, but not of any other fortress which has not submitted."

Is that a description you can apply to the occupation of these provinces? Then we are told that;

"Military occupation ceases as soon as the forces of the invader retreat or advance in such a manner as to loosen their hold on the occupied territory."

Therefore, there clearly can only be military occupation of territory where your military forces are operating for the time, and any part which your military forces do not effectively occupy at the time is not in your occupation, and until you have made your occupation

effective over every part of an enemy's territory you cannot assert that you are entitled to deny belligerent rights to those to whom you are opposed. You cannot treat the inhabitants as rebels, and until peace is concluded or you have a complete and effective military occupation of the whole territory your proclamation of annexation is nothing but a paper annexation. So much for occupation. What does this British manual say with regard to the character that the men in arms against you must possess in order to exercise and enjoy belligerent rights? It says that the first duty of a citizen is to defend his country, but this defence must be conducted according to the usages and customs of war. It then states the rules which apply to countries which have regular armies and regular organisations, and proceeds to say that;

"No rule can be laid down which is not subject to great exceptions. For example, the usages and customs of war do not justify a commander in putting to death or even punishing the inhabitants of a town after the attack has ceased on the ground that they fought against him without uniform or distinctive mark as all the inhabitants of a town may be considered as legitimate enemies until the town is taken. Similarly a population which rises en masse in a country not occupied by the enemy are entitled to be treated as prisoners of war, and not as marauders."

These are the rules with regard to occupation. Unless the country is occupied totally and in every part in the military and exclusive sense, you are not entitled to treat as marauders the men still in arms in defence of their own country. Then, again, it is stated in this manual that;

"Where the regular government of a country has been overthrown by civil tumult the absence of a recognised Government having the power to make peace would not in itself disentitle organised bodies of men, clearly distinguishable as foes, fighting in accordance with the customs of war to be treated when captured as prisoners of war."

Nothing can be more clear than these instructions, which are printed and published for the instruction of the British Army, and I cannot help thinking that it is for that reason that this proclamation was not recommended by Lord Kitchener. How did this pro-

clamation originate? It is not the proclamation of the High Commissioner or of the Commander-in-Chief in the field. It is not a proclamation which suggested itself to His Majesty's Government. I venture to affirm that this proclamation, which is an entire innovation in the laws and customs of war, is an emanation from the brains of the Ministers of Natal. We have not the smallest indication that His Majesty's Government suggested it or that Lord Kitchener was consulted by them on the matter. It comes from Natal. It is founded not upon the fact that the war is over, but upon the statement of the Ministers of Natal on 25th July, 1901. They said;

"There is a protracted continuance of hostilities. The colony is still subjected to the censorship and to martial law."

and then they proceed to recommend, first of all, that the cost of the maintenance of all women and children should be chargeable against the immovable property of burghers in the field, and that the leaders should be informed that

unless they and their commandoes surrendered by a date specified they would be banished from South Africa for life. That is the idea which sprung out of the heads of the Ministers of Natal. They sent it home. We have no account of any opinion given upon it by Lord Kitchener, and I should be glad to hear from the right hon. Gentleman whether the idea was communicated to Lord Kitchener before the proclamation was drawn up; and, if so, whether he will give the House Lord Kitchener's opinion on it; for I find that within five days the proclamation was drafted on the scheme of the Ministers of Natal and sent out to Lord Kitchener with directions to him to publish it. And in such a hurry was it drawn that those at home had not taken time to ascertain the facts. When it was necessary to consider the preamble, to show how complete is their occupation, they said His Majesty's Government is in complete possession of the Treasury of the Boers. Of course everybody knows that they never were in possession of the Treasury, and a week afterwards they found this out, and telegraphed out to correct that by striking the word "Treasury" out of the proclamation. Then it was necessary to telegraph out to correct the grammar of the proclamation. This is the character of the proclamation which

endeavours to lay upon an elaborate preamble the foundation for what I say is a denial of belligerent rights to the Boers who are still remaining in arms. They say they are in complete possession of the seat of government of both the aforesaid Republics; that is true; of the Treasury; that is not true; of their public offices and machinery of administration, as well as the principal towns and the whole of the railway line. But that is only a partial, and a very partial, occupation. I would venture to say, if the accounts one reads in the newspapers are true, that these countries are not in complete and effective military occupation at all, and that in future they will be less militarily occupied than before. I think we have a right to know what is the expectation and the policy of the Government in this matter. We are told by people who pretend to know; I have seen a confident statement in the press; that Lord Kitchener is to return on a definite date, and that a very large number of troops are to be brought home. We ought to know whether that is true or not. If, out of these 200,000 men, a large number of men are to be withdrawn, and if the present Commander-in-Chief is to leave, as the last one did, on the assumption that the war is practically over, we ought to be informed of that change of policy. But what I call attention to is this; that the preamble of this proclamation lays no foundation whatever for the penalties which it professes to impose. It proceeds to say that;

"the burghers are devoid of regular military organisation, and are therefore unable to carry-on regular warfare, or to offer organised resistance."

What do you mean by organised resistance? So far as we know, these commandos that still exist in these countries fulfil the conditions that I have read; either those proposed at Brussels or those agreed to at The Hague, or those defined in the Manual of Instructions. "They are not under the command of responsible men." They are under the command of De Wet, Botha, Delarey, and many others, and are therefore under the command of responsible persons, although they may not be acting from any single centre. Therefore this allegation is not,

in my judgment, an allegation upon which to establish the authority which enables you to deny to these men, when you have conquered and captured them in war, belligerent rights. It proceeds;

"And whereas it is just to proceed against those still resisting, and especially against those persons who, being in possession of authority, are responsible for the continuance of the present state of lawlessness, and are instigating their fellow-burghers to continue their hostilities."

The allegation apparently is that these men are marauders, that they are not acting under authority, and that there is nobody who is responsible for their actions. But your own proclamation denies that; it points out that they are persons acting under the guidance of persons in authority, that there are persons in authority who are still conducting this conflict. These are the persons against whom your penalties are directed;"Commandants, field-cornets, and leaders of armed bands." It is proved in your own proclamation that these are organised bodies within the definition I have read to you, which recognises that they are entitled to belligerent rights. A body is organised whether it consists of 10,000 or 100 men, so long as they are acting according to the rules and customs of war and under the leadership of responsible men, and you have laid no foundation for the proceedings for which this proclamation is issued.

Let me ask here what it is you expect to gain by these penalties which you proclaim in this document? You say that these leaders are to be banished. Again, I must ask, how do you propose to banish them;under what authority and in what capacity? If they are prisoners of war who have been captured while fighting for the defence of their own country there is no authority left to you at all;they are entitled to return to their own country. If you choose to keep these countries under martial law you may expel them and do what you like with them. Is that your scheme? Are you going to keep these countries, when the war is over, under martial law in order that you may Danish these men who are respected and regarded by their fellow-countrymen? You cannot banish them except by some process of law. Are you going to indict them for treason? Conceive an indictment against General Botha for treason for breach of his allegiance to the British Crown. It is absurd on the face of it. There is no authority for doing such a thing at all. You might as well induct ex-President Kruger as a British subject and a rebel. That is what I call a paper occupation, and a mere paper annexation does not make traitors of all these men who were in arms, who are in arms, and have been in arms ever since the annexation. In the case of Lord Durham there was an attempt;it absolutely failed;to establish a right to banish men who unquestionably were rebels without legal proceedings and without legal indictment. Is that the proceeding you are going to take against the leaders;Botha, De Wet, Delarey? But against the other men;the common herd;you are going to invent a most extraordinary proceeding. However it entered into the heads of the Ministers of Natal to adopt such a policy I cannot conceive. It amounts to a bill for board and lodging against the men whom you capture in war for taking care of their wives and families whom you have carried off against their will. If ever there was a case of *nec cauponantes bellum*, sed

belligerentes it is this, and certainly it would have encouraged Napoleon, if he were alive, to level against us the taunt, "a nation of shopkeepers." In what capacity are you going to charge them? If, as I contend, these men are entitled to belligerent rights, you cannot charge them for your board and lodging at St. Helena and Ceylon. Why should you charge them for keeping their wives and families in prison for your own convenience or their protection in camps of concentration? It seems to me to be an utterly unreasonable proposal, and one which is impolitic and unwise in the highest degree. It is said the war is coming to a condition in which you may treat it as no war at all. Is that true? Just test it in one way. The refugees at the Cape are extremely anxious to return to Johannesburg and Pretoria; they cannot be allowed to go back because you cannot ensure them sufficient food, for the whole of the railways, which you say you are in possession of, are required for carrying supplies for your own army. That is a very partial occupation. We are told that the country is being scoured. It is being scoured at a particular part, but the moment you march your troops away that part is reoccupied by the enemy. I have come to the conclusion that there is no military feature in the situation which justifies the refusal of the rights of war to the Boers now in arms. I believe every man in this House and country believes this war should be brought to the earliest possible conclusion, and if I thought this proclamation would have any effect in that direction I should look at it with very different eyes. But I do not believe anything of the kind. I believe the proclamation will irritate without being effectual, that it will not frighten into submission the men against whom it is directed. It is founded upon principles which, I believe, are not consistent with the laws and customs of war as they have been understood in modern times and by civilised nations. It will exasperate your opponents without helping you to subdue them. It will have the effect, I am quite sure, abroad of leading to still greater exasperation of feeling against this country if they can bring against us the charge that, in order to overpower these people, we have resorted to methods which do not belong to legitimate warfare. For these reasons I hope this proclamation may be allowed to sink into abeyance, and that we shall hear no more of it for the future.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have listened to the speech which has been delivered by the right hon. Gentleman, but I confess that at its close I am quite unable to conceive what could have been his object in making it at this period. I can judge of its effect, but I cannot understand what view the right hon. Gentleman took of the advantage of such a disquisition. The right hon. Gentleman has endeavoured to show that the action of His Majesty's Government is absurd, impracticable, illegal, futile, illegitimate, contrary to the practices of civilised warfare, contrary to the declarations of other civilised States, and, of course, to the extent to which he is successful he does undoubtedly weaken the hands of His Majesty's Government, and he does provoke and confirm that prejudice which already exists in the minds of foreign nations with regard to our proceedings. I quite understand the position of the right hon. Gentleman, that this war was an unjust war into which we ought never to have entered, but I do not understand why, under those circumstances, when he

says his one desire is to see it brought to a peaceful conclusion, he is continually interposing and intervening with language and arguments which, if they mean anything and have any effect at all, will certainly have a tendency to prolong the war. The right hon. Gentleman has demanded a statement with regard to the military situation. He seems to have forgotten that only a few days ago a similar and very natural request was made to me by the Leader of the Opposition, and that I then gave to the House all the information it was possible for me to give. If the right hon. Gentleman wants to induce me to make again prophecies such as, he says, we have made in the past and have invariably proved untrue, I decline altogether to be led to do so. It is quite true that the anticipations of everybody who has spoken with regard to this war have not been fulfilled as we should have wished them to be. Under those circumstances, I am not rash enough to indulge in further prophecies, but I stated no later than Friday week all we knew of the present position and the grounds for anticipating that it would be within the power of the Commander-in-Chief to send home a considerable number of troops at the termination of the winter campaign.

The right hon. Gentleman asked me with regard to a report or statement which, I believe, appears in the newspapers this morning to the effect that Lord Kitchener is coming home on September 15th. and that a large number of troops are also coming home with him. I have nothing to add to what I have said before with regard to the troops. With regard to Lord Kitchener, the statement is absolutely without foundation. The right hon. Gentleman complains that we give so little information. I have explained previously that we give to the House everything we ourselves receive. To complain of those who furnish us with information would, I think, be extremely unfair, for when you come to consider the present state of hostilities in South Africa and the size of the country you will see that it is absolutely impos-

sible to give a connected account of a series of isolated skirmishes and continuous pursuit by our troops of ever-evading Boer commandos. The general result is sufficiently clearly stated in the weekly returns that are made of the net consequence of the operations which are being pursued. Last week Lord Kitchener was able to announce that the efforts of his force had been more successful than in any previous week, though that was not anticipated, because, as I pointed out on a previous occasion, we had already taken so many prisoners that it was to be expected that the number captured each week would gradually lessen. I shall come later to what, in my opinion, has had that very satisfactory effect.

Then the right hon. Gentleman went on to speak about a new policy which had been adopted, and he indicated that the policy was somehow or other connected with the employment of natives. Nothing of that kind has been said from this bench. I stated distinctly on a previous occasion that the policy of His Majesty's Government was the policy which they have declared from the first; not to employ native troops for offensive purposes in this war; and the reason, of course, is on the surface; I need not repeat it. Then the right hon. Gentleman went on to denounce a statement which I had made with regard to our perfect freedom to employ natives in any future war, and he talked about the days of Chatham and

the employment of Indians in the war with America. It is quite true that Chatham denounced, perhaps on good grounds, the employment of Indians in the American War, but certainly, if I am to pay attention to that example. I should be rather careful of what I said of the employment of natives, lest, like Chatham, I should find myself a few years afterwards employing them in a war, as was done in the case of the Seven Years War and when we were fighting the French in Canada.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The American War was after the Seven Years War.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is perfectly true; my history is at fault. It is perfectly certain that the employment of Indians by civilised Government was common on both sides in those days. What I was going to say was this. The employment of natives then was on a scale and under conditions which certainly no civilised nation would for a moment consent to at the present time. The Indians were employed under their own chiefs; they exercised all their own barbarous customs, and they were properly described by the right hon. Gentleman as savages. But the right hon. Gentleman would not, I imagine, for one moment apply the description to our Indian troops.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I did not say they were.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: We have had Indian troops in China; we have had Indian troops side by side with the troops of four or five civilised nations, and let me say they did not prove themselves the least inferior to the troops of those civilised nations.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I did not say they were.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Under these circumstances, why does the right hon. Gentleman complain of my statement that we consider our hands to be free in any future war, whether with a civilised nation or not, to employ native troops, if we can employ them under conditions in which we are certain that they are under civilised control? That is the statement I made on a previous occasion, and I adhere to it. I am not going to be frightened from it by the denunciations, on insufficient grounds, of the right hon. Gentleman. These after all were only hors-d'œuvre. The long speech of the right hon. Gentleman was devoted almost entirely to the proclamation which has just been issued. With regard to that proclamation, he began by alluding to his own satisfaction that we had issued a number of other proclamations, all of which had been absolutely futile. I deny absolutely that those proclamations have been futile, or that any of them have been futile, or that there is a single one of them which cannot be said to have produced, at all events to some extent, the effect which it was desired to produce. The best answer that I can give to the right hon.

Gentleman consists in this. At the present time we have as prisoners or as surrendered more than 35,000 of the enemy in our hands. I attribute, I must say, a good number of those captures, and still more of those surrenders, to the effect of those proclamations which the right hon. Gentleman, on very insufficient evidence, declares to have been entirely futile.

Then he says this proclamation deprives, the enemy of the rights of belligerents. It does nothing of the kind. Does the right hon. Gentleman mean to lay down, as a result of all this reading of books on military law and the

proceedings of conferences in Belgium and at The Hague that if you go to war with a country and conquer that country you have no power to prevent the return there of anybody you please; that it is a belligerent right of everybody who has fought against you to return to that country? The proposition is perfectly absurd. In this case these colonies; the Transvaal and the Orange River Colonies; are part of His Majesty's dominions. We have a right to make a law in those colonies, as we have a right to make a law here if we choose to banish, to expel from the country any persons whose presence there we may consider to be undesirable, and all we have done by the proclamation is to warn certain persons that if they do not surrender by 15th September those proceedings will be taken against them. We shall prohibit their return and they will be expelled from South Africa. The right hon. Gentleman asked what was the origin of the proclamation. He says it was not a proclamation suggested to us by Lord Kitchener or Lord Milner, or a proclamation which entered into our own brain, but was the product of the ingenuity of the Ministers of Natal. If that had been true I should not have thought the worse of it on that account. At any rate the Ministers of Natal have a right to be heard in this matter. Their interests in it are more direct than those of the right hon. Gentleman, and they are most likely to know the means which are best to conduce to the peace which he and they desire.

The right hon. Gentleman is not of course aware of all the circumstances of the case, and perhaps it would be satisfactory to him if I state that the right hon. Gentleman is apparently mistaken in what he imagines has taken place. This proclamation, with one exception, was in print and approved by the Cabinet before we received the suggestion of the Ministers of Natal. Therefore, although that is the first document which appears in the papers, it is only printed as showing the feeling of the colonies on the subject. But it does happen that the suggestion arose almost contemporaneously in the minds of the Ministers of Natal and the Government. I say with one exception, which is a new one made by the Ministers in Natal, that the cost of keeping the women and children in the camps should be made a charge on the burghers. I think the suggestion went further than the one we adopted, because it seemed to be that the charge should be on the whole of the burghers still in the field, whereas we have put it as a charge only on those to whom the families belong. The right hon. Gentleman is pleased to be humorous at the expense of this suggestion which we have now adopted, and for which we are fully responsible. I confess I do not share his view. The principal object of this proclamation is to bring about the termination of the war and the surrender of those still in the field. One cause of the prolongation of the war is the fact that the burghers may continue to make war with little risk to themselves and no risk whatever to their families. We are taking care of their families and providing for them in a much better way than they were ever provided for before, and meanwhile their husbands and brothers are in the field fighting against us, certain that no loss whatever will result to them. If we can by some small penalty bring home to them that they cannot continue this without some pecuniary loss, I think we shall have done a very important thing. I will say incidentally that the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that

these people in the camps are practically our prisoners is not strictly accurate. It is true there is a certain amount of supervision over them, but that supervision is so loose that I am informed by good authority that there would be no difficulty in their escaping if they really had any desire to do so. They do not complain, but such complaints as we hear are made for them and not by them. I have authority for the statement that those Boers who are confined, with a few exceptions, express themselves upon all occasions to those who visit them as satisfied that everything has been done that can be done to treat them fairly under the circumstances.

I come back again to the legal views of the right hon. Gentleman with regard to belligerent rights. I have explained that that is entirely irrelevant to the proposal to banish certain persons as being undesirable inhabitants of our territory. We are only dealing with countries which we have made our own by conquest, and in which we have a right to make whatever laws we please, and if we make a law to expel certain persons from the country because we consider them undesirable, we have a right to do so. It has been done again and again by civilised Powers. What was done by the Germans in Alsace-Lorraine? They gave an option to the French inhabitants to take the oath of allegiance or leave the country. A great many refused to take the oath, and were permanently exiled. What the Germans had a right to do we have an equal right to do in the case of the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal. But the right hon. Gentleman went much further than that. What we understand by the right of a belligerent is not a right to return to his country unless it remains under his Government, and not if it is annexed. What we understand by belligerent rights is that a belligerent's personal property will not be confiscated, and he will not be executed except for conduct contrary to the usages of war. So long as these people are entitled to belligerent rights, we shall interpret those rights as the right hon. Gentleman does. But he must admit there is a line between belligerents and these banditti guerillas, who are not entitled to belligerent rights.

There must come a point when that is the case. It has come in every war which was ever conducted. It came in the civil war in the United States, and in the Franco-German War. What was the action of the Germans with regard to the franc tireurs? It was to declare that they refused to recognise as belligerents men who were in arms against them, firing at their soldiers from comparatively safe positions, and next day were peaceful villagers working at their various industries. I do not say that position has yet arrived in the case of the South African colonies, but it may arise, and if it does we reserve to ourselves the rights exercised by other civilised nations under similar circumstances. Although it has not arrived, there have been unquestionably acts done by the bands now in the field against us which come at all events near to the dividing line which the right hon. Gentleman admits must one day be established between the two classes of fighting men. I noticed that all the passages which the right hon. Gentleman read out of military law (including quotations from a distinguished foreigner) on the subject state that one of the conditions which justifies a man in claiming belligerent rights is that he

should have a distinguishing mark or badge. That the Boers have never had, although I do not attach much importance to that so long as they were moving in large bodies, but in no organised fashion. But if split up, as they are, into bands of two and three, sneaking in between our posts to commit acts of violence and outrage, and, as I say, of murder, it becomes of importance. If that sort of thing occurs we may have reached the dividing line contemplated evidently by the great authorities which the right hon. Gentleman quoted.

To whom of all the great nations of the world would he go if he wanted an example of honourable treatment of an honourable foe? I imagine he would go in the first instance to the United States. I am now going back to what the United States did in the civil war forty years ago. Everyone who knows anything about it and, as I have, talked to the principal actors in the war, knows that in what they believed to be the interests of humanity, and to bring the conflict to the earliest possible conclusion, they took steps against belligerents and persons not belligerents which exceeded in hardship anything we have done in this war. Talk of farm-burning! Farm-burning in South Africa was trivial to the devastation of an enormous tract of country by General Sherman in his march through Georgia. I have talked to General Sherman, and he justified it on the ground I have stated; that it was

greater humanity to make the war intolerable, that it should be speedily brought to an end. I am not going into this great controversy. What happened in the case of the Philippines? I take it because it has many points of resemblance with the war in which we have been engaged. The Filipinos are spread over a large country which is extremely difficult, although for other reasons than the Transvaal, and after the first battles the Americans were never able to come across anything like an organised force, and the war degenerated into a guerilla war, which lasted a little over two years, and now, I hope, has been brought to a final conclusion. But in November, 1899, the year before the termination of the war. General McArthur wrote (and if anyone will substitute "South Africa" in this passage for the Philippines they will see the analogy);

"The so-called Philippine Republic is destroyed. The colony is a desert. The President of the so-called Republic is a fugitive and all his Cabinet officers except one, who is in my hands. The Executive department is entirely broken up. The generals are separated without any power of conference or concerted action. The authority under which the army was brought into the field no longer exists. The army itself as an organisation has disappeared as a consequence of these facts, which are now on historical record. Men who professed to lead small bodies for guerilla warfare must act without even a shadow of authority from the de facto Government, and the operations from this time onwards will be the result of individual whim. In other words, the men who now try to continue the strife by individual action simply become leaders of banditti."

Then General McArthur recommended that a proclamation should be issued (he has a higher opinion of proclamations, than the right hon. Gentleman) offering amnesty to all who surrendered within the stated time on the payment of thirty pesetas, who gave up a rifle, accompanying it with the emphatic declaration that after the date fixed the killing of American soldiers would be regarded as murder, and

all persons concerned therein would be treated as murderers.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): Was this acted upon?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes. General McArthur was Commander-in-Chief.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Is that your policy?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: If this war degenerates into a war of banditti, if the actions are no longer the actions of belligerents, but the actions of individual brigands, yes, certainly. In doing so we shall be following the example of every civilised nation that has ever gone to war. Now the right hon. Gentleman asks in conclusion what we shall gain by the proclamation. It appears to me we cannot fail to gain by it; we must gain by it in one way or other. From what we know of the war, from reports nearly every prisoner has made to us, from correspondence published, and other correspondence which we can lay on the Table, all point to the fact that it is the action of the leaders of these men that is keeping these men in the field, and that the majority of them, at any rate, who are in the field would be glad if they could without sacrifice of pride come in. I think it is a very creditable feeling on their part. They are not, of course, except, perhaps, in a very few instances, compelled by violence to remain, but they do not like; and it is a very natural feeling; to be the first to surrender. It is the action of the late Transvaal Government, of Mr. Kruger and his friends in Holland, and the principal leaders of the Boer forces which is now continuing a war which they know, which they admit in every document passing between them which we have seen, is aimless and useless, except on the assumption that something may turn up to their advantage in the shape of foreign intervention or change of opinion in this country. They keep on the war solely, according to their own account, in the hope of foreign intervention or reaction here, and we know perfectly well how futile such expectations are. But, most unfortunately for the Boers, they are less educated as to the state of feeling here or on the Continent, and their leaders have deceived them over and over again, and a great part of their losses and the subsequent miseries they will suffer are due entirely to misapprehension of the situation. If we can bring home to these people that they personally will suffer by continuing longer in the field we may; and that is

the greatest advantage we can hope for; we may so influence them as to bring about an immediate end of the war. That is worth trying. If we cannot influence a single leader it is still worth issuing a proclamation of this kind, which I hope will have a useful result. But if it fails in that respect, at all events it will rid the Colony of men who have shown themselves by their action to be utterly irreconcilable, and who, if they remain, will be a continual source of difficulty. Any way you take it the proclamation must be a success; it will do good now by bringing the war to a close, or hereafter it will prevent a recrudescence of trouble.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Of all the extraordinary coincidences which I have ever heard the coincidence which led the Government to advise the issuing of this proclamation is the most extraordinary. I cannot understand what the account given to us of the origin of this proclamation really is. Was it, as the Secretary of State for the Colonies says, already in

print here before it was suggested to the Government of Natal?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Then the right hon. Gentleman said there was a suggestion from the Government of Natal which was accepted.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No. I said that with one exception, to which I referred, the proclamation had been approved by the Government of Natal. The section which we accepted from the Government of Natal was the provision in respect to charging burghers with the cost of the maintenance of their families.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I will not press the point of this extraordinary coincidence, but it does strike me as most extraordinary. The reply of the Colonial Secretary to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire does not strike me as answering the arguments which the right hon. Gentleman used. The Colonial Secretary instanced the case of Alsace as showing that you have the right to punish people who have been in arms against you. I wish to remind the right hon. Gentleman that there was no attempt in the case of Alsace to punish anybody until after there had been a treaty of peace conceding Alsace to the conquerors; and even then there was nothing in the nature of a real punishment, because what was done was to force people to adopt one or other nationality, and it was the indirect effect of the application of the military system that caused a virtual banishment. At all events the case of Alsace is no answer. What my right hon. friend argued very fully and fairly was that you have not at present a sufficient military occupation of these territories in South Africa to justify the issuing of a proclamation like this. Personally I am deeply concerned as to the military steps which have been taken by the Government, and I agree with my right hon. friend that there seems to be an attempt to substitute proclamations for victories in the field. It is upon this aspect of the military situation that I should like for a very few minutes to engage the attention of the House. Of course I do not know what is the belief in the mind of the Government as to the possibility of safely withdrawing from South Africa, as they propose, a very large proportion of the troops engaged there at present. My right hon. friend speaks of that as a suggestion, and he did not seem to think that it had been officially proclaimed as the policy of the Government; but when the Secretary of State for War had a difference of opinion a short time ago with a London newspaper, I understood him to say that one of the revelations of official secrets which that newspaper had made was the revelation of the intention of bringing home a very large proportion of the troops in South Africa.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: If the right hon. Baronet will refer to what I said on behalf of the Government, he will find I did not say a very large proportion. That I should understand to mean something more than half. There is no intention of doing anything of that kind.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I understood the Secretary of State for War to complain of that as the revelation of an official secret, and I want to know what military steps the Government are taking, whether or not they are adequate to the situation, and whether they make up for the weakening of the military policy by the withdrawal of the troops which has been referred to. I do not know whether

there are peace negotiations on foot, although I have heard rumours to that effect.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: My right hon. friend is entitled to put a hypothesis, but if I do not intervene it may be taken to have some foundation in fact. There is no foundation for the rumour that peace negotiations of any kind are going on.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Then I want to know what is the military situation in Cape Colony at the present time. As regards the Transvaal and Orange River Colony the military situation has improved, but as regards Cape Colony I have good grounds for my statement that the military situation is less good than it was six months ago. I cannot but believe that the invasion of Cape Colony is bleeding South Africa to a degree almost inconceivable. It is the duty of the Government, and that is the feeling in the country, not to withdraw troops from South Africa without seeing that the character and quality of the troops remaining are such as to give probability of military success in Cape Colony. That I am unable to see. Is the military situation in the colony being met with the strenuous energy it requires? I believe it is not. Although the strength of the Boer forces in the late Transvaal Republic has considerably diminished lately, I do not believe that has been the case in Cape Colony. Letters from officers conducting military operations show the contrary. When the invasion took place in December mounted Boers traversed the Colony 500 miles in one direction, 450 miles in another, and almost reached the sea on both sides, and though it has been said that the invaders have been driven off, yet military operations continue in the districts reached by the Boers in December last.

In the Calvinia district and in the Willowmore district, both to the south and west of Cape Town, the Boers are still close to the sea, and away from the railways are controlling the administration of the greater part of Cape Colony. Our general officers commanding in the field are continually forced to send reinforcements and supplies to posts practically kept in a state of siege by the Boers, and this has been going on since December last. My contention is that the Government ought to have known all this beforehand. They ought to have realised in December last what the situation in Cape Colony was, and they ought to have made preparations which they did not make to meet that situation. They were asked to send a large force of mounted men. Lord Kitchener asked for a large force of mounted men, and of the men sent 20 per cent. were of excellent material but 80 per cent. were inferior to ordinary recruits, utterly untrained and unable to ride or shoot. Since they were sent they have been painfully taught, and are not yet efficient, and they have not efficient officers. If the Government are going to bring home a large proportion of infantry, what force are they going to keep in South Africa? If a large proportion of infantry is withdrawn from Cape Colony you will be leaving there an insufficient force of experienced and trained mounted men quite incapable of coping with the present military situation in Cape Colony. I say that the Government ought to have foreseen this situation. The Secretary of State for War in the last speech which he made upon the military situation in South Africa spoke of the present condition of things as guerilla warfare, and concluded his remarks almost with the exact words of that great authority on warfare, Clausewitz, who wrote,

however, before the Mexican War, which was a guerilla war, in which the chances of the French were less satisfactory than ours in South Africa, because of the enormous population of Mexico as compared with the sparse population of South Africa. On the other hand, we have in South Africa an enormously greater force than the French ever led in Mexico; something like ten times as great; and the war in South Africa is of such a character that we cannot afford to treat it lightly. This guerilla warfare I do not believe can possibly be brought to an end by proclamation. It can only be done by warlike operations conducted by the most effective kind of military force. I should like to read a condensation of a translation of what was written by one of the greatest authorities on warfare, Clausewitz, in his immortal work in the "Armed Nation" chapter of the book on "Defence," chapter 26, book vi. I quote these words because I say that the Government ought to have foreseen the nature of this war and ought to have made the only kind of preparation which can be effective against this kind of warfare;

"However small and weak a State may be, if it foregoes a last supreme effort there is no longer any soul left in it." Suppose a surface exceeding in extent that of any country in Europe except Russia; the national character favourable, the country of a mountainous nature; a poor population accustomed to hard work, scattered dwellings. The principle of resistance exists everywhere, but is nowhere tangible. In such Armed peasants are not like a body of soldiers, who keep together like a herd of cattle and follow their noses. Armed peasants, on the contrary, when broken, disperse in all directions. The march of every small body of troops becomes a service of a very dangerous character, for at any moment a combat may arise; if no armed bodies have even been seen for some time, yet these same peasants, driven off by the head of the column, may at any hour make their appearance in its rear. There are no means to oppose to that action except detaching numerous parties to furnish escorts for convoys. They are overpowered at some points. Courage rises. A people's war should be like a kind of nebulous vapoury essence, never condense into a solid body."

That is a prophetic description of guerilla warfare quite different from that which had been seen in Spain, to some extent like that which the French had afterwards to face in Mexico, and exactly like that which we have to face in South Africa at the present time. I believe that in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony the military situation has greatly improved, out in the Cape I am convinced that the situation is no better, and that you are not facing it with those military precautions which you ought to take. What are we told in all the letters we are constantly receiving from the officers who are conducting these military operations in the field? They say as regards the movements of our mounted forces that they are greatly hampered by seniority. Every regular army must be in such cases. Before our troops can follow a considerable force of the enemy any distance preparations have to be made for requiring the consent of the various general military officers throughout the military hierarchy. This delays rapid movement. We are unable to march without guns and wagons; ammunition, forage, staff, and ambulance wagons, and a number of

dismounted men and other impedimenta, and the result is that the mounted columns now scouring the country start on terms of absolute inferiority from this point of view to the enemy who are entirely mounted men, with two or three horses each, and are entirely unencumbered by baggage and guns.

The French had to face the same problem under worse conditions in some respects in Mexico as we have to face in South Africa, because they had only at any time some 39,000 men, while the Mexicans were vastly more numerous than the Boers. On the other hand, they had to face the difficulty in some respects under more favourable conditions than exist for us in South Africa. Then, as to the mode in which they tried to face this difficulty in Mexico. The mode adopted by the French, although it failed in Mexico, was the only means by which guerilla operations of this kind can be brought to an end. Unless from your enormous force you can turn out a picked force of mounted men superior to your enemy you can never succeed in running them down. The mere presence of large numbers of troops in blockhouses and the concentration of troops on the lines of communication will never bring this war to an end. The columns which we have now in the field, taking the average of the men, are not superior to those of our enemy, and the only course you ought to take; and this is the opinion of those who are conducting the operations and who are actually commanding the columns in South Africa; is that you have got to do what the French did in Mexico, and what all the writers and teachers of military warfare say you ought to do, and that is to produce a picked body of men from your large army which will be superior to your opponents.

Just as in naval warfare you have to outnumber and watch your enemies' ships and follow them, so, in this war in South Africa, you will have to follow your enemy and run them down with a superior force. I think that before the session ends it is necessary that someone should state what is the common talk of every officer who is writing home to his relations and immediate friends. Your mounted columns are at present much below the average standard of the Boers, and they are very much hampered. The present condition of things in Cape Colony is very dangerous to the future of South Africa. You will never bring this war to an end by a policy of proclamation, and the only way possible is to get together a force which will be superior to that of the enemy.

*MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I did not join in the recent debates on South African affairs because I hold the opinion that the debates which have taken place in this House have tended to prolong the war in South Africa. We have now arrived at a stage in the war when I think it is necessary that the Government should earnestly consider the steps to be taken in order to prevent what has occurred in the past. I contend that there is no analogy whatever, as the Colonial Secretary seems to suppose, between Kaffirs and Indian troops. I have travelled on the Northwestern frontier, and how anyone can compare Indian troops with savages in Africa I know not. Speaking of the men now in the field against us, the Colonial Secretary said that their families were being provided for now in the concentration camps better than ever they were before in their lives. While on shooting expeditions I have lived in the houses of these Boers, and I should be sorry to have received from them the same scanty provisions

which are dealt out to the Boers in the concentration camps. The Government had no right to establish concentration camps unless they were able to provide for those families. If through military exigencies it was necessary to concentrate, then there was an obligation to feed those families. You have no right to bring the families of the Boers into camps

unless you are able to maintain them. You are now employing the natives; the men who have been the servants of the Boers. When a British column comes into a district these men are requisitioned as scouts by the British. They are either combatants or non-combatants, and it is idle to talk of their not being employed against the enemy if they are requisitioned as scouts. You have had to fight an enemy which, as a military Power, did not exist until 1896, when, on account of the invasion of their country, they became a military Power. We have to recollect that the Colonial Secretary has put before the House the argument that the Filipinos had received money from the American Government to lay down their arms. It is true that in South Africa we have not seen, and I hope we never shall see, a similar case. I hope that the Boer leaders will not, as has been done in the Philippine Islands, betray their people for the sake of money. I think that was a very poor argument to put forward with respect to a brave people like the Boers. I do not wish to trespass at any great length on the time of the House, but I have some notes which I wish, with the indulgence of the House, to read. In this House a few months ago I heard a discussion between the Colonial Secretary and the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the term "pro-Boer." The Colonial Secretary had used the term pro-Boer, and the Leader of the Opposition replied that that was an offensive epithet. I do not hesitate to say that if the meaning of pro-Boer is detestation of the policy of His Majesty's Government, I am a pro-Boer. We are entitled to hold our views. We are always Englishmen first, whether our views be right or wrong. We all, according to our lights, do as we think best in the interest of our country, but that any man or set of men, because they do not hold the views of the majority, are, to be termed by offensive epithets, I think myself is a poor argument. I am satisfied with the epithet if it means that I am in thorough opposition to the policy of the Government in South Africa. In regard to this question I speak in the interest of peace, and though what I am about to say I know will not be accepted by hon. Members on the other side of the House, I do ask that they will listen to what I have to say for the reason that I have studied for a number of years, the South African question, and I claim to know as much on this subject as most Members of the House, who have not made a special study of the question. I first propose to read a passage from Edmund Burke, which I think is very applicable to the present situation. He said;

"The operations of the field suffered by the errors of the Cabinet. If the same spirit continues when peace is made, the peace will fix and perpetuate all the errors of the war, because it will be made upon the same false principle. What has been lost in the field may be regained. An arrangement of peace in its nature is a permanent settlement; it is the effect of counsel and deliberation and not of fortuitous events"

The policy of the Government appears to be one of fighting this question out to

the bitter end; till the last cartridge has been fired and the last of the enemy has surrendered, without any regard for the future of these two States. Sir, I honestly believe that if you adopt that policy you will lose South Africa altogether. As the policy of carrying on the war has been delegated by the Government to Lord Milner, and as peace or war rests chiefly with him, it is necessary for the House to carefully consider whether the past actions of Lord Milner warrant the Government in relieving themselves of the responsibilities which in my opinion must rest upon them. Could any Government take a more foolish or a more irritating step than to appoint Lord Milner as administrator of these two States? What good object can be attained by that appointment? You say that you are going to have a firm policy in South Africa; that you must have a policy that will show to these rebels that the States are to be governed with a strong hand. But is there not in the British Empire a man who could have carried on the government of these countries without causing distrust and irritation in that country? Lord Milner's policy has entailed terrible loss of life and suffering to the people of this country; it has entailed the devastation of those States; it has brought poverty and misery, and it will bring greater misery yet to the people of this country through the suicidal policy of spending money in the way in which it is now being wasted. In carrying on the war you have laid waste these lands by fire and sword, and it is the boast of the Government that it is their intention to carry on the war to a conclusion and to offer no terms of peace, which you are bound to accord to an honourable enemy. In doing this you are not following the usages of civilised warfare. When Lord Milner arrived in South Africa he had a difficult position to face. He was confronted with racial hatred; a hatred which will not die away so soon as some people think. The Jameson raid was an accomplished fact, and racial hatred had been fanned by this wicked and criminal action. I am sure that Lord Milner did act according to what he thought the interest of the country and the Empire, but in his actions he was guided by one party in the Cape whose object was not so much to benefit the people living in these countries as to benefit themselves. In this House we have seen the break-up of a strong Opposition; we have seen an Opposition which, except on the Irish benches, has ceased to be an Opposition; and I attribute that very largely to the part which, with the very best intentions no doubt, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition took in reference to the South Africa inquiry. I am sure that the arguments brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire since the war broke out show that he has spoken for what he believes to be in the interest of the country, and although it has been an unpopular period he has faced it unflinchingly, but I only wish that he had not in the earlier stages, for reasons which are perhaps better known to him, become a party to the policy which was pursued in connection with that inquiry and to a verdict which not only did not give confidence but which has led to all the trouble in South Africa to-day. That is my honest opinion. But at the same time the House must not forget that all these armaments which have been gathered together in these republics and which are now being used against us were collected during this

administration and the past administration. They were not collected till after the Jameson raid. It

was your duty, with the full knowledge that all these munitions of war were pouring into the Transvaal, to have protested, but you were unable to protest, for the reason that the statesmen of this country had entered into an alliance to prevent the truth with regard to that criminal action of the raid from coming to light. If you had sent the men who were responsible into fifteen or twenty years penal servitude you would have had no war in South Africa. Here you had a case of a body of men gathering together arms and munitions in South Africa, not with the object of benefiting the country but benefiting themselves. Lord Milner found the whole press in South Africa in the hands of a few men, with the exception of *Ons Land* and the *South African News*. I do not believe there is a single paper in South Africa of any importance which is not in the hands of a few men and on the side of those who have brought this war about. Far be it from me to say one word against the integrity of the press of this country, but I think they have greatly aggravated and are aggravating to-day the position in South Africa. The *Times* and all the organs that have taken a strong attitude about the war have done so in no way from sordid motives, but solely because they think they are advocating the policy which is best for this country; but the methods they have employed and are employing to-day are not in my humble opinion calculated to promote the peace which is necessary for South Africa. The press at the present time has a great influence for good or evil in this country, and I hold that the press during the past two years has done more harm by creating and prolonging this war than the whole good it has done in the past twenty-five years. I understand that I should not be in order in dealing with the manner in which it has been worked, or is worked to-day, in South Africa, as that is not germane to the question before the House. The Colonial Secretary, in his reply to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Forest of Dean, made a very important statement; namely, that no peace negotiations of any kind had so far been entered into or attempted by the Government. That statement was, no doubt, deliberately made, but I think it is due to the House to know that the previous peace negotiations carried on by the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary were not of a very happy character, and I hope if peace negotiations are entered into again, which I earnestly trust they will be, they will not be in his hands. In March, 1899, the Transvaal Government were anxious to avoid war, and to come to a settlement with the Uitlanders. Negotiations with that object were opened between the South African Republic and this country. Meetings were held in Johannesburg and London, and the Transvaal Government deputed to attend these meetings Mr. Edward Lippert, in whom they had confidence. These negotiations were carried through in secret. All that took place in South Africa was at once wired here to gentlemen who sat in the Gold-fields Office in London. The Goldfields Office sent long messages daily to Johannesburg setting out the views of those on this side of the water. In the middle of these negotiations, when a settlement had practically been arrived at, and, let me tell the House, with the full knowledge that these negotiations were in progress, the Colonial Secretary

came down to this House on March 20th or 21st, and told the House that the promises of President Kruger were not worth having, and were valueless. I have seen copies of the original telegrams that passed between London and Johannesburg, and I should like to know whether the statement made in one of these cables was correct; that no step was taken in these negotiations without the knowledge and consent of the Colonial Office. When these negotiations were in progress, and a settlement had nearly been arrived at, a speech was made here by the Colonial Secretary. I have heard from friends that when the report of this speech arrived at Johannesburg and Pretoria, President Kruger at once said; "Here we have settled nearly all these questions that have arisen, and your Colonial Secretary in London says that my promises are not worth having. I will fight you for my country."

And from that day. March 25th, peace negotiations were at an end so far as the Transvaal was concerned in the true spirit of what peace negotiations should be. We pass down to the period of the Bloemfontein Conference, where the same policy was carried out to the letter. Was there a symptom or a desire to arrive at any settlement except the irreducible minimum shown at Bloemfontein? That was the point on which the negotiations failed. There was no sympathy, no give and take, no trust in a settlement shown. I should like to know whether you are going to carry on the negotiations which you are bound to carry on sooner or later, if you are to have an honourable peace; are you going to carry them on on the basis of the irreducible minimum? I venture to say that the proclamation which has recently been issued by the Government is the most foolish of all the many harebrained and purblind steps that have been taken in South Africa. Do you think that the people who have seen their homes ruined and desolation wrought throughout the land, who have lost their property, and whose families have been sent into concentration camps, will not treat with contempt this or any proclamation sent to them with regard to banishment of leaders, and the confiscation of any property they have left? The Boers know well enough that you can never carry this proclamation into effect, and that the whole civilised world will protest against any such proposition on your part. If you wish to create in South Africa a peaceful and contented people, you are going the very way that is calculated to create distrust. What could possibly be more calculated to create distrust than the threat to banish from South Africa the leaders of those men? Will the men who are left in South Africa after the war is over forget their comrades in arms? They will still be your foes, and they will only be acting according to the dictates of humanity and brotherhood. Every step you take in the direction of banishing men from South Africa will cause trouble not only in that country, but to the taxpayers of this country. You are bound sooner or later to hand back these territories to the Boers to administer, unless you are going to hold South Africa by the sword. That will be a new departure. But if you are going to hold South Africa by the ties of affection and sympathy with the people you have to live alongside of, you are taking the best steps to destroy those ties and that sympathy. If you choose to maintain your hold on South Africa by the sword, so surely will you lose it. Your dangers and troubles are not now. When this war is over, they are

only about to commence. If you do not come to a settlement on this question I am convinced that it will be necessary to maintain 50,000 soldiers in South Africa. Are you going to maintain these men there or are you going to have a settlement of this question by a peace which will do honour to a brave enemy? I am sorry that I have had to trespass on the time of the House so long, but I do hope and pray that the Government will not adhere to the policy of fighting to the last. It is the strong who can afford to be magnanimous; it is only the weak who show their weakness by refusing honourable terms to a brave foe.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) said that he cordially agreed with the speech of the hon. Member for Mansfield, although he thought in one thing the hon. Member had made a slight mistake; when in reference to the Bloemfontein Congress and the treatment there of Mr. Kruger by Sir Alfred Milner, now Lord Milner, he spoke of the treatment meted out by Sir Alfred Milner as the treatment of a weak man by a strong man. Had he reversed the persons he thought the hon. Gentleman would have been more accurate. Kruger was one of the strongest men of the day, and he could not help thinking that if the Colonial Secretary had gauged him more accurately he might have saved the terrible complications in which this country now found itself. He desired on this occasion to address himself to what he might call the new policy that the last proclamation issued in South Africa seemed on the verge of bringing about. The Colonial Secretary had stated that South Africa was bound to gain from the proclamation; it would gain by the submission of the Boers, or if it did not do that, South Africa would gain by having the leaders banished from the country, but surely before the leaders were banished from the country they would have to be caught. It seemed to him to show an extraordinary lack of common sense to imagine that these men would yield in any way or be tempted to yield by the proclamation which had just been issued. It was as full of the most extraordinary anomalies as a document of such supreme importance could be. It appeared to him to be an attempt to bring parliamentary methods to bear, and to bring the war to an end by the closure. Everyone would remember that when the war commenced it was said that the politicians worked for war and the military had prepared for peace. Anybody who read the proclamation would see not the hand of the soldier but the hand of the civilian, by which it had been displaced. Expert advice was glaringly absent, and although the proclamation might be fathered on the Commander-in-Chief of the forces in South Africa, Lord Kitchener, it was the work of men absolutely ignorant and unable to realise the situation. The preamble was absurd, and was a mass of contradictions. It first of all talked of the great majority being anxious to live in peace and earn their own livelihood, and went on to speak in the same manner of the prisoners in the camps; it spoke of the Boers being absolutely without military organisation, and then it went on to attack those in a position of authority." The four principal points of the preamble, put forward in grandiloquent language, were these. First it said, "We are in possession of all the principal towns of the two countries." How many principal towns were there? Three, Pretoria, and Johannesburg, which were comprised entirely of foreign elements, with conditions of life absolutely foreign to the life of the interior, and Bloemfontein, which was an overgrown village, which was also absolutely

independent of the country. If the villages, which were the real centres of the community upon which the lives of the Orange Colony and the Transvaal depended, had been dealt with, the matter might have been looked at in a quite different light. There were some eighty or ninety villages in these two countries, which represented the centres of life of the community of those countries, and of these we did not possess more than twenty-five. The remaining fifty-five were in the hands of the Boers, and of those twenty-five we did not really hold more than five, and day by day and month by month the Boers saw us vacate village after village, and the proclamation under those circumstances would only call forth their derision.

Then they were told that the burghers of the two republics were already prisoners or had submitted to His Majesty's Government, and were living peaceably to the extent of 35,000. The point was not how many had submitted but how many were left, and whether the 35,000 who had submitted were all fighting men. He believed if they looked into the statistics that they would find that not more than 20,000 fighting men were prisoners of war in our hands, and if that 20,000 was deducted from the original army the number of troops in the field against us now must be between 16,000 and 20,000. The vital point was how many men were left in the field against us. The proclamation went on to say that organised resistance was impossible; but throughout the whole history of the war as conducted by the Transvaal and the Orange Free State could be traced the work of a central authority, especially with regard to the universally carried-out rule of releasing their prisoners, and even still in the shooting of natives captured. There was evidence of a central authority throughout, and it was idle to talk of the absence of organised resistance. Perhaps the most ludicrous part of the whole proclamation was the last item, which said that the Boers continued to make isolated attacks upon small posts in detachments. Surely war, if carried on at all, was not a one-sided affair, and it was not for us to complain that it was not carried on as we wished. It reminded him of the recent events in China with regard to the demand for the punishment of Chinese Ministers; they had to be caught first, and when these men were pitted against enormous bodies of men it was contemptible to complain that they would not come out to be caught. Where was the manhood of the nation which could countenance such a proclamation being issued? He was a very humble Member of the House, but he had intelligence enough to know what a great soldier had said about the conduct of this war, and he ventured to draw atten-

tion to the letter written by that veteran Field Marshal Sir Neville Chamberlain, and no one could say a word against the feeling which prompted that letter being written. On the conduct of the war, he said;

"I dissent because the necessity has never been made clear to the nation to justify a departure from the recognised laws of international warfare."

He further stated;

"I do not wish to imply that extreme measures are never justified during war, but I do assert that the daily reports which have appeared in the press during the past seven or eight months indicate that a great wave of destruction has been spread over the Orange and Vaal States, such as has never before been

enacted by our armies."

And then he went on to say that incidents had taken place, but whenever they had taken place;

"even in the dark days of the Indian Mutiny, when there was an ever present sense of the inhumanities practised by the mutineers and others who abetted them, there never existed the idea that the horrors of war were to be indiscriminately carried into the homes of the population."

And he concluded by quoting the words of Sir Philip Sidney that "cruelty in war buyeth conquest at the dearest price." The cruelty of this war was the cruelty of the Government in demanding terms which no civilised nation had a right to enforce upon another. We were paying the dearest price for conquest. We had now a rebellion in Cape Colony which did not exist in the beginning of the war, when the conditions were ten times as favourable for the Cape colonists to rebel. It was the action of the Government which created the rebellion. They had created a hatred of our rule which had never existed before, and they could not be surprised that the people rebelled. There were two principal causes of that rebellion. One was that the Government were beginning to arm the natives; one of the greatest dangers in South Africa was the great black population, and he agreed with what the Colonial Secretary said about the native, that he was not to be treated upon an equality with the white men, but must be kept under subjection. The second cause was the execution of Cape colonists. Never had such a measure been carried out by any civilised country since the days of the Inquisition. Not only had the Government enacted

public execution, but they had forced Cape colonists to witness the execution of their countrymen when those executions took place inside the prisons. He had no words to express his disapproval and hatred of such a course. The proper course for the Government to have adopted when they heard of such things taking place would have been to have disowned them, but for a long time they would give no answer whatever to this charge, and eventually, instead of disowning the acts, merely said they would not be repeated. They would not be repeated because the Government would not dare repeat such an action. The Government had made the matter worse by attempting to palliate such deeds as those. It was actions such as these that lost us the American colonies. Similar things took place in that country 120 years ago, at the time of the American War, and there were men in the House of Lords and in this House who protested as strongly as they could against what was taking place in America. He would draw the attention of the House to the protest of thirty-one Peers against those actions in 1778;

"The public law of nations, in affirmance of the dictates of nature and the principles of revealed religion, forbids us to resort to the extremes of war upon our own opinion of their expediency, or in any case to carry on war for the purpose of desolation. Those objects of war that cannot be compassed by fair and honourable hostility ought not to be compassed at all. An end that has no means but such as are unlawful is an unlawful end. We choose to draw ourselves out and to distinguish ourselves to posterity, as not being the first to renew, to approve, or to tolerate the return of that ferocity and barbarism in war which a beneficent religion and enlightened manners and true military honour had for a

long time banished from the Christian world."

There were Members of this present House who chose to draw themselves out from what the country had sanctioned in this war, and they also protested against what was going on in South Africa, as these thirty-one peers had protested 120 years ago against what was going on in America. He considered that what was taking place now was worse than what took place then, because the world had advanced in civilisation. It might be only a small protest they made, but they could not be silent, feeling as they did that what was going on must be detrimental to the future of the Empire. Conquest had been finished with, and the word which now ought to be used was the word "pacify." Unless the word "conquest" was eliminated, in his opinion South Africa would be lost to this country. The policy of the Government would have to be reversed. We were strong enough to admit we had made a mistake, and we should acknowledge our mistake. With regard to the military situation, that had been dealt with by the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean. Perhaps he might be allowed, to quote a letter from South Africa, giving the writer's view of the civilian situation;

"Things are rapidly getting worse, and unless some change is made, and that immediately, a great number more men will be forced to join the Boer forces. The treatment of the farmers of this colony is too abominable for words, and now the trial of men by incompetent military courts for their life without reference to the civil courts is more than men will stand. The military do not seem to appreciate the fact that the majority of the farmers, English as well as Dutch, are at the mercy of the Boer commanders, and if their men are shot retaliation will follow as a natural result, and then what will be the position of the unfortunate non-combatants in the out-districts? You know that I am no alarmist, but I feel the position is rapidly drifting to a terrible tragedy."

He regretted more than he could tell that no negotiations, according to the Colonial Secretary, were possible. Surely there were terms upon which the Boers could retain their independence. Let them have their land, surrounding it with British territory. There were a dozen means of obtaining peace if only the will to obtain peace was there, and also the will to put away that false pride and obstinacy which lay at the bottom of it. Even when the war was over, the difficulties would be only beginning. Those who advocated peace were said to be anti-national and anti-patriotic. But there was something higher and nobler than merely seeking government or power, and that was to endeavour to guide one's country into the way of righteousness, peace, and right-doing.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): The Colonial Secretary began his speech by asking my right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouthshire what was his object in raising the question to which he referred, and he suggested that such speeches would have the effect of prolonging the war. That suggestion has often been made, and it is absolutely destitute of foundation. Since the negotiations at Bloemfontein in May, 1900, there has not been the slightest evidence that anything said here has had the least effect on the action of the Boers. It has been the wish of the Government from the first to represent those who have condemned the war as having had a sinister influence on the progress of events

in South Africa, and therefore we may be sure that if there had been a single case in which it could be shown that anything said in England had influenced the minds of the Boer leaders that case would have been brought out and made the most of. The absence of any such evidence is the most convincing proof that nothing of the sort has happened. In the recently-discovered correspondence between Mr. Reitz and Mr. Steyn there was a letter in which Mr. Steyn quoted, not something said in this country, but a passage from a Natal newspaper which had supported and defended the war; and that is the nearest approach to anything affording the slightest foundation for this charge. If anything said here has influenced the war it has been the intemperate speeches made on behalf of His Majesty's Government and the violence; I might almost say the ferocity; of some organs of the British Press.

I now come to the proclamation. My right hon. friend did not speak in vain, for he elicited from the Colonial Secretary what I can hardly call anything but a repudiation of the proclamation itself. That proclamation was taken by everybody who read it as a refusal of belligerent rights to the Boers in the field. The impression naturally produced by the text was that His Majesty's Government considered the time had come when the Boers should be treated no longer as belligerents but as rebels. That construction has been completely abandoned by the Colonial Secretary, and I think that is a real gain. This proclamation has been regarded in foreign countries as a declaration that the Boers were not to be treated as belligerents. For that reason I look upon its terms as having been most unfortunate, and I hope the disclaimer of the Colonial Secretary will obtain the same publicity as the unhappy proclamation itself. The long preamble seems to be intended to prove that the Boers are no longer carrying on legitimate warfare, that the struggle has degenerated into a series of guerilla operations, and that therefore the Boers have lost whatever privileges they otherwise would have had. What other meaning can there be of such references as "devoid of regular military organisation"? To begin with, that statement is not true. So far as we know, the organisation under Botha and Delarey is as regular as it was at the beginning of the war. What can be said of the passage;

"Whereas those burghers who are still in arms continue to make isolated attacks upon small posts and detachments of His Majesty's forces, to plunder or destroy property, and to damage the railway and telegraph lines, both in the Grange River Colony and the Transvaal."

Surely that means that this is not legitimate warfare; that the persons carrying it on are simply destroying property, and are not entitled to be treated as belligerents.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. BRYCE: But that is not the opinion of the Colonial Secretary, so that the hon. Member opposite is plus royal que le Roi. But although the Colonial Secretary disclaims in clear and unmistakable terms any intention of treating the Boers now as not being belligerents, he implies that a time may come when they will cease to be so regarded. That is important, and I think we should put on record our views as to the character of the belligerents, in case any attempt

should be made during the next six months to deny belligerent rights to these people. It is sometimes assumed that guerilla warfare is that which is carried on by small parties of persons. That is not so at all. The number of the forces operating has nothing to do with the matter. I will read a definition from a book on international law by a recognised authority::

"Guerilla troops are bands of men, self-organised and self-controlled, who carry on warfare against a public enemy without being under the direct control of the State. They have no commissions or enlistments, nor are they enrolled as being part of the military forces of the State. Some have attempted to apply the rule as to guerillas to inhabitants of a State who rise en masse and take up arms to repel an invasion. The distinction between these cases is manifest."

These terms apply precisely to the present case. War is being carried on by comparatively small bodies of troops. It is not for one of the parties to a war to prescribe how the struggle should be carried on by the other. If it suits our opponents to proceed by means of small bodies of men they are perfectly right to do so. The question is not whether the bands are large or small, but whether the troops are organised, whether they are under the authority of the State, whether they have recognised leaders, and whether those leaders can be made responsible for the actions of the troops. All these criteria are satisfied in the case of the Boer forces at present in the field. The Governments to which they owe allegiance have never been displaced; for the annexation is merely a paper annexation; these people are loyal to their own Governments, and so long as they retain their organisation and obey their leaders they will continue to be belligerents. It is not for one party to a war to deprive the other party of belligerent rights unless a change has passed over the nature of the war and the character of those who carry it on, which completely transforms them from being legitimate troops of their country. That has not happened in this case, there is no sign that it will happen, and until it does happen we should be committing a gross breach of international law if we refused them belligerent rights.

There is another point made by the Colonial Secretary to which I wish to advert. By what right is punishment to be inflicted on the soldiers in the field? Two kinds of punishment are proposed; perpetual banishment for the leaders, and confiscation of property for the troops. The proposal to charge upon the troops the cost of keeping their women and children is practically a proposal to confiscate their property. I am not aware of any authority in law or any precedent for pronouncing punishment against belligerents, and, be it remembered, this is put forward as a matter of punishment. The Colonial Secretary said that pecuniary penalties ought to be inflicted on the rank and file, and, referring to the leaders, "we must bring home to them the fact that they must personally suffer." He did not put the matter on the ground of the security of the State or of the preservation of peace when these countries have been reduced to the position of conquered territory, but on the ground of punishment. By what right is this done? They are not your subjects; you can only punish them if they are rebels, and the Colonial Secretary, by admitting that they are belligerents, has admitted that they are

not rebels.

Then the Colonial Secretary alleged that the women in the camps were allowed to go at will. I believe that to be absolutely contrary to the fact. These women were driven into the camps. Many of them asked to be allowed to remain on their farms. Some of the camps are surrounded by barbed wire fences. But even if it is true that now in some cases it is possible for the women to leave the camps, it must be remembered that that is a very different thing from saying they can go of their own free will. How is a woman and her children, who has been carried perhaps hundreds of miles from a desolated farmhouse, to return to her home? It is absurd under such circumstances to say that she remains in the camp of her own free will. The proposal to impose a fine; probably a ruinous one; upon the burghers in the field came from Natal, and it has the appearance of a proposal for confiscation. It has the air of a pretext for punishing the burghers in the field by taking their farms from them, in order that those farms may be open for settlement or sale by the British Government. That is quite opposed to international law, one of the first principles of which is that the private property of belligerents is safe. The Colonial Secretary made a comparison with the Filipinos, but surely the differences between the two cases are patent enough to deprive the comparison of any value. To begin with, not to dwell on the differences in the character of the two nations, and in the nature of their military organisation, these nations are two civilised States, which for many years have been regularly governed, while the Orange Free State has been recognised to be one of the best governed people in the world. On the other hand, the Philippine Republic never was an independent Government. It was an insurrectionary Government, holding its own as well as it could against the Spaniards, and it entered into friendly relations with the Americans because it believed the Americans had come to help them. There can be no parallel between the two cases. I should be very loth to think we were to imitate the proclamation which the Colonial Secretary says has been issued by the United States general, and I should like to know whether the proclamation has been acted upon. I do not believe it has, or that the public opinion of the United States would tolerate such conduct on the part of one of their generals. This proclamation has the air of an outburst of anger at the prolongation of the war, and it seems to be an attempt to effect by threats that which our arms have not yet been able to accomplish. It rests on the notion that because we desire to put an end to the war, all means are lawful to secure our object. Such a view will justify severities which I hope the Government will never think of inflicting. I have great doubts whether this policy will be successful. These methods of deportation; for they are nothing else; have an ancient precedent in the action of Nebuchadnezzar when he deported the inhabitants of the country he had conquered on the ground that the country would be a great deal more peaceful when the disturbing element had gone. But that is not an argument which should be used by a civilised and self-respecting Power. There have been three serious blunders in the conduct of the war. The first was the refusal to negotiate in May, 1900, when we were invited to negotiate, and might, I believe, have succeeded in attaching a very large portion of the burghers in the field, and in

that way have brought the war to a conclusion. Then there was Lord Roberta's proclamation, affecting to treat the burghers in the field as rebels. What could have been more fatal than a proclamation so palpably opposed to international law that the law officers of the Crown, although repeatedly challenged, never ventured to say a word in its defence, and which had to be withdrawn within two or three weeks of its issue? It was not withdrawn, however, before we had put ourselves in the wrong in the eyes of the world, and had further exasperated the minds of the Boers. Then there was the policy of farm-burning. That also was admitted to be a mistake, because, when remonstrances were made in this House, that, too, was abandoned. I believe that this present proclamation may very well turn out to be no less a blunder.

The right hon. Gentleman says it will be a gain to banish these men if they do not submit, that we should be all the better without them. Is it common sense to say that because a man opposes you valiantly in the field, fighting for his country as long as he can fight, therefore he will necessarily be a source of danger when the country has been pacified and institutions restored? I do not think it in the least follows. Nor can I see why a man should be banished for doing that which we should admire if done by anybody else. If this war was being carried on, not between Great Britain and these two Republics, but between France or Germany, and some petty State, would not the sympathy of every man in this country be with the men who were fighting for their freedom? Can we not put ourselves in the state of mind of these people? Suppose, for the sake of argument, the war is just, and we are in the right. Can you withhold your admiration from men who have so valiantly fought for their country?

I have spoken of the application of political methods to this war. So far as they have been applied they have been unfortunate. It is true, however, that if ever there was a war which ought to have been carried on with some reference to policy, and to which political as well as military methods ought to have been applied, it is this war. You are fighting, not a Government, but a nation in arms, and it was therefore vital to your purpose and end, if possible, to win over the mind of the nation, and not further to exasperate it against you. Besides, you had subjects in Cape Colony whose loyalty was doubtful, because the men you were

fighting were their near kinsfolk. It was of the greatest importance that you should not further exasperate the Cape colonists, or light up a smouldering rebellion. You want to make these people your fellow-subjects, to annex their territory, to turn the States into British colonies, to give them at some future date self-governing institutions, and to get the inhabitants to work side by side with men of British race in the endeavour to conduct the government of the country. Was it not, therefore, a capital error to alienate these people, to increase their exasperation, and to make it more and more difficult for the two peoples to live together in the future? A worse policy could not have been followed, whether with regard to the burghers in the field, the inhabitants of the annexed territories, or our own fellow subjects in the Cape Colony. All these considerations have been neglected, and I believe the main cause of the

prolongation of the war has been the methods by which it has been carried on, and the impression produced by those methods on the minds of the people of Cape Colony. We have had a melancholy prospect opened to us. It is quite possible that when we meet in January or February next the same dreary state of things will be continuing. The Colonial Secretary is an optimist, but his optimism contrasts strangely with the extreme pessimism of his tone, and very little chance is given to the forces of peace and good feeling.

There are other topics on which I wish to say a word, because this is the last opportunity we shall have for months to come. There is the question of the future constitution of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. That is a matter of such gravity that the House of Commons is well entitled to be consulted with regard to it. We ought to know what constitution it is intended to apply to these countries, because on the terms of that constitution the future of the countries depends.

I would also refer in passing to the suspension of the constitution in Cape Colony. That is a serious matter, and it is likely to become more serious. At present money is being drawn without legal warrant from the Treasury of the colony; a thing which, although done once or twice before, has never been done to so large an extent or under circumstances comparable to the present. Next October, under the constitution of the colony, it is absolutely necessary that Parliament should be convoked, and the constitution will be formally broken if that is not done. I want to know if it is the intention of the Government to permit such a serious breach of the constitution. The argument by which the other day the Colonial Secretary justified the non-summoning of Parliament would apply equally well in October next, and nothing more dangerous for the future of the country can be conceived than to allow the constitution to be broken in such a manner. It is the more serious when we consider the condition of the colony. The country is under martial law; it is occupied by large numbers of troops; it is necessary that there should be an opportunity for the statement of complaints and grievances, that there should be chances for discussion, and that acts of oppression and wrong-doing should be brought before the Legislative Assembly, so that Ministers can give their explanation. It would be a great wrong to allow martial law to subsist and at the same time to suspend legislative action. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean dwelt on the very serious condition of things in Cape Colony. I believe that is the darkest part of South Africa at present, and it will be still further darkened if you suspend the constitution, and prevent the voice of complaint having legitimate and full scope.

As to the question of terms, I am afraid this proclamation reduces the chances of any negotiations being opened. The Colonial Secretary, with the air of a man who is locking the door and putting the key in his pocket, told us there were no negotiations going on at present. In spite of that, I hope that between now and the next meeting of Parliament the question of entering into negotiations will not be neglected or disregarded by His Majesty's Government. It is not by any means the case that the defiant language of General Botha represents necessarily the set purpose and determination of the Boers. Shortly after that language was

used there came the correspondence between Mr. Reitz and Mr.

Steyn, from which it appeared there was a disposition in the Transvaal to come to terms. We have no reason to conclude that if reasonable terms were offered they would not be accepted.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): What does the right hon. Gentleman mean by "reasonable terms?"

MR. BRYCE: If I discussed the whole question of terms I should detain the House longer than I wish to do, but I think the terms should embody those stated, particularly by my right hon. friend the Member for the Stirling Burghs. They should include some provision for the restoration of the people to their farms, the grant of an amnesty at the conclusion of the war, which, I admit, cannot be made at this moment, but might well be made as part of the terms of surrender, the promise of self-government at a comparatively early date, which, unfortunately, I have no reason to believe the Government intend, and, of course, the withdrawal of the threats of banishment and confiscation of property which are now being made. I doubt whether if such terms were proposed they would be rejected. ["Oh, oh!"] I want to call attention to one great advantage, in having terms. Hon. Gentleman must not allow themselves to be carried away by bitterness or exasperation. They must look at the question as men of business who desire to see peace and tranquillity restored to these colonies. The worst thing that could happen would be, after the war has been carried on for some time longer, that the forces which are now in arms against us should, instead of making a regular and proper surrender on terms, vanish across the border into German or Portuguese territory, or scatter and, so to speak, disappear like an African river into the ground. That would, indeed, be an element of future danger, because these men would carry with them a far more bitter feeling of anger, and would be far more likely to resume insurrection whenever they thought they had a chance of success, whereas if you allowed them to surrender on terms, you would give them some little

solace in point of honour; which I do not think you ought to begrudge to brave enemies; and having made an arrangement, it would appeal to their minds that they should endeavour to observe it. There would be a far better chance of future peace and tranquillity under such conditions than if you insist on unconditional surrender. I have only one word more to say, but I must say it, because the attitude of those who from the first have protested against the war has been so constantly misrepresented. I do not refer to the Colonial Secretary's epithet of "traitors," because the absurdity of that expression is so patent that it carries its own refutation. It is language which might equally well have been applied to Chatham, Burke, and Fox when they resisted the American War, or to Bright and Cobden when they denounced the Crimean War. ["No!"] Hon. Members must remember that the term is applied to persons who simply say that this war is a ghastly and unnecessary blunder. Not only might it have been applied to those whose names I have mentioned, but also to the Duke of Devonshire, Mr. Gladstone, and the Colonial Secretary himself, when they opposed the Afghan War of 1878. But we are constantly held up as being indifferent to the greatness of England, ["Hear, hear!"] Hon. Members opposite, evidently endorse that charge. It is the

exact opposite of the truth. ["No!"] Our opinions on the merits of this war have nothing whatever to do with Imperialism the one way or the other. This is a question by itself, and one in regard to which some of us think the Government have grossly erred. That view is shared by many Conservative friends of mine. ["Oh, oh!"] How can hon. Members know what many Conservative friends have told me? But be that as it may, these are things that any man of common sense can see have nothing whatever to do with Imperialism or Little Englandism in general. Whether we are right or wrong in our view of the war does not matter so far as my present argument is concerned. History will judge between us on that matter, as history has judged of the Crimean War and the conduct of Mr. Gladstone, and those of us who opposed Lord Beaconsfield's Government between 1876 and 1878. The Prime Minister himself has now admitted that we were right, and that Lord Beaconsfield's Government was wrong.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The right hon. Gentleman has quoted the negotiations in connection with the Afghan War; he had better read them before he makes a statement of that kind.

MR. BRYCE: I was referring to the Eastern Question between 1876 and 1878.

LORD G. HAMILTON: You were referring to the Afghan War.

MR. BRYCE: No; I was referring to the Eastern Question, from the time of the Bulgarian massacres to the Treaty of Berlin. I am perfectly prepared to meet the noble Lord with regard to the Afghan War, but I was not then referring to it at all. It is because we are attached to the greatness of England, because we are alive to it, and desire to safeguard the interests of the British dominions everywhere, that we deplore the war, which, in our judgment; be it right or wrong; has struck a heavy blow at the welfare of England and her position all over the world. It is for that reason we seek, even now, to modify, in the interests of future peace and safety, the policy the Government are still following, and which, as we think, is calculated to aggravate every existing danger and imperil still further the strength and credit of the British Empire. That strength and credit has hitherto rested not merely on our naval and military strength, which we desire as much as hon. Members opposite to maintain in the fullest measure, but on the reputation of our country for justice, and the attachment to it of all the people who live under its flag.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I was very glad to hear my right hon. friend protest in the strongest possible manner against the suggestion made, not for the first time, by the Colonial Secretary, that by our attitude towards this war we were strengthening foreign prejudices against this country and prolonging the war in South Africa. Whenever the Colonial Secretary makes that statement it strikes me that he is rather begging the question. If our criticisms with regard to the conduct of the war are sound, in the interests of the country they ought certainly to be made. Take the question of reduced rations for women and children, or of the concentration camps. In regard to the former, the War Office have practically admitted they were wrong, and the order has been withdrawn. According to the Colonial Secretary we ought not to have made that criticism, and the order should have been allowed to go on. What would have been the result? Foreign nations would

have known all about it, and would not their prejudice against this country have been greatly strengthened and justified if no one here had protested against it? The way to evade prejudice is to show that there are Englishmen prepared to criticise even the conduct of our own troops when, in their opinion, it exceeds the limits of civilised warfare. It is, therefore, entirely a question of whether we are right or wrong in our criticism, and if we are right the criticism ought to be made regardless of consequences.

I agree entirely with my right hon. friend that there is not the slightest evidence in support of the charge that the war has been prolonged by our criticisms. The only bit of anything in the nature of evidence is the letter of ex-President Steyn, in which he refers to a Natal newspaper, and all that paper stated was that there was a feeling of uneasiness in England about the war. Have not the columns of Conservative newspapers during the last six months been filled with matter which might be described as "uneasiness with regard to the conduct of the war"? Look at the Daily Mail, which has supported the war from the start, and which is probably more responsible for the war than any other newspaper. It has been full of criticisms expressing uneasiness about the war during the last six months. That was probably the matter to which the Natal paper referred. Let me quote Lord Milner's words as to the real cause of the prolongation of the war. It is not the criticism in this country of the conduct of the war, but rather the things done in South Africa with the sanction of the Government, which have driven the Gape colonists into rebellion and incensed the burghers in the field. Here are Lord Milner's reasons for the recrudescence of the war, as given in his despatch at the beginning of this year;

"I doubt whether it (the movement in Cape Colony) would have succeeded to the moderate extent it has had it not been for the recrudescence of the war on the borders of the Colony and the bitter character it has assumed. Every act of harshness, however necessary, on the part of our troops, was exaggerated and made the most of by them. What principally inflamed the minds of the people were alleged instances of needless cruelty which never occurred."

That is his view. Not the statements made in this House, but the acts of harshness and severity, which we have been told were the only possible methods of suppressing the war, are the reasons given by Lord Milner for the embitterment of feeling and the aggravation of the position in South Africa. A few minutes ago I had put into my hands a letter from a Uitlander minister, and in order to show that he is not a prejudiced witness from my point of view I will quote these words from the letter;

"If we were not wholly in the right when the war began; I speak as a Uitlander; we had at least a great deal on our side. I think we had the bulk."

He, therefore, believes in the justice of the war. But he goes on;

"We are transferring that quality to the side of the Boers, and history may come to curse us as it has long since cursed Spain."

As to the prolongation of the war, he attributes it to the burning and pillaging committed in the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal, giving his authority for the statement, and then he goes on to say, referring to the recent hangings;

"I hear privately that the Maritzburg district; where Marais was executed; is

seething with fury. It will yet be found that the execution of Coetzee and Marais was equivalent to the building of recruiting offices for the Boer commandos."

Then the writer makes a statement about the peace negotiations, which I think is very significant;

"Lord Kitchener has revealed to us how they (the Boers) are now willing to interpret independence. Offer them exactly that kind of Home Rule which the Liberal party tried to obtain for Ireland, and there is no doubt it would be wholeheartedly accepted."

["Name."] I do not think there is any objection to giving the name, but I must consult the writer first. This minister goes on to denounce the policy of unconditional surrender, and says that that is responsible for the prolongation of the war.

The Colonial Secretary indicated that a period might arrive when we should treat the commandos in the field as murderers, and he quoted the proclamation of General McArthur to the Filipinos. That proclamation itself is sufficient proof that there is no ground for anything of the kind in this case. The very ground on which General McArthur proclaimed those men to be banditti was that their leaders never met together for conference. Within the last few weeks the Colonial Secretary himself has published documents showing that Schalk Burgher, Steyn, and the Boer generals in the field have had conferences. Those conferences are constantly going on. What will happen to our own men if this policy of shooting the Boers is carried out? Do hon. Members realise that during the last three months something like 1,000 of our men have surrendered to the Boers? If this policy is carried out it will end in the shooting of our men.

This proclamation seems to me to be one of the most indefensible ever issued. It is neither the one thing nor the other. You must take the one view or the other. You may say the Boers are not belligerents, and treat them accordingly, but once you admit they are belligerents this proclamation becomes absolutely indefensible.

Take the second part of the proclamation. We are to charge the burghers in the field for the maintenance of their wives and children in these camps. What is happening? We clear the country for military reasons; we take all the stock and grain; we go even to the length of destroying the agricultural implements, so that the people cannot possibly cultivate the land. But if for military reasons you deprive them of the means of livelihood and their food, you cannot afterwards say that you are not bound to keep them from starvation. We use their stock and food; our troops take the grain and forage on their farms; is any allowance to be made for that when we come to consider the bill for board and lodging? Surely it is only justice. ["No."]

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not war.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: No, it is not war; I quite agree. But does the hon. Member mean to say that we should be justified in taking away all the food from their farms, and in leaving the women and children to starve in the wilderness?

AN HON. MEMBER: We are justified in charging them for their keep.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Why take all they have got? All I can say is, if those are the

principles upon which the Transvaal is to be governed, I am not surprised that the Boers are fighting to the last. It is a most extraordinary proposition. You may say that military reasons justify the clearing of the country, but you cannot say that you are not bound to keep the women and children from starvation. The right hon. Gentleman said something about the military situation. When a question was put to him he said he had already dealt with the military situation, but he carefully refrained from saying a word about what was happening in the Cape. We are voting money in this House to conduct the war. We are asked to condemn or approve of this proclamation, and why should we not know what is going on in the Cape? I asked how many Boers there were in the Cape, and I was told about 1,500. All the newspapers; and I am referring rather to the Unionist newspapers; state that there are about 7,000 or 8,000 Boers still in arms in the Cape. Is that statement true or is it not? Is it a fact that there are still only 1,500 armed men opposing us in Cape Colony? We are entitled to know the facts.

The Colonial Secretary indicated that the war is coming to an end, and that the troops are returning to this country. Is he quite sure that he is not going to repeat the blunder of last December? The Prime Minister has referred to the war in South Africa as "the recent war." For electioneering purposes troops were sent back to this country, which included some of our best mounted soldiers, and what was the result? Why, a few months after that the war was worse than ever. [Ministerial cries of "No, no!"] Hon. Members opposite may contradict that statement, but I wish to point out that that was the opinion of Lord Milner, who said that it was worse than it had been for six months. [An HON. MEMBER: But you said "worse than ever."] Then I withdraw that statement, and what I meant was worse than it had been for six months. After some of the troops were sent home we found that the war was worse than it had been at any time for the previous six months. We are getting no information at all now as to what is happening in the Cape, and the Colonial Secretary refrained from giving us any information upon that subject. The right hon. Gentleman referred to surrenders in the Transvaal, but how many troops are there at the Cape? We ought to get that information before Parliament separates. There is only one department which has practically declared this war is over, and that is the Treasury. I say that as long as we have got to spend money at this rate in South Africa the war is not over. An estimate was made at the beginning of this year based upon the assumption that the war would be over at the end of July, but no troops have returned. [An HON. MEMBER: You have just told us they did return.] The Colonial Secretary says he hopes that in September a large number of troops will be able to return to this country. That shows that even now the Ministry recognise that there has been a grave miscalculation. The roads in South Africa are paved with miscalculations. We have had constant supplementary Estimates because the previously made Estimates were wrong, and I think we are entitled to ask the Ministry before we separate for some fuller information upon the situation in South Africa.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): This is the last occasion, or almost the last occasion, on which we shall have the opportunity, before the House separates for

what may be a very long recess, of obtaining information and explanation from the Government as to the state of things in South Africa. I do not think any of us will regret it if we bring forward for explanation those points as to which there exists in the public mind either a deficient knowledge or a legitimate anxiety. In the very few observations which I propose to address to the House I shall say little or nothing about the past; I shall confine myself entirely to the situation which immediately confronts us and to those future arrangements, many of them necessarily provisional, many of them possibly permanent, which in all human probability will be initiated before this House reassembles. As regards the actual situation, while there have been wide differences of opinion among us both as to the origin and as to the conduct of the war, while there are still wider differences, I hope narrowing day by day, as to the choice of methods of solution, I am perfectly aware of this, that there is among men of all parties and all sections of opinion, both in this House and in the country, a practically universal and unanimous desire that at the earliest opportunity it shall be brought to an end.

There are indeed many reasons in the recent development of events why we should wish to accelerate the finish. The conditions under which whatever remains of the struggle which is now being carried on are conditions which, as all history shows, are in a peculiar degree trying to the combatants and injurious to the country. We have heard something to-night about the laws of war. Those laws were framed not with a view to any such contest as now going on. They were in the main and in their normal operation adapted to a state of things where you have a considerable number of men on the one side or the other arrayed against each other, acting upon some definite plan of campaign, moving in more or less organised bodies, and subject in greater or less degree to some kind of central control. That description does not in the least correspond with what is now going on in South Africa. You have a number of independent commanders operating forces, dwindling in numbers and diminishing in resources, over wide areas of an almost illimitable territory, and, although I am prepared to give them credit for the best intentions in the world, without those conditions of discipline and that subjection

to rule which in the long run differentiates a regular army of soldiers from a body of free-lances.

On the other hand, if you look at our own men, although the conditions are not the same, they are certainly to some extent equally exceptional. No praise, I think, can be too high, no appreciation can be too warm of the great work which Lord Kitchener has done in South Africa. He has displayed, under conditions of almost unexampled difficulty, a combination of energy and patience, of zeal and moderation which will always entitle him to a high place among the great soldiers of this country. And what I have said of him I will say, and I am sure the whole of this House will say, with equal conviction of the officers and soldiers under him. In the conditions under which for the last nine months those soldiers have been carrying on their work, the chances of what is called military glory in the larger and wider sense have not been within their grasp, of the pomp and circumstances of war they have seen little or nothing. What has

been their fate? They have been working in separate columns, marching and counter-marching along the veldt, rarely indulged in that which to the British soldier is the greatest opportunity and the greatest luxury, the chance of an open battle, the eyes of the world no longer fixed upon them and public attention diverted into an entirely different direction. I do not believe that in the whole history of British arms there is a chapter which deserves to be recorded with greater admiration than the simple, persistent doggedness with which these men and their officers, with none of the ordinary advantages of military operations, with no dramatic opportunity, have persevered in a work thankless and uncongenial to them, but in the highest degree not only creditable to them, but useful and beneficial to their country.

They will go on, as we know, for as many weeks, and as many months, and as many years as the campaign may last; but without any disparagement to the splendid qualities they have displayed, there is no man among us who has a real regard both for the moral and physical conditions of our Army who is not most anxious that this intolerable burden should, as soon as possible, be removed.

What is the conclusion which I draw from this? It is this, that there is no step whatever that is consistent, or not inconsistent with the usage of war, and with the rules of humanity, that we ought not gladly to face and to advocate for the purpose of bringing this controversy to an end. Well, what is the Government doing, what steps are they taking for the purpose of bringing about that which we all desire, for which we all aim, and which we all approve? A good deal has been said in the course of the debate about the proclamation which at the instance of the Government has been issued by Lord Kitchener. If I took the same view of the facts, I should feel that there was immense force and weight in the considerations derived from international law which were urged earlier in the evening by my right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouthshire. But I must state my difference of opinion with him quite frankly. I do not take the same view of the facts. In my judgment there is no question of international law involved here at all.

I listened carefully to the explanation that was given by the Colonial Secretary in reply to my right hon. friend, and the proclamation, as I understand it, does not assume a denial of the rights of belligerents to those who are still in arms against us. If it did I should certainly take exception to it, although I agree with the right hon. Gentleman that the time may come, we may even be within measurable distance of it now, when the character of the resistance opposed to British arms may be such that you can no longer treat those who are opposed to us as belligerents, but must look upon them as in some different category. As the right hon. Gentleman says, however, that time has not yet arrived. Therefore we must leave that out of the question. No issue as to the rights of belligerents is really involved. What, then, is the real meaning of the proclamation? As I understand it, it is this. These territories are now a part of His Majesty's dominions, persons who within those territories are arrayed in arms against us are at this moment *de facto* and *de jure* His Majesty's subjects [Nationalist cries of "No."] yes, His Majesty's subjects. I need not say that the whole responsibility for the proclama-

tion rests with the Government, but it is neither more nor less than this, it is a warning to the people who, within His Majesty's territories, and being his Majesty's subjects, are in arms against the forces of the Crown that unless by a particular date they surrender to His Majesty's Government they must consider themselves as liable to punishment and expulsion.

It is a total mistake to suppose that the proclamation has the force of law; no Minister in this country has the power by putting on a piece of paper the sentence of banishment to make that sentence effective against any part of His Majesty's subjects. What the proclamation really amounts to is this, and in this respect it corresponds, I think, to a large extent with what was done at the end of the Franco-German War with regard to the inhabitants of Alsace. The proclamation says to these people, you must make your choice; if by the date fixed you surrender, well and good; if you do not, we warn you that local legislation will be initiated for the purpose of doing what was done to the inhabitants of Alsace who did not choose to come in under the proclamation on terms, banishing you from the territory to which you no longer have any claim. I emphasise this point for two reasons; first, because not only as a Liberal, but as one in favour of our forms of Constitution, I should demur with an emphasis that cannot be exaggerated to any assumption on the part of the Executive Government that they had the right by a paper proclamation to banish from any part of His Majesty's dominions any number of His Majesty's subjects. That is not the power that rests with the Executive Government.

I say this, in the second place, because before the warning given by that proclamation can be put into practical effect legislation will have to take place, local legislation, legislation which in every stage can be discussed, and which even when it has been passed into law is capable of amendment, revision, and even reversal. But, looking at the proclamation from that point of view, I express my opinion that there is no danger of either international or constitutional law being infringed, and, as far as I can

judge, it is not consistent with the usages of war or the dictates of humanity.

But the question of policy is entirely a different matter. Here, of course, we who criticise from the outside the contents and effect of the proclamation have not the advantage of the special knowledge which is within the reach of His Majesty's advisers. I do not think the right hon. Gentleman himself adopted a very sanguine tone as to its immediate effect, and I confess myself that I do not feel that it will produce any large number of surrenders, but I hope that my scepticism may prove to be unjustified. But, whether that be so or not, we cannot predict what the future may be. So far as it goes, I, for my part, am prepared to accept it; I do not say that I welcome it; as a step which may possibly conduce to that which I think ought to be the governing end to us all, namely, the acceleration of the end of the war. I hope that the Government are not going to be content with this proclamation. I should like to have, and I hope we shall have before the debate is closed, some rather more definite and explicit statement from the Government as to what is being done, apart from the proclamation, for the purpose of bringing the war to an end.

We are told that a large number of troops are going to be brought back from

South Africa. I do not complain of that. I think that probably there are a large number of troops there who must necessarily be what is called stale, who have served there over two years under conditions of unexampled hardship, and who are now entitled to relief. I am not sure that there are not a certain number of troops who, perhaps, ought never to have been sent. However that may be, and accepting the necessity, as I do, of a large and considerable withdrawal of the actual force on the spot. I do think that we are entitled to have from the Government some more definite statement than has yet been given in the course of the debate that, after discounting the proclamation and giving its greatest or least effect; whichever you please; there will remain in the circle of military action for the purpose of concluding this war such a force of mobile and efficient troops as are adapted for the end in view. We have poured troops into South Africa almost without stint in number, but I am not at all satisfied, even at this moment, that we have sufficiently grasped the real conditions of the problem.

I think I may mention as an illustration, by way of explaining my meaning, the new Yeomanry sent to take the place of the old Yeomanry, which was a very good force, composed of excellent men, who rendered a very fine account of themselves. I am not at all satisfied from all the information that reaches me, and from inquiries that I have made, that the new Yeomanry sent to take the place of the old, recruited up hill and down dale, in the highways and byways of the country, was in any sense a force capable of adequately or worthily succeeding the men who preceded them, of which any commanding officer in South Africa now would say were a real accession to the fighting strength of the army. That is a point on which I hope we shall have some satisfactory assurance from the Government before this debate is over. But the main thing, as I have said, as to the actual situation is to choose the best means open to us to bring the war to an end; and if the Government, in addition to their proclamation, can satisfy the House and the country that such a force as I have indicated is there and will continue to be maintained there until the war is over, I do not for myself doubt that these brave men, who, in what they conceive to be a good cause, have fought for months and years against desperate odds, will yield, as in the end they must yield, to the inevitable, with the knowledge that when the surrender takes place the Government of this country is bound as much by considerations of policy as of honour to give them the most generous terms it is possible for statesmanship to grant.

I pass from that to another matter, not referred to in the debate, and upon which I think we ought to have definite assurances before Parliament dissolves; namely, the future arrangements for the administration of the annexed territories. I should like, in the first place, to know with more explicitness than anything yet given to us what the Government propose as regards the civil administration of the two Republics.

We know that Lord Milner is to be High Commissioner, and I for one, as I have said many times before, have the utmost confidence in his administration. But it is not the least use having in supreme command and at the head of the administrative machine a man in whom you have confidence unless the subordinate

and delegated powers are carefully watched. As regards the Transvaal, we have the Chief Justice and the Attorney General, men of proved reputation and capacity; but I should like to know more than anything yet told us about the district magistrates who are to administer the civil administrative areas into which the colonies are to be divided. I am not speaking of the personnel; but the right hon. Gentleman should tell us what will be their functions, what degree both of administrative and judicial control they will exercise, and subject to what jurisdiction they will carry on their work. There is a still more important question. We shall see probably in the months before the House reassembles something in the nature of a social reconstruction of these colonies. ["No."] At any rate, the first stages of what must necessarily be a long, laborious, and anxious process.

We have now 35,000 burghers as prisoners of war. Sooner or later they will have to be repatriated; taken back to their own country, and with more or less promptitude reinstated in the possession of their properties and farms. To anyone who looks to the future that must appear a most anxious question. What practical steps are to be taken in this process of repatriation? And what provision is to be made in the way of advancing money, and so forth, for the reacquirement, rebuilding, and restocking of their farms? There is on the Estimate a sum of £500,000 appropriated for this purpose. I very much doubt the adequacy of that sum. At any rate, we should like to know broadly and approximately how the money is going to be spent, under what supervision, by what machinery, and in what parts of the country.

Another question quite as important for the future administration of these territories is the position of the native races. I have always thought; though my opinion is not universally shared by

my hon. friends on this side of the House; that, quite apart from the injustice of the Uitlanders, the great blot and stain on the Boer Government in South Africa was its treatment of the native races. We had a debate recently on the question of the Pass Laws which regulate native labour in the mines on the Rand. I have always thought myself, and having listened to that debate I think the result was to show, that, whether by weakness or corruption, the laws passed by the South African Republic in relation to the natives were laws which it was impossible to defend. I do not think that there is any single respect in which the substitution of British for Boer government will have a wider or a more beneficial effect than in the substitution for these laws; badly conceived, imperfectly and unsympathetically administered; by the administration of a man of tried capacity like Sir Godfrey Lagden, whose function will be to stand on the one hand as protector of the natives between them and the white capitalists, and on the other to see that their rights and privileges are adequately secured.

There is another branch of the question which has received insufficient attention, and on which we should be glad to get assurances from His Majesty's Government. I refer to that department of the law so important for the Rand which goes by the name of the Liquor Law. A law was passed by the Legislature of the South African Republic, which on paper was very stringent, dealing with the illicit supply of liquor to the natives. But it was habitually and

systematically avoided; and it is indisputably proved that the sale of bad alcohol to native labourers habitually incapacitated no less than 12 per cent. out of a population of 88,000. It was not that the law was bad, but that it was inadequately carried out. Hon. Members who are familiar with the proceedings which immediately preceded the outbreak of war will remember the murder of a lady, the wife of a Wesleyan minister in that part of the world. That murder was supposed to have been instigated; and not, I fear, without some foundation; by persons interested in this illicit liquor traffic. That was only one, though perhaps the crowning and capital case, of many illustrations of the social evils which resulted from the imperfect enforcement of the law. We know that the Rand is to be reopened, and that native labour is to resort there again. The Pass Laws, as we hope and believe, are to be modified in a humane and progressive sense. But that declaration of policy, satisfactory as far as it goes, would be rendered infinitely more satisfactory if the right hon. Gentleman could assure us that, as regards this important question of the supply of liquor to the natives, if the old Boer law is to be re-enacted, it is to be enforced with adequate administrative supervision. I have dwelt on these points in detail, which are of immense importance as regards the ultimate settlement of these territories, and I earnestly hope that on all these vital issues we shall receive satisfactory assurances.

Looking largely and broadly at the future, it seems to me that there are three main things upon which for the next few months, at any rate, our efforts ought to be concentrated. The first is to bring the war to a prompt, satisfactory, and final conclusion. The next is to take such steps as are necessary to prevent the possibility of a recurrence of those dangers out of which the war itself originated. And the third is, both as regards the white and the native population, to lay, at any rate, the first stone in the foundation of what we all hope may be an enduring fabric of liberty and justice.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I presume it is quite unnecessary to assure the House or the right hon. Gentleman that I do not rise to reply to him in any polemical spirit. With the great mass of his observations, indeed with the whole of his positive statements, I feel myself in complete agreement so far as I know. And if I rise at all it is not with the view of replying to his argument, but solely with the view of answering those questions which he has put to us. The right hon. Gentleman began by paying a well-earned tribute to the work of the British troops in South Africa at the present time. He told us in eloquent language that they were now engaged upon a task which was despoiled perhaps to some extent by the scintillation which necessarily attended the earlier and more dramatic stages of the war, and he pointed out to us that they were, nevertheless, showing those great qualities of perseverance and endurance which deserve here the gratitude of our country. Sir, I think the troops deserve all the praise which the right hon. Gentleman has given to them, but I would say also that those qualities which he has so justly laid to their credit are no new qualities on behalf of the troops of this country. After all, in countless obscure contests in many parts of the world; I might perhaps specify particularly Burma, where for two years a dangerous and laborious, and in a certain sense

inglorious, or, at any rate, not dramatic, war was carried on by the troops of this country; we have always counted, and we have counted with absolute assurance, on the fact that our troops do not depend upon the laudations which they may receive at home or the interest they may excite for the absolutely steady, continuous, courageous, and persevering persistence with which they carry out the duties entrusted to them.

The right hon. Gentleman asked me some questions about our policy with regard to the troops in South Africa, and I think some phrases which fell from him almost indicated doubt in his mind whether we have not settled on a policy of withdrawing troops irrespective of the military situation in South Africa. I can assure him and the House that that is not the case. We have every reason to hope that we shall be able to withdraw troops from South Africa, and, while we withdraw troops from South Africa, to start those civil and peaceful pursuits which are both the earnest of peace and the greatest guarantee that peace is to be maintained. But unless the military situation makes such a course absolutely expedient from a purely military point of view, not a horse, or a man will be withdrawn from South Africa. It is the military situation itself which dominates the whole situation, and though we are of opinion that we can without doubt, or, at all events, in all probability, make a great reduction in the number of our troops, and at the same time, I will not say make a beginning, because a beginning has already been made, to increase the growth of those industries upon which the financial prosperity of the Transvaal depends; unless we see our way to do that the right hon. Gentleman and the House may depend upon it that we shall sacrifice nothing in the way of military efficiency.

The right hon. Gentleman, following, I think, something that fell from the right hon. Baronet who spoke earlier in the evening, rather criticised the qualities of the Yeomanry.

MR. ASQUITH: The new Yeomanry.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Which has recently been sent to South Africa. I am glad the right hon. Gentleman has emphasised the qualification, which no doubt appeared in his speech, between the new Yeomanry and the soldiers, because nobody has ventured to criticise either the training or the quality of those drafts we have sent out to keep the regiments up to strength in South Africa. But to return again to the new Yeomanry. I should say that it is the fact that that Yeomanry went out in an untrained condition. It went out in an untrained condition on the distinct advice of our military advisers in South Africa and here. Their view was that the training could be effected there, and I believe that the new Yeomanry are now, in many parts of the country, doing admirable service, and that probably in this House and out of it we shall speak of them in very different terms a month or two hence from those which some of the critics have adopted in the recent past. I do not know that I need say anything more, so far as the right hon. Gentleman's speech is concerned, with regard to the military situation.

Questions have been showered upon us by those who say they ought to have an accurate view of the military situation before the House separates for the holidays. We have told them our view of the military situation. We have given

them the information at our disposal, and I really do not know what more we can say which would enlighten them on the subject. But let it be remembered that, while it is comparatively easy to give an account of a military situation in which great organised forces are opposed to one another in a limited field, to give an account of a theatre of operations in which the enemy are scattered in small and disorganised bands, and separated from each other by large districts, is really a practical impossibility; and the idea of presenting to the House a tactical or strategical survey of the present situation really would be a practical impossibility. The House knows perfectly well that the enemy, diminished in numbers, deprived of their supplies and their ammunition, are divided into small bands who unite or dissipate as the military situation suggests, and I could not venture to give the House any account which would enlighten them, or which would add to the knowledge which they, in common with the Government, possess of the present military position.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: What is the position in the Cape?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The position in the Cape, undoubtedly, it is true, as has been said by more than one hon. Member, is less satisfactory than it is either in the Transvaal or the Orange River Colony. But, though less satisfactory in degree, it is the same in quality. It is, again, a contest between organised and disorganised bodies. It is still a contest between small bands who dissipate and scatter as soon as our forces approach them, who, no doubt, derive support and assistance from the inhabitants of the district in which they find themselves, who are in a very difficult country, and who, therefore, it is very difficult to hunt down, but with regard to whom "hunting down" is the word which appropriately describes the situation. It is not the strategical or tactical operations between two equally organised bodies constituting two hostile armies. I pass from the military situation to say one or two words in answer to the questions which the right hon. Gentleman has put to me. He thinks, in my judgment he quite rightly thinks, that the interest of the future is not a military but a social interest, and his anxiety is not so much as to the issue of the war as it is with regard to the procedure to be adopted by this country when the war has come to an end. But I would venture to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that we really have given as full an account of our policy in this respect as the present situation renders it advisable to give. He knows, and the House knows, for my right hon. friend has clearly described it in previous speeches, that we propose to have a Governor, Lord Milner, with a Council in which there will be nominated members, and ultimately, I hope, as the transition to the full government of a self-governing colony, elected members. But that is in the future. He knows that we mean to govern all the white population with equal laws, and he knows that we mean to apply to the native population all those humanitarian principles which, I think, are dear to every party and every section of opinion in this country. With regard to the native laws, the right hon. Gentleman asked me two specific questions. One was what we mean to do with regard to the labour laws, and the other was what we mean to do with regard to the liquor laws. On the labour laws, it will be remembered by the House that we had a long debate

only a few days ago, and I think my right hon. friend, in a speech which is probably fresh in the recollection of every man who heard it, explained the general policy which the Government mean to pursue in that matter. It is recognised on all hands that it is a delicate question. It is recognised on all hands that it is not a question on which formulae can be scattered over the House and embodied in speeches with reckless disregard of the peculiar circumstances and history of the Cape Colony. But it will be sufficient to reiterate and re-emphasise what my right hon. friend said in the clearest language, which was that, in the first place, we mean to reform and revise the labour laws, and, in the second place, that we mean to administer them with purity and with equity.

As regards the liquor laws, my right hon. friend has been in communication with all those interested in the question; a question which it is admitted on all hands is vital to the future prosperity and civilisation of the native races of South Africa. Unquestionably the liquor laws were not well administered by the late Republic. Unquestionably, everybody who has looked into this subject is of opinion that the ordinary liquors which are imported by commercial agents should not, and cannot, be allowed to be sold to the natives, and we are already administering the population on that principle. I do not wish to deceive the House in any way, but I am given to understand that what is called Kaffir beer, a mild beer of native production, is not a thing it would be wise to totally prohibit. But as regards imported spirits as we know them, the various forms of "German gin" and other liquors of that kind, we are clearly of opinion that it is absolutely necessary to put the sale of such death-dealing instruments under the severest restrictions. I do not know that there is any other question which the right hon. Gentleman has asked me which requires an answer.

Is it necessary for me, in conclusion, to emphasise once more what has been said over and over again from these benches, and has been re-echoed, I believe, from many platforms in all parts of the country; namely, that neither the Government, nor the party to which the Government belong, nor the country at large are animated in the smallest degree by a vindictive spirit against those who are ranged against us in the field? We think; we on this bench at all events think; that the war has been unduly prolonged; unduly prolonged not from the point of view of our interests, but from the point of view of the interests of these Republics; these colonies. Let me say in that connection that we do not think that the difficulty, when peace has once been restored, of bringing back civilisation and industrial pursuits will be so great as the right hon.

Gentleman appears to suppose. After all, the rural population of these countries does not belong to the highly organised communities with which we are most familiar. The amount of public loans that will be required in order to enable them to resume their pastoral pursuits is not so great as, perhaps, some people suppose; nor is the difficulty of reinstating them in their farms under reasonable conditions such as need make the administrator of the Transvaal or those in this country who are responsible for supervising the administration of the Transvaal feel that they have before them an insoluble problem. I do not

believe that will prove to be a great difficulty. If it does not, if as soon as the war is

terminated the arts of peace begin to flourish, if farms begin to be re-stocked and re-built, if the great industries of the Rand again flourish, I think our present critics and future historians will be astonished at the rapidity with which not merely the former degree of prosperity of these communities is attained, but a degree of prosperity to which they have been wholly a stranger. A degree of wealth which they have never known will prove how easy it may be under good Government, with free institutions, with equal rights, to restore a country which has been devastated through all these months by the passage of armed bands from end to end. In that hope I think this House of Commons may separate for the holidays. I think we may reasonably expect that when next year we reassemble to consider these high questions of policy we may find that warlike operations have practically ceased, that the arts of peace have begun to resume their sway, and that already we have no small promise of that future harvest of prosperity which I confidently anticipate from British rule.

IRELAND; EVICTED TENANTS; POLICE AND PUBLIC MEETINGS; POLICE MANUFACTURED CRIMES; BELFAST DISTURBANCES.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I am about to ask the House to turn to another subject of a less exciting character than that which we have been discussing. I am glad to see the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland in his place, because it is upon the Irish question that I wish to make a few observations. I was glad also to observe that he was in his place during a portion of the debate on the South African War, for there is a certain analogy between some of the points in that debate and the question to which I am about to call attention. It seemed to be common ground between the two sides of the House that a certain amount of money would have to be granted in these new colonies for the purpose of enabling Boer farmers to resume the occupation of their holdings and their houses. There was some difference of opinion as to the amount of money that would be required, but the lowest estimate according to the spokesman of the Government was £500,000.

The question to which I allude also refers to the loss which has fallen on the victims of a war. It was not a war in the open field, but one of those unhappy disturbances which precede land reform in Ireland. It would be unpardonable on my part to enter into a history of the plan of campaign with the tenants.

Everyone in the House has heard of that history, and I dismiss it with this observation, that up to a certain period of the land legislation a large body of tenants were as lease-holders excluded from the benefits of the legislation, and the Government of that day showed no inclination whatever to include that large body. It was under such circumstances that a number of these leaseholders determined to bring pressure on the Government to get their grievances considered and remedied. After a time the Government did give the leaseholders the benefit of the land legislation, but in the meantime a certain number of the tenants who had joined this movement had been evicted and a certain number of them are still out of their holdings. It is to the case of these leaseholders that I wish to call attention. The Chief Secretary knows that the number of

these tenants has gradually diminished, and I would be glad if he could inform the House if that reduction was due entirely to friendly settlements between the landlords and these tenants.

I press on the Chief Secretary to try by every means in his power to induce, I might almost say force, a settlement on the landlords and tenants so that the number of these homeless and poverty-stricken tenants should entirely disappear. I do not think any man in the House would disagree with me in saying that there could not be a more wretched position than that of the tenants on the Campaign estates. They live for the most part in wooden huts of two rooms, and in these rooms families of considerable dimensions have to be accommodated. They have no means of subsistence except such as is given to them by voluntary subscriptions, and these are shifting sands on which the life of anyone should found itself. I have heard from some friends who live in these districts as to how these poor people exist, and I would implore the Chief Secretary to visit these Campaign estates,

and with his own eyes and ears acquaint himself with the condition of these people. They are to be seen sometimes haunting the graveyards and the chapels, praying for some relief from the hopeless and terrible position into which they have fallen. I will not argue whether these people have fallen into that position from their own fault or not. I am in this situation, that these people must be regarded either as heroes or victims; but I would say that every effort should be made to extract them from the miserable state in which they are. This question cannot now be settled by force either on the one side or the other; it must be by amicable agreement, and the pressure which the Chief Secretary can bring to bear. I verily believe that if the Chief Secretary were to use all the influence at his disposal; political, social, and personal; by the time Parliament met next year he would be able to announce that this question was at an end, and that every Campaign tenant would be with the full consent of the landlords restored to his holding. I refer especially at this moment to the tenants on the Luggacurran estate, the property of Lord Lansdowne, who is a member of the Ministry and a man of large means, and a settlement could not affect him from a pecuniary point of view. I have sufficient confidence that his Lordship would be willing to make some pecuniary sacrifice to relieve these poor tenants from their misery and restore them to their holdings. And if he did so it would be a good example to other landlords to come to terms with their tenants. I would appeal to the hon. Member for Armagh whether he seriously thinks the planter is a first-class tenant. As a rule the planter, who was called an emergency man, was neither by training nor temperament inclined to settle down on the land as a hard-working farmer. He is a soldier to a certain extent in retreat, and who would not regard it as a hardship to be relieved of his position as a temporary settler on the land. These planters have not in any part of Ireland succeeded, and day after day they are entering into the bankruptcy court. I pass from that estate with this final observation, that I believe if the tenants there got their opportunity from the Marquess of Lansdowne to buy out their holdings, the question might be settled with hardship to nobody, even to the planters.

I must say I am a little less hopeful as to the next estate; that of the Marquess of Clanricarde. As a matter of fact the Marquess of Clanricarde drew £20,000 a year from that district, which he never visited except for a few hours to honour the remains of his mother. I do not want to make allusion to this gentleman more rancorously than I can possibly do; but I appeal to every Irishman in the House, whatever his political principles may be, whether, so far as his duties as a landlord are concerned, that gentleman has not played an ignoble part compared with most of the landlords of England and Scotland. He has never given a subscription to any worthy object or charitable institution in the district, and he is of that type of landlord which, to a large extent, is responsible for the disrepute into which the landlords in Ireland have fallen. I am in hope, however, that the Chief Secretary, by the exercise of his well-known moderation, may be able to bring pressure to bear on the Marquess to come to a settlement with his tenants. I believe the tenants are only too willing to give reasonable terms for restoration to their homes; and what possible good can it do to the Marquess of Clanricarde to keep these farms so long empty, except for the gratification of an ignoble spirit of revenge. I am afraid I must say that a spirit of vindictive, unchristian, and almost vituperous revenge regulates the whole proceedings of that landlord. I am told that a tenant in another part of the country who had been absolutely unable to make a living, on account of his want of skill and industry, had come to the Marquess of Clanricarde and had been welcomed to the possession of two large farms from which two Campaign tenants had been evicted. I ask the House whether it is fair to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, not to speak of the tenants and landlords, to keep this foul cancer alive, when a little good feeling and good sense could settle the whole question in a week or a fortnight. I think the right hon. Gentleman might approach this question in the same spirit as his colleague the Colonial Secretary proposed to treat with the men who have been fighting against us in South Africa for the last two years, and who have cost this country so much blood and treasure. These men are at the close of the war to be met in the spirit of an irenicon, and to be given a sum of money with which to start the world again. I ask that the same spirit should regulate the proceedings in regard to the victims of the land war in Ireland.

I would have liked to have said a few words in regard to a subject which is becoming alarming. I mean the steady and large drain of the population of Ireland by emigration. This is a question which is at last rousing the people of all classes, who are asking themselves whether the Irish nation is going to perish off from the face of the earth. At this hour I cannot do more than express the hope that the right hon. Gentleman will do his duty in his responsible position, and will take such measures as will make Ireland a country in which the people can live and prosper.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): I rise to take part in the discussion on this Bill, because an opportunity is being given to refer to some matters of grave importance to Ireland which was refused to us earlier in the session. The time given to the discussion of the many matters relating to Ireland has been so

limited, and the privileges of its representatives so curtailed during this fruitless session, now drawing to a close, that I need offer no excuse to the House for trespassing on its time on this occasion. It is well known to the thoughtful in this assembly that the people of our country have experienced many wrongs and persecutions, and have been given few chances of ventilating their grievances, particularly in this House. I intervene in the discussion with feelings of pain and disappointment; pain because it is necessary for the representatives from Ireland to have to fall back on this course in order to ventilate the wrongs from which their people suffer at the hands of a Government which tries to rule them against their wishes; and disappointment, because at one time I foolishly entertained the hope that the present Chief Secretary, who, above all others, is responsible for the government of Ireland, would try to right the many wrongs inflicted on our race by his predecessors, who were Englishmen by blood and connection, and who ruled us from the standpoint of conquerors who had given their adversaries a fall, but who were afraid, if for a moment they were to relax the knee-on-the-chest policy, those adversaries would become once more strong and powerful enough to demand the full restoration of the rights and privileges which they enjoyed before the advent of force and corruption which have been practised in the government of our unhappy country. I therefore desire to join with the other Members of the Irish party who have entered their protest against the administration of the law in Ireland as carried on by the present Chief Secretary, because I have been on various occasions an eyewitness to acts of violence and illegality committed by those who are entirely responsible for the impartial administration of the law, and who dare not do anything without the authority of the right hon. Gentleman. Some time ago I went to Gara Hill, near Athenry, in the county of Galway, for the purpose of addressing a public meeting and advocating the principles of the United Irish League, which is a perfectly legal organisation, and the constitution of which is based on the principles of liberty, justice, and equality. Without even the slightest notice, the people were set upon and batoned and brutally treated. I myself was batoned in the most wanton manner, and so roughly treated that my clothes were torn and my limbs bruised. Some time afterwards another meeting was called there, which I attended, and although no proclamation of any sort or kind was served either on the promoters of that meeting or myself, the same tactics were pursued, and in my presence a young man named Finnerty was set upon and throttled by the district inspector, surrounded by a large number of constables, and his head almost smashed with baton blows, without having given any provocation whatever. So eager were the police to follow the example of their officer that they actually batoned one another in the mad rush to distinguish themselves! Several others were also attacked, with the result that the meeting was prevented from being held there; but we succeeded in holding it a mile further on. Only a few months ago I was going from Mayo to Ballinrobe, in my own constituency, and when passing through Robeen a number of my constituents met me, but the police, anticipating that I might speak there, were in full force, and by violence attacked the people, jostled and dragged myself about, and followed us about

from place to place, armed to the teeth, just as if we were expected to attack life and property, or do something of such a violent character that the ordinary law would not be able to cope with us afterwards. On two subsequent occasions I visited my constituency with similar results. I was prevented from speaking to those who sent me here to represent their views and carry out their wishes; prevented by force, which if attempted to be used in this country against the representatives of the people, or the people themselves, would arouse such a storm of indignation as to sweep from power the Government that would tolerate for twenty-four hours the disgraceful state of affairs that exists in Ireland. Some time ago I attended a meeting in the Queen's Hall in London, and outside that hall I saw such provocation given to the police who were on duty in the vicinity that led me to the conclusion that if one-twentieth part was given in Ireland the people would have been shot down like dogs. In different parts of Ireland, wherever the people try to come together and agitate peaceably for an improvement in what everybody must admit is their wretched condition, they are continually set upon by the servants of the Crown, who are put in motion by the orders of the right hon. Gentleman, who has taken the responsibility of governing Ireland, and whose action we were prevented from discussing at the proper time, but to which something may be said on the present occasion. I am not the only victim to the brutal enforcement of English rule in Ireland. It is an historical fact that on the very day the right hon. Gentleman took office, his coming was celebrated by streams of blood spilled at Wicklow, where some of the most prominent and respected members of the Irish party were present, and, I believe, attacked. Everywhere the forces of the Crown are used against the Nationalists; but nowhere are they used against Orangemen and landlord bullies, who commit the most violent crimes. Take, for instance, the case of Mr. Phibbs, of Sligo, about whose condition there seems so much anxiety on the part of the Government, and such shrieking for coercion on the part of some intolerant and bigoted newspapers in England, which are written by men who are as ignorant of the real state of affairs in Ireland as they are of what is passing in the minds of Botha and De Wet at the present moment. There has been a wonderful outcry against those who refuse to assist this Mr. Phibbs to continue robbing the people of that locality, and whose action is calculated to assist in driving away the remnant of our population that are able to go to any other country. He is one of the loyal minority, and as such will of course be supported against the people by the present Chief Secretary. Let us look for a moment at the other side of the picture, and ask whether the same howl has gone up from the intolerant, ignorant press, and whether the same anxiety has been displayed by the Government to protect Catholics against the Orangemen in Belfast, who, without any provocation, murder their Catholic fellow-workmen, smash their heads, throw them into the river, wreck their houses, threaten their lives, and through the instrumentality of persecution and outrage deprive hundreds of human beings of the means of livelihood, and of the right of those who profess the religion of the majority of the people of Ireland to pursue their ordinary occupations. All this has been done under the eyes of the Chief Secretary, and with his

knowledge, if not with his consent. I say that unless he takes the proper steps to protect the Catholic citizens of Belfast, he is as guilty as the Orangeman who fires the rivet at his fellow-workman. In one case if an Orangeman is even booed at because he outrages the feelings of the people, the forces of the Crown, horse, foot, and artillery, are brought to his relief, while in the other case innocent Catholics may be murdered and persecuted, and yet not even a policeman will be sent to patrol the place where this unbridled devilry is carried on with impunity. Is that impartial administration of the law by the gentleman who is responsible

for carrying it on in Ireland? Is that condition of affairs likely to give our people any confidence either in English law or English Ministers? In different parts of the country prosecutions are instituted on trumped-up charges, many of which are so shifty in their character as to be scouted out of court. Women have been prosecuted and imprisoned time after time for doing nothing more than making a stand for the home from which their orphans have been evicted, while thousands of pounds have been wasted in giving police protection to grabbers who have the land from which these women have been evicted. It is a crime in the eyes of Englishmen to put a common land-grabber to any inconvenience, but it is no crime to turn adrift widows and orphans with no protection or means of support whatever save the hated workhouse. I have no hesitation in saying that the law in Ireland is not administered for the welfare of its people, but is turned into an engine of persecution against them for the purposes of the Government. It is a well-known fact that the Irish police are supposed to be used for the maintenance of the law, but when I relate one or two cases showing the way the law is administered over there and the uses to which the police are put, I think reasonable Members of this House will not wonder at Irishmen looking upon it with the contempt it deserves.

In the county of Leitrim a young man named McGoohan was going to his home one night, and on his way was arrested by a police sergeant named Sheridan, and charged with the terrible crime of cutting the tails of cattle. The usual farce of trying a man charged with an agrarian offence in Ireland was gone through, and he was convicted, and sentenced to two years imprisonment. Time went by, and his sentence, savage though it was, expired, and his first act, after being released, was to make an affidavit declaring his perfect innocence of anything in connection with the charge. The police sergeant was transferred to county Clare, but he did not stop his villainous work, for there he made what turned out to be a clumsy attempt at planting threatening notices, which cost him his position, and which were no doubt intended to pave the way for outrage and murder by the paid agents of the Government. I have reason to believe that the Government made some inquiries into the Leitrim case, with the result that they are now considering what might be suitable compensation for the time spent in prison by this innocent man.

There is another case of the police being used for the encouragement of crime in the infamous attempt of Sergeant Sullivan to induce young men in the neighbourhood of Mulranny to fire into the house of a man named Kelly. Happily this attempt failed, with the result that the complicity of the Government in

the case was proved. This same Sergeant Sullivan and two constables about the same time planted poteen on a poor man named Mulgrew, prosecuted him, and succeeded in getting him imprisoned for three months in Castlebar gaol. One of the police engaged in the business afterwards boasted that he got the poteen at a place called Glenhest, and put it where the others found it. For this dirty work Sullivan was rewarded by being removed from the wild West to a choice station near Dublin, and not only was he rewarded in that way, but it would appear that he is specially free from the punishment due to crime. Since his transfer a charge has been made against him which forced the county inspector of Meath to suspend him from duty, but instead of proceedings being taken against him the matter was hushed up, and to-day he is wearing the uniform of a police officer instead of the uniform of a convict in one of His Majesty's prisons. I will return to the poteen question by referring the House to the action of the Turlough, Balguary, and Pontoon police in the county of Mayo. Here the police saw there was an absence of crime, and an obnoxious man in the locality, inspired no doubt by the police, stated that he would tax the district by bringing in an extra police force. How did they set about the work? A conference of police sergeants from these three barracks was held, with the result that one of them, who has since been promoted, actually gave money to a poor man in the district (who is prepared to prove it) to enable him to buy the material for illicit distillation. According to a Return made at the instance of the Chief Secre-

tary, as the result of a question put by me, a large number of seizures took place during that year, but no one was prosecuted, as the utensils were actually procured first by the police, and then seized by them, and duly reported. I can produce the men who saw them making the preparations, and who immediately went and broke into pieces the utensils for making illicit whisky. It may surprise the right hon. Gentleman to learn that the custodians of the law on these occasions were members of the United Irish League, and the criminals were the men who were paid to enforce the law.

I will give you another proof of the way the law is administered in Ireland. Within the past few weeks, two youths were prosecuted in Ballyhaunis for alleged booing at the son of a notorious land-grabber named Frank O'Boyle. The police served a summons on a witness named Delaney who swore that they coached him in what he should say for the prosecution, and that he was actually swearing to their orders. I will quote a report of the proceedings taken from the Connaught Telegraph;

"Willie Delaney, a sharp looking youngster, son of the herd on the island farm, who accompanied young O'Boyle on the evening of the 5th July, was then sworn, and he corroborated the evidence of the latter. The crowd called them the names already mentioned, and also cried out, 'Hi, for the dog, boys!' He identified the defendants as being in the crowd, and he saw Pat Carney carrying the old coat as a flag. Cross-examined by Mr. Barry: 'You are a cool young fellow, and you can swear fairly well?' 'I can, sir.' 'You would swear what you were told. Anyone having an interest in you would tell you what to swear here, and you would swear as directed. Is not that so?' 'Yes, sir.' 'You would swear what your

father or O'Boyle or any of the police would tell you?' 'Yes, sir.' 'Who was speaking to you about this case?' 'I don't know.' 'You don't know? Was there anybody speaking to you about it?' 'There was.' 'Who was it?' 'Constable Searson; he was speaking to me down on the farm.' 'He came to have a talk with you, and I suppose he shook hands with you?' 'He did, sir.' 'He mentioned the names of Carney and Boyle?' 'He did, sir.' 'So I thought. You are an excellent Crown witness. I suppose he told you what to swear here against them?' 'He did, sir.' 'He told you it was your duty as the herd of the boycotted grabber to come in here and swear everything against Carney and Boyle?' 'He did, sir.' 'I am really delighted that the Crown handed you over to me. What did he say to you?' 'He said I should have to go to the court and swear what I was wanted against those two boys.' 'You have sworn what he told you to swear for the purpose of the prosecution?' 'Yes.' 'Because O'Boyle is un popular in the district, because he is not liked by the people?' 'Yes, sir.' 'Did Constable Searson know the reason why O'Boyle was not liked?' 'Yes.'"

On this evidence they were bound over to keep the peace, or in default to spend a month in Castlebar Gaol. What a travesty of law! What a mockery of justice! Did they content themselves with that? No. After the two youths were convicted, the district inspector and the police surrounded them in the barracks, and tried to terrify them into giving bail to be of good behaviour, although they were determined to go to prison for the month, as they believed they were innocent of the charge against them. At first the boy Carney refused, and seeing no chance in that quarter, the district inspector went to the boy's father, and traded on his paternal feelings by pointing out the terrors of imprisonment. Mr. Carney told him in reply that the police had the same means at their disposal for getting up a fresh prosecution, and declined to give his consent. But this ingenious inspector, not to be baffled in his designs, gave his solemn promise that they would not be interfered with in future, unless the police could catch them by the hand in the act of committing what he alleged was a breach of the law. Now, I want to know from the Chief Secretary for Ireland what object this district inspector had in view, or whether he was acting in accordance with instructions received? Did this official and his subordinates then cease their evil work? No. A sergeant named Lyons, and a constable named Searson, accompanied the land-grabber into the licensed premises of Mr. Delaney, who is prominently connected with the United Irish League, although they had over forty other licensed houses between the barrack and Mr. Delaney's, clearly for the purpose of trumping up a case against him, and depriving him of his licence, because of his unwavering Nationalist principles. The land-grabber demanded a glass of whiskey in the presence of this sergeant, with note-book in hand, and when the whiskey was supplied, so disappointed was this busy-body sergeant, that he ran round the town pointing out to everybody that Mr. Delaney supplied a grabber, and asked some of the people what they thought of Mr. Delaney now. I want to know can the law be respected when its officers act like blackguards and ruffians, thirsting for vengeance against Nationalists? When this creature, failed in his attempt to get

Mr. Delaney in his meshes to make a case against him at the next licensing sessions, he went round to the members of the League, trying to arouse their ire against Mr. Delaney, but I am glad to learn that the people have treated these creatures as they deserve, with the greatest contempt.

I ask, Is that the way the law is administered in England and Scotland? No. Such scoundrelism is reserved for use in Ireland only, where the police know what pleases their superior officers and masters in Dublin Castle. Of course I cannot say whether work of that kind is the policy of the Chief Secretary. But there can be no doubt whatever that it is the policy of responsible police officers in the West of Ireland to encourage the commission of agrarian crime by their subordinates to blacken the United Irish League and get up an outcry against it. Within the past few weeks there is a sort of reign of terror in the Killmaclassar district, near West-port. There is a sort of martial law there. Some of the leading inhabitants cannot move night or day without being "shadowed" by police. Even the local district inspector spends whole nights at the doors of those people. And why? Simply to cover the ruffianism of some policeman who made an effort at spiking meadows in the locality. Like other blunderers, this uniformed "Captain Moonlight" wasn't smart enough, as he used a peculiar kind of iron peg that was in use in the Brockagh Barracks. It is time really that the Government should at once grapple with this grave question by granting the public inquiry into the acts of official blackguardism so often called for by the Mayo County Council, several district councils, and the different divisional executives and branches of the United Irish League in the country. I could give the House a large number of such cases in different parts of Ireland, but I think I have given quite enough to prove the policy of those who rule Ireland from Dublin Castle and Westminster. Apart altogether from the doings of the police, who, after all, are mere instruments in the hands of our rulers, and who do this terrible work to qualify themselves for promotion, we have the judges of the land forgetting the solemnity and dignity of their positions, assuming the role of Crown prosecutor once more and shrieking, as it were, with the vehemence of a Judge Keogh, for the blood of those charged before them for political offences.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member is not in order in referring in that manner to the judges.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: We have leading Crown Prosecutors engaged in the unholy work of jury-packing, wherever a man is charged with being engaged in the furtherance of the national cause. The policy pursued by England in its government of Ireland has been a most ruinous one. During the past fifty years about 4,000,000 of our people have gone to other lands;going at the rate of well over 70,000 every year;and I am glad to say they have enough spirit to carry with them undying hatred to the Government that is the cause of their exile. The great war that is being waged in South Africa is not so destructive, so far as the numerical loss may be counted, as the drain of emigration from Ireland which is caused by the continued misgovernment of that country who do not know, nor care to understand, our people. Although light may be thrown on the way that things have been done in Ireland by English Ministers, who think it a duty to govern

Ireland against the wishes of its people and their representatives, I fear it will have no beneficial result, as prejudice and social hatred are too deeply rooted in the ministerial mind to listen to anything coming from an Irish quarter. Many previous debates and Ministerial admissions have shown that not only the glorious constitution of England, but the rights of personal safety and private property, recognised by the ancestors of the Australian blacks who danced before the Duke of Cornwall the other day, are completely abrogated whenever the strange constituents of the few Tory members for Belfast take into their heads to indulge in an orgie of unbridled ruffianism.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order: That is not language which can be used in regard to hon. Members of this House.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: I was not referring to hon. Members, but to constituents of the hon. Members for Belfast. A glance into the real origin of those recurring disturbances will explain the responsibility of the authorities controlled by the Chief Secretary. It may be stated as a fact that was notoriously of common knowledge long before the recent riots or the prosecutions, that language of the most ruffianly and most inflammatory character; language so vile, so filthy, so utterly abominable that the newspapers declined even to indicate its character when it was repeated in public was used from the steps of a Government building for years. Why were those ruffianly Orangemen allowed to use the steps of a public building when the Nationalists would not be allowed to use the courthouses built by their own money for the United Irish League meetings, or even by a district council in the discharge of its business if a cad of a local magistrate objected? Are not these further reasons for protesting against the Chief Secretary's policy of Irish administration? Why are not precautions taken against the repetition of this disgusting and inflammatory language? Why are the police in Munster and Connaught instructed and hired to listen at windows and keyholes and to insult and obstruct peaceable meetings of United Irish Leaguers, while this tornado of unmentionable filth was being poured into the public ear every Sabbath afternoon in a city garrisoned by 1,000 policemen? Why was not a Government reporter sent to these meetings, which were undoubtedly of a dangerous character, and addressed by this terrible ruffian Widdowes, who got ten years and five months imprisonment here and in America for committing an unnatural crime, while official reporters have been sent all over the country to United Irish League meetings which were without exception of the most peaceable character? Perhaps I may answer and say more of English impartiality as we know it. In Munster and Connaught a man's liberty is endangered and his county proclaimed if he refuses to speak

to some person whom he rightly regards as an enemy to his class and his race. But in happy Belfast and on the streets of Portadown any foul-mouthed scoundrel can come forth into a public arena and level the grossest insults and the most outrageous calumnies at holy women whose devoted lives have been given to the care of the helpless and the sorely stricken and the little children, and against saintly men whose time and talents are spent in the service of their people, their church, and their God. But that is not all.

There are other and even more significant facts in connection with these ever-

recurring scenes of shame and violence in the city of Belfast. The right hon. Gentleman, whose administration in Ireland we impeach, knows of the existence of a scurrilous sheet called the Belfast Protestant, which I understand is produced under the direction of the vendors of the oratory I have described. This loathsome sheet is devoted from cover to cover almost to the circulation of libels and infamies more horrible and revolting than even those which these foul-mouthed authors are allowed to level against Catholic nuns and Catholic priests in the public streets and squares. The right hon. Gentleman has, I believe, seen this precious organ of the peculiar Protestantism professed by this leprous coterie of firebrands. He knows who prints it. He knows how it is circulated, or if he does not he could have made himself acquainted with the facts just as speedily as they could be transmitted over the telegraph wires. What has he done to stop the circulation; or rather distribution; of this pernicious source of bigotry amongst ignorant Orangemen in Belfast, and of hatred and ill-will between all classes of the community? Have thousands of police raised it all over Ulster? Or is it still untouched because the names of two of the Unionist representatives of Belfast figure prominently as generous subscribers to its funds, and the infamous propaganda it is carrying amongst the most violent sections of the people in cities and towns in Ulster? Or is it because his own policy has not been attacked as it has been attacked in the columns of the Irish People? Here in my place, and in the presence of the members of the

Government, I say there is no law in Ireland, as law is understood in countries claiming to be civilised. The landlords and their henchmen, the jury-packing lawyers, the bailiffs, the sheriffs, and the police rule the south and west. Law and order in the north are absolutely subservient to the goodwill of the maddest gangs of bigots that ever disgraced human nature. And it is because these things are so, and that the Irish people and their representatives are face to face with such facts and circumstances every day of our lives, that I intervene in this discussion and protest against the continuance of a system of misgovernment which aims at nothing if it does not aim at the extermination of our Irish race. In my own native county, close on 10,000 men are compelled to leave home every year to live a life of constant drudgery and hardship, only to leave their wives and children at home in such wretched circumstances as to prevent them from getting the necessary food, clothing, or education to fit them for the life before them. And all this while tens of thousands of acres of the best land in the world are left unfilled for the benefit of a few greedy individuals. This is more of English law as we know it in Ireland, and the present Chief Secretary is undoubtedly responsible for the continuance of that wretched state of affairs. The other night, in reply to some questions, I heard the Chief Secretary say that in Belfast the police never carry arms except for purposes of ceremonial display. Well, as far as I have observed, they do nothing more than have ceremonial displays in the south and west of Ireland. Whenever I go to my constituency, there appears to be a great ceremonial display, for no less than from fifty to one hundred policemen and officers follow me, armed with rifles, bayonets, batons, and all the paraphernalia of war, without any necessity

whatever, as I believe. I am one of the most moderate of men in my demands. I will take this opportunity of asking hon. Members of this House how would they like to be treated when they visit their constituencies as I have been when time allows me to visit mine—On the last occasion I was at Ballyhaunis two policemen were stationed above my

hotel door, two others below the door on the opposite side of the street, while a detective-sergeant and a constable kept walking up and down before the door during the time I was there. What kind of a policy was that? The Chief Secretary also said that policemen could not go into Harland and Wolff's place in Belfast, because it is private property; but I say they had as much right to go in there as to go into the back yard of my hotel and keep guard on it after I succeeded in leaving the hotel unknown to the six who were set to watch me. Is that more of English law as we know it in Ireland? I may take the liberty of telling the Chief Secretary that the sweetness of tongue and emptiness of promise mixed, as it has been, with a great deal of the callousness and brutality of the worst of his predecessors which has so far characterised him, will no longer be tolerated. He must not try to ride two horses at the same time, or he will come down as great a failure as any of those who fail to accomplish that most impossible task of governing a nation against its people's will.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): It can hardly be expected that at this late hour of the night I shall be able to do full justice to the many points raised by hon. Members from Ireland. The hon. Member adduced a number of cases to prove that the police in Ireland were actuated by an unreasoning spirit of brutality towards the inhabitants of that country, and that, with the connivance of the Irish Secretary, they endeavoured to find fault with the United Irish League. The House will not be surprised to hear that I am not prepared to deal with all the cases to which the hon. Member referred, but among them I did recognise a number of old friends. There was the cross-examination of a boy. Is any reply needed to such a case? The boy dutifully replies, "Yes, Sir," to every question put to him by the cross-examining counsel, and I think any gentleman who has had experience of the law will agree that those questions were leading questions. If the hon. Member had read out the examination in-chief, no doubt we should have found that the answer was "Yes, Sir," to

every question put by the other side, and that on re-examination the same simple method was followed. The reason more importance was attributed to the affirmative examination than the affirmative cross-examination is that the former was confirmed by the evidence of other witnesses, while the latter was absolutely uncorroborated. Then came the case of Sergeant Sullivan. The hon. Member said the sergeant was charged with an offence, and that the matter was hushed up. The charge was brought by a most disreputable character; it was closely examined into, and found to have not the slightest foundation. The sergeant was absolutely cleared, and yet upon that case the hon. Member not only attacked the constabulary, but attempted to involve the Government in a charge of supporting men who were unworthy of support, and of conniving at their offence, to the neglect of the proper maintenance of order in Ireland. I now

come to the case of a man named McGoohan, who was convicted on a charge, and sentenced to two years imprisonment. I regret to say that that man was convicted on a false charge.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Is it not the fact that sixty Catholics were ordered to stand by when the jury was being packed to convict him?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no knowledge of that fact, nor is it relevant to my argument. The charge made is that the Government habitually connive at the infamous administration of the law. I think I have fairly disposed of two cases, and cleared the police and the Government of any such imputation I am now dealing with the third case, in regard to which I openly state my opinion that the sergeant of police was guilty of infamous conduct, that he was a cunning and unscrupulous scoundrel, and that on evidence given by him an innocent man was sent to prison for two years. I instituted a most searching inquiry into that case; I left no steps untaken which would enable me to arrive at the truth. When I obtained proof, I directed that the innocent victim of this infamous action should be substantially compensated, and public reparation made to him.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: What compensation?

MR. WYNDHAM: I prefer not to state the amount, but it is substantial. That illustrates the attitude of the Government towards so lamentable and rare an occurrence.

MR. DILLON: Not rare.

MR. WYNDHAM: I may say that a searching inquiry has been instituted into the records of any similar occurrences in this country, and compensation on the highest scale that can be discovered will be given. That is a very frank statement, and it is typical of the attitude of the British Government. ["Oh, oh."] There were three courses open to me with regard to this officer. There was no evidence on which this sergeant could have been prosecuted in a court of law. I might have said, "I am dissatisfied with this sergeant's evidence. I will therefore remove him to another district. No charge can be brought against him on which a conviction could be secured; therefore I can take no further steps." Or I might have instituted a prosecution, knowing that no conviction could be secured. I think the best course was that of making a departmental inquiry, and dismissing the sergeant from the force, thereby inflicting upon him a very great punishment, as he loses his pay, his position, and his prospect of pension. I have dealt with the three cases I recognise in the long tissue of vehement denunciations, and if I had had warning of the others, doubtless I could have disposed of them in a similar manner. I do not charge the hon. Member with bringing forward these accusations without in some sense believing them to be true. I think he is deeply concerned over some of these agrarian disputes which unfortunately have raged in Ireland for many years, and which to a limited degree rage still. But I ask the House whether any solution to the Irish land difficulty is to be found in such an attitude as the hon. Member has adopted to-night? The case of Mr. Phibbs was mentioned. Let me tell the House the origin of that case. There is in Ireland a farm into which the surrounding tenants were permitted by the landlord to place certain capital. The tenants desired to buy that farm. There is no machinery in the Statute-book enabling them to do so. In

order to secure their

object, by what process of reasoning I cannot imagine, they withdrew their capital from the farm. I do not think that was a wise proceeding, and I doubt whether it was legal. The farm being left derelict of their own will and motion, another man offers to take it. It is let to him. That man is entitled to all the protection the law can give him. Apart from the illegality of subjecting that man to petty annoyance, and people in humbler circumstances who serve him to great oppression, it is stupidity. How can such action advance by one year or one day any satisfactory solution of the land question in Ireland? Is it not clear that if this illegal, wicked, and stupid war is waged, any such appeal as is made to me cannot be entertained by any Government which may happen to be in power? But fortunately these melancholy events, which at one time were spread over a large area of Ireland, are now confined to small districts, which can and will be dealt with. Therefore I have not altogether set on one side the hope that the Government may be able in the future to take up once more the difficult task of passing land legislation for Ireland which may hasten the solution of the difficulty which all desire. It is quite clear that you cannot deal with the Irish land question unless you banish from the social atmosphere of Ireland disorder and oppression. Only when that has been done can anybody hope to carry out this difficult task of reconstruction.

The hon. Member for the Scotland Division opened his speech by trying to draw an analogy between some features in the Irish agrarian question and some features in the situation in South Africa. He pointed out that it is the policy of the Government when the war is over to give assistance to the citizens of the two republics to take up the pursuit of agriculture. Yes, Sir, when the war is over, and to those who have ceased to wage war. Everything turns upon that. The hon. Member instanced the case of the evicted tenants, who had taken part in the Plan of Campaign. That was a land war; I accept the description; a war the wisdom of which was doubted by many of the hon. Members who then sat on those benches. These derelict farms are the monuments of that war. Can those monuments be abolished unless every intention to renew that war has been abandoned? It is in no spirit of vindictiveness that I say it would be wrong to Ireland and wrong to Irishmen, who may be tempted to imitate those courses, to use exceptional State action to put back those evicted tenants until all parties in Ireland have abandoned any intention of renewing that war. In saying that I am but repeating what was said by the First Lord of the Treasury on a somewhat similar occasion. I will quote his words, because they give very accurately my own view of this matter. He said;

"I for one should certainly not contemplate it; (that is, using the money and the legislative power of Parliament for this purpose); with equanimity unless every sect or party would hold out to us the hope that we have seen the end of these things."

If there is no prospect of the renewal of this warfare certainly it is to the interests of the Government to wipe out all traces of the warfare, of the past. But so long as there is a prospect of the renewal of this warfare; and I say this in no spirit of vindictiveness; the Government cannot come to the assistance of

those who may be tempted to adopt this course in the future.

I quite readily accept one sentence which fell from the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool. He said that this question could not be settled by force, and that the only way to settle it permanently was by amicable agreement. I accept that statement, and I say that I think no lasting good can be done in regard to the land question except by the co-operation of all those interested in it. I am profoundly convinced of the truth of that statement. If you can accomplish this object by means which are desirable and legitimate this may prove beneficial to Ireland. The hon. Member at the beginning of his speech claimed that the leaseholders had only entered into a legitimate combination for the benefit of the land. Does that statement not make us pause and reflect? The object of this agitation is simply to hunt out these leaseholders and take from them their land. [Nationalist cries of "No, no!"] But I know of cases of this kind. The difficulty in Ireland springs largely from the fact that a great part of Ireland is occupied by what I may call agricultural slums. The present First Lord of the Treasury is the first statesman who attempted to deal with these agricultural slums. In my opinion the only hope of a successful solution of the problem is by pursuing the line which my right hon. friend laid down, but how can we increase holdings that are too small if land which they might buy in the open market is being made the subject of illegal oppression and open disorder? Owing to economic disasters in the past, and owing to hasty legislation; I refer to the work of the Encumbered Estates Court; there are in Ireland many properties upon which it is no man's interest and in no man's power to take any steps to benefit such properties. We can only deal with that question by legislation, and yet I have in my mind a case which was referred to at question time. One of these estates is at present in the courts, and it is stated in this case that those who have the administration of this estate would be ready to sell one farm upon the estate to the occupiers in the neighbourhood. But what was done in this case? A meeting was summoned in order to intimidate the person who owns this farm. Can any court of law or any Government worthy of the name countenance a proceeding so disorderly and fraught with the most evil consequences? Why cannot this farm be bought by entering into negotiations for purchase by offering a fair price? I believe this can be done, and will be done in those parts of Ireland where we are not confronted with lawlessness and disorder. I recognise that at this time of the night I cannot discuss fully the Irish land question. In my opinion this is the first and the last question connected with the welfare of Ireland, and it deserves the earnest and the serious attention of all those who may cherish the hope that something may be done for the agricultural community in Ireland. But the Irish land question can never be solved so long as recourse is had to violence and disorder in preference to the more certain method of legislation by agreement.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE PROFESSORS; NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I

have a question which I desire to put to the Chief Secretary connected with the Queen's College, Belfast, in reference to two appointments of professors which have been made there some little time ago. Those interested in Queen's College

believe that some injustice has been done to these two professors who have been appointed, and the chairs they hold by the terms of their appointment. These appointments have been limited to seven years. I find that, without exception, the appointments to those very same chairs, three of which have been made in quite recent years, have been permanent appointments, and that the same thing has taken place in connection with appointments at Queen's College, Galway. I say that there is no reason whatever for this limitation. My right hon. friend told me that this was either a case of misapprehension or a misunderstanding, and I should like to ask him whether the misunderstanding arose from a recommendation made in Belfast, or whether it took place by some superior authority. I say that, apart from the fact that these appointments have been made, so far as my examination goes, permanent in Galway and Belfast without exception, there is no reason whatever for limiting them in Belfast, for neither in the new university of Birmingham or any other university is there to be found any analogy for limiting such appointments. Such limitations are contrary to the practice of the medical profession, and they must lead to inferior men applying for these appointments. I ask my right hon. friend to consider whether these men cannot be placed upon the same footing as their colleagues occupy in Cork and Galway.

I want also to say a word on the question which has been raised with regard to the residual grant. I have gone into four or five instances of the non-payment of the balance of the residual grant, and I am convinced that an error has been committed by somebody in authority. The matter is a very complicated one, but I will put it broadly in this way. There are innumerable instances in which amounts which vary from three months to fifteen months in special instances are still owing, in my opinion, to national school teachers. My suggestion is that the Chief Secretary should appoint an independent accountant to examine the books. If it is an error in book-keeping they will not be satisfied by the opinion of the department which made this error. Therefore, I would ask him whether he cannot this time appoint an independent accountant to go into these intricate calculations. I believe that if my right hon. friend were to take that course it would go a very long way to allay the feeling of irritation which exists at the present time, for which I think there is a certain amount of justification, and which irritation has been created by the general dissatisfaction which at present exists. The new regulations are in my opinion very inadequate, and certainly they deprive the existing school teachers of the prospects of preferment which they had a right to look forward to, and which they could obtain in the past.

RAILWAY SERVANTS' GRIEVANCES.

*MR. BELL (Derby): I am sorry to have to detain the House for a few moments with the discussion of another subject, altogether different from that which we have been discussing to-night. It is a subject on which I believe I shall be able to elicit the practical sympathy of all hon. Members of this House, having regard to the very long hours we have been obliged to work this week in this Assembly. The question I am going to raise is as to the operation and administration by the Board of Trade of the Hours Act of 1893. The Hours Act of 1893 was the

result of a Royal Commission, which sat for about, I believe, two years, to inquire into the hours of employment of railway servants. The Act was then passed as the result of that inquiry, its provisions being framed to give power to the Board of Trade in order that they might without friction or labour troubles inquire into the hours worked by railway servants upon complaints laid before them. I find now that the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade on 15th June last, when the Estimates were being discussed, made a statement which was not absolutely correct, and he will, I am sure forgive me for saying this, for I do not in the least impugn his veracity. The statement he made was doubtless in accordance with the information and advice supplied to him. The right hon. Gentleman, in replying to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, eulogised the railway companies for the manner in which they themselves were reducing the hours of their employees, pointing out that for the year ending-July of this year;the report of which was published on the 3rd of August;it is shown that there were forty-one cases reported to the Board of Trade during the twelve months ending July.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): July last year?

*MR. BELL: Yes, July last year. Now, I know the right hon. Gentleman was perfectly earnest in what he said, and that the Report was prepared by a gentleman in whom this country had absolute confidence, but who unfortunately is now deceased. I refer to Sir Courtenay Boyle. He states in his Report that; "The Report shows a continued decrease in the number of complaints made. The exact number of such complaints received during the year ended 27th July, 1900, was 41, as compared with 46 in 1890, 76 in 1897 and 156 in 1895. The steady fall in the number of complaints which has lasted continuously since the last-named year, may, I think, be taken as indicating a tendency on the part of the railway companies to watch the effect of the revision of hours and themselves to adjust their tables of working hours without waiting for representations from the Board of Trade."

What I desire to call the attention of the Board of Trade to particularly is that that is not quite correct as to the reason why so few complaints were laid before the Board of Trade. The fact is that the men themselves who are compelled to work these long hours have got sick of laying complaints before the Board of Trade, in consequence of the extraordinary delay which occurs in the Department in making inquiries into them. Whilst I could enumerate scores, if not hundreds of cases I have simply selected one from each of several railways as typical cases for the consideration of the President of the Board of Trade. On the 22nd February, 1900, I laid before the Board of Trade a complaint on behalf of the shunters of the Lancashire and

Yorkshire Company. This was acknowledged on the 23rd of February by the Board of Trade. They were asked for a further reply on the 8th of August. On the 11th of August they wrote to say they were in communication with the company. They were again asked for a reply on the 1st January, 1901, and on the 7th of January they wrote to say that they were still in communication with the company. No definite reply has been received up to this moment. Why is it that in the case of a

complaint made on the 22nd February, 1900, there has been no reply made up to the 15th August, 1901? That is a case affecting one centre on the Lancashire and Yorkshire. Then there is a case of "long hours of signalmen at Nottingham Great Central." The Board of Trade was written to on the 5th September, 1899, and the complaint was acknowledged on the 6th September. They were again written to on the 1st of August, 1900, and acknowledged the further communication on the 3rd August, and their reply was received on the 7th of August, 1900, and the result was that the hours were reduced from twelve to ten per day. In that case it took eleven months to elicit a reply. Here is another case, on the London and South Western. "Long hours of platform staff on London and South Western Railways (Sundays)." Representations were made to the Board of Trade on 20th July, 1899. They were acknowledged by the Board on the 22nd July. On the 18th August the Board asked for further information, and that was sent on the 23rd August, the communication being acknowledged by the Board on the 25th August. No reply coming to hand, a further representation was made on 20th November, which representation was acknowledged on the 22nd November. Further representations were made on the 20th July, 1900, and the Board's final reply was dated 26th July, the result being that the intervals of rest were increased before and after the long turns. It took over twelve months to obtain that reply from the Board of Trade. On the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway there is one cabin in which the signalmen make longer hours than are safe even in the interests of the public, much less

in the interests of the men themselves. The men complained. The Board of Trade was communicated with on the 28th of September, 1899. The letter was acknowledged by the Board on the 29th of September; further information was asked for by the Board on the 6th of October, and it was sent on the 2nd of November, and acknowledged by the Board on the 4th of November, 1899. No less than twenty-three months have elapsed since representations were first made, and no reply has been yet received.

In this matter of long hours during the past week or so hon. Members themselves have had a striking experience of its ill-effects, and they will at any rate sympathise with these men for whom I am pleading. I have made numerous complaints on behalf of engine-drivers and goods guards, and these are men who hold very important posts, as everyone knows. Here is a specimen of the hours of work of engine-drivers and firemen on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway amongst other complaints received. On Monday, 18th March, in the Wigan shed the men worked 11hrs. 50mins.; on Tuesday, 13hrs. 45mins.; on Wednesday 13hrs. 50mins.; on Thursday, 13hrs. 15mins.; on Friday, 14hrs.; and on Saturday, 12hrs. 10mins., or a total of 78 hours 50mins. for the week. These are the hours of the engine-drivers and firemen who have to work our railway business. If hon. Members in this House get so fagged out after ten or eleven hours work, what must be the condition of these men who work the locomotives on our railways if they are kept at work longer than twelve hours a day? I know that at the present time there are a large number of men on our railways who are kept at work for twelve, thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen hours a day continuously. It is in view of these facts that I urge the President of the Board of Trade to apply the

provisions of the Act of 1893; that I ask him to make the conditions under which these men work better than they are under the powers he already possesses for that purpose.

I desire particularly to call attention to the statement in Sir Courtenay Boyle's Report that there were only forty-one complaints made during the twelve months ending July, 1900. Well, I myself laid before the Board two specific instances in which there were a greater number of cases of long hours than are contained in the Report altogether. I made a representation to the Board on November 1st, 1899, as to the long hours worked by the goods guards at Sheffield on the Midland. The statement I made was that in the previous week eighteen guards worked upwards of 100 hours. On 8th November the Board replied that there was nothing in my letter to show that the representation was authorised by the men concerned, and asking whether the complaint was made at the request of the men. On the 10th of November I wrote to the Board to the effect that it was not absolutely necessary, in accordance with the powers conferred on the Board by the Act, that the men themselves should make the complaint. The first section of the Act of 1893 says;

"If it is represented to the Board of Trade, by or on behalf of the servants, or any class of servants of a railway company," etc.

It is clear from those words that it is competent to me or to any Member of this House to make representations on behalf of the men. If any hon. Member finds or is of opinion that the engine drivers or guards or any other class of employees on a railway have been working longer hours, or are working longer hours than they ought to, he has a right under this Act to lay a complaint before the Board of Trade. But the Board of Trade desired to know from me whether the representation made was authorised by the men concerned, and I replied that the complaint was laid by the secretary of the Sheffield branch of the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants, and that complaints by him were regarded as authentic by me. That was on 10th November. On the 30th of that month, 1899, further representations were made by me to the Board to the effect that in the previous week fifty-nine goods guards had worked upwards of 100 hours, and that one man had worked 126 hours. This was in the month of November, let it be observed, in the midst of foggy weather. At one station alone fifty goods guards work upwards of 100 hours, and one of them 126 hours in one week. In these two instances, in one month of the year 1899 I made representations to the Board of Trade showing that sixty-eight

goods guards had worked excessive hours; upwards of 100. This cannot have received the attention of the Board, otherwise they would not have set forth in their Report that only forty-one complaints were made in the year ending July, 1900. I have here another typical case of the hours of signalmen on the London and North-Western Railway. Representations were made to the Board of Trade on the 19th February, 1901. They were repeated on the 4th June, 1901. On the 8th of June a reply was received, which read as follows;

"With reference to your letter of the 4th inst. on the subject of the hours of duty of some of the signalmen employed at Longsight, I am directed by the Board of Trade to state that they inquired into this case, but that the circumstances

disclosed did not appear to warrant further action."

In regard to this let me remark as to railways generally that there is reason to fear that too frequently incorrect information is given to the Board of Trade by the railway officials. They do not compare with the statements which come from the men themselves, and I think it would only be fair that the two sides should be made known in order that either one, if it is inaccurate, should be corrected.

There are further instances I wish to point out; and I may here remark that it is a strange thing that so much of this trouble should emanate from the London and North-Western Company. Why this is the case I am unable to say. But it seems to me that the fault lies either with the railway companies or the Board of Trade, or both. I hope to hear from the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade as to whether it is with his Department, or with the railway companies, that the fault lies in regard to this extraordinary delay in obtaining decisions in regard to complaints of long hours of service on our railways. I made a representation on behalf of the wagon examiners employed by the London and North-Western Company at Newark and Doncaster. These men have to deal with moving vehicles and their occupation is most dangerous, but, nevertheless, though the Act of Parliament was passed in 1893, it has taken till April of this year for the Board of Trade to find out that they cannot act in the case of men who are

wagon examiners, though they are not employed on premises belonging to the London and North-Western Company, they are employees of that company, and work London and North-Western traffic at Newark and Doncaster. To my mind, the spirit of the Act was, and is, that the men employed by the company should be under the Act so far as hours of employment are concerned, without drawing the line so fine as it endeavoured to draw it in this particular instance. The Board of Trade pointed out to me that they could not act, as they say;

"for the reason that the employees in question were not engaged in working the traffic on any part of the lines of the company by whom they were employed."

I wrote again, and on 19th April they replied and promised to follow the case up. Mr. Hopwood said in his letter;

"I am, however, to add that the Board will give renewed consideration to the matter, and, should it appear desirable, will be further advised therein."

This opposition has simply been raised by the London and North-Western Company or the Board of Trade to find out the interpretation of the particular words in the Act of 1893, "engaged in working the traffic on any part of the lines of the company." It is with a view to facilitating matters a little more in this direction that I have felt myself obliged to trouble the House with these few remarks to-night. I think it most extraordinary that from twelve to eighteen months should be occupied in ascertaining whether or not the men employed in the signal cabin at a particular station are working excessive hours or not. I do not for a moment believe that all this unnecessary delay is due to the Board of Trade. I am familiar with the process of negotiating with the railway companies, and I find that this is one of the best cards they have to play; this delay in the negotiations. Rightly or wrongly they believe; and I believe rightly with

many people; that if they delay long enough in negotiation those who negotiate with them will get sick and tired of the whole business and let them have their own way. That is the exact position with regard to the hours of labour of railwaymen. It is not the fact that the number of complaints have become fewer because the railway companies have been so considerate as to reduce the number of hours. I have pointed out that in two instances sixty-eight men have worked upwards of one hundred hours, and that in itself is enough to prove what I have said.

And now I feel compelled to call attention to the exceedingly heavy number of railway accidents that occur on our railways. We have been discussing tonight for a considerable time the number of men killed and wounded in South Africa. I am bound, before we terminate this session, to say a word or two on behalf of those who are killed and wounded in our industries in this country, and particularly those killed and wounded on our railways. These accidents on our railways are continually progressing. There has been a very heavy increase last year, though since July, 1899, we have had an Act for the Prevention of Accidents to Railway Servants. I am not going to dwell on that for any length of time. I know that Lord James of Hereford is considering the rules drafted by the Board of Trade, but in regard to these rules, as in regard to the provisions of the Hours of Labour Act, I am afraid that the railway companies are impeding the action of the Board of Trade. In the matter of the rules they are pressing on the Board of Trade too many amendments. Their action is the same with regard to all measures which pass this House which are intended for the amelioration of the condition of their employees. They do everything they can to prevent their successful operation. The time has come when something should be done by the Board of Trade to bring pressure to bear on these people to compel their co-operation in the saving of the lives and limbs of railwaymen. I will not trouble the House with reference to all the railway accidents, but a return has been made out bearing upon those which occur in connection with thirty-six different grades or sections of railwaymen employed. One-third of the fatal accidents and more than half the accidents resulting in injury to railwaymen occurred in connection with six grades only out of the thirty-six. In the case of the capstan men we find that last year one in every 131 was killed, and 1 in 11 was injured;

in the case of yardsmen 1 in every 165 was killed, and 1 in every 58 was injured; in the case of the shunters 1 in every 197 was killed, and 1 in every 12 was injured; in the case of the goods guards 1 in every 267 was killed, and 1 in every 15 was injured; of the drivers 1 in every 673 was killed, and 1 in every 33 injured; and of the firemen 1 in every 789 was killed, and 1 in every 27 injured. No less than 181 were killed and 2,667 injured in those six grades. One in 391 of the whole number was killed, and 1 in 26 injured. I find that in these six grades there are 70,759 men employed. The same companies employ 68,661 mechanics; just 2,000 less than the number of men employed in the six grades I have enumerated. Of these 68,661, only 19 were killed and 47 injured, or 1 in 3,613 killed and 1 in 1,461 injured. I mention these figures to draw attention to the fact that the mechanics are under the protection of the Factories and

Workshops Act, and that they are better protected than the men employed in these more dangerous trades connected with the railways. I mention them to press on the Board of Trade the necessity of doing all they possibly can to facilitate the operation of the new rules. It should be remembered that the injuries sustained by our railwaymen are not slight injuries, and between the war and the railways I am afraid that ere long we shall have half our male population going about our streets cripples. In the six grades with which I have been dealing I find that 31 lost legs or feet, 14 arms or hands, and 19 fingers or toes. Two grades were the principal sufferers in these respects, namely, shunters and goods guards. Of the shunters, 9,244 in number, 47 were killed and 693 injured. Ten lost their legs or feet, 2 lost their arms or hands, and 4 lost their fingers or toes. Of the goods guards, 14,720 in number, 55 were killed and 877 injured, 12 lost their legs or feet, 5 lost their arms or hands, and 7 lost their fingers or toes.

Now, this is too serious a matter to be allowed to slip by, and I certainly think that everything that can be done should be done to prevent these horrible accidents on our railways. I am not going at this hour; half-past one o'clock; of the morn-

ing to put before the House all I had intended saying. We on the railways advocate shorter hours, and I will apply the principle we profess to the best of my ability. I am, however, forced by the exigencies of the occasion and the importance of the questions with which I have to deal, to avail myself of this opportunity. And I must say a word or two in reference to replies the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade has given on one or two occasions to myself and several other Members as to automatic couplings on our railways. He has said that the matter has not been lost sight of. Well, it has been within sight for the last twenty years, but I trust that during the next twenty years it will come much closer to the view than it has been in the past. I am afraid that the accidents which occur are not all accurately reported. Some accidents occur through the coupling pole which do not get reported at all as coupling accidents. I have here one or two cases in point to show that accidents occur which are primarily due to the want of automatic couplings, though they are not reported as coupling accidents. One poor fellow was killed at Newark on the 4th August. He had to run with the brake by the side of the wagons and was forced to carry his coupling pole with him. He was not in the act of coupling, or uncoupling, but it appears from the evidence given at the inquest that the accident was due to his shunting pole getting between two broken pales of a fence or gate attached to the checker's hut. It was pointed out that where the truck was passing a space of eighteen or nineteen inches only would be left. The man was thrown down under the wheels of the wagon he was guiding. The accident was not reported as an accident due to coupling or uncoupling, but the instrument which, in the absence of automatic couplings, he was obliged to use in coupling operations, was the primary cause of the accident. The accident, therefore, should have been called a coupling accident. I have another case here which will show that the Act of Parliament as it was passed is not made a proper use of by the Board of

Trade. It is a case in which an accident undoubtedly took place, but in which the Board say they cannot interfere, because nobody was killed. It is not only in fatal cases that inquiries ought to be made. I want to see inquiries made before people are killed, in order to prevent fatalities. The case I am now referring to took place at Kircaldy Harbour, on the 10th April, 1901, on the North British Railway. It was on a mineral branch line. The branch line is on a falling gradient of one in forty part of the way. The engine which works on the line is only fitted with a hand-break. No break-van is used. The guard has to fix sprags in the wagon wheels. On the morning of the accident the guard only succeeded in fixing one sprag, instead of three. The train gained speed and got out of the men's control. The fireman had to jump off the engine to hold a pair of catch-points over, in consequence of the boy who does this usually not being on duty then (5-10 a.m.). The train ran right over the pier into the water (at any rate the engine and some wagons did so), and the driver had to jump off. The train consisted of an engine and six wagons. No one was injured. I asked the Board of Trade to hold an inquiry, but Mr. Hopwood on the 18th April replied that;

"as this accident occurred on a mineral line and no person was injured, it is not one that the company are required, to report to this Department."

I maintain that accidents such as this should be inquired into. The driver in the case I have referred to was a fortunate fellow, and had a happy escape, but if he had remained on his engine, and had gone into the harbour with it, he would in all probability have been drowned, and an inquiry then would have taken place. I want to know what is the use of an Act to prevent accidents to railway employees if we have to wait until some one is killed or injured before an inquiry is held? I find in Major Druitt's report of the locomotive boiler explosion on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway at Knottingley, on March 11th last, that the inspector reports;

"The main cause of the explosion was the use of an unsuitable material for the fire-box stays, some of which were defective at the time of the explosion."

I have put several questions to the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade as to this matter, and the House will agree that according to this report I was perfectly justified in so doing. The Lancashire and Yorkshire Company have adopted a new system, and I find no fault with the economy of the company in that respect. I do not complain of their using a more powerful engine and working it at high pressure, but what I wish to make clear is that this company have eight or nine more engines of the same class, and that the men complain that the pressure is so high, and the material used in the construction so bad, that a great deal of leakage occurs, and the drivers could not work the trains properly. This engine exploded, two poor fellows were blown to atoms, and an inquiry was held by Major Druitt, who has given as the cause of the accident the employment of unsuitable material. Well, I should like to ask whether or not the Board has made inquiries, or proposes to make inquiries, in respect to the other engines of the same class belonging to the company, to find out if the stays of those engines are made of the same material as those of the engine that was destroyed? There ought to be some such inquiry before any more men are blown

to pieces. It is very unfortunate indeed that these things do occur. I know they can be prevented, and in connection with this particular engine I refer to I think the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade will remember that I put a question to him on the subject six weeks ago. Before this engine exploded she was leaking so badly that the driver on one occasion had to take his train into a siding, unable to get steam enough to work it home. And because this occurred; not through his own negligence, but owing to the bad construction of the engine, as was amply demonstrated six weeks afterwards when she blew up; the result of his leaving his train and taking his engine to the shed empty was that the driver was reduced in the company's service to the extent of 1s. or 1s. 6d. a day. And he is in that reduced position to-day, and all because he could not work his engine. The blowing up of the engine, surely, is sufficient proof that

the man was innocent on that occasion. The last point I have to put to the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade is as to whether it is not possible for him to get his inspectors to present their reports of inquiries with greater despatch. It was important that this should be done, as it was now becoming the practice or custom for the railway companies to delay reinstating men. In this way, if anything happens, and there is reason to think that the men are to blame, they are suspended whilst a Board of Trade inquiry takes place, and they are not reinstated until such time as the Board of Trade publishes its Report. In this way, six weeks, or two months, or ten weeks, or three months may pass before the Report comes; the men are suffering a loss of wages all the time, and then, when they are reinstated, even if the Report of the Board of Trade is not unfavourable to them, the sum of money deducted from wages during this long period is too much for the companies to hand back to the men. The treatment of the men is not, by any means, such as the railway companies say it is, and therefore I can only seek to apply the same remedy to their grievances as the companies themselves apply; that is to say, make the best use of this House in the endeavour to secure the best possible conditions for the men employed on our railways. I find that the chairman of the Chatham and Dover Company (Mr. Forbes) complained bitterly at the half-yearly meeting the other day that the men were nursed too much by the Board of Trade. He said they were wet-nursed by the Board of Trade. I can assure him and the House that the contrary is the case. The men are not wet-nursed by the Board of Trade. It is in the case of the companies that the wet-nursing is practised. I maintain that in the very instance I am dealing with, namely, the delay in furnishing the reports of the inspectors who make inquiries, is a wet-nursing of the companies. I am not inventing this charge myself, but I hold that I have quite as much ground for saying that the companies are wet-nursed as Mr. Forbes, one of their chairmen, has for saying that the men are wet-nursed by the Board of Trade. This chairman says at a shareholders' meeting that they are in such a helpless, powerless condition

now that they can only look to Parliament to help them. Well, the companies have a fair stock of directors and shareholders in this House, and they advocate the taking of measures to increase their number. I think if the railway companies

find it to their advantage to have directors in the House, the men are in duty bound to look to securing a similar advantage in the interest of the safety of their own lives and limbs. They are bound to make every use of every Act of Parliament passed for their protection, and to secure the good offices of the Board of Trade wherever and whenever they can, in order to improve the conditions of their service.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The hon. Member for Derby has addressed himself mainly to two subjects, namely, the Hours of Labour Act and its administration by the Board of Trade, and the Railway Accidents Act, and I will deal briefly with each of these. The hon. Member has called attention to the fact that the applications under the Hours Act have undoubtedly diminished, almost from the first hour in which the Act was passed. That diminution is attributed in the Report of the Board of Trade to a tendency on the part of the companies themselves to adjust the hours to a reasonable length, and I think, notwithstanding what has fallen from the hon. Gentleman, that that is the real reason why the applications have diminished so much in number. There were only forty-one applications last year, and I doubt whether for the year ending in July last there will have been half that number. The hon. Member attributes this diminution to quite a different cause, namely, to the delays of the Board, and the disgust of the men at the delays. Undoubtedly the hon. Member has adduced some instances in which the time taken in negotiation between the Board and the companies has seemed to be inordinately long. I am not prepared to discuss these particular cases; I could not do so without referring to Papers and studying the actual course of negotiations which have taken place; but I would remind the hon. Member of this. If the Board of Trade on full investigation made an order, and the company did not obey it, there is what is equivalent to an appeal to the Railway Commissioners. The Board of Trade itself is powerless to enforce an order except through the Railway Commissioners, and if what is equivalent to an appeal to the Railway Commissioners were resorted to by the companies, I am afraid that the delays would be greater than they are at present. The officials of the Board of Trade have been able to obtain a satisfactory settlement in a very large number of cases, and in no case has it been necessary to enforce their order through the medium of the Railway Commissioners. This I say to the credit of those officials. As to the particular cases the hon. Gentleman has mentioned, I would say that if there has been undue delay in a special case it would be well that he should make an appeal. I would then examine that case, and, if necessary, and I thought there had been undue delay, I would take care that steps should be taken to hasten the proceedings, but so far as I am aware I have had no personal appeal from the hon. Member with respect to any of these cases. I hope that in future he will appeal to me personally on the subject, and I can assure him that the appeal shall have my best attention.

Now I come to the question of accidents. The hon. Member has admitted that so far as, the drawing up of rules under the Accidents Prevention Act of last year is concerned, there has, since the beginning of this year, been no undue delay. I think he is cognisant of what is passing, namely, that we are doing our best to come to an arrangement with the railway companies by which the draft rules

already published shall be accepted as far as possible, either in their original or in a modified form, by the railway companies, so that all appeal to the Railway Commissioners provided for under the Act may be avoided. But there are one or two other matters that the hon. Member has referred to. There is, for instance, automatic couplings. The position with regard to that is this; I think I stated it the other day in reply to a question; it is simply that any couplers which may be adopted, automatic or otherwise, must be capable of being adapted to all railways, so that traffic belonging to one company may be run on the line of any other company. To secure this uniformity, it is desirable that the companies themselves should be satisfied as to what is the best form of coupler. They are making experiments at the present moment with various kinds of couplings, and until these experiments have been carried further than they have gone at present I do not think it would be wise for the Board of Trade to put in operation the powers they possess under the Act. But as the hon. Gentleman has said, I stated the other day the course which I proposed to follow. If after experiments and a certain lapse of time nothing of a satisfactory character is accomplished by the railway companies, it will be necessary for the Board of Trade to intervene in some way or other. I can assure the hon. Gentleman that I have not lost sight of the matter.

The next point of the hon. Member was a complaint as to the Board of Trade having been asked to inquire into an accident, but having declined on the ground that there had been no loss of life or injury to limb. In this matter I may say it is for the Board to comply with the law as it stands. If we were to go further than that, and inquire into the causes of all accidents, we should require to have a regular army of inspectors, and we should be destroying the responsibility of the companies on which the safety of their working depends. So far as I am able to judge, I do not think it would be desirable to introduce, in the case of railways, a system of inspection similar to that in use in the case of factories. I am sure it would throw on the Government Department a task which it would be almost impossible to undertake. I would illustrate that by reference to the explosion which lately occurred on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway. The cause of that explosion appears to have been the weakness of the material of which the stays in the fire-box were composed. The hon. Member would appear to suggest that the proper course to adopt would be to inspect the locomotive before an accident happened to see whether or not they were properly constructed, so that accidents of this kind could be avoided. But such inspection would be impossible;

*MR. BELL: No, no. What I suggested was that something should be done in the case of the engines of the same class as that which exploded. I said that the railway company had a number of engines of a similar class, and I wished to know what steps were to be taken to ascertain whether or not the fire-box stays were made of the same material.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not think we could do more than we have done; that is, to report in the case of the accident, and to call the attention of the company to the fact that the accident arose from the weakness of the material of which the stays were composed. Of course, the companies in all these cases take notice

of the reports, and I have no doubt they will take steps to remedy the weakness which the inspector in this case has discovered. I believe that already they are doing that, and are substituting for the amalgamation or alloy of which the stay is composed a copper stay. The only other matter dealt with is the despatch in publishing the reports of the inspectors. I am not prepared to admit that there is any unnecessary delay. If the hon. Member studies the reports on these accidents; and I am sure he does; he will see that they are of a nature which require a considerable amount of labour on the part of the inspectors. The report as to the Lancashire and Yorkshire accident itself is one evincing the great care and labour bestowed on the inquiry by the inspector. I do not believe there is unnecessary delay, but here, again, if he can show me that this is the case; if he will confer with me personally; I will certainly look into any case submitted to me, and do all I can to reduce the delay in making the reports. I will reduce it to the smallest possible point.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: May I venture to make an appeal to the House to bring this discussion to a close. As we all know, the strain on the House has been very great. We have sat now for three successive days for more than twelve hours each day. Everyone whom I am addressing knows that it is the general wish that we should separate on Saturday, but that can only be done by getting through this and other Bills on the Order Paper to-night. I hope that will be done without throwing on the officials and ourselves a really intolerable burthen.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.) said he desired to make two observations with reference to the question raised by his hon. friend the Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool. At the same time he desired to acquiesce in the request made by the right hon. Gentleman, and would confine his remarks to the question of the evicted tenants on a particular estate which he knew very well, namely, the Clanricarde estate, and he trusted he should be able to prove that the Plan of Campaign was in no way responsible for the conflict which had taken place between Lord Clanricarde and his tenants, and that the tenants did everything which any impartial tribunal would expect of them in order to avoid a conflict.

*MR. SPEAKER: How does the hon. Member make that question bear on the salary of the Chief Secretary or on any other Vote? The hon. Gentleman cannot now discuss the land question.

MR. ROCHE said he thought he was entitled to discuss the position of the evicted tenants with the hope, however faint, that something might be done to reinstate them.

*MR. SPEAKER: By legislation?

MR. ROCHE: Yes, Sir.

*MR. SPEAKER: Legislation cannot be discussed on the Appropriation Bill; it must be a legislative matter.

MR. ROCHE said that they were promised a Land Bill which they did not see.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order order! That question does not arise.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said that in the absence of the Chief Secretary he would ask the Attorney General for some information with reference to the man McGoohan, who was one of his constituents. He had been pressing that case on the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General for some time, and he admitted that

they had met him very fairly. They had decided that the man was unfairly convicted and that he would be given substantial compensation. He now wished to know what was the amount of the compensation. The man was charged with cutting the tails off cattle and that offence was proved against him by a police sergeant named Sheridan, whom the Dublin Castle authorities since discovered was a scoundrel and who was dismissed from the police force.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.) said that the question the hon. Member asked was precisely the question which his right hon. friend the Chief Secretary had refused to answer.

MR. TULLY said that that was what he complained of. He wished to know whether the compensation would be on the scale of that granted to another innocent man in his constituency named Hepburn, who was sentenced to imprisonment for life for a crime of which another man afterwards admitted he was guilty. Hepburn was released, and got a couple of thousand pounds compensation for the imprisonment he had suffered. Would McGoochan be compensated on the same liberal terms?

MR. ATKINSON said that the Chief Secretary had stated that the man would get compensation, but it was obviously undesirable to state the amount.

MR. TULLY said if he got compensation on the scale given to Hepburn he would be satisfied.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) desired to direct attention to a question of legal procedure which had occurred in Ireland during the last few days. Everyone knew it was impossible to convert to Protestantism either a Catholic or a Jew without expending more money than it was worth, but there appeared to be in England a faction which was determined to spend large sums in endeavouring to convert Irish Catholics. On the 26th June last an evangelistic platform was pulled down in the county of Wexford and some farmers were charged with pulling it down.

They were dis-

charged by the local bench. What happened? Did the Government wonder why law and order were held in such contempt in Ireland or why no Irishman expected anything like fairness in such matters. Nearly two months had elapsed since those men were discharged, and on Monday last the local resident magistrate, Sir Robert Paul, was passed over and a gentleman named Meldon was brought down from the county of Wicklow to the town of Wexford, where he visited the local sessional prosecutor, Mr. Cooper, and between the two of them they concocted warrants against the men who had been discharged from custody and who would have attended on summonses. At three o'clock in the morning a posse of police twenty or thirty in number dragged those ten farmers from their beds and brought them in cars not to their own petty sessions district at Ferns but to Gorey. Meldon stayed in Wexford all night although his residence was in Bray and proceeded by the 10.15 train to Gorey, the Crown Prosecutor travelling with him in the same carriage. As soon as they arrived a special court was assembled and the ten men were brought before it over the miserable question of a Wexford hut. What did Meldon do? The Commissions of the Justices of Peace as he understood had expired owing to the six months which had elapsed since the demise of the Crown. He supposed Mr. Meldon's commission had not elapsed but however that might be, he sat as a

special court in Gorey, and the men applied for an adjournment in order to have professional advice. Meldon, who knew that the local magistrates would get resworn if he gave any time, refused to grant an adjournment longer than up to Friday but he said that for the convenience of the accused he would adjourn the case to Ferns, where he would sit alone and return the men for trial at the next winter assizes, so that they would not be tried in Wexford at all.

They were asked to respect law and order. It was impossible. He had tried to do it, but it was no good. These instances were of importance only because they were symptomatic. When you are prepared to go these lengths over the petty question of whether a man should preach the Gospel in his own extraordinary way, how could a man expect that the law would be administered fairly and decently when the great question of landlord and tenant came up? It must be remembered that the Irish had an educated clergy. But these fellows were converted on the Monday, and you sent them down to convert Catholics on the Tuesday. They heard their vulgar accents and their bad grammar; they heard them shouting the name of God in what, to his mind, was a blasphemous manner; all this in the midst of a population with an educated clergy, and who revered the name of God. Was it surprising that the people rose against this abominable spirit? He regretted that they threw over this Gospel tent, or this blasphemy Inferno, as he would prefer to call it, but could that be wondered

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Firbank, Joseph Thomas

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Fisher, William Hayes

Lucas. Reginald J. (Portsmouth)

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud)

Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)

Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Gardner, Ernest

Macdona, John Cumming

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

Maconochie, A. W.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Majendie, James A. H.

Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Gordon. Maj Evans- (T'r H'mlets
Malcolm, Ian
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Beach. Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Bignold, Arthur
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Maxwell, Rt. Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Bill, Charles
Greene, W. Raymond-t Cambs.)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Gretton, John
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Brassey, Albert
Groves, James Grimble
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hambro, Charles Eric
Morgan. David J (Walthamstow
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Banbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Caldwell, James
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Mount, William Arthur
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Murray (Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Helder, Augustus
Nicholson, William Graham
Chamberlain. Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.

Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Charrington, Spencer
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Pretymann, Ernest George
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Horniman, Frederick John
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Purvis, Robert
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Randles, John S.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Ridley. Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Colville, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Robertson, Herbert. (Hackney)
Cranborne, Viscount
Keswick, William
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Davenport, William Bromley-
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lawson, John Grant
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Llewellyn, Evan Henry

Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Long. R Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lowther, Rt. Hn J W (C'mb Penr)
Spear, John Ward

at? The Protestants of England, who expected their name to be respected, sent down into an area in which he had no jurisdiction a paid minion to re-try these men, to drag them out of their beds at three or four o'clock in the morning, to arrange the nice intricacies of the law in order to enmesh them and send them off to a foreign venue at the next winter assizes. And this was done in the name of law and order. That law and order would never get respect from the Irish people. They despised it. Those who did these things in the name of law and order would only cause law and order to be despised, and their own names, however high they were, would be despised in addition.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 141; Noes, 49. (Division List No. 476.)

Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Tollemache, Henry James
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk Mid
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Valentia, Viscount
Wodehouse. Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Sturt, Hn. Hvmphry Napier
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Thomas, J. A. (Glamorgan, Gow.
Williams, Rt. Hn J. Powell- (Birm.
Thornton, Percy M.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York. E. R.)
NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ambrose, Robert
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Joyce, Michael

O'Malley, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Loamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Govern, T.
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cullinan, J.
Murnaghan, George
Roche, John
Delany, William
Murphy, John
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Dillon, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sullivan, Donal
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N.)
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Tully, Jasper
Field, William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Doherty, William
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Bill read a second time and committed for to-morrow.
NAVAL WORKS BILL.
Considered in Committee;;
(In the Committee.)

[Mr. J. W. LOWTHER (Cumberland, Penrith) in the Chair.]

Clause 1::

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said that a quarter past two in the morning on the last day but one of the session was not a proper opportunity to discuss a proposal of this magnitude authorising the expenditure of £;27,000,000. They had been appealed to by the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the score of economy, but he was afraid that they were now spending their money very recklessly. He was in favour of doing everything that could possibly be done to strengthen the fleet, and to defences of a maritime character he raised no objection. But he wished to point out that in regard to Naval works in the past there had been a very great amount of extravagance. They were now practically giving the Government a vote of credit amounting to several millions of money, and as to the way that money was going to be spent they knew nothing at all. A number of hon. Gentlemen interested in this matter were not in attendance, and at this time of the morning he would content himself by merely making his protest against bringing a Bill of this magnitude forward so late in the session, and in future when a Bill of this character was introduced he hoped it would be brought in earlier.

Clause agreed to.

Other clauses and schedule agreed to.

Bill reported, without amendment; to be read the third time to-morrow.

MILITARY WORKS BILL.

Considered in Committee::

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1::

MR. DILLON said he proposed to move the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Member for West Islington. The finance of this Bill as he ventured to point out yesterday, was totally different from the finance of the Naval Works Bill.

There was no doubt that the Naval Works Bill, in common decency, ought to occupy one night at least more, and he had not yet obtained one single word of explanation in regard to the totally different systems of finance adopted in these two Bills. In the case

of the Naval Works Bill, no matter what the liability for work might be, they were asked to vote in the present Bill only so much money as it was estimated by the Board of Admiralty could be spent in the next two years. In the case of the Military Works Bill they were asked to vote borrowing powers equal to the total estimated cost of the work. The result of this policy in previous years had been simply ludicrous; for whereas in the present Bill they were called upon to vote a fresh credit of £;6,000,000, the Government admitted that they had an unexpended balance of £;7,000,000. He thought that was a reckless system of finance, and the comparisons he had made showed that even the War Office had already got a long way ahead of the Admiralty in regard to extravagance. The moment the War Office estimated for work, although that work might extend over ten years, they demanded the full amount to cover the whole period. That was a most extravagant and slovenly method of finance. The War Office ought to be content, like the Admiralty, with the sum really required for the current year.

He objected also to the clause on the ground that the fortification of London would be a monstrous and grotesque waste of money. The Secretary of State for War and the Under Secretary had sketched out a proposal to fortify London by a chain of fortified posts. Nothing could be more preposterous and absurd than this proposal at a time when Paris, which was more exposed to invasion, intended to abolish the fortifications and turn them into boulevards.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 8, to leave out the word 'six,' and insert the word 'two.'"; (Mr. Dillon); instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'six' stand part of the clause."

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton: In regard to the last part of the hon. Member's speech lean assure him that neither the money undisposed of nor any other money will be taken for the defence of London proper. All the money which will be voted tonight is allotted simply for those sea-

board defences, which I think he will agree are necessary. With regard to the method in which this Bill is drafted and the difference between it and the Naval Works Bill, I do not attempt to explain the difference, but I wish to point out the method on which this Bill is drawn. We ask for certain works, and we state to the House what we believe is the total amount the works will cost. We do not ask the House or the country all at once to put to the credit of the War Office the sum mentioned in Clause 1 of the Bill. We simply ask that the House should authorise the completion of these particular works, and that they should understand at the same time what the works will cost. We ask the House to authorise us to go on up to the limit of expenditure set down for that particular item. It is put before the House and the country in as clear a way as we possibly can. The full liability as to the works to be constructed is known, but nothing is asked from the country in the way of actual cash until the time comes when we want the money to pay it over to the contractor who is carrying out the works. It will therefore be seen that there is no difference of method between ourselves and the Admiralty.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) said the money was not only asked by the War Office, but they got authority to draw it when they wanted it, and that was what the Admiralty did not do. The War Office asked for money before they wanted it, and he agreed with the hon. Member for East Mayo that it was a most extravagant way of dealing. He thought the Admiralty system was infinitely preferable.

SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) objected to voting money for defence works when they were not told where the money was to be spent. He congratulated the War Office upon having abandoned the policy of fortifying London. He thought that was satisfactory progress in the true direction. Was any of this money to be spent on Wei-hai-wei?

LORD STANLEY: No.

SIR JOHN COLOMB: The War Office were getting in the thin end of the wedge for the fortification of Wei-hai-wei.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS protested against the scandal of asking the House to sanction

the expenditure of several millions of money at three o'clock in the morning at the very end of the session.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) asked the noble Lord whether any unexpended balance in connection with works which had been authorised and not completed would be diverted to new works, and, if not, what would be done with money now voted and not spent? Could any

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Gordon. Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)

More, Robt. J. (Shropshire)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud)

Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'r H'mlets

Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Gore. Hon S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)

Mount, William Arthur

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury

Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)

Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)

Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)

Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)

Balfour, Rt. Hon Gerald W. (Leeds

Gretton, John

Nicholson, William Graham

Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.

Groves, James Grimble

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks

Hambro, Charles Eric

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Bignold, Arthur

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.

Pretyman, Ernest George

Bill, Charles

Harris, Frederick Leverton

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Blundell, Colonel Henry
Haslett, Sir James Homer
Purvis, Robert
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Randles, John S.
Brassey, Albert
Helder, Augustus
Reid, James (Greenock)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Ridley Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Caldwell, James
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
(Harrington, Spencer
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Keswick, William
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lawson, John Grant
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Spear, John Ward
Colville, John

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Cranborne, Viscount
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Davenport, William Bromley-
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Dickson, Charles Scott
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Thornton, Percy M.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Tollemache, Henry James
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Macdonald, John Cumming
Valentia, Viscount
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Maconochie, A. W.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Williams, Rt. Hn J. Powell- (Birm.
Fielden Edward Brocklehurst
Majendie, James A. H.
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks. E. R.)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Malcolm, Ian
Wodehouse. Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Fisher, William Hayes
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H E (Wigt'n
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Gardner, Ernest
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Duffy, William J.

Ambrose, Robert
Crean, Eugene
Field, William
Barry, E. (Cork. S.)
Cullinan, J.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Delany, William
Flynn, James Christopher
Clancy, John Joseph
Dillon, John
Gilhooly, James
Cogan, Denis J.
Doogan, P. C.
Hayden, John Patrick

of the money be spent on the defences of Wei-hai-wei or London?

LORD STANLEY: With any unexpended balance no new works of any kind can be begun.

The whole of the works we intend to begin are in the schedule and in front of the House, and no new works besides these will be commenced.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes 126; Noes 52. (Division List No. 477.)

Hayne. Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

Nannetti, Joseph P.

Power, Patrick Joseph

Healy, Timothy Michael

Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)

Reddy, M.

Horniman, Frederick John

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, S.)

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Joyce, Michael

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel Sullivan, Donal

Leamy, Edmund

O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)

Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N.

Lundon, W.

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

Tully, Jasper

O'Doherty, William

Mac Donnell, Dr. Mark A.

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.

M'Govern, T.

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)

Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)

M'Killop, W. (Sligo, N.)

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Mansfield, Horace Rendall

O'Malley, William

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Murnaghan, George

O'Mara, James

Murphy, John

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

*MR. HERBERT LEWIS said he wished to reiterate the protest which he had made in regard to the Naval Works Bill. He thought it was a scandalous thing that they should be called upon to sanction the expenditure of several millions at three o'clock in the morning. This was oligarchic Imperialism, not democratic Imperialism. He protested against it in the name of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was absent. He wished to refer the House to a most admirable speech which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had delivered at the Mansion House to the bankers and merchants of the City of London on 26th June last. He thought that when the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made an appeal for a party of economy, that appeal should receive some response, and if there was only one man to stand up in response to that appeal he should be that man. The right hon. Gentleman had given some very sensible advice in regard to the opinions offered by experts in these military and naval matters. He said;

"In all these matters, and in many others to which I need not allude, we are always, of course, confronted with the professional expert. Now, I have seen a good deal in my public life of the professional expert. He is always cocksure, he always differs from another expert, he is always expensive, and he is not infallible. He is gifted with an unbounded belief in the inexhaustibility of the public purse, and with a supreme contempt and disgust for any Treasury official, or any Chancellor of the Exchequer who checks him in the realisation of his momentary fancies. Hear the experts by all means, weigh carefully whatever they put before you, but in your public affairs, as in your private affairs, act with prudence, intelligence, and judgment, and weigh their advice before you take it."

Alas, had not that been proved by the experience of the House of military experts and their theories? They had been warned that if they did not vote these ten or twenty millions they would be traitors to the true interests of the country. He would ask who were those who had been the true patriots, and had built up its great trade and commerce? It was the men who advocated public economy and retrenchment. These Bills meant heavy taxation. It might be that they were necessary, but if so they had been made necessary by the policy of the Government, which had estranged Great Britain from every nation on the face of the earth. These Bills, which were practically votes of credit given blindfold to the Government, had been forced on the House at the end of the session, and he asked an explicit assurance that that would not be repeated, and that when next a Naval or Military Works Bill was introduced it should be brought forward at an early period of the session. He hoped that the House of Commons would try

to regain some of its liberty of criticism and control, which had been rapidly passing away from it.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2 agreed to.

Schedule;;

*MR. HERBERT LEWIS said that the first item in the Schedule was three-quarters of a million, and there was no indication as to where the money was to be spent. It was perfectly well known that there was not the slightest difficulty in foreign Governments, who knew the way to go about it, obtaining every information in regard to these works, and he wanted to know why the Government hid these works with an impenetrable veil of secrecy from the House. Certain payments were to be made in distant parts of the world, particularly in regard to some of the colonies. He especially wished to know what the expenditure was for at Esqui-

mault. He also drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that there was no contribution whatever from Canada. In Australia the population was taxed for naval and military purposes at the rate of 3s. per head, whereas the inhabitants of this country were taxed 33s. per head for these purposes. We only received £136,000 from Australia and New Zealand on condition that our Fleet was maintained in these waters.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said he should like some explanation with reference to the £164,000 which was asked for for expenditure in Egypt. He observed that under the head of ranges there were items for mobilisation and store-rooms, which had absolutely nothing to do with ranges. It was perfectly absurd that they should be included in the Vote for rifle ranges. All he desired was that it should not be thought that they were spending over £1,000,000 on rifle ranges when less than half a million was being actually spent. This was a sham, and made it appear as if the War Office were putting up more ranges than they were actually doing. The answer of the Financial Secretary to the Treasury on the previous night was very indefinite. No doubt the hon. Gentleman was anxious to do what he could, but his answer was only a general expression of anxiety on his part to do well.

MR. F. W. WILSON (Norfolk, Mid) said he desired to support the remarks of his hon. friend. Ranges were being mixed up with artillery and other matters, with the result that the public thought that money was being spent on them, whereas it was being actually spent in other directions. The country would not be satisfied until the Government took up the question of providing rifle ranges seriously.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal Co., N.) said that like the hon. Member for North Louth he frankly admitted he had not an Imperial soul, and the matter he desired to raise had no connection with Gibraltar or any other outpost of the Empire, but referred to his own constituency. Under the Military Works Act of 1897;

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not entitled to discuss the Military Works Act of 1897. He must confine himself to the Bill before the Committee.

MR. O'DOHERTY said that fortifications were at present being constructed at the entrance to Lough Swilly, which prevented a great number of fishermen from

following their calling, thereby inflicting a great hardship on them. He would suggest that a few hundred pounds should be spent for a boat slip in that district in order that the fishermen might still be able to pursue their calling. He understood that there was no objection as far as the military authorities were concerned. If that were not granted, the breadwinners of fifty or sixty families would be turned out of employment. He hoped the matter would be inquired into, and that he would receive a satisfactory assurance from the noble Lord.

MR. TULLY said he wished to move to omit the reference to rifle ranges. [Several HON. MEMBERS: Not rifle ranges.] Then in deference to his hon. friends he would move an Amendment with reference to Bermuda. He was anxious to have the grant for Bermuda struck out. Whenever the First Lord of the Treasury was in the House, especially at such an early hour in the morning, he was always closed.

*THE CHAIRMAN; The hon. Member must now confine himself to Bermuda.

MR. TULLY said he objected to £84,000 being spent in Bermuda, because he had noticed that the Government were sending Boer prisoners there, just as Irish prisoners of war were sent to that island. Was the money required for barracks for the Boer prisoners? If it was, he objected to Imperial money being spent for imprisoning those gallant men.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Member will look at the Bill he will see that there is nothing about prisoners in it. He must confine himself strictly to his motion.

MR. TULLY said he would move to reduce the grant to Bermuda by £80,000 Amendment proposed;

"In page 4, line 4, to leave out '£84,000' in order to insert '£4,000.'"; (Mr. Tully.)

Question proposed, "That '£84,000' stand part of the Schedule."

LORD STANLEY said he was afraid he could not accept the Amendment, nor did he suppose that the hon. Member imagined for a moment that he would. The money was to provide barrack accommodation for an infantry battalion, and also for some small minor works which had to be carried out.

MR. TULLY said that after the satisfactory explanation of the noble Lord he would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DILLON said that there were many items in the Bill to which under other circumstances he should feel bound to call attention, but he would confine himself to moving the omission of one item, namely, £164,000 for providing barrack

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

Johnston, William (Belfast)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Doxford, Sir W. Theodore
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Fellowes, Hon. A. Edward
Keswick, William
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lawson, John Grant
Balfour. Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds)
Fisher, William Hayes
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Foster, Philip S. (War wick, S. W.)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Gardner, Ernest
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Bignold, Arthur
Godson, Sir A. Frederick
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Bill, Charles
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gordon, Maj. Evans- (T'r H'mlts)
Macdona, John Cumming
Brassey, Albert
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Maconochie, A. W.
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Caldwell, James
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)

Majendie, James A. H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Malcolm, Ian
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Gretton, John
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Groves, James Grimble
Maxwell, Rt. Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. Wm.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Charrington, Spencer
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
More, Robert Jasper (Shropsh)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Helder, Augustus
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Mount, William Arthur
Colvile, John
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Cranborne, Viscount
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Davenport, William Bromley-
Horniman, Frederick John
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Nicholson, William Graham

accommodation in Egypt. He specially selected that item because he thought it involved a very large question of policy. Of course the expenditure meant a public statement of the intention of Great Britain to break her solemn pledge to

Europe and to maintain a permanent occupation in Egypt. They knew perfectly well that that had always been the intention of the Government, but it was a different matter to vote £;164,000 for permanent barrack accommodation in that country, which would be declaring to Europe that the solemn pledge given by England was valueless, and that England meant to remain permanently in Egypt. He would content himself with taking a division as a protest against the policy involved in the Vote.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 4, line 11, to leave out 'Egypt, £;164,000.'";(Mr. Dillon.)

Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

The Committee divided::Ayes, 126; Noes, 47. (Division List No. 478.)

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)

Tollemache, Henry James

Pretymann, Ernest George

Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)

Valentia, Viscount

Pryce-Jones, Lieut.-Col. Edw.

Seely, Capt. J. E. B (Isle of Wight)

Walker, Colonel William Hall

Purvis, Robert

Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)

Williams, Rt. Hon. J. Powell (Birm)

Randles, John S.

Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)

Wilson, A. Stanley (York. E. R.)

Reid, James (Greenock)

Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)

Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)

Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)

Spear, John Ward

Wyndham, Rt. H George

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson

Stanley, Hon. Arthur) Ormskirk

TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Scale-

O'Doherty, William
Ambrose, Robert
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Joyce, Michael
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
O'Malley, William
Cogan, Denis J.
Mac Donnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Mara, James
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Govern, T.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Crean, Eugene
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, N.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cullinan, J.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Reddy, M.
Delany, William
Murnaghan, George
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Dillon, John
Murphy, John
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Doogan, P. C.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sullivan, Donal
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Tully, Jasper
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

Question put, "That this be the Schedule to the Bill."

AYES.

Acland-Hood. Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Doxford, Sir Win. Theodore

Jones, William (Carnarvonshire

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Keswick, William

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc, Stroud

Fellowes, Hon. A. Edward

Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Lawson, John Grant

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Finlay, Sir R. Bannatyne

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Firbank, Joseph Thomas

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r

Fisher, William Hayes

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine

Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds

Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)

Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.

Gardner, Ernest

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks

Godson, Sir A. Frederick

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Bignold, Arthur

Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgm & Nairn

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)

Bill, Charles

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Macdona, John Cumming

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Gordon, Maj. Evans- (T'r H'mts

Maconochie, A. W.

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Brassey, Albert
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury)
Majendie, James A. H.
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Malcolm, Ian
Caldwell, James
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Gretton, John
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Groves, James Grimble
Maxwell, Rt. Hn Sir H. E. (Wigt'n)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r.)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Charrington, Spencer
Haslett, Sir James Horner
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Morgan, David J. (Walthamstow)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Heath. James (Staffords., N. W.)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Collings, Rt. Hn. Jesse
Helder, Augustus
Mount, William Arthur
Colomb, Sir John C. Ready
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead)
Murray, Rt. Hn. A Graham (Bute)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Colville, John
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)

Cranborne, Viscount
Horniman, Frederick John
Nicholson, William Graham
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Dickson, Charles Scott
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pretymann, Ernest George
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 129; Noes, 46. (Division List No. 479.)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Tollemache, Henry James
Purvis, Robert
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Valentia, Viscount
Randles, John S.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Reid, James (Greenock)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell- (Birm.
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks. E. R.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Spear, John Ward
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Royds; Clement Molyneux
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ambrose, Robert

Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Malley, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lundon, W.
O'Mara, James
Clancy, John Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Govern, T.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
Murnaghan, George
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cullinan, J.
Murphy, John
Sheehan, Darnel Daniel
Delany, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sullivan, Donal
Dillon, John
Nolan. Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n N.
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Tully, Jasper
Duffy, William J.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Doherty, William
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Bill reported, without Amendment; to be read the third time to-morrow.
EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.
Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 and 2 agreed to.

Schedule::

MR. TULLY moved to omit the Irish Sunday Closing Act, 1878. Year after year the Act had renewed, and it was time the Government made up their minds as to whether or not it was to be a permanent Act. He was not certain that the disadvantages of the Act did not outweigh the advantages, for instead of being a Sunday Closing Act, it was a Sunday Opening Act for the low class public-houses.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 4, line 24, to leave out '(24) 41 and 42 Vic., c. 38, The Sunday Closing (Ireland) Act, 1878.'";(Mr. Tully.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the schedule."

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) thought the time would soon come when the whole question of Sunday closing in Ireland would have to be considered, and some decision

arrived at. It was unsatisfactory to have an Act of this kind renewed year after year for twenty years, but it would be an absurd thing to strike it out of the present Bill. Nobody suggested that the Act should be entirely repealed, and he should certainly vote against the proposal of his hon. friend, in which course of action he thought he would be supported by many hon. Members around him. He earnestly hoped the Amendment would not be pressed, especially as there was a point which they desired to discuss about to be raised.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. O'DOHERTY moved to omit lines 25 and 26 from the schedule, referring to the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1881, and the Amending Act of the following year. The House, he thought, could not have the slightest idea of the drastic and atrocious provisions contained in the original Act. One of the provisions was that any person having arms in a district proclaimed under the Act could be hauled up by an ordinary policeman without any information being laid, and imprisoned or fined, even though the arms might be perfectly useless for purposes of discharge. The definition of arms included not only fire-arms, but swords,

pikes, and bills, and he had known men of spotless character to be dragged before magistrates for having arms which were absolutely useless. They not only complained of the provisions of this Act, but they also complained of its partial administration, particularly in the north of Ireland. There the Act had only been used to harass and persecute Nationalists in country districts, and it was never put into operation in the Orange districts. On the 6th of June last, a bomb, described by the Chief Secretary as being of a dangerous character, was discharged in the Catholic quarter of Londonderry, and an expression of regret at the occurrence had been made on behalf of the Government. If a like outrage had happened in the county of Sligo or Mayo in which Nationalists were implicated, did they imagine that an expression of regret would for one moment be taken as a sufficient excuse? Some weeks later another bomb, which was also described as being of a dangerous character, was discharged from the city walls

of Londonderry, and two children were seriously injured. He asked the right hon. Gentleman if the police authorities in Londonderry had communicated the names of the two men who had discharged this bomb. The reply he received was that the Castle authorities again accepted an expression of regret from those two men who had committed this outrage. Had that occurred in the South or West of Ireland or in the Catholic districts of the north of Ireland what would have happened to those men? Why, they would have been sent to penal servitude for at least two years. Were they to understand that there was one law for the Nationalists and another for the Orangemen? The Chief Secretary had admitted that the Castle authorities were afraid of prosecuting their supporters in the north of Ireland. Those men were merely the tools of those who appeared on the election committees of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and it was the duty of the Chief Secretary to at least see that justice was meted out to Nationalists in those districts as well as to Orangemen. Not long ago a procession of Orangemen marched through the streets of Londonderry carrying naked swords, and no prosecution was instituted against them until some months afterwards, during which period the question was brought to the front by the press. Later on two resident magistrates were sent to try twelve of these men for illegally carrying naked swords, and they were fined 1d. each with costs. In other parts of Ireland if Nationalists were found carrying naked swords they would get six months imprisonment. They had heard a great deal about the grievances of the Uitlanders, but if the right hon. Gentleman would see that the Catholics in Ireland got the same treatment as their Orange brethren he would be doing a great deal. In the North of Ireland the punishment was most drastic in the case of Catholics, but in other cases when the offenders happened to belong to the opposite party they got off with penny fines! He thought the examples he had given showed that this Act was not administered impartially in the Protestant and Unionist districts in Ireland, while in Nationalist country districts it was used to persecute the Catholic inhabitants. In the county of Donegal a procession marched through a proclaimed district, and in this case three men carried naked swords, and yet there had been no prosecution. He begged to move the Amendment standing in his name on the Paper.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 4, lines 25 and 26, to leave out '(25) 44 and 45 Vic. c. 5, The Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1881.'";(Mr. O'Doherty.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Schedule."

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member opposite said that this is not the date or hour to discuss the merits or the demerits of this Act, and I quite agree with that statement. This Act was placed on the Statute-book by Mr. Gladstone's Government in 1881; it was renewed in 1886 by another Government of Mr. Gladstone's, with the full concurrence of the Irish party. It has been renewed subsequently in the Expiring Laws Continuance Act by the Administrations of Lord Salisbury and by his political opponents. Every Government during the last twenty years, has found it necessary, or at any rate expedient, to keep the Act on the Statute-book. The complaint of the hon. Member is not so

much of the existence of the Act, but he suggests that it is not properly administered, and he argues that its application should be more general, and states that it is applied more stringently in some places than in others. I am afraid that I cannot accept the hon. Member's illustrations. The bomb fired at Londonderry, which figured in the hon. Member's speech, has often been mentioned before, and it was in fact a rocket with a metal case and an explosive inside. One of these rockets fell into a yard and harmlessly burst, and another was found by a boy and injured him while he was handling it. When these facts were made known to the person responsible for the fireworks he was admonished that such rockets were not to be used, and he expressed his regret. I think sufficient notice was taken of the incident. That is the character of the evidence brought forward by the hon. Member, who says that the Act is maladministered. Although I could develop that argument at great length, I do not think I should do so at this time of night (4 a.m.). The Government do impartially administer the Act; it is not true that they deliberately, or even carelessly, apply it more stringently in some parts of the

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Cranborne, Viscount
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Davenport, William Bromley-
Heath, J. (Staffords., N. W.)
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud
Dickson, Charles Scott
Helder, Augustus
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Douglas. Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Doxford, Sir W. Theodore
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Horniman, Frederick John
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Fellowes, Hon. A. Edward
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Fielden, Edw. Brocklehurst

Johnston, William (Belfast)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Finlay, Sir R. Bannatyne
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Bignold, Arthur
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Keswick, William
Bill, Charles
Fisher, William Hayes
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Lawson, John Grant
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gardner, Ernest
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Brassey, Albert
Godson, Sir Augustus F.
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Gordon, Maj. Evans- (T'r H'mlts)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Gore, Hon. S. T. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Macdona, John Cumming
Charrington, Spencer
Gretton, John
Maconochie, A. W.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Groves, James Grimble
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hambro, Charles Eric
Majendie, James A. H.

Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. Wm.
Malcolm, Ian

country than in others. It is enforced in agrarian districts, and it is in operation in the cities of the north. I do not think I should be justified in labouring this matter at any great length. If I have failed to satisfy the hon.

Member he can test the opinion of the House by taking a vote.

MR. O'DOHERTY said the Act gave the police power to visit houses where they knew firearms were stored. There were houses in Derry where firearms were stored, and prosecutions did not take place.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) denied that there was impartial administration when a man in his constituency was sentenced to five years imprisonment for the alleged dropping of a simple explosive, while an apology was accepted in Derry for the explosion of a missile which actually did injury to persons. How would Englishmen like to be so treated? The Act was administered in the most outrageously unjust manner.

Question put.

The Committee divided: Ayes, 120; Noes, 50. (Division List No. 480.)

Mansfield, Horace Randell
Pretymann, Ernest George
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Bryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Spear, John Ward
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Purvis, Robert
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Randles, John S.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Tollemache, Henry James
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Valentia, Viscount
Mount, William Arthur
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Walker, Col. William Hall
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)

Sackville, Colonel S. G. Stopford-
Williams, Rt. Hon J Powell- (Birm
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid).
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath-
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Nicholson, William Graham
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Smith. James Parker (Lanarks.)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork. N. E.
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Doherty, William
Ambrose, Robert
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Caldwell, James
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William
Clancy, John Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Colville, John
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Govern, T.
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, N.)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Cullinan, J.
Murnaghan, George
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Delany, William
Murphy, John
Sullivan, Donal
Dillon, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n, N.
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
Tully, Jasper
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor. James (Wicklow, W.)

MR. O'MARA moved to omit the Light Railways Act. 1896, from the schedule on the ground, as he stated, that the Act had been mainly used by speculators for their personal and private profit. He understood that the Act was to be brought before the House, next year, and therefore he would not state his objections at any great length now.

AYES.

Acland-Hood. Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Colville, John
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Brassey, Albert
Cranborne, Viscount
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Caldwell, James
Dickson, Charles Scott
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Arnold-Forster. Hugh O.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Fellowes Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.
Charrington, Spencer
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Beach. Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Finlay, Sir R. Bannatyne
Bignold, Arthur
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Bill, Charles
Colomb, Sir J. Charles Ready
Fisher, William Hayes
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.
Amendment proposed;
"In page 5, lines 11 and 12, to leave out '(33) 59 and 60 Vic. c. 48, the Light
Railways Act, 1896.'";(Mr. O'Mara.
Question put, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the
Schedule."
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 124 Noes, 45. (Division List No. 481.)
Gardner, Ernest
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Randles, John S.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Long, Rt. Hn. D. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Cordon, Maj Evans (T'r H'mlets
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Royds, Clement Molyneux
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Gretton, John
Macdona, John Cumming
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Groves, James Grimble
Maconochie, A. W.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Win.
Malcolm, Ian
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Spear, John Ward
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk
Healy, Timothy Michael
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Heath, James (Staffs., N. W.)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Helder, Augustus
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Talbot, Lord K. (Chichester)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Mount, William Arthur
Tollemache, Henry James
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Horniman, Frederick John
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

Valentia, Viscount
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Nicholson, William Graham
Williams, Rt. Hn J. Powell- (Birm.)
Johnstone, Hey wood (Sussex)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wilson. Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
J ones, William (Carnarvonshire)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Keswick. William
Pretymann, Ernest George
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Lawrence, Win. F. (Liverpool)
Purvis, Robert
Lawson, John Grant
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork. N. E.)
Hayden. John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Ambrose, Robert
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Barry, R. (Cork, S.)
O'Malley, William
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lundon, W.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Clancy, John Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Govern, T.
Crean, Eugene
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Reddy, M.
Cullinan, J.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Murnaghan, George
Delany, William
Murphy, John
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Dillon, John
Sullivan, Donal
Doogan, P. C.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Thompson, Dr. E C (Monagh'n N.
Tully, Jasper
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Doherty, William
Schedule agreed to.
Bill reported, without amendment.
Motion made, and Question put, "That
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Agg-Gardner James Tynte
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
the Bill be now read the third time."
The House divided:; Ayes, 124; Noes, 45. (Division List No. 482.)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
Morris, Hon. J Martin Henry F.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Mount, William Arthur
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds)
Gretton, John
Murry, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bule)
Balfour, Kenneth R. (Christch.)
Groves, James Grimble
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir Michael Hicks

Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Bignold, Arthur
Hambro, Charles Eric
Bill, Charles
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.
Nicholson, William Graham
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Haslett, Sir James Homer
Brassey, Albert
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Scale
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.-
Pretymen, Ernest George
Helder, Augustus
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Caldwell, James
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Purvis, Robert
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Randles, John S.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Horniman, Frederick John
Reid, James (Greenock)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Charrington, Spencer
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Sackville, Col. S. (J. Stopford-
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Keswick, William
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Colville, John
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Cranborne, Viscount
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Seely, Capt. J. E. B. (Isle of Wight)
Lawson, John Grant
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Davenport, W. Bromley-
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Spear, John Ward
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Stanley, Hon Arthur! Ormskirk
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Macdona, John Cumming
Tollemache, Henry James
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Maconochie, A. W.
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Valentia, Viscount
Fisher, William Hayes
Majendie, James A. H.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Foster, Philip S. (Warwick, S. W.)
Malcolm, Ian
Williams. Rt. Hn J Powell-I Birm.
Mansfield, Horace Kendall
Wilson. Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)

Gardner, Ernest
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Gordon, Maj Evan s- (T'r H'mlets
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Gore, Hon. S. E. Ormsby- (Linc.)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst'w
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork. N. E.)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Ambrose, Robert
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry", W. O'Kelly, Conor, (Mayo, N.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William O'Mara, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Clancy, John Joseph
London, W.
Cogan, Denis J.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell. Dr. Mark A.
Crean, Eugene
M'Govern, T.
Reddy, M.
Cullinan, J.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Murnaghan, George
Delany, William
Murphy, John
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Dillon, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sullivan, Donal

Doogan, P. C.

Duffy, William J.

Nolan, Joseph (Louth. South)

Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n, N.

Flavin, Michael Joseph

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid

Tully, Jasper

Flynn, James Christopher

O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

Gilhoolly, James

O'Doherty, William

Bill read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

*MR. CULLINAN said he opposed the Third Reading of the Bill because, while assistance was given to the landlords in Ireland, none whatever was given to the evicted tenants. Those were most glaring cases, and he was sorry that they had not had a proper opportunity for discussing them.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.) said the point raised by the hon. Member was that, owing to the defaults of the tenants, the sums referred to had become irrecoverable. The hon. Member said that they should be recovered from the landlord, as they went to improve his property; but under the law they could not be recovered from the landlord. They could not put a charge on the landlord for money borrowed by his tenant without his consent. If the landlord's consent were made necessary, it might be impossible for the tenant to obtain the loan in many cases.

MR. T. M. HEALY said it was now more than ten years since the first of these Public Works Loans Bills had been introduced, and he then appealed to the Government to make the landlord liable. Lord Goschen was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the matter was debated at length, but the Government declined to take his advice, with the result that where a loan was granted to a tenant who was subsequently evicted the landlord was allowed to get the benefit of it, with the connivance of the Government.

MR. TULLY said he wished to support the remarks of his hon. friend. He observed that £23,352 was to be wiped off for one union in England, whereas only a few hundred pounds were being wiped off in connection with Irish unions. He certainly thought the Secretary to the Treasury should give some information as to the large sums that were to be wiped off in England, compared with which the sums to be wiped off in Ireland were a mere bagatelle.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork, Mid.) said he wished to know if loans were to be advanced to emergency men without sufficient security, and not advanced to tenants who had proper security.

Question put and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

LIGHT RAILWAYS (No. 2) BILL.

Considered in the Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. TULLY said the Bill was to appoint two Commisisoners at £;1,000 a year. As he had already said, if the First Lord of the Treasury were present he would be closed.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. Member to bear in mind the Standing Order with reference to repetition.

MR. TULLY said that the clause stated that two Commissioners were to be appointed, but some explanation should be given as to why they should be paid £;1,000 a year. He objected to Clause 1, and would move to omit it.

Bill reported without amendment; read the third time and passed.

MARRIAGES LEGALISATION BILL [Lords].

As amended, considered; read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.

BERWICKSHIRE COUNTY TOWN BILL, [Lords].

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that if the right hon. Gentleman intended to proceed with the Bill he would have to make up his mind for a long and, he was afraid, acrimonious discussion. He begged to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned.";(Mr. John Redmond.)

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire) said that the Bill was a small one, but it would be quite impossible to go on with it if hon. Members made up their minds to oppose it. He was not responsible for the speech of the hon. Member for Berwickshire, which had no connection with the Bill. However, he would accept the motion of the hon. Member.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that the reason they opposed the Bill was out of compliment to the hon. Member for Berwickshire, because it was proposed to change the county town from Duns.

MR. DILLON said he desired to support the motion for the adjournment of the debate. So far as he was concerned he would vehemently oppose the Bill, and he had decided on that course long before the speech of the hon. Member for Berwickshire.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that the hon. Member helped the hon. Member for Berwickshire at election times.

MR. DILLON said that it was at those times he made the acquaintance of the people who now begged him to oppose the Bill.

Question put and agreed to.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

VALUATION (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1::

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 12, after 'hundred,' to insert 'subject to revision in accordance with this Act and.'";(Sir Jas. Haslett.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. T. M. HEALY said he was in favour of assisting the Government to pass the Bill, but it was well they should know what the exact position was. The hon. Member opposite was a member of the Belfast Corporation and represented one section of the population in Belfast, and it was desirable that any Amendment he proposed should be considered in a fair spirit. The Bill now before the Committee was an entirely different Bill from the measure which was read a second time, and he had some doubt as to whether the title would cover the proposal of the Government. However, he would close his eyes to that, as the Bill would be for the benefit of the public in Belfast; but it should not be all give on their part and all take on the part of the Government. He wished to know whether the Government would accede to his proposition, not that appeals should be suspended, but that the time limit for them should be extended. He had had no opportunity of putting his Amendment on the Paper.

MR. WYNDHAM said he desired to indicate the attitude of the Government on the matter. His hon. friend the Member for North Belfast had moved an Amendment in which the hon. and learned Member for North Louth had concurred. The hon. and learned Member wished to know what was the attitude of the Government as to the question of extending the time for appeals. That proposal, or rather a proposal somewhat akin to it, was put before him yesterday, and for his part he would not object to it. There appeared to be a consensus of opinion that the period during which appeals should be lodged should be extended.

MR. DILLON said he desired to know what would be the exact effect of the two Amendments standing in the name of the hon. Member for North Belfast. He was not absolutely clear as to how it was proposed that the revision should be carried out. As he understood it, it was proposed that certain new buildings which under ordinary circumstances would be valued by the revisers and added to the rating list should be brought in under the Act. How could that be done? Was it to be done under the new or the old system?

MR. ATKINSON said the Amendment of his hon. friend provided that the revision would be carried out on the old valuation.

MR. TULLY asked whether the final report of Commissioner Barton would be issued.

MR. ATKINSON said it would not be necessary.

Question put, and agreed to.

Clause 1 agreed to.

Clause 2;

MR. T. M. HEALY moved to insert words extending the time of appeal to the 1st of March, 1903.

Amendment agreed to.

SIR JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.) said he desired to move an Amendment that the revaluation might at the option of the appellant be computed as from the 1st of November, 1902.

MR. T. M. HEALY said that that would shorten the time by six months.

Bill reported; as amended considered; an Amendment made. Bill read the third time, and passed.

FISHERIES (IRELAND) BILL.

As amended considered. Bill read the third time and passed.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 22nd day of July last Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes after Five of the clock, a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 16th August, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Greenock Corporation Order Confirmation Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to Amendments to, Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords] without amendment.

PETITIONS.

ROYAL DECLARATION BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, against; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Hindley; and Peaslake; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGNS OATH ON ACCESSION BILL AND ROYAL DECLARATION BILL.

Petitions against, from West Calder; and Mid Calder; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COLONIES (COLONIAL ACTS, ROYAL ASSENT).

Return [presented 15th August] to be printed. [No. 362.]

BOARD OF TRADE (LABOUR DEPARTMENT) WORKMEN'S CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES).

Copy presented, of Report on Workmen's Co-operative Societies in the United Kingdom, with Statistical Tables [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TEA AND COFFEE, 1900.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 1 14th August; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 363.]

BRITISH SHIPS (DESSERTION OF SEAMEN ABROAD.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 8th August; Mr. Hain]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1898.

Copy presented, of Return showing the Total Payments into and out of the Local Taxation (Scotland) Account for the financial year 1900–1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of the Annual Local Taxation (Scotland) Returns for the year 1899–1900 [by Act]: to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 364.]

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 13th August; Mr. William Redmond]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 365.]

SOUTH AFRICA.

Copy presented, of further Return of numbers of persons in the Camps of Refuge in South Africa, July, 1901, [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH AFRICA (DESPATCHES).

Copy presented, of Despatch by General Lord Kitchener, dated 8th July, 1901, relative to Military Operations in South Africa [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (PAY, NON-EFFECTIVE PAY, AND ALLOWANCES).

Copy presented, of List of exceptions to the Army Regulations sanctioned during the year 1900–1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MARRIAGES, BIRTHS, AND DEATHS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Registrar General, being for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

Copy ordered, "of the Second Memorandum considered at the meeting of the Board of National Education in Ireland, on the 30th day of July, in connection with the recent resignation of the Most Reverend W. J. Walsh, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin, together with copies of all further proceedings of the Board with reference to this matter (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 261, of Session 1901).";(Mr. Wyndham.)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 366.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT, 1888.

Copies presented, of Orders made by the various County Councils in England and Wales under Sections 57 and 59 of the Act, as confirmed by the Local Government Board [by Act]; to lie upon the Table

EAST INDIA (INDIAN RAILWAY MATERIALS).

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 13th August; Sir Charles Cayzer]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 367.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2694 and 2695 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

REVENUES OF CYPRUS.

Return ordered, "of (1) all sums paid in the two years 1898–9, 1899–1900, out of the moneys arising from the Revenues of Cyprus; (2) of all sums voted by Parliament in the same period in aid of the Administration of Cyprus; and of the surplus remaining in each year over and above the payments made, together with the interest thereon (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper No. 42, of session 1899).";(Mr. Pierpoint.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;CENSORSHIP;FREEMAN'S JOURNAL CORRESPONDENT.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that the letters and articles sent by Mr. J. J. Comerford, as correspondent of the Freeman's Journal in South Africa, posted weekly at Cradock during February and March, 1900, with two exceptions, were never received; and that, on Mr. Comerford making complaint to the Chief Military Press Censor in Pretoria of the seizure of his letters and articles,

Major Sawyer was directed to investigate the matter, but on his making inquiries at Cradock he was suddenly transferred to another station, and no further step in the investigation was taken; and, having regard to the fact that Mr. Comerford has addressed repeatedly letters to the Chief Military Press Censor on this matter, and has received no reply, whether any and, if so, what steps will be taken to restore to this gentleman the photographs and manuscripts seized in transmission through the post, or to compensate him for the loss of his literary work as a journalist not at the seat of war and not holding a military licence.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton): I have spoken to my hon. friend the Member for Westmoreland on this subject, as he was censor at Cape Town and dealt with this question when it arose. He has promised to look up the papers and communicate with the hon. Member on the subject.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Will that be before next session?

LORD STANLEY: I hope so.

CONCENTRATION CAMPS;BLOEMFONTEIN CAMP.

MR. FLYNN (Cork N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the medical officer's report upon the state of health of the children in Bloemfontein camp has been yet received at the War Office; was Lord Kitchener asked by telegraph in the last week of June concerning the doctor's report, and, if so, with what result.

LORD STANLEY: The report has not yet been received. Lord Kitchener telegraphed on the 2nd July that he would forward the medical officer's report.

MR. FLYNN: Will the report when received be published?

LORD STANLEY: I am afraid I cannot give any answer to that question.

DORDRECHT EXECUTION;COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE OF BURGHERS.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if, when he has obtained the information from South Africa, he will circulate the report received to hon. Members or make a communication stating what were the exceptional circumstances connected with the compulsion of British colonists to witness the execution of their countrymen at Dordrecht; who gave the order for such compulsion; if it was sanctioned by the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa, and, if not, whether

the officer responsible for it has been punished; and whether these colonists were convicted criminals or prisoners, under what penalty did they attend, and what object was gained by such compulsion.

LORD STANLEY: I am not in a position to make any such pledges on behalf of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War.

COETZEE'S EXECUTION.

MR. LEAMY (Kildare, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he has yet received any official information to the effect that several of the leading inhabitants of Cradock have been deported for refusing to obey the order to attend the execution of Johannes Petrus Coetzee; and, if so, will he state by whose order was the deportation carried out.

LORD STANLEY: No information has as yet reached the War Office.

INSURING SOLDIERS' LIVES.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the officer commanding the 3rd Battalion of the Royal Welsh Fusiliers insured the life of each member of his company who went out to South Africa; whether he can state what sums have been paid in respect of such policies and to whom; and whether this officer was acting in this matter with the knowledge and consent or sanction of the War Office.

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware of this transaction, which, if it exists, is purely a private transaction, and does not concern the War Office.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: If such a thing has been done, could the noble Lord prevent it?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir; it is a purely private transaction.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Is an officer allowed to make money by insuring the lives of soldiers?

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Had he the power to send the men into the fighting line?

PRIVATE REILLY, 1ST BATTALION DEVONSHIRE REGIMENT.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state what arrears of pay and pension are due to Private George Reilly, No. 6,304, of the 1st Battalion, Devonshire Regiment, who died at Standerton on 6th May last, and when the amounts due will be paid to his father; also whether the officer commanding the Royal Welsh Fusiliers held an insurance policy on the life of Private Reilly; and, if so, whether he has paid over the sum so obtained to the father of the deceased lad.

LORD STANLEY: This man's estate has just been reported from South Africa as amounting to £15 1s. As he appears to have died intestate, steps will be taken at once to issue the estate to the father. Any insurance that may have been effected is purely a private matter, of which the War Office has no cognisance.

SOLDIERS' PENSIONS; CASE OF JAMES ROGERS.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether any inquiry has been made into the case of James Rogers, late of the 33rd Foot Regiment and Army Reserve, who enlisted on 29th November, 1860, at Manchester, and the date of whose discharge as stated on the War Office parchment is 7th October, 1882; and, seeing that this man has been refused the pension to which he has been entitled, as the Chelsea Commissioners have confounded him with another soldier of the same name and with shorter service, whether he will take steps to have Rogers remitted the arrears of pension to which he is entitled.

LORD STANLEY: The information given in the question is insufficient to enable the case to be traced. Will the hon. Member be good enough to forward to the War Office the parchment certificate referred to.

DESTITUTE VETERANS IN BELFAST WORKHOUSE.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state how many Army pensioners are at present inmates of the Belfast Union Workhouse, and what pension each of these old veterans receives; whether he is aware that some time ago the commanding officer of the district refused, when applied to for a military funeral for an old soldier, an inmate of the workhouse, to grant the request thus made, or to in any way assist in providing

interment for the old man, and that ultimately the funeral was carried out by subscriptions raised locally; and if, in the future, some arrangements will be made whereby old veterans who have served in the Army will be provided with decent interment at the expense of the State, so as to obviate such funerals being carried out by public subscription.

LORD STANLEY: There are forty-two pensioners inmates of this workhouse, with pensions varying from 4d. to 2s. 3d. a day. I am not aware of the application for a military funeral mentioned, but under the Regulations such funerals can only be granted to officers or soldiers dying during their colour service.

WOOLWICH ARSENAL FOREMEN.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether foremen employed in or about Woolwich Arsenal have been offered a pension on condition that they forego their right to payment for overtime and withdraw from membership of any trade union.

LORD STANLEY: A proposal is under consideration for granting pensions to foremen employed in certain departments under the War Office. Among other conditions attaching to the grant are the cessation of payment for ordinary overtime, as is now the case with principal foremen, and the withdrawal from membership of any trade union. The latter proviso was made at the suggestion of the Foremen's Association, a body which is recognised as representing their interests.

MR. KEIR BARDIE: Will the cessation of membership be compulsory?

LORD STANLEY: Yes, Sir; at their own request.

PROPOSED ROYAL WATER CORPS.

SIR MICHAEL FOSTER (London University): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to certain proposals contained in a scientific publication for the prevention by means of a Royal Water Corps of enteric and other water borne diseases in war, and whether, in view of the recent heavy losses by these diseases in South Africa, he will give these proposals his serious consideration in order to ascertain whether they offer any practical suggestions for preventing such disasters in future.

LORD STANLEY: The attention of the Secretary of State for War has been called to the pamphlet in question. The proposals have been carefully considered, but are found to be entirely impracticable for active service.

VOLUNTEER CAMP ATTENDANCES.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if, in order to prevent Clause 10 of the draft of a scheme relative to the efficiency of the Volunteers now lying upon the Table, prior to submission to His Majesty the King in Council, operating to the detriment of the Volunteer force, and to Volunteer soldiers unable by the nature of their employment to attend a camp every other year, he will cause it to be amended so as to give general officers commanding districts power to dispense with such attendance under exceptional circumstances upon the recommendation of commanding officers.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. Attendance at camp for at least every alternate year is considered a vital part of the scheme of reorganisation. The Secretary of State for War cannot, therefore, consent to any such concession as is suggested in the question.

VOLUNTEER MUSKETRY REGULATIONS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if, before sanctioning any increase in the present musketry requirements of the Volunteer force, and bearing in mind that they exceed those of the Army Reserve, Militia, and Yeomanry, and entail in most cases of urban corps frequent journeys to distant ranges, he will give consideration to the difficulties encountered in fulfilling the existing conditions, owing to the paucity of target accommodation and the restrictions to which the ranges available are subject.

LORD STANLEY: The cases alluded to would appear to be amply covered by paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft of the scheme of efficiency laid before the House, which will be generously interpreted.

GAMBLING ON H.M.'s TRANSPORTS.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been called to the prevalence of gambling on His Majesty's transports, and is he aware that during the past week a case was tried in the law courts in which it was given in evidence that a youth of eighteen years had lost £330 during a journey from Africa to England, and will he adopt such measures that will reduce or extinguish this practice of gambling on His Majesty's ships.

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware of the prevalence of gambling on board transports. Inquiries are being made into the case referred to. The Regulations forbid any such practice, which should be firmly suppressed by the senior officer on board.

PORTSMOUTH DOCKYARD JOINERS' PAY.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that the rate of pay received by the joiners employed in the Portsmouth Dockyard is under the rate paid to joiners employed in outside shipyards in the district; and, seeing that the pay for joiners employed outside the dockyard at Portsmouth is 8d. per hour and not 7½d. whether he will give instructions that the rate of pay of carpenters and joiners engaged at Portsmouth Dockyard shall be altered to correspond to the rate paid by outside firms.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): I must refer the hon. Member to the answer that I gave him on the 26th ultimo. The information at the disposal of the Admiralty is to the effect that the rate for outside joiners is 7½d., and not 8d., as stated in the question. Under these circumstances it is not considered necessary to make any alteration in the rates of pay of joiners in Government employment.

In reply to a further question the HON. GENTLEMAN said the difference between the two rates of pay was very small indeed.

UNCLAIMED NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

MR. MAJENDIE (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the list of persons entitled to unclaimed naval prize money, which was to have been taken in hand in January last, is near completion, and whether the form of that list will be such as to enable claimants to verify their claims; and whether, to save time and facilitate examination by claimants, he will consent to a publication of the list in sections, and have the first section published immediately.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The preparation of the list referred to was sanctioned in May last, but it deals with a long period, and I cannot as yet precisely state when it will be completed. It will be proceeded with as rapidly as possible, and I hope to be able to present it in about three months. The list will be in such a form as will enable applicants to verify their claims readily. It would be possible to publish the list in sections, but in the opinion of the Admiralty such a course is not desirable.

NAVAL MANŒUVRES;PRESS CORRESPONDENTS.

*COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, having regard to the fact that the Admiralty have refused to allow correspondents to be present at the forthcoming combined manœuvres of the Channel and Mediterranean Squadrons, with the view of information being afforded to the public as to the readiness for war of the British fleets, the Admiralty will reconsider their decision, and will afford the correspondents facilities for seeing the movements of the ships.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It is not considered in the interests of the service that any persons not connected with the service should be embarked on the ships engaged in the forthcoming tactical exercises. Full opportunities of obtaining information as to the state of preparation of the Fleet are always afforded to representatives of the press during the annual manœuvres, and it is not proposed to extend the privileges already granted.

NAVAL MANŒUVRES;REPORT.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether, for the information of the public respecting the late naval manœuvres, the Admiralty will forthwith publish a complete statement of the claims referred to the umpires upon both sides, together with their decisions thereupon; whether on the conclusion of the approaching combined manœuvres of the Mediterranean and Channel Squadrons they will publish a similar statement with regard to them; and whether they will appoint a committee with similar general instructions to those given to the committee which was appointed in connection with the manœuvres of 1888 to consider and report upon the recent and approaching manœuvres.

The following Question also appeared on the Paper;:

MR. HARMSWORTH (Caithness): To ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if it is intended to issue any Report upon the recent naval manœuvres; and, if so, when such Report will be issued.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: A complete statement of the claims referred to the umpires will be included, as usual, in the Report of the manœuvres presented to the House. The reply to the second paragraph of the hon. Member's question is in the negative, as the combined fleets will be engaged in tactical exercises only. There is no intention of appointing a committee, as suggested in the third paragraph.

INDIAN FAMINE COMMISSION'S REPORT.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, having regard to the fact that the Report of the Indian Famine Commission

appointed in 1900 was submitted to the Viceroy in May last, whether, in view of the bearing of the Report upon the future administrative action as regards famines, he will state the reasons why this delay has taken place in laying its recommendations before Parliament.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Baling): The delay is due to the fact that the Government of India had to consider very carefully the recommendations of the Commission and the action to be taken upon them, which, as I stated in this House on the 8th instant, involved complex and most important questions. I have only very recently received the Report from the Government of India together with a despatch giving the result of their deliberations. As soon as I have dealt with the various suggestions made I shall publish the papers together with conclusions upon them that the Government have arrived at.

BOMBAY LAND REVENUE BILL.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the Bombay Land Revenue Bill recently introduced in the Bombay Legislative Council; whether he is aware that this Bill will empower the Government to resettle the holdings of cultivators, without the rights of sale or mortgage, in tracts of the country where tenants have possessed those rights for the last fifty years; whether it is the intention of the Government, under this Bill, to sell the holdings now in arrear on account of the recent famine, and to resettle their holdings without the rights at present enjoyed by them; whether he is aware that this Bill is opposed by the native members on the Select Committee of the Bombay Legislative Council, and by associations in Bombay; and is he aware of the feeling it has created in the province; and whether, in view of the principle hitherto followed in Bombay and other provinces with regard to the preservation of the tenant-rights of cultivators, he will give an assurance that this House will have an opportunity of further considering the subject before the measure is passed into law.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: I am aware that a Bill is before the Bombay Legislative Council for the amendment of the Land Revenue Code of the Presidency, though I cannot accept the hon. Member's description of it as altogether correct. I am also aware that some misapprehension exists in India as to its objects and provisions. The whole subject is being very carefully considered, both by the Bombay Government and the the Government of India, and will be further considered by myself in Council, if the measure in question becomes law. I can give no assurance that I will take any steps to interfere with the constitutional methods of legislation for India.

CONGESTION ON INDIAN RAILWAYS.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the attention of the Public Works Department of the India Office has been drawn to the delays and congestion of the traffic on the East Indian and other railways converging on the Howrah goods station at Calcutta, and the consequent hindrance to export trade from the port of that city; and whether he will consider the desirability of causing an independent investigation to be made by an engineering Commission as to the practicability by means of canals or otherwise

to relieve the congestion of railway traffic at the point referred to.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The congestion of traffic on the railways referred to has recently been under consideration by a special Committee of railway authorities, members of chambers of commerce, and merchants appointed in India. This Committee has recently reported to the Government of India, who will inform the Secretary of State of their recommendations after considering that Report. Pending the receipt of the views of the Government of India, I do not propose to take any such action as is suggested in the hon. Member's question.

CHINA;IMPORT DUTIES AND FORWARD CONTRACTS.

MR. YERBURGH: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that it is customary in the China trade for our merchants to make contracts, more especially for cotton goods, for forward delivery, extending in some cases over some months; and whether exemption from the increased import duty will be granted to merchandise under such contracts as were made prior to the acceptance by His Majesty's Government of the five per cent. effective tariff.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): We understand that the arrangement which the foreign representatives at Peking have decided to propose to the Chinese Plenipotentiaries provides that the enforcement of the five per cent. tariff shall not take effect until two months after the signature of the protocol, and that merchandise which has started on the way out within ten days after the date of signature will be exempted from payment of the new duties. If it should appear that cases of hardship arise under this arrangement His Majesty's Government will consider whether some further arrangement can be obtained for treating such cases on their merits.

WAIMA ARBITRATION.

MR. MANSFIELD: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can explain why the negotiations between Great Britain and France with regard to the claim for compensation for the murder of British Officers and men at Waima in 1893 have taken nearly eight years and are not yet completed; and also will he say what arrangements have been made for the widows and orphans pending the settlement of these prolonged negotiations.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The delay in arranging for a settlement of the Waima incident has been due to the necessity of establishing to the satisfaction of the French Government that the incident took place in British territory, to the time required to come to an arrangement as to whether arbitration should be adopted as the method of settlement for several pending questions, of which the Waima incident is one, and, finally, as to which of these questions should go to arbitration first. Various payments have been made to the sufferers by His Majesty's Government in anticipation of the award.

IRISH LADY'S ESTATE IN MADRID.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that in the case of an Irish lady (Miss Mary Teresa Barry) who died in Madrid on the 15th June, 1899, leaving considerable

property in that city, a Dublin solicitor, acting for the next of kin, communicated with Sir H. M. Durand, British Ambassador at Madrid, so far back as 29th June last, asking for information about the property of the deceased, and subsequently cabled requesting a reply and offering to defray the expense of procuring the information, and that no reply has yet been given; whether he can say if Sir H. M. Durand received such communications; and, if so, why he did not reply; and will he see that Sir H. M. Durand, or the person whose duty it is to interest himself for the protection of the property of British subjects in Madrid, will give immediate attention to this matter.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Nothing is known at the Foreign Office of the matter to which the hon. Member refers, but Sir M. Durand will be communicated with and requested to report.

COAL DUTY REBATES.

MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if, following the precedent of rebate of duty to those who had made coal contracts, the Treasury will grant a similar rebate of duty to importers of sugar under bona fide contracts made so far back as December, 1900, for monthly deliveries extending up to the present date, and resold at old prices during the first three months of this year, and on which the contractors can prove they will thus lose the sugar duty.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): There is no statutory authority to grant the rebate asked for by the hon. Member, nor do I think there ought to be. Section 10 of the Finance Act specially enables importers of sugar, in the absence of agreement to the contrary, to recover the duty as an addition to their pre-Budget contract prices.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT;"DROP" REGULATIONS.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he is aware that in executions as carried out in this country death is seldom instantaneous, that in the majority of cases the vertebra is neither dislocated nor fractured, and that in many cases the pulse beats at the wrist after the fall of the drop for five or six minutes; and whether he will order a careful inquiry to be made into the present method of conducting executions in Great Britain and Ireland, with the view of steps being taken to prevent any possibility of the convict being conscious of suffering.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The exact cause of death is carefully investigated in each case, and this evidence is entirely opposed to what is suggested in the question. I have no reason for supposing that any further inquiry is needed.

CONTINENTAL CHINA AND EARTHEN-WARE TRADE.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is inviting a number of Continental china and earthenware manufacturers to a conference, and, if so, can he state when the conference is to take place, and where, and will British manufacturers be also invited to attend it.

*MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir, there is no such proposal.

HOURS OF DUTY OF PARLIAMENTARY POLICE.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the late sittings of the House have involved a corresponding extension of the hours of duty of the constables in and about its precincts, and what remuneration he proposes to make to these men.

*MR. RITCHIE: The police employed at the Houses of Parliament receive a special allowance while so employed. No additional money allowance is made to them on the occasion of late sittings, but the men are relieved for refreshments from time to time, and compensation in the shape of "time off," and also extra leave is allowed when the House is not sitting. When a sitting of prolonged duration is expected, arrangements are made to supply extra men if required.

BRADFORD LABOUR DISPUTE.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that, on the 17th of July, four members of a trade union, who were acting as pickets in connection with a labour dispute now being waged at Bradford, in Yorkshire, were arrested at the instance of an employer whose workmen are on strike, and conveyed to the police station, where, after being examined, they were liberated, no charge being preferred against them, whether he is aware that shortly after midnight on 19th July these same men were arrested in their homes and conveyed to prison, charged with intimidation and persistent following, and that the charge of intimidation broke down and had to be withdrawn, and three of the accused were acquitted of the charge of persistent following, and whether he can explain why these men were arrested during the night, and will he say what action he purposes taking.

*MR. RITCHIE: I am informed that the men were not arrested as suggested in the first paragraph of the question. They gave their names and addresses at the police station, and went away without any charge being made against them. Warrants were afterwards issued, and the arrests were effected in the early morning of the 19th. The chief constable informs me that these men reside in different parts of the town, and that it was necessary to effect the first arrest early in order to give time to arrest the others so as to bring them before the magistrate at once. I can take no action in the matter, but I must add that this explanation does not appear to me to be satisfactory.

RAILWAY FATALITY AT LONDON BRIDGE.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the fatal accident which occurred near London Bridge Station on the 18th July to a boy named Percy James Southey, who was travelling in a South-Eastern and Chatham Railway Company's train; whether he is aware that at the inquest it transpired that efforts made to stop the train by means of the communication cord were unsuccessful in consequence of the latter being out of order, and whether he proposes to order an inquiry into the matter.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD, OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Yes, Sir, the Board of Trade are in communication with the railway company in this case, and when their reply has been received I will consider whether an inquiry can usefully be held.

PROVISIONING OF MERCHANT SHIPS;THE "COLONY."

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of

Trade whether he is aware that James M'Donald, an able seaman, was put on shore on Saturday, 10th August, at Palmouth, from the British sailing ship "Colony," suffering with scurvy, that M'Donald is now lying ill in Greenwich Hospital, and that during the passage home the crew of this vessel were supplied with short allowance of provisions; whether he will cause inquiries to be made at once with regard to this matter, and instruct the superintendent before whom the crew may be discharged to take a statement from each man respecting the provisions with which they have been supplied during the voyage, and whether the Board of Trade have power to prosecute shipowners who, in consequence of not supplying crews with proper allowance of good wholesome food, endanger the health of the men.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have ascertained that, on the arrival of the "Colony" at Falmouth it was found that the seaman referred to in the question was suffering from a bad leg and thigh, being the only sick man on board. He was at once seen by the port medical officer, and by the owner's instructions was paid off at Falmouth instead of being taken on to Hamburg. I have at present no evidence that he was suffering from scurvy. The master reports that lime juice was regularly issued, and the owner states that ample provisions (including fresh meat and vegetables) were supplied. No complaint was made to the officials at Falmouth by any one of the crew, but further inquiry will be made at Hamburg. The Merchant Shipping Act lays down regulations with regard to seamen's food, medicines, anti-scorbutics, etc., and provides penalties for infringement.

THE "MAB."

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that in November last, at Baltimore, the master of the steamship "Mab" assaulted the steward, that the steward asked permission to go on shore to make a complaint to His Majesty's Consul, and that the master had the steward and cook arrested and imprisoned for three days; that on the arrival of the vessel at Liverpool in December last proceedings were taken at the police court against the master, who was fined £3; and that on the vessel's arrival at Barry the master endeavoured to deduct the expenses of his trial from the wages of the steward and cook; whether it is the intention of the Board of Trade to ask the master of the "Mab" for an explanation of his conduct in refusing to allow the steward and cook of this ship to go ashore at Baltimore to lodge a complaint against him for his assault on the steward, and will he ask His Majesty's Consul at that port to explain on what grounds he issued a warrant for the arrest of these two men.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have no official information with regard to the occurrences referred to in the question beyond entries in the log of the "Mab" which appear to show that the proceedings at Charleston (not Baltimore) were quite regular. Inquiry shall be made as to what took place at Liverpool and Barry, and also respecting the allegation that the steward was not allowed to make a complaint to His Majesty's Consul at Charleston.

THE "ANCONA"; CREW'S GRIEVANCES.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will cause an inquiry to be made respecting the treatment of the crew of the "Ancona"

by the master and first and second officers, who assaulted several of the crew during the voyage from Tacoma to Hamburg.

I beg also to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that a seaman named Henry Herbert, engaged on the British sailing vessel "Ancona" on 18th February of this year at Tacoma, and that shortly after joining the vessel he was assaulted by the chief mate and a boarding master named Ryan; whether he is aware that Herbert immediately complained to the master, asking his permission to go on shore to report the matter to His Majesty's Consul, which permission the master refused and left Tacoma without giving him an opportunity of having the boarding master arrested for the assault; and will he take steps at once to hold an inquiry into the matter.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: In reply to this and the following question, I can only say that the Board of Trade have no information with regard to the matters to which the hon. Member refers, but inquiries shall be made.

THE "GATHORNE."

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been directed to the death of a fireman, named Townsend, on board the ss. "Gathorne"; whether he is aware that, although this man complained of being ill for several days, he was compelled by the chief engineer and the master to continue at work; and that, in consequence of the treatment which he received at the hands of the chief engineer, Townsend jumped overboard and was drowned: and whether he intends to have this case thoroughly investigated on the arrival of the "Gathorne" in the United Kingdom.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, my attention has been called to the case to which the hon. Member refers, and I have already instructed the Solicitor to the Board of Trade to make arrangements for the holding of an inquiry by a Superintendent of Mercantile Marine under Section 690 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, on the return of the "Gathorne" to this country.

SEAMAN'S DEATH ON THE "DEVON."

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has received any report with regard to the accident which happened to a seaman named Robert Christiansen on board the steamship "Devon" on 3rd March of this year at Port Natal; whether this man was sent aloft to put a new guy on number five derrick, and that he had to climb up the guy with a heavy sling over his shoulders, with the result that his strength gave way and he fell a distance of 50 feet into the hold of the vessel; and whether he can state if the owners have paid any compensation to this man for the injuries he sustained, and if he will cause an inquiry to be held in this case.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The information I have received with regard to the case to which the honourable Member refers shows that the accident happened on the 2nd April, not on the 3rd March as stated. I am not in possession of any details in the case, but will make further enquiries and place myself in communication with the owners.

RAILWAY SUB INSPECTORS.

*MR. BELL: I wish to ask the President of the Board of Trade a question of which I have not given him notice, but I have no doubt the right hon. Gentleman

can answer it; namely, when he proposes to appoint the sub-inspectors of railways, for which salaries have been provided in the Estimates.

*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I cannot answer that question.

ABINGDON MARKET.

MR. MANSFIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is aware that the local authorities do not agree that the order for isolating the pigs in Abingdon Market was given on the 13th May, that the inspector, Mr. Anderson, frequently wired to the Board as late as 15th May to get the order, and that Mr. Elliott admitted in his letter that the order for isolation was given on 16th May, although the police did not receive the actual order to isolate till 18th May; and, under these circumstances, and as the pigs were taken from the owners and kept for two and a half months, during which time all but eight of them have died, will he agree to pay compensation as though they had been slaughtered.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): I stated that the order came into force on the 13th. It was of course given long before, as it is a standing instruction to all local authorities which comes into force directly an outbreak occurs. It is not the fact that the Board's inspector telegraphed to get the order either on May 15th or any earlier or any subsequent day. It is not the fact that the Secretary to the Board admitted that the order for isolation was given on 16th May. It is not the fact that the police did not receive the order till 18th May. The police superintendent is also the inspector of the local authority, and it was his duty to isolate, and he did isolate, the swine under the Swine Fever Order on May 13th.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE REGULATIONS.

MR. ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture, having regard to the fact that the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease has now ceased in Argentina for over nine months, and in view of the measures adopted by the Argentine Government against the importation of British pedigree cattle into Argentina, whether there is any prospect of this regulation being rescinded or a short period of quarantine being substituted in the near future, and whether his attention has been called to the effect of the dislocation of the trade of farmers and breeders of pedigree cattle with Argentina in agricultural districts throughout the country.

MR. HANBURY: The evidence before me does not support the statement in the first part of the question. I shall be glad to show the hon. Member that evidence. I do not see why the export trade in pedigree cattle from this country to Argentina should be affected by the existence or non-existence of the disease there.

BUTTER REGULATION COMMITTEE.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, having regard to the nature of the inquiry to be held by the Butter Regulation Committee, he would recommend that the evidence of all witnesses be taken in the presence of the press.

MR. HANBURY: The decision on such a point must rest with the Committee themselves, who at their first meeting decided that the usual course should be

followed, and the inquiry be held without press reporters.

SWINE FEVER IN LINCOLNSHIRE.

MR. MANSFIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he will give particulars of the cases of outbreak of swine fever in the Spalding Division of Lincolnshire which have necessitated the closing of the markets of Spalding, Holbeach, Boston, and other places; and also whether he will consider the advisability of putting a cordon round the area of the outbreaks in preference to closing the whole of the markets available for the small holders and farmers of the district.

MR. HANBURY: There have been thirty detected outbreaks of swine fever in the area referred to since the beginning of July. Several of them have been traced to the markets referred to. The system of allowing no movement over the whole area except after twenty-eight days' detention in one place has been found to be the most effective method of extinguishing the disease in the district. If the hon. Member suggests that free movement should be permitted within the whole area, but no movement outward should be allowed, this would mean the spreading and continuance of the disease within the area. If he suggests that there should be thirty small areas in which alone movement should be prohibited, and in all the rest of the present area movement should be free, there is no guarantee whatever that the diseased swine are all included in those thirty areas, and the disease would therefore continue to spread over the district outside them.

MR. JOYCE: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if, owing to the vital importance of this question to an important trade in Ireland, it would not be possible to allow the witnesses to give their evidence in public? What is there to conceal?

MR. HANBURY: It is a matter for the Committee to decide. I do not see any special reason why the ordinary rule should be broken.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): Is it not usual for the press to attend these inquiries?

MR. HANBURY: No, Sir.

MR. JOYCE: Well. I hope the evidence will be published.

TUBERCULOSIS COMMISSION.

MR. JASPER MORE (Shropshire, Ludlow): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether it would be possible for the promised Royal Commission on tuberculosis to inquire whether cancer is communicable from animals to man.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): As I stated yesterday, the appointment of a Royal Commission with regard to tuberculosis is still under the consideration of the Government. Assuming, however, that such a Commission is appointed, I do not think it would be practicable that the matters referred to it should include an investigation of the subject mentioned by my hon. friend.

POST OFFICE; SPECIAL LEAVE PECULATIONS.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will explain why the instructions of the Secretary to the Post Office, to surveyors, of April, 1891, regarding special leave, are not being equally carried out in all districts; is he aware that Postman G. W. Bates, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, has been compelled to

refund two days' pay for special leave granted on the occasion of his marriage in May last, whereas officers in London, Glasgow, and elsewhere have been granted such leave without deduction of pay; and whether, in view of these circumstances, the Postmaster General will issue an order to have the instructions of April, 1891, applied equally to all officers of the Department.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The Postmaster General is not aware of the circumstances of the case referred to, but he will make inquiries, and let the hon. Member know the result as soon as possible.

POSTMEN'S STRIPES.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state how many hours duty per day constitute a full time duty in regard to postmen's employment counting for the award of good conduct stripes for unestablished service previous to appointment to the establishment.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Eight hours for day duty, or seven hours for night duty, for town postmen.

COLCHESTER POSTMAN'S STRIPE GRIEVANCE.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will inquire into the case of town postman Eastell, of Colchester, who, on 23rd November, 1898, was deprived of a stripe for an offence which he denied having committed; is he aware that, although the Tweedmouth Committee recommended the restoration of a stripe after a lapse of two years, this man's stripe was only restored on the 1st April, 1901; what was the reason for so withholding it; and will the stripe pay which would have been received by him between November, 1900, and April, 1901, had the Committee's recommendation been acted upon, be now paid to this postman.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is aware that postman Eastell was deprived of a good-conduct stripe in 1898 for misconduct, and that the stripe was not restored until April last. The Tweedmouth Committee did not recommend that stripes so taken away should be restored in two years. Two years is the minimum period which must elapse before a stripe can be restored. There is no intention of allowing Eastell stripe pay for the period between November, 1900, and April, 1901.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS CHARGES.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will issue instructions to charge as one word only the name of each place in the United Kingdom; and can he say why in telegrams Woodford Green is charged as one word, but Camden Town as two words, and St. Pancras as one word, but Charing Cross as two words.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Instructions were given many years ago that the name of every town and village was to be charged for as one word. The Postmaster General agrees with his predecessors in thinking that this was an intelligible and clearly defined concession, and he is not prepared to extend it to the names of places or districts within towns. The fact that the concession has been made in the case of towns and villages explains the anomaly to which

the hon. Member calls attention; and I may add that to do what he suggests would not only involve the telegraph service in further loss, but would create fresh anomalies of a nature much less intelligible than the one he has now in view. As to St. Pancras and Charing Cross, the Postmaster General believes that he is simply following established usage, words having the prefix "St." being universally regarded as one, while "Charing Cross" is always regarded as two. MR. HENNIKER HEATON: Will the hon. Gentleman carry out the reform this year or not?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: What is it the hon. Member wants?

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: The fulfilment of a promise made some years ago.

LIVERPOOL TELEGRAPHISTS PROMOTION GRIEVANCES.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been directed to the manner in which vacancies in the clerks' class on the telegraph establishment at Liverpool have been filled recently; whether he is aware that, on the last occasion, a telegraphist, who has been passed over twice previously during the present year, received promotion, passing over twenty of his seniors; whether the men to whom promotion has been refused were warned of the intention of the department to ignore them, and whether the qualifications necessary for promotion were indicated clearly.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is the fact that a sorting clerk and telegraphist, who has been passed over twice during the present year, has recently received promotion, passing over twenty of his seniors. The men passed over were not warned that there was an intention to ignore them, because there was no such intention. The promotions were made only after the fullest consideration of the claims and qualifications of each of the men concerned, and on the ground that the officer in question and the others who were promoted were the best qualified to fill the vacant posts.

TONBRIDGE POSTMEN'S PETITION.

MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, with reference to a petition, dated February, 1899, from the postmen of Tonbridge, praying for a higher scale of pay, he can say what decision has been arrived at, or when a reply may be expected.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The memorial for increase of pay forwarded by postmen at Tonbridge in 1899 was duly considered, and it was decided that there was then no case for raising the wages. It is regretted that by an oversight this decision was not conveyed to the memorialists at the time. A later petition has been received from the postmen on the same subject and is now under consideration, and the Postmaster General's decision shall be communicated to the applicants as early as possible.

CLYDE MUSSEL BEDS.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the sublease entered into between the Fishery Board and Dr. Fullerton, in regard to the Clyde mussel beds, was submitted to the town councils of Greenock and Port Glasgow for their approval before being signed; and, if so, upon what date did this take place.

I beg also to ask the Lord Advocate whether in granting a lease of the Clyde mussel beds to Dr. Fullerton, the provisions of Clause 13 of the Sea Fisheries Regulation (Scotland) Act were taken into account by the Fishery Board of Scotland, and can he state the names of the members of the Fishery District Committee.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The answer to the first question is in the negative. The matter was fully explained in my answers to the questions asked by the hon. Member on the 26th of last month. In reply to the second question, no Fishery District Committee has been appointed for the district in question. The lease to Dr. Fullerton was granted by the Fishery Board in exercise of their statutory powers.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Is it competent for the Fishery Board to grant this lease where a district board has been formed?

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: No such board has been formed.

CHARITY COMMISSION-CLOUDESLEY ESTATE FUND.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Parliamentary representative of the Charity Commission whether he can explain why the income of the Richard Cloudesley Estate Fund over and above £1,000 per annum has not been transferred to the Official Trustees of Charitable Funds in Chancery as required by the Commission's scheme of 1873 dealing with the charity, and whether the Charity Commission will communicate to the Borough Council of Islington the names of any gentlemen submitted for their approval to act as trustees of the charity; and whether they will consider any recommendations made to them before giving their approval.

THE PARLIAMENTARY CHARITY COMMISSIONER (Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN, Kent, Tunbridge): The balance appearing in the accounts does not consist entirely of income, but partly of capital and partly of certain sums deposited for the renewal of leases and similar objects, and it must be apportioned before any transfer to the official trustees

See preceding Volume, page 228.

is effected. The Commissioners do not propose to take any steps for the appointment of trustees of this charity until the present proceedings in Chancery are terminated, but whenever they do propose to make any such appointment they will communicate their proposals to the Borough Council of Islington.

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, having regard to the fact that a contract was made between the School Board for London and their non-teaching staff in 1888, whereby the employees submitted to a deduction of two per cent. from their salaries, the conditions being that when they reached the age of sixty, or if previously incapacitated through infirmity, they should be entitled to superannuation on the Civil Service scale; whether he can explain why the non-teaching staff servants of the Board are now obliged to accept less than one-fifth of what was agreed upon, and whether he can suggest any course that would mitigate this treatment.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): This is a matter between the School Board for London and their staff, of which the Board of Education has no cognisance and in which it has no right to interfere.

MR. FLAVIN: Can the right hon. Gentleman suggest any means by which these people can get full payment?

SIR J. GORST: No, Sir, I cannot.

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the practice of publishing notices of local government elections in Ireland by placards only exists in some districts; and whether, in view of the complaints that this system of advertising, where not supplemented by advertisements in the local newspapers, is not sufficient notice to the public, whether he will see that in future all such notices of elections are advertised in the local newspapers.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Election Orders require that notices of the elections shall be given by posting copies of the same at public places. No complaints have been made to the Board that this system of publication is insufficient. If any representations are made they will be considered, but, obviously, no change could be made in the direction suggested without consulting the local authorities upon whom the expense would fall.

LOST PROPERTY IN DUBLIN CABS AND CARS.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that property left in cabs and cars of licensed drivers in Dublin, and handed over by them to the Carriage Office authorities of the Dublin Metropolitan Police are, when unclaimed within a certain period, sold, and the proceeds appropriated by the authorities without any consideration being extended to the drivers who delivered them to the police; and, whether, in view of the fact that these cab or car drivers lose time in delivering up valuable articles so found to the authorities at Exchange Court, he will direct that some compensation shall be made to them out of the sums so realised for their loss of time.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has not been correctly informed. Unclaimed property found in licensed vehicles is detained for twelve months and then sold. If the article is valued at £5, or upwards, the Chief Commissioner of Police specially assesses on the merits of each case the reward to be given to the finder. If under £5, a reward equal to three-fourths of the sum realised by the sale is paid.

ALLEGED POLICE INTERFERENCE WITH WITNESSES AT BALLYHAUNIS.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a prosecution took place at Ballyhaunis, county Mayo, on 29th July last, at the suit of the Crown, against two youths named Carney and Boyle; that a lad named Delaney, who was a witness for the Crown, swore that he was prepared in the evidence he should give by a policeman when serving him with a summons; and, whether he will take steps in

future to prevent members of the police force from preparing Crown witnesses in the evidence they should give in a court.

MR. WYNDHAM: This boy, aged twelve, did, by replying in the affirmative to a leading question put in cross-examination, accept the suggestion referred to. On re-examination he made it clear that he had received no instruction whatever and had sworn only to what he had himself seen and heard. His evidence was confirmed by other witnesses. The defendants, who were twenty and twenty-three years of age, were ordered to give sureties for their future good behaviour, or to be imprisoned in default. They adopted the first alternative.

DIRECT LABOUR ON IRISH ROADS.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary) S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will advise the Local Government Board to inform county and district councils that the Provisional Order enabling councils to employ direct labour on roads and other works has become law, and that they may now proceed to prepare schemes which can come into operation on the 1st of April next.

MR. WYNDHAM: This matter will be fully dealt with in a circular letter which will shortly be issued to the local authorities.

VACANT IRISH FISHERIES INSPECTORSHIP.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any communication to make to the House in reference to the appointment to the vacant position of fishery inspector in Ireland, and whether full inquiry into the qualifications and practical experience of candidates will be made before filling up this vacancy.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the second paragraph is in the affirmative. Beyond this I have nothing to add to my statement in answer to the questions addressed to me on the 20th. June on this subject.

MR. FLYNN: Will the appointment be made before the reassembling of Parliament?

MR. WYNDHAM: I should think it most improbable. It may never be made.

IRISH NATIONAL LEAGUE; KILLORGLIN BRANCH.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution passed by the Killorglin branch of the Irish United League, proposed by Mr. Thomas M'Donagh Mahoney, J.P., calling upon Mrs. Mary Shea to give up a farm at Keelnabrack, Glenbeigh; whether he is aware that a bullock belonging to Mrs. Shea was injured subsequently to the League meeting, and has died since; whether any protection is being afforded to Mrs. Shea; and whether it is proposed to take any action with regard to Mr. T. M'Donagh Mahoney, J.P.

MR. WYNDHAM: An indoor meeting of the League was held at Killorglin on the 30th ultimo. The police were not present at the meeting, and the resolution alleged to have been passed at the meeting has not been published. On the following day a bullock, the property of John Shea, died, but whether the act was or was not malicious I am not yet in a position to say. Every necessary protection is being afforded to Mrs. Shea.

MR. FLAVIN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is absolutely no truth in the statement?

†See Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. xcv., page 918.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. FLAVIN: Has the right hon. Gentleman any information that such a resolution was passed?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have replied fully on that point.

MR. FLAVIN: If policemen were standing outside the door, why is there no evidence that the resolution was passed?

LORD HEADLEY'S ESTATE, CO. KERRY.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what are the difficulties in the way of a sale of the estate of Lord Headley, in the county of Kerry, which is now under the court; and, having regard to the fact that the tenants have expressed their willingness to purchase, whether he can do anything to expedite the sale of their holdings to them.

MR. WYNDHAM: There are no proceedings pending in the Land Judge's Court for the sale of the estate referred to. There were proceedings at one time pending, but the petition was dismissed so far back as 1884.

RASHENNY RAILWAY STATION.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether representations have been received by the Board of Works from merchants and farmers resident at or near Rashenny station, on the new railway from Buncrona to Cardonagh, requesting them to have a goods shed erected there in order to protect the goods and farm produce carried by the railway; and whether, considering the small expense that the construction of a goods shed would entail, the Board of Works will have the station buildings completed in this respect.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The probable traffic requirements of the districts to be served by the railway were carefully considered when the plans were being prepared, and the necessity of a goods store as Rashenny was not suggested. If, after experience, it is found that a shed is required at this place, the company will no doubt provide it.

LONDONDERRY CITY AND COUNTY INFIRMARY.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will consider the advisability of including the Londonderry City and County Infirmary in the list of those prescribed by the Local Government Board Order relating to trained nurses in workhouse infirmaries in Ireland, in order to provide that nurses trained in the said infirmary shall be eligible for appointments in workhouse infirmaries in the surrounding districts; and, having regard to the degrees held by the staff of the said infirmary, which consists of five visiting physicians and surgeons and one resident doctor, and to the ensuring thereby of efficiency of training for nurses, will he place the nurses trained in this infirmary on terms of equality with nurses trained in Belfast and Dublin.

MR. WYNDHAM: Owing to the relatively small number of patients that can be treated at this hospital, the Local Government Board has not seen its way to

recognise the training given there as sufficient to entitle its nurses to recoupment under the provisions of the 58th section of the Act of 1898. I will, however, give the whole subject my personal consideration during the recess.

IMPRISONMENT FOR CONTEMPT OF COURT; M'ELLIGOTT'S CASE.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a man named M'Elligott, of Shruagh, Ballymagauvan, county Cavan, has been recently arrested and committed to gaol for contempt of court for retaking possession of his farm, from which he was evicted by an order of the Irish Land Commission because he refused to give up his farm to the landlord for the price fixed by the Land Commission, which was £;60 less than he was offered by a solvent purchaser; is he aware that M'Elligott recently offered to pay two years rent and costs to the agent of the landlord if allowed to remain in possession; and, having regard to the circumstances under which M'Elligott was evicted, will the Government direct his release and take steps to amend the law so as to prevent similar cases arising in the future.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that this man was committed to prison on the 30th July on a writ of attachment issued by the Master of the Rolls. The Executive cannot direct his release as suggested; the matter is not one in which it can intervene. To purge his contempt he must apply to the Master of the Rolls. The reply to the concluding inquiry is in the negative.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): How long may this man be kept in prison?

MR. WYNDHAM: That rests between him and the judge.

MR. M'GOVERN: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the latter part of the question?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no right to review the proceedings of a court of law, and I do not propose to do so.

TEACHING OF IRISH IN IRISH SCHOOLS.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I bog to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. James Coakley was appointed to teach Irish in the Midleton (county Cork) Union school, on 8th June last, and that his appointment has not as yet been sanctioned by the Local Government Board, and whether steps will be taken to ratify the appointment without further delay.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Board will offer no objection to this appointment, and the guardians will be so informed.

IRISH COUNTY COURT VALUERS.

MR. EDWARD BARRY (Cork County, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Mr. Martin, a county court valuer in the West Riding in the county Cork, recently in his private capacity valued the farm of Mrs. O'Sullivan, Glencurragh, Skibbereen, for the landlord; whether it is in accordance with official regulations that, as a county court official, he should do so, and, if not, will steps be taken to remove him from the position of county court valuer.

MR. WYNDHAM: The question has been referred to Mr. Martin, who states that he never valued the farm in question, either for the landlord or for the county

court judge. The latter would not employ him to value a farm which he had previously valued in his private capacity.

ARRESTS OF IRISH CRIMINALS-COUNTY LIABILITY FOR EXPENSES.

MR. GILHOOLY (Cork County, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland whether he is aware that the Cork County Council refused to pay £;9 4s. expenses incurred by the police authorities in following from Cork, and arresting in London, a man named Cornelius Sullivan; can he state under what authority the police made the demand, and whether it will be persisted in.

MR. WYNDHAM: The county council has refused to repay this amount, which, under the circumstances, will be deducted from the moneys payable to the council out of the Local Taxation Account. The expenses incurred in the pursuit and apprehension of offenders are chargeable to the county under the provisions of Section 4 of the 14 and 15 Vict., cap. 85.

SERGEANT SHERIDAN;CASE OF CORNELIUS BRAY.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that more than a month ago the constabulary authorities held an inquiry in Hospital, county Limerick, in connection with the cases of Cornelius Bray and a man named Murphy, when Sergeant Sheridan was stationed in that town; is he now in a position to give the result of the inquiry

is he aware that Bray was arrested on a charge of hay-burning on the night of 26th November, 1897, and was convicted at the Cork Winter Assizes on this charge, and that after two years and a quarter in prison he died within four months after his liberation; and whether, under the circumstances, the Government intend to give any compensation to Mrs. Bray for the loss of her son.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer to the second paragraph is in the affirmative.

MR. DILLON: In view of the extraordinary circumstances surrounding this case, will the right hon. Gentleman reconsider his decision not to grant a public inquiry into the case of this man Sheridan?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir. I endeavoured last night to give the grounds on which I arrived at the decision, and I am afraid I cannot reargue the case.

MR. DILLON: I attach so much importance to the question that I shall raise it again to-morrow on the Appropriation Bill.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Is not the evidence sufficient to justify putting the man on his trial?

*MR. SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the question.

SERGEANT SHERIDAN;CASE OF MURPHY.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that rather more than a month ago the constabulary authorities held in Hospital, county Limerick, an inquiry in regard to the conviction of a man named Murphy, for cutting the tail off an ass belonging to a man named Cregan, when ex-Sergeant Sheridan was stationed in Hospital some three or four years ago; have the authorities as yet come to a decision as regards this inquiry; and will the Government give any compensation to Murphy for the time he spent in prison.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to this question is in the affirmative.

INTIMIDATION IN LEITRIM.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been drawn to the prosecution at Kiltyclogher (county Leitrim) Petty Sessions on the 13th instant of eight defendants, at the suit of District Inspector Maxwell, on a charge of intimidation; is he aware that the court on the occasion was constituted of two resident magistrates, under 50 and 51 Vic, c. 20; and will he explain why the defendants were not charged under the ordinary common law dealing with such offences.

MR. WYNDHAM: Proceedings were instituted (by the police) against ten persons on charges of riot and unlawful assembly (arising out of disturbances which occurred recently in this district). The cases against four of the defendants were dismissed, and in the remaining six cases convictions were returned, resulting in terms of imprisonment varying from fourteen days to one month. On the application of the defendants the sentences were increased to five weeks to allow of an appeal. The proceedings were taken by direction of the Government under Section 2, Sub-section 3 (a) of the statute mentioned. The Government considered that this procedure was the most appropriate to the kind of offence with which the accused were charged; namely, riot and unlawful assembly. In view of the fact that an appeal is pending I must refrain from further characterising the offence.

CORK AND FERMOY LINE.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Treasury have, in accordance with the undertaking of the First Lord, called up the £93,000 due from the Rosslare Company, or has he had any further reply from that company as to the construction of the Cork and Fermoy Line.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I received a letter yesterday from the chairman of the company stating that he had found it impossible to secure a meeting of the Fishguard Board at this season of the year, but promising to call the Board together at the earliest possible moment after the vacation. At the same time he asked that, having regard to the length of time during which the company's application of the 18th April was under consideration by the Treasury, some little further time should be allowed for the repayment of the £93,000. I think that this is a reasonable request under the circumstances. I have had no indication of the Fishguard and Rosslare Company's intention in regard to the Fermoy line since the debate in this House on the Great Southern and Western Railway Bill, but I gather from the statement made on that occasion that the company intended to proceed with its construction.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said the company had violated the condition on which they obtained the money, and he wished to know what reason there was for giving them further indulgence.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I consulted with my right hon. friend the First Lord on the point. The company approached the Treasury on 18th April, and the final reply of the Treasury was not sent until 26th July. That reply stated that the company must adhere to their parliamentary engagement, and the money would be called up if they did not. The chairman represented that that was very short

notice, and, in view of the difficulties of getting the Board together at this time of the year, asked for a short postponement. There is no intention of releasing the company from their obligations.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The obligation to construct this line has not been fulfilled by the company, and the position now is that they have to return this money. I wish to know whether this postponement of the fulfilment of the obligation in regard to the money means that a further indulgence is to be given to this company.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Having regard to the fact that the company's application was under the consideration of the Treasury for three months, and the final reply of the Treasury was only sent to them a few days before the date on which the money was due, it seems not inequitable to give them a little further time to make this payment.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I think it is quite reasonable that they should get some further time.

IRISH EDUCATION; HAND AND EYE TRAINING CLASSES.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, although various centres for hand and eye training classes have been formed in different parts of Ireland, it is impossible for teachers in remote districts to attend such classes, which in many cases are only held on alternate Saturdays; and seeing that some teachers who desire to attend the class at Dunmanway, county Cork, are more than forty miles distant from Bantry, the nearest railway station, and that a further railway journey of twenty miles would have to be undertaken, whether he will arrange for the holding of a special training class of a few weeks duration during the months of September or October conducted by the head organiser in Dublin for the purpose of imparting the necessary instruction.

MR. WYNDHAM: In the remoter parts of the country there are many schools situated at an inconvenient distance from the centres at which hand and eye training classes have been formed. Every effort will be made to reach as many as possible of these schools when selecting centres for the classes that are yet to be formed. Owing to his present engagements it would not be possible for the head organiser to conduct in Dublin, during the months of September and October, a special class such as is suggested, even if it were considered desirable that he should do so.

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS.

MR. MOORE (Antrim, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the vacation period in schools in the north of Ireland is about to commence, and that, in many cases, the teachers have not yet received the amount of the expenses incurred by them in attendance at the classes instituted at the various centres by the National Board for the instruction of teachers; and if he will endeavour to have these sums recouped to the teachers before the vacation commences.

MR. WYNDHAM: All claims for travelling expenses received in the National Education Office in connection with manual and practical instruction and other classes for teachers, where the courses of instruction have been completed, have

been paid; with the exception of four irregular claims which are under consideration. Where classes have been interrupted by vacation, the head organisers in charge have already been instructed by the Commissioners to forward claims from the teachers who are entitled to their expenses up to the date of the cessation of those classes.

IRISH TEACHERS AND THE RESIDUAL GRANT.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the views which have been expressed regarding the money known as Balance of Residual Grant, he will consider the advisability of appointing two chartered accountants to investigate the matter, one to be nominated by the teachers and the other by the Government.

MR. WYNDHAM: A Return has been laid which will, I trust, dispose of the doubts that appear to be widely entertained on this complicated matter. Should this expectation not be fulfilled, I shall be prepared to consider the suggestion which has already been urged on me by my right hon. and hon. friends the Members for South and North Antrim.

KERRY RETURNS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Returns dealing with rates in Kerry, with attendances of National Education Commissioners, with the expenditure of school grant (Act 92) under four heads are yet ready; and, if not, can he say when they will be issued.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Return relating to the attendance of Commissioners was presented in corpore on the 5th instant. The distribution of the Paper rests with the Stationery Office. I understand it will be available in a few days. The other two Returns, which have been presented in dummy, will it is hoped, be completed and sent to the printers in the course of a fortnight.

DUBLIN VETERINARY COLLEGE.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what are the conditions and qualifications, if any, under which students may enter the Veterinary College, Dublin.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not aware; but the conditions will be found in the college prospectus, which can be had on application to the principal of the college.

IRISH CENSUS STAFF.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the recent Census appointments in the Registry of Deeds Office, Dublin, received the sanction of the Treasury Remembrancer; and if not, will they be submitted for his sanction; is he aware that boy writers are put into competition with men clerks, and that, as a result of this task work, the boys go for long periods without food, to the injury of their health; and will he consider the advisability of altering this system of working with the view of securing accuracy in these public reports.

MR. WYNDHAM: The department referred to is the office of the Registrar General. The number and rates of pay of the staff employed on the work of the Census have been fixed by the Irish Government and the Treasury, but the disposition of the staff is a matter entirely for the Census Commissioners. The boy copyists are

not put into competition with men clerks. In no case has a boy employed on taskwork been permitted to work on the same after office hours, and all the boys are allowed the usual half-hour for lunch.

CATHOLIC EMPLOYEES IN BELFAST.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that a number of Roman Catholic coopers in the employment of the Anglo-American Oil Company, in Belfast, have been discharged from their employment on the ground that the company was no longer able to afford them any protection from attacks by workmen of other religions; and can he state what steps he intends to take in the matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes. Sir; I am informed that Roman Catholic workmen, four in number, in the employ of this firm, were discharged by the manager, who assigns as a reason for this step that he "feared some of those employed in the shipbuilding yards might enter the premises, to intimidate the Roman Catholics, smoking, and thus cause a fire." This reason seems to me very frivolous, and in substance wholly inadequate as a justification for an act which is on the face of it arbitrary and unfair and wholly uncalled for, in view of the fact that the Government gives ample protection to all who may need it, and that the owners and managers of the shipyards are co-operating with the Government by threatening to curtail the hours of labour in the yards in the event of any such excesses on the part of their employees. No other firm has adopted such a course. I shall give the matter my immediate and close attention.

ALLEGED DEATH FROM POLICE VIOLENCE AT THURLES.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the circumstances attending the death of James Brennan, who was arrested by two members of the Royal Irish Constabulary on Monday last at Thurles, and so badly treated by them that death, it is alleged, resulted from the injuries inflicted.

MR. WYNDHAM said he had only received the notice since he entered the House. He had no information, but

would make full inquiry and communicate the result to the hon. Gentleman.

IRISH COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT CASES.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the cases of *Green v. The Freeman's Journal*, decided by the Irish Court of Appeal in 1899, and that of *Hildesheimer v. Faulkner*, decided on 2nd August, 1901, by the Court of Appeal in England; whether he is aware that in the former case the court held that, under the Fine Arts Copyright Act, 1861, the court were bound to affix a separate penalty in the case of every infringement, and damages of one farthing were inflicted for every copy of a newspaper printed in which appeared a small copyright design, and that these penalties amounted to about £146, whereas in the English case referred to the Court of Appeal held that Section 6 of the Copyright Act referred to did not enable the court to assess damages amounting to money of the realm for each offence; and whether Mr. Attorney General will advise the Government to introduce legislation to assimilate the construction of the

provisions of the Fine Arts Copyright Act of 1881 in England and Ireland.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): My attention has been called to the matter referred to. It is quite possible that the last-mentioned case may be taken to the House of Lords, and the law on this point finally settled. It is therefore premature to make any promise of legislation on this subject.

THE BREHON LAWS.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state what progress has been made with the publication of the fifth and sixth volumes of the Brehon Laws, whether the remaining sheets and index have been finally revised, and whether the volumes will be issued, as promised, before the end of the summer.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: About 100 pages of Vol. 5 await a final revision. The remaining pages (some 500) and the index have been passed for press. The glossary referred to as a sixth volume is completed with the exception of eight pages of print, which have not yet been revised. I have not given, and cannot give, any promise on the subject of the date of completion of the work; but there is no reason to suppose that its publication will be deferred much longer.

SNEEM PIER, KERRY.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can now state if the difficulties in connection with the erection of a goods store on Sneem Pier, county Kerry, have been removed, and whether the construction of the store can be proceeded with immediately; and whether he can state what steps have been taken to place a buoy in the position agreed upon near the pier.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Congested Districts Board has given instructions to have a buoy placed near the pier. As regards the first paragraph, I recently stated that I had referred the matter to one of the Board's inspectors, who would take a suitable opportunity of inquiring into the position of affairs. When his report is received the question will be further considered.

INNISKEEN POSTMASTERSHIP.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that Mr. Fitzpatrick, of Inniskeen, was dismissed from the position of postmaster at Inniskeen owing to alleged intemperance in the post office on behalf of the friends of Mr. Fitzpatrick, and that a declaration has been sworn by two respectable persons that no drink was consumed on the post office premises on the 21st December last, and whether he will take steps to clear the character of Fitzpatrick and his family; whether he can now state how it was that Mr. S. Lockington, the present postmaster, was enabled to apply for the office, while the late postmaster did not know of his dismissal until the workmen came to take away the wires; and as the present postmaster, Lockington, does not live at Inniskeen, but at Dundalk, eight miles distant, if he will appoint someone that will be able to give their entire time to the duties of the office.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Several questions on this subject put by the hon. Member

have already been answered giving full information as to the reasons for declaring the Inniskeen office vacant. The occurrence of the 21st December last did not form the sole or principal cause of the action taken, which was grounded on the intemperance and generally unsatisfactory conduct of the persons carrying on the duties of the office, and the affidavit in question furnished no reason for reopening the question. As already stated in answer to the hon. Member's previous questions, the appointment of sub-postmaster at Inniskeen has not yet been filled. The person in whose charge the duties have been temporarily placed is not Mr. S. Lockington but Mr. W. Corrigan, whose premises were selected because they were the most convenient that could be found in the emergency. The duties at Inniskeen are not sufficient to justify the department in insisting on the person appointed giving his whole time to the service.

IRISH-SPEAKING CLERKS IN THE POST OFFICE.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that considerable delay is occasioned in the delivery of letters addressed in Irish, in the country districts of the county Cork, owing to the non-appointment of sorting clerks possessing a knowledge of Irish; and whether steps will be taken to insure that at least one sorting clerk in each postal district in the county Cork (including Midleton) shall be acquainted with the Irish language.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No complaints on this subject appear to have been reported to the General Post Office in London; but in any case, the Postmaster General does not consider it necessary to take special steps to ensure that a knowledge of the Irish language shall be possessed by persons employed in the post office in Ireland. He has given instructions that in the event of a letter in Irish passing through an office where it can be deciphered, the address shall be translated into English and the letter sent on to its destination.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Am I to understand that no steps will be taken to secure the due delivery of letters addressed in Irish?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Gentleman is not to understand that. But the Postmaster General does not think it necessary to insist that post office officials should be able to speak Irish.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Then what steps are to be taken to ensure that letters addressed in Irish are delivered?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think that very few who write Irish cannot also write English.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why should they not address letters in Irish?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: For the convenience of the public and of the Post Office.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Have you not appointed Welsh-speaking officials in the Welsh post office?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Surely Irishmen are entitled to address letters in their own language.

ROSSCARBERY MAILS.

MR. EDWARD BARRY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether any steps are being taken for transmitting the mid-day mails to Rosscarbery on their arrival at Clonakilty.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General regrets that he is still unable to come to a decision on the question of establishing a day mail service to Rosscarbery, the inquiries on the subject not having been completed. As soon as he is in a position to do so he will communicate his decision to the hon. Member.

IRISH POSTMEN AND BANK HOLIDAYS.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will explain why Irish rural postmen are not allowed the same privileges as English and Scotch rural postmen in the matter of the shortening of the hours of duty on bank holidays.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not understand in what respect the hon. Member thinks that the English and Scotch rural postmen enjoy greater privileges than the Irish. If he will be good enough to give me particulars in writing, I will have inquiry made into the matter.

PACIFIC CABLE BOARD.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the proceedings in connection with the formation of the Pacific Cable Board; whether this Board entered into any contract respecting the construction of the cable before any resolution of Parliament or other sanction was obtained; and was any money paid in the nature of instalments before sanction of Parliament was obtained; and, if so, was this action taken with the sanction of the Treasury representatives on the Board; and what explanation of these proceedings can the Treasury offer to the House.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The Treasury and the Agents General of the several colonies interested entered into a contract with the Telegraph Construction and Maintenance Company for the construction and laying of the Pacific cable before the sanction of Parliament was obtained. This was in accordance with the regular practice with regard to contracts involving subsidies to telegraph companies or payments; to steamship companies for the conveyance of mails. The exceptional feature in this case was that the first instalment of payments under the contract fell due, and therefore had to be paid, before the payment was sanctioned by Parliament. When the contract was agreed to I had every reason to anticipate that we should be able to submit it to the judgment of the House before this instalment fell due, but this proved to be impossible owing to the congestion of business in the early part of the session. I take the entire responsibility for what occurred, but I think my action in accepting the contract was perfectly justified, because prices of materials were rising so much at the time that, if we had not accepted the contract when we did, we should probably have incurred a considerable loss in the price of the cable.

OFFICE OF WOODS AND FORESTS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that there has been no opportunity of discussing

the Vote for the Office of Woods and other administrative questions of special interest to Wales, early facilities will be afforded for the discussion of those questions in the course of next session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman will readily recognise that I can give no pledge with regard to the course of business next session, but if there be any desire of the kind suggested by him, I shall be very glad to consider it.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: The right hon. Gentleman made a similar promise earlier in the session, and representations have been made to him from time to time through the usual official channels, but, unfortunately, have not met with success. I hope we may have better fortune next session.

*MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon): Having regard to the importance attaching to Crown lands and foreshores in Wales, and the fact that non-party conferences have been recently held to discuss them, will the right hon. Gentleman give his personal consideration to this Vote early next session?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he quite appreciated the desire of the hon. Gentleman.
BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: What is the business for to-morrow?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The House will, I presume, according to precedent, meet at 10 o'clock to-morrow morning to read the Appropriation Bill a third time and to dispose of the remaining stages of outstanding Bills, and meet again at four o'clock in the afternoon for prorogation.

NATIONAL GALLERY (PURCHASE OF ADJACENT LAND) BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.

STANDING ORDERS.

Ordered, That the Standing Orders of this House, as amended, be printed. [No. 368.]

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to;Agricultural Rates Act, 1896, etc., Continuance Bill; East India Loan (Great Indian Peninsula Railway Debentures) Bill; Registration of Births and Deaths Bill; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill; Local Government (Ireland) Bill; Congested Districts Board (Ireland) Bill; Pacific Cable Bill; Colonial Acts Confirmation Bill; Customs Duties (Isle of Man) Bill; Burgh Sewerage, Drainage, and Water Supply (Scotland) Bill; Expiring Laws Continuance Bill; Public Works Loans Bill; Light Railways (No. 2) Bill; Valuation (Ireland) Bill; Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, without amendment.

That they have agreed to Amendments to;Marriages Legalisation Bill [Lords]; Lunacy (Ireland) Bill [Lords]; Public Libraries Bill [Lords], without amendment. Early Closing of Shops.;That they communicate Copy of Report from the Select Committee appointed by their Lordships in the present session of Parliament to inquire into the length of the hours of labour in shops; and whether any and, if so, what steps should be taken to diminish them, together with the Minutes of Evidence, Proceedings of the Committee, etc., as desired by this House.

Betting.;That they communicate Copy of Report from the Select Committee

appointed by their Lordships in the present Session of Parliament to inquire into the increase of public betting amongst all classes, and whether any legislative measures are possible and expedient for checking the abuses occasioned thereby, together with the Minutes of Evidence, Proceedings of the Committee, etc., as desired by this House.

That they request that this House will be pleased to communicate to their Lordships Copies of the Reports from the Select Committees appointed by this House in the present Session of Parliament on;

1. Steam Engines and Boilers (Persons in Charge) Bill;

2. Steamship Subsidies;

3. National Gallery (Purchase of Adjacent Land) Bill;

together with the Proceedings of the Committees and Minutes of Evidence, etc.

Printed copies to be communicated accordingly.

PRIVILEGE;THE GLOBE NEWSPAPER AND IRISH MEMBERS.

Order for the attendance of the Editor and Publisher of the Globe Newspaper [15th August] read.

Mr. GEORGE ELLIOT ARMSTRONG, the Editor, and Mr. WILLIAM THOMAS MADGE, the Publisher, of the Globe newspaper, were called in and examined, in relation to the Article complained of.

*MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Armstrong, I believe you are the editor of the Globe newspaper?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I am.

*MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Madge, I think you are the publisher?

MR. MADGE: I am, Sir.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform you that yesterday there were brought under the notice of the House some passages in an article in the Globe of Wednesday last, and that after due consideration the House came to the resolution that such passages were a gross breach of the privileges of this House, and an order was made for your attendance at the Bar. I have to ask you, Mr. Armstrong, and afterwards you, Mr. Madge, whether you have anything to offer to the House by way of explanation or excuse for your offence.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Sir, in obedience to your direction I appear at the Bar of this honourable House, and, in deference to your decision. I beg to express my regret for the appearance of the article which appeared in the Globe of Wednesday last, and to apologise to this House.

MR. MADGE: Sir, I can only associate myself with the observations of Mr. Armstrong and apologise to the House of Commons for my share in the publication of the article in question.

*MR. SPEAKER: Unless the House has other directions to give, I suggest that the persons at the Bar should now retire until the House has considered the matter. Let them retire.

[Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Madge then withdrew.]

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I conceive that after what has occurred the proper course the House should now adopt, following precedent in this matter, is to pass a resolution that Mr. Speaker do censure the editor and publisher of the Globe newspaper for the breach of the

privileges of this House which they have committed and for which they have apologised, and I therefore beg to move: "That this House, while recognising that Mr. George Elliot Armstrong, the Editor, and Mr. William Thomas Madge, the Publisher, of the Globe newspaper, have disclaimed any intention of imputing corrupt motives to any Members of Parliament ";[Cries from Nationalist Members: "No, no, they have not said so."] Perhaps I

I should alter the form of the motion and say "have apologised to this House for the breach of the privileges of this House of which they have been guilty, is of opinion that the said George Elliot Armstrong and William Thomas Madge have committed a breach of the privileges of this House by the publication of an article in the Globe newspaper of the 14th instant headed 'Irish Rowdies,' and that they be called in and reprimanded by Mr. Speaker for the breach of privilege they have committed."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House, while recognising that Mr. George Elliot Armstrong, the Editor, and Mr. William Thomas Madge, the Publisher, have apologised and expressed their regret for the article impugned, is of opinion that Mr. George Elliot Armstrong and Mr. William Thomas Madge have committed a breach of the Privileges of this House in the publication of the article in the Globe newspaper of the 14th instant headed 'Irish Rowdies,' and that they be called in and reprimanded by Mr. Speaker for the breach of Privilege which they have committed.";(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I think what has occurred and the necessity the First Lord of the Treasury has had to revise and alter the terms of the motion he has now moved shows conclusively that something further will be required by the House of Commons. I can assure the House that I had no idea that there would be any necessity for me to intervene at all this afternoon. I fully expected that an apology and a withdrawal would be made on the part of the gentlemen who were called to the bar; and I can assure the House that I am exceedingly pained that I have again to touch this matter at all. But, Sir, it must be evident to the fairness of the House of Commons that something more must be done in the matter. The First Lord of the Treasury clearly had the same view of what would occur that I had myself, for he framed his motion on the supposition that these gentlemen, having been adjudged by the House guilty of a gross breach of its privileges, would come forward and withdraw the offensive statements they have made

They have not done so, and the First Lord of the Treasury has felt himself constrained to alter the terms of the motion he came down to the House ready to move. I confess I regret that the task I am now fulfilling was not undertaken by the Leader of the House himself. I think, if he will allow me respectfully to say so, that when these gentlemen did not at the bar of the House fulfil what evidently was his idea of the necessities of the case, according to the terms of his own motion, it was his duty to have taken some action which would have compelled the complete withdrawal and disclaimer by these gentlemen. Under these circumstances I must leave the House of Commons to decide for itself what further action should be taken. For my part I must be allowed to express the opinion that, if these gentlemen are not compelled to come to the bar and

specifically withdraw the statements which they made affecting the honour of certain Members of this House, I for one would regard the whole of these proceedings as little better than a mockery, and, indeed, something almost amounting to insult to Members on these benches. As I have said, it is painful to me to refer to the matter again. I put this view before the House of Commons, and I leave it so. I will not move any amendment to the motion of the First Lord of the Treasury. If the House of Commons, having unanimously decided that this was a gross breach of privilege, and having unanimously called on these gentlemen to come to the bar, is satisfied with the bald apology which was given, and is satisfied with the refusal of these gentlemen to withdraw their statements, then I say the shame and the dishonour will rest on the House of Commons.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think that if the hon. Gentleman took objection to the kind of words used by the persons at the bar, the proper time to have made objection would have been while they were there, in order that they might then and there be cross-examined as to whether they had gone far enough to satisfy the House. What these gentlemen have done was to express their regret and to apologise. I infer from that that they withdraw.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Why did you change your resolution then?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is no change in the substance of the resolution. My view still is that when anybody apologises and expresses regret for something he has said or done, that does carry with it by implication, by inevitable implication, the withdrawal of the charge. But if there be any doubt on that point, the proper way is to order them to come back, and that will settle the question.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I must say that I have never heard, and I should think very few people in this House have ever heard, a more meagre and inadequate apology for a grave offence against the dignity of this House. The right hon. Gentleman said that the persons at the bar expressed their regret.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: And apologised.

MR. ASQUITH: And apologised. At any rate, I think it has always been the practice of the House, and it should be the practice of the House, to demand in a case of this kind not only an apology but a withdrawal, and a withdrawal as explicit as the apology itself. I think the House would do well to accede to the suggestion the right hon. Gentleman has made, and to have these persons summoned back to the bar in order clearly to understand whether they do or do not withdraw the imputation.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I think they made a most meagre apology. They said, Mr. Speaker, that in deference to your opinion they apologised. Since Midshipman Easy apologised to the bo'sun, there has never been a worse apology given.

*MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Madge be summoned again to the bar? Then let them be brought in.

Ordered, That Mr. GEORGE ELLIOT ARMSTRONG and Mr. WILLIAM THOMAS MADGE be again called in.

And they were again called in, and were addressed by Mr. SPEAKER as followeth::
I have to inform you that this House is not satisfied with the terms of your

statement or apology, and finds them not sufficiently explicit; and desires to be informed categorically whether or no you, both of you, disclaim the charges made in the article in question, and entirely withdraw them.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Sir, I regret very much indeed the interpretation which this honourable House has placed upon the article which appeared in the Globe of Wednesday last, and, if I may be allowed to do so, I repeat the explanation, or rather I adhere to the explanation, given in our article of yesterday, and that explanation is tantamount to a withdrawal. I also, in order to make the point absolutely clear, do withdraw that statement, and I do so while expressing great regret that the House should have placed that interpretation upon my words.

*MR. SPEAKER: Do you, Mr. Madge, desire to add anything?

MR. MADGE: No, Sir.

*MR. SPEAKER: I may point out to you both that the House considered yesterday the article in yesterday's issue of the Globe to which you have referred, and came to the conclusion that that was not a satisfactory or correct explanation of the article of Wednesday; and the opinion of the House was that the article of Wednesday's issue did contain a distinct charge of corruption against Members of this House, and that was the meaning of the statement in the resolution of which I have informed you that you had committed a high breach of the privileges of this House. Therefore, without reference to anything that may have appeared in Thursday's issue of the Globe, I must ask you to state now at the bar of this House categorically whether you do or do not withdraw the imputation which the House has decided was contained in the article of Wednesday.

MR. ARMSTRONG: I do, Sir.

*MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Madge, I ask you also.

MR. MADGE: I must, Sir.

*MR. SPEAKER: There must be no quibbling over words, and no trifling with the House. You must say whether you do withdraw it categorically, in the sense I have stated, or you must decline.

MR. MADGE (after a pause): I will.

*MR. SPEAKER: Do you accept the interpretation I have put to you, and do you withdraw that statement?

MR. MADGE: I said, Sir, I will; I do, Sir.

*MR. SPEAKER: Does any hon. Member wish to say anything further before they withdraw from the bar, or to suggest any question that I should put? Then they may withdraw.

MR. ARMSTRONG and Mr. MADGE then withdrew.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I need not make the motion again, but I should prefer, if the House desires it, without unnecessary formalities, to move the motion in the form in which I originally drafted it.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Resolved nemine contradicente, That this House, while recognising that Mr. George Elliot Armstrong, the Editor, and Mr. William Thomas, Madge the Publisher, have disclaimed any intention of imputing corrupt motives to any Members of Parliament, and have withdrawn every such charge, is of opinion that the said Mr. George Elliot Armstrong and Mr. William Thomas Madge have committed

a breach of the Privileges of this House in the publication of the article in the Globe newspaper of the 14th instant, headed "Irish Rowdies," and that they be called in and reprimanded by Mr. Speaker for the breach of Privilege which they have committed.:(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

The said Mr. GEORGE ELLIOT ARMSTRONG and Mr. WILLIAM THOMAS MADGE were again called in and reprimanded by Mr. SPEAKER, as followeth::

The House, having considered the disclaimer and withdrawal which it has heard from you, has come to this resolution:;"That this House, while recognising that Mr. George Elliot Armstrong, the Editor, and Mr. William Thomas Madge, the publisher, have disclaimed any intention of imputing corrupt motives to any Members of Parliament, and have withdrawn every such charge, is of opinion that the said Mr. George Elliot Armstrong and Mr. William Thomas Madge have committed a breach of the Privileges of this House in the publication of the article in the Globe newspaper of the 14th instant, headed ' Irish Rowdies,' and that they be called in and reprimanded by Mr. Speaker for the breach of Privilege which they have committed."

In accordance with that resolution, it is my duty to convey to you the judgment and censure of the House; and in so doing I must remind you that the dearest treasure of this House is its reputation for the pure and unspotted discharge of its legislative duties, and it deeply resents any imputation whatever made upon that reputation. It is especially sensitive to any imputation or accusation of that kind made against Members of Private Bill Committees, who in the discharge of their duties, which they perform so admirably and so justly, have to deal continually with very large pecuniary interests and to exercise judicial functions in dealing with them. Such an accusation you have made against Members of this House. You have not attempted to justify it, nor have you given any satisfactory excuse or explanation of it, but you have done all that was left for you to do, that is, you have unreservedly disclaimed any intention of committing a breach of the Privileges of this House, and you have withdrawn any charges you have made. Under those circumstances the House does not purpose to proceed further against you, except to reprimand you for your conduct, and accordingly in the name of the House I do reprimand you for your action and offence.

Then they were directed to withdraw.

Ordered, That the Reprimand delivered by Mr. Speaker be entered upon the Journals of this House.:(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported, without amendment; to be read the third time to-morrow, at ten of the clock.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Lords' Amendments considered.

Lords' Amendment, on page 51, line 12::

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) pointed out that this and various other Amendments showed the danger of passing such a Bill so rapidly at this period of the session. Everyone who knew the late work which had been thrown on the draftsman and the officials at the Home Office in connection with

the Bill would be surprised that so few mistakes had been made as appeared to be the case. When Bills were passed with such rapidity it was impossible to avoid very serious slips, and he was afraid that even now other slips would be discovered.

Amendment agreed to.

Lords' Amendment, on page 58, line 18::

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): said the undertaking given by the Home Secretary in regard to Irish home industries had not been carried out in another place. He was aware that the right hon. Gentleman was most anxious that there should be no interference with those industries, and he believed the excuse given was that the section under

which exemptions by way of Orders might be given was sufficient to meet the case. But when the Bill was before the House there was an almost unanimous consensus of opinion that some change was necessary, and that change had not been made.

*The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon) said the hon. Member was altogether mistaken in saying that he proposed to give legislative recognition to the exemptions in question. He simply undertook to consider whether anything could be done in another place. On very carefully reading the Bill it was found that one of the clauses gave the Home Secretary full power to deal with any small industry in any way he thought advisable, and he did not consider any further relaxation should be made.

Amendment agreed to.

Lords' Amendment on sixth schedule, page 100, line 25::

MR. T. M. HEALY said he could not see what advantage was gained by the addition of the words after "supplied by way of trade."

*MR. RITCHIE said the objection taken when the schedule was last before the House was that, as then worded, it would apply to a factory lighting its own office. It was clearly not the intention of the Government that that should be so, and therefore other words had been inserted.

Amendment agreed to.

Remaining Lords' Amendments agreed to.

*MR. RITCHIE: I think it is only due that I should express my appreciation of the extraordinary devotion, energy, and skill which has been displayed in respect of this particularly heavy undertaking by all the officials of the Home Office.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that the work in connection with this Act had been done with a rapidity which was little short of miraculous.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): thought very great credit was due to the whole Department for the extraordinary courtesy and ability which they had displayed. Personally he expressed his thanks to the right hon. Gentleman for his courtesy, and he had displayed extraordinary skill in piloting this Bill through all its stages.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): suggested to the President of the Board of Trade that he might consider the advisability of having a sufficient number of copies of the Act printed, so as to have a copy placed in every library connected with

workmen's institutes in the United Kingdom.

*MR. RITCHIE: Every hon. Member of this House by putting his name down can receive a considerable number of copies, and perhaps in this way the object of the hon. Member may be attained.

EAST INDIA REVENUE ACCOUNTS.

Order for Committee read.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The three financial statements with which I have to deal are associated with a period of continuous agricultural misfortune and depression in Western India. A drought unequalled in its dimensions, intensity, and duration, has throughout this period afflicted Bombay and the Central Provinces, causing a distress and loss and depreciation of agricultural credit and property which have not, so far as we know, been equalled during the last century. Putting for a moment on one side the misery, the privation, and the mortality inflicted upon humanity alone by this awful visitation, the property lost to the agricultural community in Western India is estimated to be not less than £;50,000,000 sterling. India has few large industries other than agricultural, and the largest of her industrial enterprises is the production and manufacture of cotton. This industry is situated in the midst of the afflicted districts, and has suffered accordingly. It is no exaggeration to say that in many parts of the province of Bombay during the greater part of this distress all private employment ceased, and the whole of the labouring classes were thrown upon the shoulders of the Government. In accordance with the pledge I repeatedly gave in this House, that the whole administrative machinery and financial credit of the Government of India should be fully exercised in saving life and relieving distress, a gigantic task and expenditure were thrown upon the financial system and credit of India.

There were many Members in this House who doubted if the resources of India were capable of sustaining this burden, and who, in their anxiety that there should be no miscarriage of relief from want of funds, pressed upon me the advisability of a large grant from the Imperial Exchequer as an essential aid to the Indian Treasury. The relief expenditure has been very great, but I am glad to be able to say that, while not a single demand from any local authority has been refused, we have been able to meet it without difficulty from our own resources.

Taking the cost of direct relief and the loss to the revenue during the three years in question, they amount to £;10,044,000, and, if we add to this the temporary burden thrown on cash balances from loans and advances, we arrive at a total sum of £;15,171,000, which for famine relief alone had to be found by the Indian Exchequer. Under conditions such as these, it will be imagined by many that the statements I have to make must, so far as the balance of expenditure and income are concerned, necessarily be unsatisfactory, and that, even assuming that this vast additional expenditure could be met without a permanent depreciation of credit, still it must have disorganised, for the three years in which it occurred, the equilibrium of Indian finance. I am glad to be able to dissipate, at the outset of my statement, any such anticipation. Since the territories of the East India Company passed over to the authority of the Crown

I doubt if any Secretary of State has been able to make a more satisfactory statement than it will fall to my lot to unfold. The surpluses of income over expenditure, including all cost for famine relief, are large, continuous, and progressive. We have had certain windfalls to assist us, but the most interesting features of the figures that I have to deal with are that they show that, notwithstanding the great losses and depreciation of agriculture in the West, taking India as a whole, the vast community within its borders have progressed and prospered, and there has been a distinct economic advance. The fact is that the great peninsula of India is not a country, but a continent, and the 300,000,000 inhabitants it contains are not one nation, but many nations, races, and communities, widely differing one from another, and living under dissimilar climates and physical divergencies, and such is the law of compensation that it almost invariably follows that the loss in one province and the distress of one community is the gain and benefit of those in other parts of the peninsula.

I shall, no doubt, be told in the ensuing debate that my figures are optimistic, that my survey of Indian finance and India's economic condition is superficial and rosy, and that my figures are cunningly manipulated to bide the increased impoverishment, if not the insolvency, of India. These comments are the reply that is annually made in certain quarters to the official statements of facts and figures connected with India's financial progress. I am no optimist. My tendency is to inflate rather than contract the difficulties I see ahead; and this characteristic as years advance grows rather than diminishes. This is the twelfth annual statement that, in the course of my political life, I have had the honour to make on behalf of the Indian Government. On every occasion certain of my critics have questioned the accuracy of my figures, which they allege are founded more on official optimism than actual facts and reliable forecast. On every occasion in the course of the next twelve months the actual figures of the closed accounts, as opposed to my estimate, have been more favourable than my anticipation. But then it may be urged that, even if my figures are statistically correct, my review of the economic and material progress of India is thoroughly fallacious, that I fasten upon a few extraneous incidents and inflate them to the glorification of British rule in India, but that I ignore the inner life of the great mass of the community, who are steadily under our processes becoming more and more impoverished.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): No, no.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: Well, Sir, on that point I will only make this one remark. The test by which I judge of India's material advancement or retrogression are not my own, nor those of the Indian Government. They are the economic tests universally accepted and applied to all civilised nations. Year after year the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his annual statement upon Great Britain's finance and industrial condition, applies certain criteria as to the country's prosperity. If he can show that the general powers of consumption and production of the community, the deposits in the banks, the average wages in town and country, the intake of taxation, the proceeds of dutiable articles; if he can show that all these in combination are satisfactory, it is accepted as

unmistakable evidence that the community is advancing and prosperous. If the test be a sound one here, it cannot be the reverse in India. If this test be accepted in the case of this country, it should not be disputed in the case of India. I care not what test you apply in order to ascertain whether India is improving or deteriorating, provided it is one that is accepted and in universal use amongst other civilised nations; but I wish to enter my protest against the assertion, not infrequently made by those unable to disprove our statements, that India is a country so peculiarly organised and constituted that she is to be exempt from the tests and criteria which are universally applied to all other civilised communities. For the year 1809–1900 the charge for famine expenditure, exclusive of loans, was £;3,442,000, but the revenue was so satisfactory that we were able to meet the whole of that exceptional charge and, at the same time, to realise a surplus of £;2,774,623. The finance of the next year, 1900–1901, passed through various changes and permutations, and caused considerable anxiety to the Indian Finance Minister. Mr. Dawkins was responsible for the Budget, and he was compelled to estimate that he would have to meet a direct famine charge of £;4,648,300, and therefore he did not like to estimate for a larger surplus than £;160,000 He anticipated, as he had a perfect right to do, that he might depend this year upon a normal rainfall. Unfortunately, his anticipations were not realised, and for the third year in succession, and, contrary to all meteorological experience and records, drought fastened again on the very richest part of Western India. It was under these circumstances that I had last year to make my financial statement. It was clear that there would have to be additional provision made for famine relief, and, therefore, knowing that increased expenditure was certain, but being uncertain as to the dimensions it might attain, I budgeted for a deficiency of £;826,000. The famine expenditure did largely increase, and reached the large sum of £;5,561,000, but I am glad to say that so satisfactory was the return of the revenue under almost every single head except land revenue that, now that I have got the final figures for the year, my estimated deficit of £;826,000 is turned into a surplus of £;1,671,000.

MR. CAINE: Does that include the grants in respect of troops employed out of India?

*LORD G. HAMILTON: I was coming to that. We had a windfall this year, because a considerable number of troops were taken off the Indian Establishment and engaged both in China and South Africa, and whilst they were so absent the whole charge of their maintenance was borne by the Imperial Government. But, on the other hand, a certain proportion of the saving was expended in rearming the native troops and in various ways in improving the efficiency of the army that was in India. The really satisfactory feature of this year's finance is that as regards salt, excise, customs, post-office, and telegraphs there is a substantial increase, and that the railway account is better by £;641,000 than was anticipated.

There is an important change effected in the Mint this year, which is worthy of the notice of the House. It has always been the practice in the past to include the profits from the Mint in the ordinary revenue of the year. Before the Mints

were closed these profits consisted mainly of seignorage, the profits on each rupee that was coined being small. When the Mints became closed to the public sellers of silver, the profits on each rupee coined, the exchange value being taken at 1s. 4d., were large. The number coined was small; but in this year the demand for coined rupees, partly on account of famine and partly by a desire on the part of traders to exchange rupees for the gold sent to India, became very great. The Government had to purchase silver largely, and the upshot of the coinage operations of the year was that we coined no less than 171,000,000 rupees. The profit is very large. It amounts to about 26 per cent. of the intrinsic metallic value of the rupee, and this gave a net profit of £;3,000,000 sterling. No part of this profit has been credited to revenue. If it had been so realised, the surplus would have been upwards of £;4,500,000. The profits of the amount for this year and subsequently have been set aside to form a source of income by a gold reserve fund which has been established to give stability to exchange and security to the currency system we have recently established in India. If this sum had, in accordance with practice, been included the revenue of the year, the surplus of India would have amounted to nearly £;5,000,000 sterling. In the same twelve months, notwithstanding increased taxation, the deficit in this country was £;53,000,000.

The House is empty, and there is not so large an audience as I had last year. I am sorry for it, because I should like to bring home to certain gentlemen the argument which these figures suggest. Last year, on the discussion of the Indian Budget, the First Lord of the Treasury, my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and I had to stand almost alone the whole night combating the view that a large grant should be made from the Imperial Exchequer for the purpose of helping India to meet its famine charges. As I have stated, every demand made by the Indian Government was acceded to; but if the House had had their way, and £;5,000,000 had been voted to India, it would have made little difference as regards famine disbursements, but it would have gone to swell the large surplus in India and to have increased the deficit of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer here. In other words; and that is why I am sorry the audience is so small; if the House had had their way last year, at a time of exceptional financial pressure, they would have put additional taxation on the taxpayers of this country in order to add to the largest of modern surpluses in India. We, certainly I, opposed the grant not so much in the interests of the English taxpayer as in the interests of India herself. If the whole structure of Indian finance is becoming stronger and more reliable, it has become so under pressure and from the knowledge that it must be self-sustaining. I quite admit that occasions may occur in which it is essential that the Imperial Treasury should come to the rescue of Indian finance, and if, in a moment of unexpected or dire emergency, its credit requires supporting, let the Imperial Exchequer at once come to its assistance, but not otherwise.

In ordinary times the relations between the two Exchequers should be just and fair, India, as the weaker partner, getting the benefit of any doubt where the relative incidence of a common expenditure is open to question or uncertainty.

Such are the relations I have endeavoured, not without success, to establish between the two Treasuries. The principles which I have laid down in connection with the expenditure connected with military expeditions outside India have been universally accepted and have been in force for some years past, and when the Commission upon Indian Expenditure, after a long delay, reported last year in favour of a considerable transfer to the Imperial Exchequer, which had hitherto been borne by the revenues of India, the Chancellor of the Exchequer at once assented to that proposition. And, moreover, we have established the principle that, where there is a difference of opinion between the two Exchequers, the question in dispute shall be referred to arbitration. I quite admit, in dealing with Eastern communities, the great part which sentiment and the emotions play in framing a policy and giving effect to it, and, if you like, I will go further and say inlaying down the general principles which should govern administration. But I think everybody will agree with me that if there is one branch of administrative and executive work in which sentiment and emotion should find no place it is in that of finance. Anyone who will take the trouble of reviewing the finance of those who have been unfortunate in money matters, whether it be individuals or communities or nations, will find that where they have had recourse to sentimental or emotional finance it has generally ended first in repudiation, and subsequently in bankruptcy. So much for the figures of the second year.

I now come to the third year, in which we now are. Sir Edward Law estimated for a surplus of £;690,900 four months back, but the prospects have so improved by a general increase under all the substantial heads of revenue since March last that, by the latest telegrams, the surplus is raised to £;1,824,200. On the expenditure side, as compared with the preceding year, there is a reduction of £;3,245,000 of expenditure connected with famine. The House will, I am sure, be glad to know that the latest information as regards the crop prospects in India is, on the whole, satisfactory. The prices in certain districts are higher, and though there is not a large diminution at present in the numbers on relief in Bombay, their physical condition is reported as good. I think we may confidently expect that there will be nothing approaching to famine in any part of India during the present financial year, but the districts which have so sorely suffered during the past three or four years will require close watching and, possibly, careful nursing. There is an increase in the Army expenditure of £;1,982,000. This may be divided into two sums of almost equal dimensions, one of which represents the increased cost associated with the return of the contingents that have been in China and South Africa, and the other half will be expended on the rearmament of the native forces with the most modern rifles, the increase of artillery, the improvement of the transport service, a large purchase of ordnance stores, and the erection of factories in India for the manufacture of munitions of war. I hope this last experiment will answer, and that we shall, as years roll on, be less and less dependent on supplies of this character from this country. The great bulk of this expenditure in connection with improvements in the service is what I may call capital expenditure, and will not recur.

Perhaps it would be well that I should explain how we stand with reference to ways and means. This year we propose to spend, in accordance with our usual practice, a large sum upon the development of railway communications, and we shall be able to meet most of this expenditure from our cash balances, surplus, and other resources, but it was estimated that in order to meet the remainder of this expenditure it would be necessary to raise a loan of two crores, or £;1,333,000, in India, and a loan of £;1,000,000 in this country. It was subsequently decided to reduce the rupee loan in India to half that amount. My financial advisers were of opinion that, looking to the magnitude of temporary debt in the country, and to the amount of railway capital which was proposed to be raised, and to the fact that the price of India Three per Cent. Stock was above par, I should offer for subscription £;3,000,000 Three per Cent. Stock at the price of 98, in place of the £;1,000,000 shown in the Budget. Unfortunately the day that we invited tenders for the subscription there was a heavy fall in American securities. In consequence a very large sale of Consols took place, with the result that there was a considerable fall in their price. It became clear that we were not likely to realise the whole of the loan. The amount placed was £;700,000. Since then we have improved our position by the increase of the estimated surplus, which is better by £;1,150,000 than was anticipated.

Therefore we stand very much

as we did before. I must of course reserve to myself a free hand as to the methods by which I may for the remainder of the year provide the necessary ways and means to meet this capital expenditure.

In reviewing, therefore, the finance of the last three years we find that, without additional taxation, the revenue of India has met a famine expenditure of over £;10,000,000, notwithstanding wholesale agricultural prostration in Western India, as well as depression elsewhere in the staple industries of cotton, tea, and indigo, and that at the end of those three years there is a surplus of £;6,377,000. These figures show a stability and recuperative power in the financial system of India which must be to many a surprise, if not a revelation. The conclusions they force upon us cannot be put on one side merely by sneers at the optimism of the Secretary of State for India, nor can they be reconciled with the theory that year by year and decade by decade the mass of the population of India are becoming more and more impoverished. If India has emerged successfully from the great ordeal through which she has recently passed it is mainly due to the far-seeing policy which the Indian Government have for many years adopted in financial matters. That policy has been neither shortsighted nor niggardly. The Indian Government have never attempted to increase their revenue by piling up taxation. Their policy has been to utilise reproductive and recuperative agencies, such as railroads, canals, irrigation, cheap postal and telegraphic communication, and improved agricultural and industrial processes, and the establishment of a sound currency, to enlarge the source of India's production and powers of exchange. The task has been a long and costly one, and for years the return on the financial outlay, on the expenditure of effort, and on organisation which this policy entailed gave few outward signs of growth and encouragement. The current of general progress has

been sluggish, with many backwaters, which some of my critics have mistaken for the current itself. But though slow, so as at times to be almost imperceptible, the material advance has been continuous. The recuperative powers of which my statement gives proof mean larger resources and greater staying power than before. If twenty years ago we had been compelled to pass through such an economic convulsion as has for the last five years attacked Bombay, our means of communication, our organisation, our resources, and the powers of endurance of the people themselves would have been wholly inadequate to sustain the attack, and wholesale disaster on a gigantic scale must have ensued. I admit that the numbers on relief and the loss of cattle and crops during the last famine were greater than in any preceding visitation of which we have record; but this is due not to the increased poverty of the people attacked, but to the unprecedented dimensions of the drought. There is a small school in this country as well as in India who are perpetually asserting that our rule is bleeding India to death. Since I have been Secretary of State I have taken great pains to collect and investigate any information or evidence I could obtain, no matter from what quarter it came, which by facts, figures, or other reliable information tended to support this allegation. I admit at once that if it could be shown that India has retrograded in material prosperity under our rule we stand self-condemned, and we ought no longer to be entrusted with the control of that country. But no such facts, figures, or evidence have I ever been able to obtain. That a section of the public both here and in India believe this allegation is clear from their constant and unwearied repetition of the charge. But this belief is founded not on figures, or facts, or economic data, but on a plausible syllogistic formula that they are never tired of repeating. India, they assert, is a very poor country; its poverty is annually increased by the yearly drain caused by an excess of exports over imports. This drain is enforced upon India by the necessity of yearly meeting the obligations of the Government in gold in this country, and as this Government by continual borrowing increases these obligations so it quickens the process of impoverishment. I do not know whether the hon. Gentleman the Member for Camberwell holds those views.

MR. CAINE: Not at all.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: But I think he will admit that I have not unfairly stated the allegation that is constantly made.

MR. CAINE: It is hardly worth answering.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The allegation is made so often that I should like to examine it. I admit that this question of the condition of the people of India is one to which we ought to give most attention.

MR. CAINE: Hear, hear.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: As I said, the evidence points to an improvement of the condition of the people. Although in parts of India there may have been declension, as regards India generally any test that you can apply, whether it relates to consumption or production returns, customs, excise, salt tax, railways, Post Office deposits, or has regard to the clothing or food or house equipment of the great mass of the population, shows that the economic movement

of the last fifty years has been upward and not downward. Sir James Lyall was president of the Famine Commission which inquired into the working of the Famine Code in 1897-98, and I specially pressed him to inquire and obtain evidence as to whether the material condition of the population in the districts which had been afflicted by famine had, during the last twenty years, improved or deteriorated. The recollection of the distress and recent misery was vivid in the minds of all who gave evidence; but he asserted, with the unanimous concurrence of his Commission, that, so far as 83 per cent. of the population was concerned, there was clear and indisputable evidence that their condition during the last twenty years had improved. As regards the remaining 17 per cent., composed chiefly of coolies and labourers, he had some doubts whether the rise in wages which they received had kept pace with the rise in the price of food. Sir, the Viceroy has recently taken the greatest pains to ascertain, upon the same data as were furnished to the Famine Commission of 1880, what the average income per head of the agricultural population is now as contrasted with that twenty years back; and he ascertains that, whereas in 1880 it was Rs. 18 per head, in 1900, notwithstanding the increased population, it was Rs.20 per head; not a great increase, but still an advance. During the same period the income per head of the non-agricultural population is estimated to have risen from Rs.27 to Rs.30. Passing on from individuals to aggregates, the total area under cultivation in 1880 was 194,000,000 of acres; it is now 217,000,000 of acres, an increase that has fully kept pace with the growth of the population. But when we turn to the yield per acre we see a marked improvement; in 1880, the yield of food crops per acre was 730 lb., and in 1900, 840 lb. If we turn to the non-agricultural population there are evident signs of continuous improvement. The distress of the past five years has mainly affected the West of India, in which the bulk of India's manufacturing industries are situated; but I find that, notwithstanding the depression during these five years, the cotton factories have risen in number from 143 to 186. There has been a considerable increase in foundries and railway workshops; jute mills have risen from 29 to 33, and imports of machinery and of mill work during the last five years have increased. Now these movements, small as they individually are, are all travelling in the same direction; they all indicate progress. But the industry that has made the most important advance during the last five years is coal. Twenty years ago the whole output of coal in India was not a million tons. Ten years back it was over two million tons, in 1898, three years back, it was over four million tons, in 1899 five million tons, and last year it was over six million tons. Up to last year, India was an importing country; last year she increased her internal consumption by half a million tons, and for the first time became an exporter of coal. There are a number of known coalfields untouched by railways. We are developing these by the extension of a new line which will pass through the part of the country where they are located, and I have very little doubt that in the course of a few years, the output of coal in India will be doubled. There are enormous deposits of ironstone in India, and much of it is of fine quality but, so far as we know, nowhere in the vicinity of coal. Still, it is not improbable that attempts will be made to start the steel

industry in India, and, if success is associated with such an enterprise, a far-reaching impetus would be given to Indian trade and manufacture. Now I have given a good many figures and facts to the House, and if I add to the facts I have thus enumerated the constant import and retention of precious metals on a very large scale by India, I have produced overwhelming accumulative evidence to show that the economic movement in India is certainly on the upward grade.

Let me deal now with the next allegation. It is true that the exports of India exceed the annual imports, but that does not prove that India is yearly becoming poorer. In Great Britain our imports for many years past have annually exceeded our exports. We are the creditors of the world, and the water-carriers of the trade of the world, and we import the overwhelming mass of the food we require and of the raw material used by our great industries. Under this regime we have prospered and become richer decade by decade; but the United States have, during the last few years, made phenomenal bounds in prosperity. During that period the excess of her exports over her imports has risen from 100,000,000 dollars in 1895 to 540,000,000 dollars in 1900. Is she the poorer? On the contrary, she has so increased her accumulated wealth and loanable capital that New York is now competing with London as one of the financial centres of the world. It is clear, therefore, that to base any conclusions upon the mathematical test of simple subtraction of exports from imports, or upon any survey of only the external trade of a country, but without taking cognisance of the general trade of which it is a portion is thoroughly misleading. The simple fact that India exports more than she imports is no proof whatever that she is annually becoming poorer, for the vast increase of the volume of her external trade is evidence of industrial development and of increased powers of internal consumption.

Let us now look at the nature of the payments made in this country on behalf of the Indian Government. It is not tribute or deadweight disbursements; it represents in every case payment for service rendered, and service of the most valuable and remunerative character. By far the largest part of the so-called home charges is the interest payable on debt and railway capital. These two items are practically convertible, for all the debt incurred here for many years past has been for remunerative purposes, the development either of railways or of irrigation. The total capital put into the railways is about £200,000,000 sterling, and that connected with large irrigation works about £25,000,000 sterling. For these purposes we have borrowed and continue to borrow, but these borrowings do not impoverish India. There are two classes of borrowers in this world; those who borrow because otherwise they cannot meet their immediate obligations, and those who borrow in order to improve their property and to augment their income. The first are under compulsion to borrow; the second are free agents. India is in the latter category. We could stop borrowing at once if we thought it advisable to do so; but we deliberately continue our policy of borrowing because past experience has shown us that the development of the railroads and the irrigation works is a most desirable investment for the people of India. The indirect benefits that railways have conferred upon India are so

great and indisputable that the sternest of economists have not grudged the annual charge imposed upon the revenues of India for the purpose of developing railway enterprise. Twenty years ago the annual charge connected with the railway account on the Indian revenue was £;2,000,000 sterling. The railway mileage then open for traffic in India was about 6,500 miles. The railway mileage in working order now is 25,000 miles, and, as the system has extended, the charge has become less and less, so that India has annually got the benefit of a larger and larger railway mileage, and paid less and less for increasing advantages, until at the present moment the Indian railways are worked at a profit and are a source of revenue. The Indian railway accounts are so extremely good that the House will allow me to explain them. The charge against railway revenues, as shown in these accounts, includes not only the working expenses and interest on all lines open, but also the interest on all the capital of unfinished lines. In addition to that there is a special charge which represents a sinking fund for the redemption of debt, which, I should think, from a strictly accounting point of view, ought not to be made a charge against the annual receipts. The Government of India have the power, under the contracts made with the guaranteed companies, of purchasing their lines at certain stated intervals, and they have the power, if they wish to avail themselves of it, of purchasing by a terminable annuity which lapses in fifty years. A considerable portion of this annuity represents the payment of capital, and that repayment of capital at the present moment amounts to the large annual sum of £;590,000; and, under the operation of the sinking fund, in fifty years the Indian Government will acquire possession of a magnificent railway property, which is now valued at £;85,000,000 sterling, absolutely free from debt or any annual charge connected with the payment of interest. Bearing in mind this special charge against railway receipts, it is interesting to note the remarkable improvement shown during the last five years in the railway accounts. In 1897–98 there was a loss on the railway account of £;709,000. In the next year that loss was reduced to £;620,000. In the first of the three years with which my statement deals the whole of this loss was wiped off', and there is a profit recorded of £;76,000. In the next year this profit has increased to £;156,000. In that year we acquired possession of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway, and in consequence of this operation of taking over a line and stock, the marketable value of which was £;35,000,000 sterling, a large increase of the sinking fund had to be made. Sir Edward Law, therefore, estimated for the next year that, including the whole of this increased charge, there would be a deficiency of £;164,000 on the railway account, but the traffic receipts of the first four months have been so satisfactory that it is now calculated that the whole of this estimated loss will be swept away, and that there will be, after including the whole of the sinking fund, a profit of some thousands of pounds.

MR. CAINE: Does the right hon. Gentleman ignore the standing loss of £;40,000,000 on the Indian railways?

LORD G. HAMILTON: That has nothing whatever to do with it. When there was a loss

on the railroads, of course it affected the finances of the year, and if the finances of the year had been unable to meet that charge and you had had to add to the capital value of your railways to enable you to meet the interest charge, then that figure might be taken into account. But that loss was not year by year and wiped off, and now all we have to do is to deal with the interest charges, and, taking these charges into account, the working of the railroads gives a profit during the past three years. The result of this system of borrowing for railways is that we have wiped out the annual loss, and if we deduct the Sinking Fund, which is a charge arbitrarily placed against the railway revenues, we find that the railway system is not only now costing us nothing, but, in addition to all its enormous indirect benefits, is contributing £;600,000 a year to the Indian Exchequer out of its profits. This, then, is the result of the policy which the hon. Gentleman wants to prove is placing the Indian Government year by year in a worse financial position and ought to be put a stop to. I maintain, on the other hand, that this judicious system of borrowing has been the salvation, both financially and otherwise, of India. If it had not been for the great development of railway enterprise it would have been absolutely impossible for us to have attempted to cope with one tithe of the distress which has been caused by the failure of the rains in certain parts of India. Although the working of the railroads is satisfactory, I think we ought not yet to be satisfied,

but ought to try to improve it. Lord Curzon and I for some time past have been desirous of having the working and organization of our Indian railroads investigated and reported upon by an outside railway authority. Great credit is due to the Public Works Department for the ability shown in overcoming the great engineering difficulties they have had to encounter; and the construction, development, and general administration of railways in India has on the whole been crowned with marked success. But I have little doubt that a railway authority, trained for many years to study economy, expedition, and cheap carriage, under the pressure of competition and the shareholders' desire for dividends, might be able to make valuable suggestions as regards the working of railways in India. I hope I have succeeded in securing the services of an expert of very great experience and attainments. He should start at once, and, before he finally reports, he will investigate the railway system in America with the view of reporting how far the methods that there prevail could with advantage be introduced into India. I need not trouble the House with the reference which will be given to him for his inquiries, beyond stating that his attention will be specially directed towards the development of light railroads amongst the more densely inhabited agricultural districts of India. I am hopeful that when that report is made we shall be able to take action upon it which will add to the value of the railroad property of India.

The other great branch of remunerative capital outlay is irrigation. More than twenty years ago I presided over a Committee of this House which reported upon this subject, and the experience that we have since gained has tended to confirm the substance of that Report. Upon certain conditions, which combine a continuous supply of water independent of the local rainfall, and passing

through a country which by gravitation permits the transmission of water in various directions, the benefits of irrigation and its profits are very great. Excepting the Punjab and Sind, there are few, if any, parts of India where this combination is to be found on such a scale as to justify very large works, or where, if the conditions do exist, they have not been fully utilised. But I am doubtful insufficient attention has been given to smaller and less ambitious works, such as reservoirs, tanks, and all those smaller schemes which, according to the climatic and physical conditions of the country, are calculated to meet local drought. These schemes occupy the great intermediate domain belonging to irrigation which is to be found between the humble well and the vast distributing works connected with the large rivers of India. The development of this class of irrigation is closely associated with land assessment and famine labour relief works. We must be most careful to see that our land revenue system by unduly assessing such improvements does not discourage the cultivator from making them, and we can, I think, by financial help or otherwise, encourage local bodies, corporations, and well-to-do individuals to plan and promote the storage and distribution of water in the manner most likely to withstand the particular forms of drought to which their localities may be liable. Though many of the relief works made during famine are subsequently useful, still their utility at present is in no way commensurate to their cost. To bring together into one focus all forms of irrigation, and lay down, both as regards Government work and private effort, rules for their interlacing, encouragement, and control is a task which we propose at once to undertake; and I have secured as chairman of a commission for this purpose Sir Colin Scott-Moncrieff, whose work in Egypt has been so remarkable that it has effaced the recollection of the excellent services which, as an irrigation officer many years ago, he performed in India. With him will be associated a revenue and engineering officer of the highest repute, and a native gentleman of capacity and administrative experience.

But there is an agency as potent as either railways or irrigation in promoting India's material progress, whose activities, though silent, are ubiquitous and never-ceasing, and which demands a word of notice. I refer to our gold currency policy. It has stood the test of three successive adverse years, and not only has it emerged triumphant from that ordeal, but it has during that period lightened the strain which India's economic system had to sustain. One of the objects both of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton and myself in promoting the adoption of a gold currency and standard in India was a firm belief that it would, by steadying exchange, largely increase the flow of loanable capital to India, thus developing industry and assisting agriculture by lowering the price of money and the rate of interest both in good years and bad years. Amongst the witnesses who appeared before the Currency Committee, no man spoke with greater knowledge and authority than Mr. Lindsay, of the Bank of Bengal, and he has recently communicated a memorandum to the Finance Minister in India, from which I will quote the following pregnant extract;

"A comparison of the rates of interest ruling in 1899 and 1900 with those in force during the preceding two years appears to indicate that the flow of

capital to India anticipated by the Indian Currency Committee of 1898 has begun; and, to judge by the comparative ease with which the exceptional strain caused by the famine of 1900 was met, there is reason to believe that, should confidence in the stability of exchange be maintained, the existing facilities for the import of foreign capital will be ample to meet all legitimate demands on the short loan market in India."

He then points out that there have been, during the past twenty-five years, three great famines in India; a famine in 1877, a famine in 1897, and a famine in 1900, which was the most serious and the longest maintained. The published rate of interest averaged in the first year 8.3 per cent., in 1897 7.9 per cent., but in 1900 5.3 per cent. So after this I hope I shall never be told again that India is too poor a country to bear the luxury of a gold standard. As I stated before, we coined last year 171,000,000 rupees, and the profit upon this coinage was about £3,000,000 sterling. No part of this profit has been credited to the revenue, but it was passed on to the cash balance, and temporarily used as loans to native States and advances to cultivators. As such loans are repaid, it is intended to set the proceeds apart for the maintenance of a gold reserve fund, of which a part will be held in gold and a part invested. A beginning of investment has already been made, £1,000,000 of gold being sent from India, and about £1,000,000 of Consols have been purchased with the proceeds. But the possession of a gold reserve fund and of gold in the Treasury balances and currency reserve enables the Government to protect India from fluctuations in exchange. Formerly, the Government could only meet sterling obligations by the sale of Council bills to the public, or by borrowing; and it was sometimes necessary to press these Bills on a falling market. Now the Government has a third and valuable resource. The Government can ease the market by sending home gold from its Treasury balances, or can draw gold from the currency reserve, or from the new gold reserve fund, or the Secretary of State can sell a portion of the invested funds. Sir, it has long been recognised that the possession of a stock of gold capable of being used in this way is one of the best possible safeguards for maintaining a stable exchange between England and India. On June 30th of this year the gold held by the Indian Government was thus located:; Paper currency reserve, £5,400,000; Treasuries, £180,000; gold reserve fund, £1,100,000, making a total of about £6,700,000, exclusive of £500,000 in the gold reserve in England.

I received a few days back the Report of Sir Antony MacDonnell's Commission upon the famine administration of the last drought, and this Report also contains suggestions relating to the principles which govern the suspension and remission of land revenue during times of exceptional distress. The Report is long, able, and unanimous; and in the course of a short time I hope to be able to give effect to many of its recommendations. There is in certain quarters an impression that our land assessments are in many parts of the country unduly high, and that the inability of the cultivators to meet distress caused by drought, as well as their indebtedness to the moneylenders, is largely to be attributed to these high assessments. My mind is perfectly open on such questions; I have never been able to obtain yet reliable evidence or figures in

support of this contention which stood subsequent examination; and upon this point I may say that Sir Antony MacDonnell's Report, which is unanimously signed by all the Commissioners, in no way maintains or advances any theory that our land assessment is too high. At the same time, I readily admit that it may be that the rise under resettlement may sometimes be too sudden, and that here and there assessments may have been too high. And it is, further, an undoubted fact that the indebtedness of the occupier in many places is a serious economic and political danger. I do not believe, however, that the general rate of assessment is too high; on the contrary, compared with what it was under native rule, it is undoubtedly moderate, and should be well within the general paying capacity of the cultivator, provided he is free from the clutches of the moneylender. If the indebtedness of the ryot and landowner be a serious admitted evil, can we free him from its grip and consequences? My belief is that this indebtedness largely arises from two causes. We have strengthened the tenure of the occupier, and thus increased the value of the security he can offer, and the procedure of the civil courts has expedited and strengthened the moneylender's powers of foreclosure. To remedy this state of things we are having recourse to counteracting processes. We have imposed in the Punjab and are about to impose in parts of Bombay certain restrictions on the powers of alienation by the occupier. The legislation is tentative, and will have to be very closely watched.

The other measure to which I allude is an attempt to establish land banks. This is a proposal to which much attention and investigation in recent years have been given. A Committee at Simla, under the presidency of the Finance Minister, is now sitting, and I hope, in the course of this year, one or more experimental banks will be started. This problem in all countries has proved a difficult one, but its solution in India is aggravated by the relatively much greater position which Government there occupies in the minds of the governed compared with Administrations in a self-governing community. These banks to be useful must be numerous; to be numerous they must be self-supporting and self-governing; but they cannot

be started without Government support. We have, therefore, to try and define the support to be given so that it should be of such a character that, whilst sufficient to start a bank, it should automatically diminish and cease with the lapse of time. Too much care cannot in this respect be given to the constitution and framework of the pioneer institutions.

There is yet a further inquiry I have to refer to, and this will interest my hon. friend the Member for North-East Bethnal Green. The indefatigable Viceroy has another great investigation in hand dealing with a subject which, if not strictly germane to those with which I have been dealing, does indirectly affect the future industrial prospects of India; namely, the reform of the existing systems of education. No one, looking at the systems in force, can deny that primary as against secondary education has been neglected, and that, in the higher branches of education, a purely literary degree of a perfunctory character, and in many cases of no subsequent use, has, until quite recent times, pushed technical and industrial education out of the field. These obvious

defects must be redressed, and in any reform in the direction I have indicated the Viceroy will have the support of the whole commercial and industrial intelligence of India.

I have now enumerated the various inquiries and investigations which the Government of India have set on foot, some of which are complete, some proceeding, and others not yet commenced; but, in relation to all of these, there is but one desire on the part of those who started them; that they should bear fruit on the earliest opportunity. We are fortunate at this juncture in having as Viceroy of India a statesman who, in addition to other remarkable qualities, has a capacity of work in himself, and a power in moving others to similar exertion which I have never yet seen equalled. In his hands there will be no delay in taking action upon reports when made; and, as there will be a prompt co-operation here, I hope that, within a limited time, the reforms we have in view may be in working order in their respective spheres of operation. But I cannot mention Lord Curzon's name without pointing out that it is not only in connection with questions of material progress in India that his work is to be lauded; in other directions he has done even more valuable service. It is not so much that he has made any marked departure from the principles which have animated his distinguished predecessors, as that, gifted with a remarkable power of sympathetic speech, he has brought vividly home to all ranks of the native community the beneficent intentions of the Government of which he is the head, and the unselfish objects of the policy which it is perpetually endeavouring to promote. The fortunes of Great Britain and India are indissolubly united, and that curious and incongruous union, as it may seem to some, must, so long as it exists, bring in its wake a string of problems which would at first sight seem to baffle any stable solution. Upon the foundation of an Act of Parliament of a self-governing people there is established a Government at the other end of the world necessarily autocratic in its constitution and summary in its procedure, which exercises sway over one-sixth of the human race. It has been frequently predicted that, as this House becomes more and more democratic in its character from the lowering of the franchise, so would it show a greater disposition to interfere in the policy and practices of the Government of India. So far from this having taken place, the exact reverse has occurred. I was Under Secretary of State at the India Office twenty-seven years ago, when a higher franchise prevailed in this country, and my work then was, as far as Parliament was concerned, much heavier than it now is.

MR. CAINE: More interest was taken in Indian affairs.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: No, that is not the case; it is not due to a diminution of interest in Indian questions; on the contrary, at no time can I recollect that there was a wider or more general sympathy with our fellow-subjects there than now prevails in this House.

MR. CAINE: There is no opportunity of expressing it.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: I repeat, in my judgment, and I think I may speak with some authority from my connection with Indian administration for many years, there never was a time when there was a more anxious desire on the part of all

sections to take an interest in Indian affairs. The truth is that a democracy loves many things, but most of all the exhibition of strength if associated with justice; and it is ready to support and applaud a strong Government in India, provided that those who exercise authority there exhibit the qualities of justice, vigilance, and fearlessness; but, of these attributes, first comes justice. It is sometimes said that the foundation of our rule in India is force. I deny that proposition. Justice is the foundation of our authority in India; force is in reserve, but only to uphold justice. Up to the time of the establishment of our Government in India her past history was one continuous record of the rule of fighting minorities dominating peaceful majorities. We suppressed the turbulent few to the immeasurable gain of the quiet many. To maintain justice between man and man, to ensure equal treatment between race and race and creed and creed; this is the mission and should be the glory of British rule in India. The volumes of multifarious papers, reports, and correspondence dealing with different branches of work and administration that come under the cognisance of the Secretary of State for India are generally pleasant reading. They do indicate the success and thoroughness with which this task of enforcing justice is carried out by our rule in India. But I occasionally come across undoubted miscarriage of justice, where verdicts are given contrary to the clear opinion of the judge and the evidence he has analysed; and, although these cases are very few and far between, they are generally connected with incidents where European and native have come in collision. The Viceroy has on more than one occasion in manly and eloquent language pointed out that any one who in any way aids, abets, or connives at such a decision is doing his best to destroy the moral foundations of our authority in India, and I wish here publicly to endorse every word he has so said. There are problems ahead, social and political, which must crop up in the future, and whose handling will be difficult, and solution impossible, unless we can associate with their ultimate settlement confidence and trust in our motives and integrity. The Viceroy has already during his present tenure of office, achieved two great personal successes; by his talents and personality he has strengthened the external policy of India, and at the same time has infused vigour and activity into every branch of internal administration, thus winning the admiration of the governing classes, and, on the other hand, by his consideration for the sentiments, feelings, and rights of the native populations, he has gained their especial esteem and confidence. Under the auspices of the new century, I believe that this rare and happy combination of governing qualities will inaugurate a new era of prosperity and progress in India.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do not leave the Chair."

*SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAG-GREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I am sure the House will rejoice with me at the satisfactory character of the finances and general affairs of India as disclosed in the lucid review which we have just listened to with so much interest. After more than three years of severe affliction India, according to the detailed and comprehensive statement made by my noble friend, shows to-day a capacity for recuperation which is evidence at once of the soundness of her administration, of the copious resources of the country, and of

the thrifty habits and power of patient endurance of her peoples. After grappling with famines of exceptional severity, and making provision for a large outlay on further reforms and increase in the army, and placing to the credit of railways ten and a half crores of rupees and another crore to that of irrigation, the Finance Minister forecasts in his Estimates for the year under review a balance on the right side of upwards £1,671,000. If no untoward circumstances, such as another serious failure of crops or complications on the frontier, occur to dislocate the calculations on which this conclusion is based, we shall have reason to congratulate our fellow-subjects in India on the cheerful prospect that is before them of retrieving their economic position, which has been so gravely affected by the tribulations they have suffered in recent years.

The Secretary of State has made tonight several well-merited references to the splendid utterances and work of Lord Curzon since he took up the Viceroyalty. The tribute which he has thus paid is not too high or exaggerated, and will doubtless be endorsed by this House. Lord Curzon had at the outset of his career drawn out a programme for his activity which he classified under twelve heads, and he has been able to show that much has been already accomplished under many, if not all, of them. His most important work in the past year was the inauguration of the new frontier policy, which has admitted of the withdrawal of our troops from several advanced positions on the borders, and replacing them by tribal levies. It is a right step in the direction of minimising the chances of complications with the frontier tribes, and if the confidence reposed thereby in those tribes is not utterly misplaced, we may hope that they will realise and act up to the responsibility imposed on them for the security of peace. This, together with the formation of a new agency, constituting the Trans-Indus districts into an administration directly under the control of the supreme Government, is an act of high statesmanship making for tranquillity on the frontier which in process of time will possibly tend to lessen the great burden of frequent punitive expeditions on the Indian Exchequer. The reduction of upwards of a million and a quarter in the Army charges during the past year owing to the absence of regiments in South Africa and China is an item of the financial statement which is not only satisfactory in itself, but gives food for reflection whether a readjustment of the military expenses now borne by India should not be effected upon a more equitable basis than at present existing. Although it may not furnish quite a strong argument for a permanent reduction in the number of troops, still it points unmistakably to the fact that they are always available for service out of India, and that a considerable portion of them form an invaluable reserve for general Imperial purposes, and it is not therefore unfair to argue that the proportionate cost should be defrayed by the Imperial Exchequer. It would be an act of but bare justice to India.

It will be proper to refer here with satisfaction to the scheme which has been matured by the noble Lord and the Viceroy for the creation of an Imperial cadet corps. We have not yet the details of it before us, but I welcome the idea of opening out a field of military service for the scions of the ruling and noble

houses of India, worthy of the traditions of those families in the past, and of the capacity which our brave Indian troops have proved over and over again in our own time. The confidence and responsibility reposed in the higher classes by their inclusion in the Army will, I am sure, be amply rewarded by the feelings of devotion to the paramount power which will be fostered thereby. The additional expenditure which the new reforms in the military service will necessitate will be regarded with some concern in India. All such increases are unpopular, especially in countries where, as in India, people are not taken into confidence as to the causes which make them desirable, but it is possible to reconcile popular opinion by allowing the people to share in some of the incidental benefits resulting from such increase. For instance, among the reforms projected, there is to be a large addition to the Indian medical service, and the Government of India might well take this opportunity for giving local medical men scope for their activity in this service. There has been a long standing and justifiable complaint that men trained in India for the medical profession who enter the public service have no prospect of promotion. Capable men of long experience have to relinquish their posts, or retire after a service of more than thirty: years without having had any appreciable advance in pay and position from where they began early in life. I trust, therefore, that in the contemplated increase of officers in the medical service, the Government of India will make some provision for the inclusion of men of tried and long careers as a reward for work which has hitherto been ill-requited. Among the measures for relieving the cultivators in India from some of the chronic difficulties which lead to their impoverishment, I note that Lord Curzon promises to try the experiment of Agricultural Banks. I trust it will prove successful, for it is admitted generally that the very hard terms on which the agricultural communities obtain their loans at present from the money-lenders are extremely oppressive. Once they get into the clutches of this class of usurers, they can never get free of them. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the experiment should be given a fair trial, and I hope the result will be encouraging.

Now, Sir, there is one matter of very serious importance which has for some years naturally caused much irritation throughout India, to which I ask the permission of this House to refer. It is with regard to the maintenance of the rights, privileges, and fair treatment of our Indian fellow-subjects in other parts of His Majesty's dominions, and it is most desirable that they should know what is being done by the Secretary of State and the Viceroy to protect them against the mean and despicable attempts made in several colonies, both in Australia and Africa, to rob them of the equality and justice to which they are entitled as British subjects. Sir, the legislation in those colonies directed against British Indian subjects has become a scandal, and the people of India have well nigh lost all hope of redress. But the other day a piece of such legislation was vetoed by the King, thanks to the stand made against it by the Colonial Secretary, and I shall read to the House an extract from an article published in one of the most prominent native papers of India, the *Bast Gofar*, to show with what feelings the news was received there::

"Apart from the material injury that such legislation promises to inflict on the native Indian settlers in those colonies, the sense of humiliation and moral degradation which is being so keenly felt by the Indians throughout the Empire in consequence, is likely to create disaffection and serious mischief before long. The current of hostile feeling has been found running too strong, however, among the whites for the Government to deem it safe to interfere in the manner the native Indians have so long desired; and of late it seemed as if relief would never come till the stronger race themselves learnt to appreciate the other better, which meant the Greek calends. It has been at the moment when we had almost despaired of any effective action being taken by the British Government in defence of the rights of our countrymen that Reuter has flashed us the good news 'that Mr. Chamberlain has declared, in the House of Commons, that he has disallowed the Queensland Anti-Asiatic Act, because it excluded British subjects of India solely on account of race and colour, and was also offensive to Japan, placing its subjects in the same category as Asiatics generally, without considering their civilisation.' As we have said, for this firm attitude we were altogether unprepared, and our countrymen will, therefore, feel all the more grateful to Mr. Chamberlain for his action in the matter. It is only to be hoped that he will remain firm and consistent throughout, and that he will not only forbid such legislation in other colonies, but also try to emancipate our countrymen in those Settlements where such cruel and oppressive enactments already exist."

I can only echo the sentiments so well expressed by the writer that my right hon. friend the Secretary for the Colonies will exert his great influence to stem the tide of such pernicious legislation. I cannot refrain from expressing my deep sense of the antipathy which both he and the Secretary of State for India have repeatedly manifested to the humiliating and oppressive treatment to which those of the people of India who reside in the colonies are subjected, and would here openly acknowledge with gratitude the consideration which they have given to the representations frequently made by me on the subject. But, Sir, it is evident that the Indian Administration both here and in India should not only take vigorous action to arrest this invasion on the rights of those whom they are bound to protect, but publicly declare what steps they are taking to safeguard their interests when they are attacked. We do not know yet what is being done to re-habilitate the lascars with regard to their employment on British ships after the judicial pronouncement of Mr. Justice Mathews which recently decided that they must be allotted the same space as European sailors. Of course, nobody can quarrel with the judgment, but the conflict of Imperial with Indian law which it has demonstrated calls for active interference on the part of the Government of India to redress the great hardships inflicted on so industrious and honest a working class community as the lascars. They do not want the additional space, for which reason, and owing to their thrifty and sober habits, the owners of vessels are glad to employ them. I do not see why they should be deprived of the advantage which these conditions of life give them for earning an honest livelihood. These are only a couple of illustrations of the unfair treatment from which some

classes of our British Indian subjects suffer, and which fills them with much apprehension as to their future. I know that the noble Lord and the Viceroy have been doing all they could to protest against the wrongs thus inflicted on the Indian population, but it is time that what they do in this way should be made known to the people themselves, as it would on the one hand be a matter of some satisfaction to them, and on the other lead to an expression of public opinion throughout the country which will have some beneficial effect in the colonies. If no adequate steps are taken to arrest this onslaught on the rights of British Indian subjects, I am afraid the time will come, and that very shortly, when the House of Commons will have to decide whether the pledges and promises repeatedly given by British statesmen and the British nation to the people of India for fair treatment are to have any force or effect in future. The noble Lord very rightly said in one part of his eloquent speech to-night that the strength and vindication of our rule in India was the justice which it secured to the people. In this phrase are embraced the maintenance of their just rights and the security of their just treatment. If, however, in the face of the oppressive and disabling measures adopted in the colonies, Imperial statesmen were to throw up their hands and argue that, because they are self-governing administrations, they could not be touched even when they trampled underfoot the noblest traditions of the British constitution, then the right to govern India from here would be seriously impaired, not only in the eyes of the people of India but in the sight of foreign nations.

Now, Sir, I come to the motion which stands in my name on the Notice Paper, as follows;

"That this House views with approval the efforts made within the last two years by the Viceroy and local Governments in India to foster the indigenous industries of the country and promote technical instruction, and is of opinion that, for the better and more rapid attainment of these objects, a public inquiry into the present condition of industrial education should be held with a view to devising a thoroughly regulated system of elementary technical and industrial training in connection with the existing educational institutions throughout India."

I must confess to a feeling of satisfaction at the position in which the question of technical and industrial education for India stands to-day, as compared with that in which it stood three years ago, when I first drew the attention of the House to it. The advocacy of this branch of popular instruction was then viewed in some quarters with suspicion as an attack on higher education. Today that suspicion has been entirely dispelled. Then it was vaguely conceded by even friendly critics that it was no doubt something good for India to have, but that the energy and intellect of the people must be first concentrated upon their academic and doctrinaire reforms and high political ambitions, which, although noble in themselves, can be, after all, the pursuit of a few, and not the occupation of the masses in a nation, however advanced. To-day, it is admitted that skilled labour and the training of large classes of the people for industrial avocations are as indispensable to the welfare of India as to the prosperity of any other country, and that it is the first duty

of both the Government and the people to foster them. It is broadly recognised that if India is poor, that if she cannot keep abreast of other civilised countries in the van of national prosperity, if she is condemned even in our colonies and denied her just rights, that one of the main causes of her weakness is the fact that 95 per cent. of her children are eking out a bare subsistence from the soil without the knowledge and the capacity to delve under the surface down to those mineral resources with which she is bountifully supplied by nature, or to manipulate skilfully even those products which pass through their hands to foreign manufacturers. This is a new departure in popular sentiment, at which I have reason to rejoice. The ample sympathetic acknowledgment of the necessity for remedying the great want of industrial education which the noble Lord has repeatedly made in this House and out of it, and the spirited utterances of Lord Curzon on the subject on his landing in India, have mainly brought about this awakening. Both the Viceroy, and Lord Northcote in Bombay, have made this branch of instruction a main plank of their educational platform, and the numerous testimony which I have received from all parts of India, not excluding prominent native States, in the shape of inquiry as to the best means of promoting it shows that their lead is followed by native gentlemen of the highest intelligence and distinction. In his speech on the last Indian Budget, Lord Curzon again referred to the topic in these words; "First, I would name educational reform, the placing of education in India, in its various branches; university, higher, secondary, technical, and elementary; upon a definite scientific footing, and the clear determination of the relations between private enterprise and the State."

The utterances of prominent men of all races in India show that the public mind is ripe to welcome such reform. Nor is the necessity for it any the less apparent by its being urged by almost everyone who has any suggestions to make in regard to remedial measures for famines, that in industrial pursuits lies the future security of India against the terrible ravages of hunger. One of the most notable utterances of this kind is that of Mr. J. D. Rees, in his "Famine Facts and Fallacies," in which he points out what the people of India are capable of doing in the industrial line in these words;:

"The Indians are cunning workers in wood and ivory, capital carpenters, good blacksmiths. As shoemakers they might with education approach the Chinese standard. As weavers they are unsurpassed, probably unequalled in the world. Gold, coal, manganese, lead, copper, and other minerals abound in the bowels of the earth; diamonds and other precious stones are found upon its surface; the forests are full of rare and valuable products over and above timber, out of which anything can be manufactured from a ship to a match-box. Skins and tanning materials are equally plentiful; alongside cotton and jute grow dyeing materials. The best of carpets are made by the most ordinary prisoner in gaol. Fibres are positively a drug in the market. At present Germans and Japanese supply at sufficiently low prices for their clients furniture, fans, ropes, mats, carpets, baskets, combs, boxes, shoes, umbrellas, matches, buttons, and a hundred other things which could be equally well made in the country."

He goes on to say that these articles are not made in India, and that the foreign manufacturer is not too proud to supply them. Yes, Sir, the German and the Austrian and the Japanese manufacturers supply all these articles to India. It is even worse than that, for they take away the raw produce and send them back to India in the shape of useful and: dainty articles, which have become things of ordinary consumption for large classes of her people. The valuable woods and the timber of her forests are not manufactured either into ships or matches by the local people! And now the question before us is, Why and how is it so? and the wrong of it being admitted, the next question is, How can the evil be remedied? But before I come to these questions, I must deal with one or two arguments which a certain class of optimists employ to make out that, after all, the backward condition of industries in India is common to many prosperous countries also, and, secondly, that the lack of industries is not so great as it is made out to be. With regard to the first argument, I am prepared to admit that there are thriving nations from among whom now and then an industry disappears from various causes. But then there are other scientific and technical occupations taking its place, or their great wealth and resources do not make the loss, if it is absolute, appreciably felt. If, for instance, some such existing pursuit ceases to be followed here, other of our home manufactures are on so gigantic a scale that the loss is scarcely perceived. Now, with regard to the second argument, it is in a sense true that there are, after all, various industries existing in India, and new ones being occasionally taken up. The last published Statement of the Moral and Material Progress of India gives, for instance, the following table of what are called "large industries."::

Silk mills

7

Soap factories

47

Tanneries

135

Iron and brass foundries

106

Sugar factories (large and small)

229

Donee works

44

Cotton ginning factories, cotton presses

773

Jute presses

122

Cotton and woollen spinning and weaving establishments, not classed as mills

24

Hope factories

25

Oil mills

195

Cutch and lac factories, large and small

140

Flour mills

103

Ice factories

56

Pottery and tile factories

140

Bone crushing factories

19

Tobacco and cigar factories

26

Silk filatures

66

Glass factories

6

Dye works

8

Indigo factories, large and small

5,094

Printing presses

756

Dairy farms

71

These together with

Cotton mills

186

Jute mills

33

Woollen mills

4

Rice mills

160

Saw mills

85

Paper mills

9

Breweries

28

give a total of 8,693 of so-called "large factories." From a superficial point of view, this number may be regarded as satisfactory even for so big a country as India. But, Sir, the total of the men employed in these establishments is under 660,000, a fourth of which number is engrossed by the cotton mills, which are most apt to suffer in times of famine owing to the scarcity or dearness of cotton. At the best of times, however, the whole of the largo industries give employment to a mere trifling fraction of the teeming population of the country.

Then, again, we have to take into account what is the share India derives from these industrial institutions. A great deal of the capital employed in them is British and foreign; likewise the direction or administration of them is in other than Indian hands. Of course, I cannot and do not complain of this, as I quite recognise that in the absence of Indian capital and Indian trained men it is to the advantage of the country to have these industries even with foreign help. But, from the point of view of the actual benefit accruing to India, it must be conceded that the existence of these more than 8,000 factories is not such an economic boon to the natives as appears at first sight. In fact, the chief gain to the country is the mere living wage earned by the inferior workman. I hope I have shown conclusively that the optimistic arguments to which I have referred are unsubstantial, and do not justify the assumption of any such hopeful prospect of Indian industries as might allow us to remain indifferent any longer as to the future. The other day when a teacher of mechanical engineering was required for one of the very few technical institutions in the country, they had to advertise for one in the papers here. The salary offered was about £300 per annum, and when I asked the noble Lord if a man of the engineering capacity of that modest valuation could not be found in all India, he admitted in his reply that that was so. This was just the answer I expected, but what a commentary it was upon the educational work accomplished after upwards of a century of settled British rule in India, and after half a century of a settled system of public instruction! Sir, it is perfectly clear that that system requires to be fundamentally altered. I do not think that the present standard of higher education should be reduced. That standard must be maintained for the literary and academic needs of the country. But some means must be devised for the training of large classes of her population so as to adapt them for skilled industrial pursuits. A beginning can be made by attaching to the existing schools technical departments and workshops. It is not possible in the course of a general discussion on the Budget to enter minutely into the details of any scheme of such an educational reform. Indeed, the subject is so vast, and has to be considered from so many different points of view, and the change which the present system will have to undergo would be so extensive, that a public inquiry into the whole question is a necessary preliminary to the inception of a new scheme of industrial education. My noble friend has given us the cheerful information that Lord Curzon has in hand an investigation for bringing about a reform of the existing systems. This makes my task simple, and I feel I need not enter at present into further argument in support of the terms of my motion, which will no doubt be embraced in the promised investigation, as I trust that I have made out a sufficient case for the inclusion in that inquiry of the whole question of industrial education, the absence of which is now so generally felt, and the adequate provision for which can no longer be delayed, and is in fact loudly called for by all classes of the people.

I have to thank the House for the indulgence which it has extended to me in listening to these somewhat lengthy remarks on a subject in which many hon. Members are not likely to feel any immediate concern. But I can assure them that

it is of paramount importance to the welfare of our great Indian dependency. I have given prominence to two among the several topics I have passed over in review to-night. The first relates to the protection of the rights and interests of British Indian subjects in our colonies, and the second has reference to their future well-being by means of industrial development. Both these subjects have an intimate bearing on the national well-being, not only from the Indian but from an Imperial standpoint. Both these subjects have aroused public interest in that country, and I should fail in my duty if I did not on the floor of this House declare that there lie upon British statesmen the most sacred and serious obligations to boldly grapple with these problems. The solution of the former will require the exercise of rare courage and tact, that of the latter a no less firm determination, to brush aside existing prejudices and to introduce necessary reforms. The Secretary of State for India, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the present Viceroy are the men to whom the people of India look with confidence for that solution, and I for one have no doubt that they will have the cordial support of this House in doing that justice to the people of India in the one case, and in securing in the other that great educational improvement which will give our fellow-subjects a firmer faith in the benevolent intentions of the British nation towards them. I beg, Sir, to move.

MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): formally seconded the Amendment. Amendment proposed;

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words 'this House views with approval the efforts made within the last two years by the Viceroy and local governments in India to foster the indigenous industries of the country and promote technical instruction, and is of opinion that, for the better and more rapid attainment of these objects, a public inquiry into the present condition of industrial education should be held with a view to devising a thoroughly regulated system of elementary technical and industrial training in connection with the existing educational institutions throughout India.'"; (Sir Mancherjee Bhownagree.)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I suppose the discussion will now be limited to this particular Amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

LORD G. HAMILTON, who was very indistinctly heard, was understood to say that he believed that several hon. Members wished to speak upon other questions connected with the financial statement he had made. In these circumstances it might be for the convenience of the House if he dealt with the Amendment which his hon. friend had moved at this early stage. His hon. friend had truly said that the cause of education in India was now in a more satisfactory condition than it was a few years ago; and he thought that his hon. friend might fairly take upon himself some of the credit which had resulted from the efforts he had made in season and out of season in the direction of that improvement. It must be obvious, however, that until there was an increase of the existing industries by the multiplication and diversification of industrial employment, the condition of the people would not be benefited to that extent which every well-

wisher of India would naturally desire. In various ways the development of technical and industrial education had been advanced, and, as the hon. Member for North-East Bethnal Green was well aware, some influential gentlemen in Bombay who had this question very much at heart had been pressing upon the Government of India to consider the advisability of establishing a college to promote industrial research. As he had already stated in his speech, the question of general education in

India had been under the consideration of the Viceroy, and the Viceroy had determined to suggest an inquiry into the whole system. He could not state what the terms of the reference would be and what form the inquiry would take, but he felt confident that it would be much in the direction of promoting the objects which his hon. friend had in view. Therefore, if he could not accept the Amendment it was not because he was not in entire accord with it, and he hoped his hon. friend would be satisfied with the assurance he had given.

Question put, and agreed to.

Main Question again proposed.

MR. CAINE: I shall not under the circumstances move the resolution which I have placed upon the Paper, although I differ very strongly from a great deal which has been put forward in this debate. I wish to associate myself with those critics to whom the noble Lord referred as holding certain heresies, which he detailed at some length, and which he said existed in Parliament "in other quarters." I will not allow myself to be drawn into the many issues which the noble Lord has raised, but I will come at once to the line of argument indicated in the resolution which stands in my name, and which I shall not now be able to move. I should like to say, in the first place, that there is one point in the noble Lord's speech with which I am in entire accord. I wish to express my entire concurrence in every word which has been said with regard to Lord Curzon, who has rendered, and I hope will still continue to render, great services to India. I do not deprecate the value of British over-rule. It is the only condition which is possible in India. India has benefited by it enormously. Mr. Caine's Amendment was: "That this House recognises the devoted and earnest endeavours of the Viceroy of India and all concerned in famine administration to relieve the suffering people in the famine districts, but regrets that during a long series of years the attention of the Government has been directed too exclusively to measures for the alleviation of distress to the neglect of those adequate means of prevention recommended by successive Famine Commissions; and this House urges upon the Government of India that no other objects of expenditure, either in order of time or in amount expended, shall be allowed precedence of such measures as are calculated to prevent these constantly recurring calamities."

in the past, but British over-rule is by no means infallible. We have to realise that the duty of this country and of this House is to govern India for the benefit of the Indian people, and not simply to exploit the country for the benefit of the British people.

The Amendment which I have down on the Paper refers to the Indian famine. There is no need for me to take up the time of the House with any eulogy of the

splendid work done by the Viceroy of India, and by every official from the highest to the lowest, who has been concerned in famine administration during the last two or three terrible years. I have always declared that the Indian Civil Service is the finest in the world, and is filled by men who think nothing of self, and are prepared to make every sacrifice of comfort, health, and life in the discharge of the heavy duties which so often fall upon them. I feel sure that the whole House will join with me in an expression of grateful recognition of their unrivalled services during one of the greatest trials of their quality that has occurred for many a long year. The one great need of Indian administration is economy, and by economy I mean not parsimony and cheeseparing, but the wise expenditure of Indian resources. There is no country where public expenditure, rightly administered, brings in so quick and profitable a return. It is impossible to prevent that great waste of Indian resources, recurrent famine, without expenditure. The great need of Indian finance is the diversion of expenditure from waste to useful works. For instance, it is sound economy to reduce the amount spent on armaments and increase that spent on irrigation. In regard to the financial review of the last three years in the Explanatory Memorandum, I wish to point out that the net revenue at the end of that period has been increased by £;443,000, the whole of which, and £;90,000 more beside, is due to opium increase. It is, however, quite a fallacy to claim this increase from such a source as being a good feature of Indian finance, for further on in the Memorandum we are told that there is an estimated falling off next year on opium revenue of £;600,000, so that this particular increase is only ephemeral, and ought to be treated as such. I would like to know what amount of this increase is due to Indian consumption, as I have reason to believe that, perhaps unconsciously but none the less certainly, the Government of India is stimulating the consumption of this drug in India with a view to making up for losses in China. During these three years expenditure in England on behalf of India has gone up nearly fourfold, to £;1,654,000. These increases in England are always occurring, with the most serious consequences to India. It is significant to note that none of the additions are for purposes which add to the productivity of India. £;680,000 of this expenditure is for ordnance stores and other military purposes. In reference to the previous debate on the hon. Member for North-East Bethnal Green's resolution, I want to know why this large amount of ordnance stores cannot be manufactured in India, as I am quite certain that not only this but many of the other general stores purchased in this country could be procured in India at a much smaller cost. I hope the time is not far distant when the Government of India will be permitted to make their own purchases and their own contracts for stores direct instead of through the intermediary of the India Office in London. The total increase in expenditure has been nearly two and a half millions.

I will take as an illustration of possible economy; though, it may be, in small directions; the costliness and folly of borrowing money from the feudatory states, and as an illustration of possible economy in large directions those unnecessary armaments which more than all beside cripple Indian finance. I will

quote from an official Return of all loans raised in India a number of loans from native States. I wish to point out that the Government of India has borrowed from the Maharaja Holkar £1,000,000 at 4½ per cent. for 101 years. A more ridiculous transaction was never carried out, The money could to-day be borrowed easily at 3 per cent., but here is a needless payment of £15,000 a year for at least eighty years, and before this loan is repaid the Government will have disbursed in interest, apart from the principal, £3,500,000, of which £1,500,000 represents the difference between 4½ and 3 per cent., and would have been much better sunk in irrigation than in the pockets of the wealthy Maharaja. I could give many such instances as this of the waste of public money by the Government of India, but I will content myself with referring those Members who wish to look further into the matter to the Report of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, on which I had the honour of serving. I want to know, and I hope my right hon. friend will be able to tell me, why, when this loan was arranged, a sinking fund was not provided to extinguish the loan in forty or fifty years instead of having it now as a weight around our necks. I have no desire to depreciate the personal loyalty and general good administration of the State of which Scindia is the chief, but this £15,000 a year would have been a good deal better sunk in enterprises for the prevention of famine. A similarly wasteful policy is carried out with the railway loans, to India's great suffering. Another loan from Scindia, this time of £1,500,000 at 4 per cent., is perpetual. Here the position is worse, for you have £1,500,000 of loan involved with no period of stoppage, This money could be borrowed at 3 per cent., and if it were a short instead of a long loan it could be easily replaced. Here we are giving a sort of pension in connection with this Scindia loan. The finances of India bristle with such foolish expenditure as this. As a result of the Expenditure Commission the Secretary of State has transferred nearly £300,000 from Indian to British expenditure, and a careful examination of the evidence shows items of bad and unjust finance too numerous to quote, but coming to large sums in the aggregate. The expenditure which is now to be transferred from the Indian to the British Exchequer had been paid by India for something like the past twenty-five years, and if you go back and give restitution it will take away the argument with regard to the grant which was pressed upon the Secretary of State last year. With regard to the question of the reduction of armaments, I am satisfied, and I think many in the House will agree with me, that it is the only way by which any real relief can ever be got to Indian finance. Army charges were less by £1,270,000. That was due to the absence of Indian regiments in South Africa and China. The increase of the Army expenditure in India is a source of alarm. The increase in the coming year is no less than 160 lakhs; more than a million sterling. In 1890-1 the gross expenditure was £21,000,000, and in 1897-8 £27,000,000. I do not give the following years, because they are complicated by the alterations which have taken place in the value of the rupee, but the expenditure is steadily increasing year by year. The troops out of India during last year were; in China, 20,000, native; in South Africa, 8,200, British; elsewhere, 4,000, native; total, 32,200. What I want to know is whether India is

safe when these 23,000 are away? Is there no danger to India by their withdrawal? This is not a period of exceptional peace. During the last five years the Indian Government, on the advice of the noble Lord himself, have suspended the Habeas Corpus Act. [Lord G. HAMILTON: No.] They arrested two brothers and kept them in prison without trial. [Lord G. HAMILTON indicated dissent.] They arrested the men without telling them why they were arrested; they were locked up for months without being told why, and they were turned out without being told why they had been arrested. India was supposed to be seething with rebellion and revolution. We have had a period of famine, and plague, and serious attacks of cholera, and the whole condition of the country was tending to its discontent, and, despite that, 32,000 troops were taken out of India and employed elsewhere. If it is safe to take them out, it is safe to do without them altogether. If 10,000 British and 20,000 Indian troops were so considered and charged to the Imperial revenues, it would relieve India of 30,000,000 rupees, which could at once be made available for famine preventive works such as irrigation.

Let me point out that all these suggested financial reforms are doubly important in view of the frightful condition of chronic famine into which the country has fallen. We have 540,000 on famine relief at present. Famine is simply insufficiency of food, whether caused by drought, or when the seasons are fairly normal, by high prices. The Secretary of State's observation early last year that the famine in India was a famine of money and not of food was, so far as the first part of the remark is concerned, an awful admission of the state of things to which the country has been reduced. It gives the whole case away to the critics of the Government of India; but, as a whole, the sentence is not accurate. There is in a sense food enough to leave a portion in the dealers' hands, because tens of millions of people do not get sufficient to eat one month out of the twelve. Poverty, not scarcity, is the root cause of Indian famines.

The country is, in its famine aspect, drifting from bad to worse, and from worse to final ruin, unless this constant tendency to recurring famine is prevented.

Note the history of the nineteenth century, divided into four equal parts:;1800 to 1825;five famines, with slight loss of life;1802–3, 1804, 1807, 1812–13, 1823–25; some of these arose from wars, and none extended over a large area. 1826 to 1850;two famines;1833, 1837; these were mainly local, and great suffering was caused in certain localities, notably in northern Madras; the 1833 famine led to the great Godavari irrigation works being begun. 1851 to 1875;(by this time practically all India, as we know it, was under our sway) six famines, with the loss of 5,000,000 of lives, spread over the whole; the worst was in Orissa. 1876 to 1900;four of the most terrible famines ever known in India. As to the first, 6,250,000 of lives were lost: as to the last two, during the ten years in which they occurred, according to the correspondent in India of the great medical journal the Lancet, 19,000,000 of deaths from famine and famine diseases occurred. In addition fourteen parts of the Empire suffered from famine and scarcity. There were thus eighteen famines in the last twenty-five years of the nineteenth century. How completely famine has gained a hold on the Empire may be judged from this summary:;First period;five famines,

perhaps 1,000,000 lives; second period;two famines, 500,000 lives; third period, six famines, 5,000,000 lives; fourth period;eighteen famines, 27,000,000 lives. All the foregoing facts are taken from the Famine Commission Blue-books of 1880 and 1887, and other more recent official Papers. In the last twenty-five years of the past century more

than one million of people died on an average every year in a British-ruled country;that is, two each minute, 2,880 each day, and during the past ten years the average has been four each minute, 210 each hour, 5,760 each day. The last famine was the worst of all.

I should like to deal with that piece of robust optimism entitled "Statement Exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India." The whole of the chapter on famine is the great speech of Lord Curzon to the Legislative Council on 19th October, which is well worthy the earnest attention of everyone interested in India. I want to read two or three extracts from the speech of the Viceroy. He says;

"There have been many great droughts in India, but there has been no other of which such figures could be predicated as these.

It must further be remembered that, unlike previous famines, that of 1900 was separated by the short space of only two years from a drought not greatly inferior to it in extent and scarcity. Some tracts which suffered in 1896–97 have been fortunate enough to escape in 1899–1900. But the most calamitous feature of the recent famine has been that there were others which not only suffered again, but suffered in a worse degree. This was the case in the Central Provinces and in portions of Rajputana, Central India, the South East Punjab, and the Bombay Dekkhan. Apart from this area of two-fold distress, the centre of gravity tended on the present occasion to shift towards the west. The cluster of native states lying between the Nerbudda, the Jumna, and the Sutlej were swept into the area of scarcity. Finally, the fertile provinces of Guzarat and Kathiawar, whose rainfall is generally so abundant and so steady that they have been styled the Garden of India, were attacked, and there, in proportion as the immunity hitherto enjoyed has been the longest, so was the suffering the most widespread and enduring. This was the situation with which we were confronted a year ago, and which has gradually developed since. It was not merely a crop failure, but a fodder famine on an enormous scale, followed in many parts by a positive devastation of cattle;both plough cattle, buffaloes, and milch kine. In other words, it affected, and may almost be said to have annihilated, the working capital of the agricultural classes. It struck some of them when they were still down from the effects of the recent shock. It struck others who had never before known what calamity was, and who were crushed and shattered by the suddenness and directness of the blow. It attacked native States to whose Durbars had never previously been brought home the obligation of famine relief on an extended scale, and whose dearth of administrative staff was enhanced by the poverty of their financial resources. It laid its hand upon primitive hill men, unused to discipline or restraint, impulsive, improvident, lazy, living in an almost barbarous state in wild and inaccessible jungles. It sharpened the lurking nomadic instinct of wandering tribes, and sent them

aimlessly drifting about the country, a terror to the famine officer and an incubus to the camps. For a year it never left hold of its victims; and one half of the year had not elapsed before famine had brought its familiar attendant furies in its train; and cholera, dysentery and fever had fallen upon an already exhausted and enfeebled population. This is the picture of suffering that India has presented during the past year. We must investigate and report upon the various public works that have been undertaken in the course of the recent famine, and must provide for the execution of a continuous programme of preventive works in the future."

That is the only line in the speech of the Viceroy which speaks of prevention.

Then he goes on to say;

"In this connection I would remind my hearers that the last Famine Commission, in their Report, devoted much attention to the matter. Unfortunately the recent famine came upon us before their recommendations had had time to bear fruit, and in the rush and hurry of the overwhelming calamity of the past year works had often to be improvised, so to speak, in a moment, to meet the demands of a particular area, whether the work was or was not likely to be of permanent value. Against this danger we shall require to guard by insisting upon the methodical preparation of district programmes, and upon the formation of provincial branches, to be charged with this special duty. Railway earthwork has been pretty well exhausted for the present. More roads exist than can be properly kept up. But there are few parts of the country where works for the storage of water are not practicable. They may not, probably will not, be directly remunerative. But if such a work will conduce to greater security of the crops, and if it can be maintained at a moderate cost, it is just the sort of work which should be taken up or kept in hand for an emergency. No direct programme of relief should be considered complete until every possible irrigation or water storage scheme in the district has been examined, until a definite opinion has been come to as to its practicability and utility, and until detailed plans and estimates have been prepared for every accepted scheme. So far as recent information goes, the total cost of the famine of 1899-1900 will have been::

British India::

£;

£;

Direct relief outlay

6,390,000

Loss of revenue and compensation for dearness

3,240,000

Loans and advances to landholders and Native States

4,260,000

13,890,000

Native States::

Relief, expenditure, and loss of revenue, over and above the 3,000,000l. lent by the Government

(approximately about)

4,500,000

How much time is required for the Report of a Royal Commission to bear fruit on a question of this kind? Twenty-years after a Royal Commission reported on a series of preventive schemes we have been through the greatest famine that has ever occurred in India. The Viceroy says a small famine Commission was appointed in the latter part of 1900 to report on four points. They are all points with regard to inquiry into relief, and not a single instruction was given to report as to prevention. Suppose we keep up the ratio of these famines of which I have been speaking, the number who will die in the first quarter of this century, 1900 to 1925, will be over 50,000,000. What did the Famine Commission recommend? I quote from the Report of the Commission itself;

"Among the means which may be adopted for giving India direct protection from famine arising from drought the first place must unquestionably be assigned to works of irrigation."

These words are quoted and reiterated by the Commission of 1898; twenty years afterwards. The Commission recommends that these works should be prosecuted as energetically as may be consistent with true economy. I do not care how much you spend on irrigation. It is the most profitable method in which to invest the vast surpluses of which the noble Lord is so proud to-day. What I want to ask the noble Lord is, whether, since 1888, irrigation has had the first place in the mind of the Indian Government? How much have we spent on irrigation? A capital expenditure of £60,000,000 has gone for railways, and £10,000,000 only for irrigation. That is irrigation first, I suppose! One sixth only, as compared with railways, which in themselves do not cause a single ear of corn to grow. Railways have been pushed on too rapidly for an agricultural and poor country like India. There are few parts of the country where the storage of water is not practicable. I call upon the Government to carry out the recommendation of their own Commission and put irrigation first. What have the Government been doing all these years? They have been busy improving relief and neglecting prevention. They prepared a famine code so elaborate and far-reaching that they boasted that never again would millions die during a famine. I have nothing but praise for the code as a piece of administration. It is as fine a piece of administration as ever came from the Civil Service. What is their record? I have already shown the loss of life that has occurred. The Agricultural Department is not a bad department at all, but what has it done? Take, for instance, Sir James Caird's proposition that to keep pace with the growth of the population there should be an increased production from the soil of a bushel per acre in each ten years. What has been done to ensure this? Practically nothing. The Agricultural Department for all India has been strengthened, but has done nothing; while the Madras Department has fallen into the background. For the soil and the people, save a little irrigation, nothing has been done. Meanwhile the land revenue has been maintained by three things. First, the additional yield from such new land as was brought into irrigation, the dry land meanwhile yielding less and less. In the central provinces the estimated yield of wheat per acre in the year 1896-7 from irrigated and dry land was 600 lbs., while the actual yield was only 390 lbs., and for the four subsequent years

405lbs., 322lbs., 229lbs., and 307lbs., or an average of 350lbs. The second cause of the maintenance of the Land Revenue was the annexation of new territories; but the most important was the help of the money-lender. I put a question to a noble Lord on 15th March last, which brought out these facts. In Surat last year, out of 95 per cent. of land revenue collected, 85 per cent. was received by the Government direct from the moneylender. The whole of the district is practically in the hands of the moneylender, yet all the use they seem to have for the money-lender is to pass drastic legislation, such as the Land Alienation Act in the Punjab, and a like Act in Bombay, and so make borrowing more difficult. Where would the Government be but for the money-lender?

They are sawing off the branch on which they roost at its junction with the trunk, and will come a heavy cropper as the work of their own hand. Why should they not establish agricultural banks by which the curse of India may be abolished? The noble Lord and his colleagues have reduced India to the condition of a country so rack-rented that only the money-lender last year stood between them and financial ruin.

A Bill is now before the Bombay Legislature called the Land Revenue Bill. In the year 1895-6, the Bombay Government closed with a clean balance-sheet; virtually the whole of the land revenue was realised. Then followed the famines of 1897 and 1900, and the cultivators are now heavily in arrear. The arrears of the land revenue due from them are said to be about 134 lakhs of rupees, corresponding to nearly one million pounds sterling; and these arrears are due from about one-third of the cultivated lands of the entire province. The obvious duty of the Government of Bombay after such a terrible calamity is to grant remissions, but I am alarmed to find from the Indian papers that a different policy seems to be contemplated. The Government have legally the right to sell the defaulting holdings for arrears, and they are taking power under the Bill I have mentioned to resettle them without those tenant-rights which they have hitherto possessed. In other words, the grave calamity of recent years is being taken advantage of to pass a law which, if enforced, will deprive one-third of the tenantry of Bombay of those rights of sale and mortgage with respect to their holdings which they have enjoyed under British rule for over half a century. Since the days of Elphinstone, Lord Canning, and Lord Lawrence the policy of the British Government has been to foster and create proprietary rights in the cultivators of the soil, and now, all of a sudden, in a year of unprecedented distress and famine, the new Bill seeks to extinguish these rights over one-third of a large and populous province. The tenants of Bombay may be poor, and may be indebted to their money-lenders, but the proper course to relieve them would be to moderate the land revenue, and to grant remissions after famine, not to deprive their holdings of that marketable value which they have so long possessed. The Bill has produced a grave and wide-spread discontent, it is regarded as a confiscation of tenant-right over a large part of the country, and it may lead to the most lamentable consequences. The Bill was referred to a Select Committee of the Bombay Council, and the minority of that Committee

dissented from the Report on the Bill. In the Minute of dissent they say; "We regret we are unable to sign the report which a majority of the members of the Select Committee have adopted. The Bill, we fear, has little to recommend it beyond the intentions of Government. At the same time it is obviously capable of being so worked as to revolutionise the existing land tenure over a large and constantly increasing area of the Presidency. Its leading principles are open to serious objection; and its introduction at the present juncture has been widely misunderstood and has been attended with results which all must deplore. The public have had hardly any time to examine the precise character and scope of the measure and formulate their objections; the Bill having been first published only on the 18th May last, and that, too, simply in the English language. Meanwhile a vague feeling of panic; perfectly unwarranted so far as the intentions of Government are concerned; prevails everywhere, both among agriculturists and sowcars, the former imagining that the Bill threatens their proprietary rights over their holdings and the latter being under the impression that it will eventually lead to a partial confiscation of their property. Under the circumstances we feel bound to recommend that the Bill should be dropped altogether, or that at any rate its further consideration should be postponed until next year."

I sincerely trust the noble Lord will pay some attention to this Minute of the native members of the Council, and that the Bill will not be pressed.

I have taken up the time of the House much longer than I intended, but there is another point to which I wish briefly to refer. The Excise policy of the Government in India undoubtedly stimulates very largely the consumption of intoxicating liquor. The shops for the sale of intoxicants are practically a Government monopoly, and the consumption of intoxicants has practically doubled in the last twenty-five years. The Government, instead of stimulating the consumption of intoxicants, should stimulate the consumption of quinine. Having the liquor trade in their own hands, and having no vested interests to buy out, they could abolish

all the liquor shops to-morrow. The people of India are practically total abstainers, and probably 250 millions out of 300 millions have never tasted liquor in the course of their lives. In talking on this subject with the Finance Minister in Calcutta he said to me; "If we abolish the liquor shops what are we to do to get revenue?" I said; "That is your business, not mine; but by your present excise policy you are encouraging the people to take drink for food, and the certain result of that is the degeneration, demoralisation, and impoverishment of the people." I hope the noble Lord, before he leaves office, will do something to diminish this evil, and that more money will be spent than now on irrigation.

*MR. COHEN (Islington, E.): The hon. Gentleman who last addressed the House, the hon. Member for Camborne, referred to the subject of India as being a very interesting and vital subject, and he found it difficult, he said, to keep his observations within the limits he desired, because of the interest he takes in every branch of the question. I do not think I shall experience so much difficulty. I do not rise with the view of answering the hon. Gentleman on a

great many of the points to which he called attention, but there is one thing upon which I should like to meet him point blank. He charged my noble friend with what he called optimism. I do not know what is meant by that expression. If it means that my noble friend and his predecessors have always painted Indian finance in colours which are too favourable, then I say the optimists are those who have spoken the truth, and the pessimists are those who have been inaccurate in their forecasts. If there be any person who is entitled to congratulate himself and the House upon the position of affairs in India at this moment it is my noble friend. In this year 1901 we have presented to us accounts showing a far more favourable state of affairs than could have been predicted, or that any reasonable person would have ventured to predict had he known the unfavourable influences at work during the year which has been under review. I should like to know, if my hon. friend opposite considers my noble friend an optimist for the very moderate language

in which he has described the situation which he had to unfold, what he would call a Chancellor of the Exchequer who had such a state of affairs to present to this House with regard to this country with influences so adverse to him as my noble friend has had to combat. I venture to say my noble friend, having regard to the facts he had to unfold, was studiously moderate in his statement, and I repudiate the charge of optimism which has been brought against him. The hon. Member opposite said a great portion of the financial success of India was due to the army charges having been so much reduced. There was no doubt about that, but the hon. Gentleman adduced from that the argument that if the army was not wanted it should not be retained, and he asked, Was it safe to withdraw these troops? The answer to that, I suppose, is that it was safe, or they would not have been withdrawn; but surely the hon. Gentleman would recognise the difference between withdrawing temporarily troops who could be brought back at a moment's notice and reducing the number of troops permanently.

MR. CAINE: If my hon. friend will allow me to explain, what I advocated was that the cost of these 20,000 troops should be transferred, but that they should be retained in India as a reserve for the defence of the Eastern portion of the Empire.

*MR. COHEN: They are retained there, in the first place, for contingencies which might happen, and which have happened, but which are becoming less probable, and if my hon. friend recognises that, I am sure he will at once acknowledge that the charge of these troops could not be borne by the Imperial Exchequer.

MR. CAINE: The Indian army, with out these troops, is sufficient to preserve law and order in India.

*MR. COHEN: There was one expression which just escaped my hon. friend on which I should join issue with him. He says you do not require this large army; that 30,000 troops would be more than enough to preserve law and order. That is not what the army is

there for at all. Troops in India are not called out to keep order in a street squabble; they are called out for the protection of the frontiers, and it would not be safe if they were withdrawn. I press that view, because an injurious effect would be created if it was believed that troops were kept in India for a

purpose for which they are not used at all. There is one other point to which I wish to allude. My hon. friend opposite has charged my noble friend with taking an optimistic view of Indian affairs of finance and the social religious wellbeing of the native races. Our belief in that view does not proceed at all from any diminished solicitude for the welfare of all the native classes throughout the Indian Empire.

I pass now from the rather formal attack, or reflection, of my hon. friend opposite on the Indian Government to the concrete charge which he brought against the Indian Government in connection with the dire troubles which they had to combat. I can sum it up in one pregnant sentence. We have embraced measures of relief, and are said to have neglected measures of prevention. I think there ought to have been a little more, evidence before such a charge as that was made. I have studied with very close attention the Indian Papers circulated before the Indian Budget, and I claim that the policy of Lord Curzon has not only not been open to the charge of neglecting protection, but if there has been any particular characteristic which has distinguished the versatility of Lord Curzon in this matter it is the progress he has made in works for provision against famine, and the success which has attended his efforts. Now I claim, and I think my hon. friend opposite will agree with me, that the two principal, if not the two only preventive measures against famine are railways and irrigation. With regard to irrigation, I think my hon. friend is not very fair to the Viceroy, and I should like to read two sentences from a speech by the Viceroy;

"I will quote the words of the Chief Commissioner, Mr. Fraser, with reference to the recent famine. 'It is impossible,' he writes, 'to overestimate the benefits which railway extension has conferred upon the provinces. If Chattisgarh, for instance, had not been opened up by railways, it is horrifying to think of what might have occurred. The recent extensions of the Bengal-Nagpur Railway poured in supplies of the cheap scalded rice of Orissa which penetrated far into the interior. In 1897 this source of supply was wanting, and the more expensive rice from Burma was the chief food-stuff brought in. In the famine of 1897, when exports were carried away in the early months, the Chattisgarh people pointed to the railways as an exaggeration of their ills. In this famine they have regarded them as their salvation. Within one year the railways have brought into the province grain enough to feed three millions of people for a year. Now this is a very instructive quotation, for it shows how in 1897, when the Chattisgarh people held fairly large stocks, they resented the depletion of these by the railway and a rise in prices later on. On the other hand, in 1899 there was in over two-thirds of Chattisgarh no crop at all. Where, I wonder, in such a case would the grain-pits have been? On this occasion, had it not been for the railway, the entire population would have perished like flies."

MR. CAINE: My only complaint is that for one part spent on irrigation seven parts are spent on railways.

MR. COHEN: So far as I am concerned, if I had to place one before the other, I should place railways first and irrigation second, and the testimony of Mr.

Fraser, the Chief Commissioner quoted by the Viceroy, which I have just read, is sufficient to show what the railways have done for the prevention of famine. I do not wish to elaborate it; it must be perfectly clear that the extension of railways, if not a protection against famine itself, tends to a mitigation of its ravages. There is a delusion that railways tend to increase the price of grain stuffs. They only tend to equalise them, and bring grain stuffs within reach of famine-stricken districts, and I rejoice to know that the present Viceroy has determined to proceed with this energetic policy with regard to the extension of railways, which, as I have already said, has so brilliantly characterised this distinguished Viceroy. A few years ago there were only 5,000 miles of railway in India, now there are 25,000 miles at work, and I believe that the more this railway policy is pursued, without regard to the fact whether the railway passes through fertile or barren districts, the greater will be the protection against these terrible visitations of famine to which it seems certain India is bound to be intermittently exposed. I congratulate my noble friend on the position which

Indian finance has attained, and upon its comparative stability, which I attribute to two causes. In the first instance, I attribute it to the stability of the exchange, and I do not think I ought to refer to that without paying a tribute to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton, the predecessor of my noble friend in his office, for the splendid services he rendered in this regard. I believe they laid the foundation of the stability for Indian credit.

The Viceroy of India explained that it was his constant desire to promote the flow of British capital into India. Let me tell the House that the flow of British capital into India does not need any encouragement. It is a thing which we should be powerless to prevent, so long as the exchange is stable. The moment people know they can get their money back whenever they want it they never do want it; given stability in the exchange, capital will flow into India. Nothing can stop it. If I differ from any expression in the speech of the Viceroy to the Legislative Council I differ, and I do so with all humility, with him in the idea of separating railways likely to be flourishing from those which do not pass through such fertile districts. I do not think he ought to do that. I think capital ought to be tempted to Indian railways, provided there is reasonable security that the money can always be paid back, and provided there is a reasonable return for the investment. The error made in former times is where contracts were made whereby Indian investors were assured of a handsome income where things went wrong, and a more handsome income where things went right. That is not right. They ought to be assured of a reasonable return for their capital; more is not needed, and more should not be given. It is a matter of indifference whether the railways pass through barren or fertile districts, and I hope they will be encouraged, because, a reasonable return having been given for the capital, the balance ought to go to the Indian Government. I can only congratulate my noble friend on the satisfactory statement he had to make to this House, and I hope in the future, as in the past, it will be the luck of my noble friend always to be what is called optimistic, because he has always been

accurate in his forecasts.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): We cannot get over the fact that the total loss in revenue on concessions of railways in India is fifty millions of tens of rupees, although it may be contended that the indirect gain to the country has more than compensated for a part of that. But, however that may be, I was glad to hear one thing, which was that the noble Lord had employed an expert to examine into the financial working of the railways in India, and I am assured that such action will bear useful fruit in the future. I desire to associate myself with every word that has been said with regard to the action Lord Curzon has maintained since he has been appointed to the position of Viceroy. It fell to my lot in 1898 to express, so far as this side of the House was concerned, our hopes with regard to that appointment. Everything we then said and every hope we expressed has been fulfilled, and more than fulfilled, by the capacity and energy, the courage and wisdom of Lord Curzon, under circumstances of unexampled difficulty which have up to now met his administration. I am not now going to refer in detail to the famine, although I cannot help thinking with the hon. Member for the Camborne Division that the House to-night did not grasp sufficiently the seriousness of the case. I still think it is better to go to the root of the scourge of India than to constantly attempt temporary remedies. We are face to face with a serious question. If famine is to recur in India as frequently in the future as it has in the past, the outlook for India is dismal indeed. I am not a pessimist. I think it is possible to take reasonable and wise steps for preventing famine, and it is possible to resist the evil consequences to a large extent, but I venture to lay down the proposition, with which I think no one will disagree, that it will be necessary that the administrative policy of the Government of India in the future in dealing with famine should be wiser than it has been in the past in its endeavour to meet and minimise these terrible calamities which so frequently occur in the heart of that great empire. There are only two points to which I should like to direct attention with respect to this question, and they arise out of the delay in the publication of the Report of the Famine Commission of 1899. The

noble Lord said at question time that the reason of the delay was that the questions raised were of so complicated a nature that the Government had not yet had time to decide as to the action to be taken, but the publication of the Report would not involve the Government in the necessity of deciding what action they were to take. The other point is with regard to the Bombay Land Revenue Bill. I am not in a position to argue the merits of that case, but I think, having regard to the seriousness of the matter, it was a reasonable request that was made by the members of the Committee which discussed the Bill that a delay should take place before the Bill is passed. I still hope it is possible for the Government to consider the possibility of granting a delay.

I now desire to say a few words with regard to the motion which I put down on the Paper, namely;

"To call attention to the lack of parliamentary facilities for the discussion of Indian questions; and to move, That this House views with grave concern the lack

of parliamentary facilities for the consideration of Indian questions, and is of opinion that no arrangement will be satisfactory which does not provide that the appointment of the Committee on the Indian Accounts takes place at such a period of the session as to afford adequate time for the discussion of Indian affairs."

I was rather astonished at the remark made by the noble Lord that experience had proved to him that the House is taking an increased interest in the affairs of India; that statement is in strong contrast with the continuance of this kind of thing year after year, and I think the appearance of the House to-night shows that that statement ought to be explained and qualified in certain points. I cannot help thinking that until something is done to enable us to come more frequently into close contact with Indian affairs it will be impossible to stimulate Members of this House in this matter. What has happened in the last forty years? The controlling statute with reference to the presentation to this House of the East India Revenue Accounts is the Act of 1858, but I venture to say that what Section 53 of that Act lays down as necessary to be done in regard to the publication of Indian finance in this House makes it clear that the intention of that Act was that these accounts should be

presented at a reasonably early period. If that was considered necessary when the Act of 1858 was framed, how much more necessary is it that the spirit of that section should be carried out to-day. I move forward now to the Select Committee appointed in 1871, on the motion of Sir Harry Foster. That Committee sat until 1874, and made the following recommendation on this point;

"That no arrangement would be satisfactory unless the Committee on Indian Accounts was appointed within three weeks of the opening of each session."

I asked the noble Lord the other day whether he had considered the advisability of carrying out the recommendations of the Commission of 1898 on Indian expenditure; that was with regard to changing the financial year, and making the end the 31st December instead of the 30th March. The noble Lord said the Select Committee of 1871 had reported against it, which was quite true; but it reported most strongly in favour of the principle I have just referred to, namely, that this statement might be made within three weeks of the opening of each session. What are the difficulties in the way of carrying this out? The Indian system of keeping accounts is generally considered one of the most perfect in the world. The advantages of the change would be two-fold. In the first place, there would be many advantages from the Indian standpoint. The statement in India would be laid before the Legislative Council early in January, in the cool season of the year, and the making of the financial year to close at the end of December would help rather than put difficulties in the way of those engaged in carrying out the financial policy of the Government of India. From a parliamentary standpoint the advantages would be obvious. The attention of the House of Commons would be drawn to Indian affairs at an early period of the session, and I believe, with the improved opportunities for debate, there would be created a new interest in Indian affairs, a new capacity for dealing with them, and an increase in the power of Parliament really to help and encourage those charged with the administration of that great dependency.

The noble Lord stated the other day that he had sent out the recommendation of

the Commission of 1898 to the Government of India, but they were not at present prepared to advise in favour of it. I submit that in a matter of this kind, which concerns firstly and chiefly this House, it is not the Government of India, but the House of Commons that should decide the question.

Let me give one concrete case as an example of the difficulty under the present system in the way of this House getting an opportunity of considering most important points of policy. I refer to the new frontier arrangements. As far as I understand the proposal, it is a good plan, but it cannot be denied that it involves more than one important issue of considerable interest. To begin with, there is the substitution of military rule for civil government. But we have not had an opportunity of learning the facts or of considering the situation in regard to that matter. Lord Curzon has referred to the publication of the proposals of the Government of India with regard to the matter, and he also said in March that the Secretary of State had given his consent. In June last I asked the noble Lord when he would be in a position to lay Papers on the subject, and he replied that he would not be in a position to do that, because he had not received a reply from the Government of India to a previous despatch of his. I hope he will now be able to give some information on that specific point, and also inform the House as to the exact position with regard to these new arrangements. I believe we are all agreed that some change should be made, so that we might be enabled to discuss Indian affairs more frequently and at an earlier period of the session; the only question is as to the way in which the idea can best be carried out. The Select Committee of 1874 made a recommendation which, if given effect to, would practically answer our purpose. If, however, there is any doubt in the mind of the Government as to what should be done, would it not be a good plan to appoint at an early date a small Committee, composed of Members of this House and representatives of the Government of India, to make a recommendation on this specific point? I believe that such a decision would be of real value both to the Government of India and to the good administration of the affairs of the country.

*MR. J. E. GORDON (Elgin and Nairn): I am sorry to introduce a somewhat jarring note into the chorus of congratulation to-night, but for a year past I have had a friendly controversy with the noble Lord, and I hope he will not take any remarks I may make (on a matter of business) as a personal reflection upon himself. This time last year the House sanctioned an expenditure of £34,800,000 to repay the shareholders of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. The Government, however, exercised their right of selecting another method of repayment by deciding on annuities, instead of a cash payment, and in the calculation involved in finding out the correct "rate of interest" in connection with these annuities a blunder has taken place by which trustees, widows and orphans, and penny-banks, and insurance offices have amongst them lost towards £3,000,000. I believe that this is due to want of care on the part of the India Office, a want of thorough personal responsibility in the solution of this contract, and also by an error of judgment in an almost equally influential quarter; namely, the Bank of England. Last autumn I addressed a letter of warning to the Chancellor

of the Exchequer, to which I received a courteous reply concluding with the remark that it was impossible for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to interfere as the contract, he had been informed, had been settled according to precedent. I shall be able to explain that the information given to the right hon.

Gentleman had no foundation in fact, and it is because, indeed, I am convinced, all the precedents for twenty years have been violated that I am bringing the matter up to-night. This House has a Parliamentary responsibility for the correct determination of these contracts, for the actual terms of repayment were omitted from the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Bill (indeed, were then unknown), and have never yet been scrutinised or passed by the House of Commons, but only others, dummy

terms, which have not been acted on. The contract now under investigation is the fourth since 1880, and the previous three have been harmoniously settled between the high contracting parties without a murmur of dispute or discontent. For twenty years these Parliamentary and Departmental precedents have ruled the investments of insurance offices, trustees, penny-banks, and so on, and those persons who bought their securities on a Parliamentary guarantee that those clear, just, and harmonious precedents would be maintained, have now been deceived, and have lost their money. Fortunately for my argument the noble Lord has done almost as bad a thing as to write a book. For, twenty-two years ago, he presided over a Select Committee, and on reading the Report of that East Indian Railways Select Committee and the evidence then given by men so eminent as the present Prime Minister, Lord Cranbrook, Mr. Cave Brown, Sir Julian Danvers, and other authorities on these financial subjects, I find myself in complete accord with that Committee as to precedents and practice. The noble Lord's memory has misled him;

LORD G. HAMILTON: No, it has not.

*MR. J. E. CORDON: Yesterday I put this very pertinent question to the noble Lord;

"Whether he is now prepared to publish the manner of calculating the rate of interest used in connection with the amount of Great Indian Railway Company's annuities; whether it was identical with the process employed when the Indian Government terminated the lease and repaid the capital of the Scinde and Eastern Bengal railway companies; and if not, what cause there was for altering the precedents of the past twenty years."

In reply, the noble Lord stated;

"The Secretary of State has no knowledge of the manner in which the rate of interest was calculated by the Governors of the Bank of England in any of the cases mentioned."

LORD G. HAMILTON: Hear, hear.

*MR. J. E. GORDON: I am sorry the noble Lord accepts the answers which have been put into his hands. He will be sorry for it "in the morning."

LORD G. HAMILTON: Pardon me, I am responsible.

*MR. J. E. GORDON: The noble Lord is no doubt officially responsible for an answer acknowledging his own ignorance of the very data upon which three great financial contracts have been settled. Moreover he is not prepared to justify

his position to the shareholders, for whom, indeed, he is trustee, nor is he able to stand at that Table as the guardian for the finances of India and say his bargain is an equitable one alike for buyer and seller. That is the position set up by the answer, and I regret that the noble Lord accepts it. But I turn to page 61 of the Report of the noble Lord's Select Committee, and there I find that authorities far higher than myself agree with me and differ from the noble Lord. The attitude of the noble Lord is that he has no responsibility or knowledge. He shifts the responsibility to the Bank of England, and that is where the mistake has occurred. In answer to Mr. Henry Fawcett, the present Lord Cranbrook (then I presume Secretary of State for India), stated that the Secretary of State "was not bound to consult the Bank in any way," and if at all, "only for consultation as to the money market";

LORD G. HAMILTON: Lord Cranbrook was speaking of an arrangement made outside the contract.

*MR. J. E. GORDON: The noble Lord's memory fails him again, for he has for a long time told me that this East Indian Railway Company's settlement, so elaborated before the Select Committee, was an exceptional termination, and that the terms there laid down were not to be taken as precedents for future settlements. If the noble Lord would read the Report again, and more carefully, he would find that this limitation of precedent, though correct as to new conditions and arrangements with fresh shareholders, etc., has no reference to the "rate of interest" which governs this annuity question in the contract. On being asked as to whether the Bank of England had any responsibility, Lord Cranbrook answered "not as arbitrators in any sense of the word." He then says "the Bank of England has nothing to do with the principle," but it is indeed this principle that the noble Lord has handed over to one fallible and unchecked gentleman (outside of the India Office) with such disastrous results. He ought to have faced this responsibility and dealt with the principle as himself a trustee, not only for the finances of India, but for the shareholders. Again, Lord Cranbrook went on to say "the Bank of England has nothing to do with the interpretation." The noble Lord, then, differs from his predecessor, and has handed over to the Governor of the Bank of England the interpretation of this principle, which has cost the company nearly £3,000,000. The Governor of the Bank of England has, I believe, made a mistake with reference to the rate of interest. He would probably tell you so himself. I have no difficulty in lodging the responsibility in the right quarter, because when the India Office refused to accept it, I naturally applied to the Bank of England, and I have had replies assuring me that the Bank of England has no responsibility for what the noble Lord says they have every responsibility. The truth is that the functions of the Bank of England have been acted on in haste, in error, and beyond their proper sphere. Documents were laid before the House last session, when the India Office gave the Bank warning that they might presently be asked to determine this question, but the Governor of the Bank of England, unfortunately, without consulting the parties interested so deeply or considering the precedents, blurted out an answer to a question which Parliamentary Papers prove had never been put to him. The question put to the Bank of England was a very simple one,

namely: Tell us what the average rate of interest has been during the last two years on the Government debt of India. The answer to this question for the last two years of the contract was about £3 5s. There were £112,000,000 of debt, at 3½ per cent., 3, and 2½ per cent., and the average works out at about 3¼ per cent. Here is where the error has been committed. The contract question is, What is the rate of interest "received" in London? "Received" by whom? By the "receivers" of Government dividends, by the holders of Government stock? That question has not yet been answered. The reply from the Bank of England I have in my hand. It is;

"I am directed to say that the Governors have undertaken the duty imposed upon them,

and have determined that the average rate of interest received "by persons who invested" in the three India sterling stocks, viz., 3½ per cent., 3 per cent., and 2½ per cent. during the two years ending 31st December last is £2 17s. per cent."

The truth is that the Governor of the Bank of England by inadvertence finds out, not the average rate "received" on £112,000,000 by the holders of Government stock, but the interest "received by investors," who are a different and smaller class of persons, probably less than one-fifth of the contract whole. The noble Lord is refusing responsibility which I maintain still rests and will remain upon him to see that this contract is fulfilled. He tells us he does not know the exact methods of a great financial operation for which he has paid £35,000,000.

LORD G. HAMILTON: No. Parliament says that the governor or the deputy governor shall decide. I have left the decision to the governor and deputy governor. The hon. Member and his friends chose to appeal to a court of law; the decision has been given against them, and the hon. Gentleman should explain why he is now bringing it before the House of Commons.

MR. J. E. GORDON: This precedent since 1880 has been established as a solemn Government and Parliamentary obligation, and it has been practically followed in the case of the Scinde and Eastern Bengal Railways. I am not a director of any company, and I will state why I have taken the matter up. From 1875 to 1890 I had an opportunity of knowing every possible view that came from the India Office, the Banks, and the railway companies, and I was shocked to see at the end of twenty years of precedents so gross a departure, also the refusal of the India Office even to tell the shareholders why their terms should be 15 or 20 per cent. less than the contract terms, or why the India Office accepted without intelligent scrutiny an obvious and unexpected misinterpretation of the contract on the part of the Bank of England. As to the law courts, the case is a very complicated one, and the Report of that Select Committee will tell you that a contract made with the East India Company fifty years ago is naturally most obscure. The law court's view was simply on a small issue, and on the second alternative only, before a Chancery Judge. I am not going to discuss what happened there, but it was very amusing to see one of His Majesty's Judges explaining that the obscurity of this contract was so dense that he must have time to discover a fresh alternative interpretation, and yet to those who knew

the contract the matter had been for twenty years as clear as daylight. There is a moral responsibility attaching to a matter of this kind, and I do not think the noble Lord's political conscience will be satisfied until he has found out for himself the details as to how this contract has been wound up. So far from the noble Lord's view as to method being correct, I find that in paragraph seventeen of his Select Committee the interest of all the obligations was taken at par, and it was not taken at "investors" premium prices. Putting aside my own views, which are of very slight importance compared with those of Lord Cranbrook and the noble Lord himself, I think I have established a case to ask the noble Lord, in the defence of the parliamentary routine and honour of this House, and in defence of the India Office, to make full and public inquiry into this matter. If the India Office does not know of these affairs, I think I am justified in asking the noble Lord to make inquiries. If he does not know, the Bank of England ought to know, and the Public ought to be informed, and if he inquires he will then be able with a good departmental conscience to look into this question and see whether he does not hold a great railway property, and whether he can retain within his parliamentary pocket a sum of nearly three millions of money which possibly belongs to another class of persons.

MR. LEAMY (Kildare, N.): I did my best to follow the hon. Member opposite in what he has stated, but I got rather lost in my endeavour to understand him. I only wish to say a few words of protest against keeping back the discussion on Indian affairs until this late hour. The only Indian Gentleman who is a Member of this House speaks on behalf of three millions of people. I am sorry the hon. Member for North-East Bethnal Green is absent now, and that he does not appear to take enough interest in this subject to remain till the close of the debate. The House is almost now a jaded House, and it is almost an affront to think that this great subject is being discussed in a House like this. I want to say a few words with regard to the famine. I have not studied this subject very closely, but I have seen statements from time to time in the leading metropolitan newspapers. I have also seen many illustrations in the principal illustrated papers, and all I can say is that I can hardly imagine any man with any human sympathy at all reading these statements and seeing these illustrations without them making his heart sore. I have read that some six millions or seven millions of the King's subjects in India perished from famine within the last twelve months. I entirely agree with the hon. Gentleman who sits below me that, instead of talking about the splendid exertions of Lord Curzon, or anybody else, what you ought to do is to try and prevent the famines from arising, Famines have occurred and recurred in India for many years past. Owing to the conditions of the climate it is quite possible that, no matter what may be done, famine may recur under the most beneficent rule. You have in that magnificent Empire a people who are on the verge of famine every single season when there is a drought, and we know, at the same time, that these people are ground down by taxes. It is a fine thing, I know, to talk about your great Indian Empire. It is a fine thing in your little island over here to be able to stretch your hands across the seas and to say that you hold this great Indian Empire in your palm. Does this not bring with it some responsibilities? Whatever

my opinions as an Irish Nationalist may be, I am not going to say that you are any worse governors in India than France would be if India happened to be a French Empire. But there must be something wrong when the wants and the wishes of these 300,000,000 people are never heard of in this House. If one of your Indian princes possessing a native army were to revolt, then we should have day after day questions in this House and debates and divisions, but these people are quiet, and there is never a word said about them, and all we do is to meet together for a few hours at the end of the session, and we do not know half the time what some hon. Gentlemen who take part in this debate are talking about. I heard the hon. gentleman opposite who represents North-East Bethnal Green talking about some petty question of technical education, at a time when some 7,000,000 people have perished in one year from famine. I make no accusation against the noble Lord or against the administration of India, because I have not sufficient data before me. What do we ever hear in this House about India? There is a duty devolving upon every hon. Member in this House, even though, like myself, he be an Irish Member, and that duty is to say something on behalf of the suffering millions of India. The fact remains that millions are perishing from famine every year, and it is the duty of every hon. Member of this House to see whether it is not possible to do something which will prevent the recurrence of these famines. I know the Mansion House Fund is opened for this famine, and is generously contributed to. I would ask, when you come here frequently for millions of money for your battleships and your armies on paper, why you do not come here and demand three or four millions to meet the famine in India? Why do you leave it to the unfortunate people of India to make this provision for famines? It is time that there should be an end to this.

I make no accusation against the administration of the Government of India, but I do say that there must be something wrong. You talk about the solidarity of the British Empire; you talk about the manifestations of loyalty by the people throughout the world; you create new titles for the King, but supposing there were one million people in Australia perishing of famine, what would the Government do? Why, they would come to this House immediately and ask for help. Why will you not help the Indian people? You are proud enough to boast that the Indian troops are ready to fight your battles, and that Indian princes generously offered to help you to fight the Boers, but when the people are dying of starvation no one comes down here to ask for money to help them. I have all through this session opposed the imposition of taxes upon Ireland, but if any Minister came down here and asked for money for the starving people of India I venture to say that there would not be a single Irish Member who would not vote for such a proposal. It is a cruel, unjust, and dishonourable action upon your part to shirk the proper discussion of this question, and to keep it back until the last moments of a dying session.

SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): The great end and aim of the Indian Government appears to be economy. I confess that, compared with the ordinary standard which we have set before us in this country, the policy of the Indian Government appears to be singularly exempt from the extravagance which has attacked this country in so virulent a form. I think the Secretary of State and the Government

of India may be congratulated upon the most satisfactory statement of the finances of India which has been brought forward for many years. I believe this is all the more welcome because it has occurred in the year of a great famine, and I hope that the rule which has been followed on this occasion will not only be continued as far as regards this country, but will also be gradually introduced into the accounts of the Government of India.

In the optimistic tone which has been adopted, and which I believe is thoroughly justified by the circumstances, there is no doubt the Secretary of State is at variance with a large body of private opinion in India. In that country there appears to be a clear line between official opinion, which is optimistic, and private opinion, and judging, as one must judge at a distance, from the returns of revenue and the tables of commerce, I confess that I do not see any reason either for disappointment or pessimism. If you consider the fact that the Government of India has had to face during the last two years one of the greatest famines of the century. I think it will be readily admitted that both the returns and the revenue are highly satisfactory. The noble Lord the Secretary of State for India has brought forward some very interesting figures respecting the average revenue of each individual of the country.

I do not, however, attach any very great importance to such estimates. It appears to me to be most difficult to arrive at any correct data upon the subject, but what I do regard as of considerable interest is the continued large importation of treasure to India. The statistics of last year show that the total import of gold and silver into India amounted to more than seven millions sterling. If we go back one year further we shall find that it amounts to eight and a half millions, and those figures, being largely in excess of the average imports, appear to me to disprove to a large extent the theory of the impoverishment of the Indian ryots. Indeed, taking the years from 1870, it will be found that the aggregate importation of treasure into India in those thirty years amounts to the gigantic sum of 200 millions sterling, and that the rate of importation during the last fifteen years had been 50 per cent. higher than during the first fifteen years. I consider that these facts, which are indisputable, show two things. First, that the current talk about the extreme poverty of India has been somewhat overstated, and, secondly, that, with occasional intermissions on account of famine, the wealth of India is pursuing a gradual and even a rapid path of progress.

This view was put forward by a large body of expert opinion and of commercial opinion before the Currency Commission, when it was stated that the establishment of a fixed exchange at 1s. 4d., which was then considered a high level, would exercise a dangerous influence upon the export trade of India. What are the facts? The exports last year amounted to, approximately, seventy-three millions sterling. This figure compared with that of the highest year previously known; seventy-five millions sterling. There has thus been a drop of only 4 per cent., although the year under review is one of almost unexampled famine. These figures seem to me to prove that all the pessimistic forecasts regarding the baneful influence upon the export trade of a fixed exchange of 1s. 4d. have been disproved by recent experience. I think that the consideration of native opinion

in India is a subject which deserves to engage the attention of this House and this country. You

cannot afford to ignore the native opinion of a large section of the country which you govern. I venture with all deference to put forward what appears to me to be a possible explanation of what I consider is undue pessimism.

It appears to me that Indian public opinion has not perhaps sufficiently realised the full importance of the currency reform which has been carried out in the course of the last few years. The question of currency appears now to have lost most of its interest, but it should not be forgotten that for fifteen or twenty years this most difficult and most interesting question of exchange threatened to ruin the very essence and fabric of Indian finance. In relation to the currency, it is important that we should take stock of the situation and that the House should realise various laws which appear to be established by recent experience. The first is that the influence of a low exchange upon exports is largely transient and momentary. A falling exchange is a temporary stimulus to export, but it ceases to operate as a considerable factor the moment the exchange has established itself at the lower level. The second deduction is that the real factor in determining the price of exchange is much less the relation between the exports and imports from India than the demand for currency for the purposes of internal trade in the country itself. It is essential to bear this in mind, not only because it has been found to be the key solution, but because without exception, in my judgment, much of the future success of the currency depends upon it.

The two phenomena of a large export trade and active internal circulation occurring at the same time, the high exchange which occurs with them is wrongly attributed to the large exports, instead of to the active internal circulation.

If the House will permit me, I will give two examples which appear to me to prove the probable correctness of this theory. In the first place, it is an acknowledged fact now that famine is a factor in high exchange. Everyone can understand that famine cannot possibly be an element in a large export trade, but it is an element which induces a considerable abnormal demand for currency on account of the large payments

which the Government make in their relief camps. My second example is that the frontier wars which have occurred during the course of this currency experiment have proved to be important factors affecting this question. No doubt these frontier wars are elements which increase the small transactions required in currency. I think, therefore, that these two factors, although they may not absolutely prove this theory, undoubtedly show that the real phenomenon on which those responsible for the finance of India should keep their attention is the amount of the supply of capital afforded to India in relation to the demand for it. We are apt to neglect to a very large extent the figures which are usually considered as a guide in this matter; the relation between exports and imports.

There is only one other subject connected with Indian administration upon which, with the indulgence of the House, I should like to say a few words, and it is the introduction of European capital into India. It is obvious that a community of more than 200,000,000 people, which subsists almost solely, and certainly

mainly, upon agriculture, is exposed to a very grave danger in case of drought and disturbance of the ordinary monsoon. I consider that the creation of non-agricultural resources is the paramount and perhaps the most important duty which now devolves upon the Government of India, and I think it will be admitted that the diversification of employment and of the means of livelihood of the inhabitants of India can only be achieved by the introduction of extra Indian capital and European supervision and organisation. In the admirable debate which took place on the Budget of India Lord Curzon wound up his speech by enumerating the various reforms which had been achieved and the schemes which the Government had in contemplation, and they form a splendid record. In regard to this question, what I would say is that, if the financial classes of this country are somewhat shy in regard to investing their capital in India, it is, to some extent, due to the fear that the official classes in India are not altogether friendly to private enterprise. There is an idea that if a venture proves successful in India that the Government or the officials of the Government somehow or another

will prevent the full profit coming to the adventurer. I only mean by this that there is a certain hostility to any considerable profit being made by private individuals in India. I do not at all say that this fear or this suspicion is justified, but I am certain that if the Government of India and the Viceroy desire to have a steady flow of capital into the country which they administer then they must find means to reassure capitalists and the investing public on this point. The Indian Government have, I believe, already done away with the most important danger which prevented capital flowing into India; namely, the fluctuation in exchange; and it remains for them to dissipate the perhaps needless alarm which exists with regard to the attitude of the Indian administration in regard to the investment in India. If the Government do so they will be able in a few years to give to commerce and industry a far larger share in supporting the labouring population of India. I am convinced that by so doing the wealth of our great dependency will be increased, and that this reform will conduce to the greater happiness of a large number of the population, that it will strengthen and popularise our trade in India, and tend to consolidate our Empire.

*LORD G. HAMILTON welcomed the intervention of his hon. friend as a great financial authority in an Indian debate, and as a valuable contributor to these discussions. The views which had been expressed by his hon. friend as to the industrial condition of India would receive most careful consideration. Turning to what he described as the extraordinary speech of the hon. Member for Elgin and Nairn, he said that earlier in the evening two gentlemen had been brought to the Bar for insulting Members of the House. But he did not think that the language these gentlemen employed was more insulting than the language used by the hon. Member. The hon. Member practically accused him of deceiving a number of persons, who had in consequence lost their money, and implied that the parliamentary honour of the Secretary of State was at stake, that his answers were founded on gross ignorance, and that £3,000,000 were in parliamentary pockets which belonged to other people. This was very strong

language; but the House did not understand what the hon. Member was talking about. He was amazed that any hon. Member should apply such language to another Member of the House. As Secretary of State three years ago he had to decide whether or not they should, under the existing contract, purchase the Great Indian Peninsula Railway. The Government decided to buy it, and they availed themselves of the option in the contract to purchase the railway by annuity. The terms of that annuity had to be priced, and they were settled by the directors and the Government without any dispute. Then according to the contract the question was referred to the Governor and the Deputy Governor of the Bank of England to decide the rate of interest payable on that annuity. The rate of interest was decided at £;2 17s. Certain shareholders protested, and an appeal was made to him to allow the case to go to the courts. He consented, and the case went to the court, which decided in favour of the decision of the Governor and Deputy Governor. An appeal was carried to the Appellate Court, and it also decided in favour of the Bank of England. The shareholders declined to carry the case further. Those were the facts. Reference was next made by the hon. Member to the decision of a Select Committee which sat twenty years ago, of which he (the Secretary of State for India) was chairman. He was acquainted with the purport of that Report; he carried it by his own casting vote. It dealt with the purchase of the East Indian Railway. The period for purchasing the main line had arrived, but there was a branch line for which the period of purchase had not yet arrived. A contract was arranged for the purpose of buying the whole line. This was referred to a Select Committee. Three members of the Committee thought that the terms were too favourable, and the greatest difficulty was found to get them to assent to the exceptional arrangement due to the necessity of acquiring the branch line, which the railway was under no objection to sell. He decided it by his casting vote, and the Committee decided that the contract should not in the smallest degree determine the interpretation of contracts in future. He thought that the hon. Member must on reflection see that he had used unpardonable language.

*MR. J. E. GORDON said that no one in the House had a greater respect for the noble Lord, and if he had conveyed the impression which the noble Lord indicated he withdrew the language complained of as regards the noble Lord himself. He had asked for information on three occasions during more than a year as to the actual arrangement on which this great financial undertaking hinged, and the noble Lord had said that he was ignorant, and had refused information to the shareholders who had elected him as chairman for the purpose of appeal to the House of Lords.

*LORD G. HAMILTON said he was one of two parties obliged by statute to go to the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank of England to arbitrate between them. He declined to cross-examine these gentlemen with reference to the method in which they had arrived at their decision. ["Why?"] Supposing that the decision had been very favourable to the hon. Member and his committee of shareholders?

*MR. J. E. GORDON said he belonged to no committee of shareholders. A year ago he attended the statutory meeting to make this great arrangement. He chanced to attend, and explained the position to the shareholders, and the 400 gentlemen

present were so indignant with the callousness of the directors in this matter that they elected him as chairman of a supplementary meeting, and asked him to proceed with an appeal to the House of Lords. The case never went there, because the favourable consideration of better terms were expected from the India Office. This was twice held out by the railway company's chairman who was in communication with the India Office. Further, this proposal was made because the period for calculating the rate of interest had been altered by the India Office (adversely to the interests of the shareholders) by one-half of the entire two-years period, without equivalent or excuse.

*LORD G. HAMILTON asked, supposing the decision had been one which was satisfactory to the hon. Gentleman and the 400 discontented shareholders, what would the hon. Gentleman have said if he had insisted on the governor and deputy-governor explaining the exact methods by which they had arrived at their decision. The hon. Gentleman must know, as every business man knew, that if by statute the Government were compelled to leave a question to an absolutely impartial authority, which was above suspicion, those concerned must abide by the decision at which it arrived. He must protest against the remarks of the hon. Gentleman. He might not have wished to cast any personal reflection, but such an attack did permanent harm to the office of which he (the Secretary of State for India) was for the time being the head.

The hon. Member for Camberwell entered into the question of the famine, and he gave expression to the view that a parliamentary grant would have done much to prevent loss of life. If it would have had that effect, he would have unquestionably asked for it; but there had been during the whole of the famine no lack of funds. Let him remind the House what was meant by famine in India. A famine in India arose from drought. Eighty per cent. of the population were agriculturists, and if there was no rainfall for ten months the whole occupation of 80 per cent. of the population ceased. What would the position in this country be if 80 per cent. of the population were thrown out of occupation? Even in the richest part of this country, in Lancashire, there was a temporary failure in the cotton trade, and there was terrible distress in that part of the country. It must be borne in mind that when a drought occurred, not only did employment cease, but the wage-earning power ceased also, and all means of transport became disorganised. That was the difficulty that had to be faced. It had been suggested that the famine could be killed and the wealth of the country immensely increased by irrigation works. If that were the case the Government of India would have spent very much more money on irrigation. But these last two famines had occurred almost entirely in Bombay and the Central Provinces, and the conditions that had to be dealt with were of an abnormal and unprecedented character. In Bombay it was impossible to carry out irrigation works. Under certain conditions irrigation paid exceedingly well. Where there was a continuous rainfall, running through a country where it could be distributed by gravitation, there was at once a condition of things which made irrigation of extraordinary agricultural value; but there were only a few areas in India where that could be done. At the present moment, he thought, with one exception, there was hardly an

irrigation work in Bombay. It was absurd to lay down the proposition that by spending enormous sums of money in irrigation works the famines could be stopped. He was, however, so far agreed with the hon. Gentleman as to say that the matter should be properly looked into.

The hon. Member had suggested that as the Government had lent a considerable number of troops for Imperial purposes in South Africa and China it was clear that they were not wanted in India, and there ought to be a permanent reduction made in the military establishment. He had always welcomed discussion on Indian matters in that House on the understanding that no attack was made on men absent in India who, under very difficult circumstances, had to perform an unpleasant duty, and he welcomed the kindly criticisms of the hon. Member. But he was hardly treating the Indian Government fairly when he suggested that there should be a permanent reduction of the military establishment. All the Indian Government had done was to run the risk of making a loan to the Imperial authorities of a certain number of troops, who were to be repaid as soon as possible. While he disliked unlimited military expenditure, he could not hold out any hope of a reduction of the military establishment below its usual normal strength. In proportion to the civil population the military establishment in India was extremely small, and he should feel bound to accede to all requests which were made to him with a view to maintaining the efficiency of the Indian Army. The hon. Member had estimated appalling figures in regard to the loss of life by famine. He could not accept those figures. The loss had been very great, but in these visitations far more people died from drinking bad water than from want of food. One of the difficulties which had frequently arisen was to obtain a supply of pure water. The effect of drinking impure water was to produce cholera, and then the loss of life was great. He admitted that the loss of life was much greater than was expected, taking into consideration all the exertions that had been made to save life. It was estimated that the loss of life was a million and a quarter, of which three-quarters of a million were in British territory. But the hon. Member stated the loss at 27,000,000.

MR. CAINE: Over twenty-five years.

*LORD G. HAMILTON said the population of British India had increased by over 33,000,000 in twenty years, and, if they added the 27,000,000 the hon. Member said had been lost by famine, it followed that the increase of the population had been 60,000,000 in twenty years, which was absolutely phenomenal.

Another hon. Member had described the Bombay Land Revenue Bill as an attempt on the part of the Bombay Government to deprive occupiers of their homes. There was no such intention behind the Bill. In the Punjab there were cultivators of the land who had complete tenant-rights, but there was a limitation on their powers of alienation, and this form of tenure had proved most successful. There was no doubt that in the Bombay case the Government, during the next few months, would have to make a considerable number of re-grants of their land to occupiers who had forfeited their holdings in consequence, of their insolvency, but whom the Bombay Government wished to reinstate. The object of the Bill was to prevent these reinstated occupiers from again getting into the clutches of the money-lenders. He could assure the hon. Member that the whole of the agitation against

this Bill was a money-lenders' agitation. In India there were loud denunciations in the popular press and in the Congress of the terrible state of insolvency and indebtedness of the land cultivators, but when the Government attempted to relieve this indebtedness the whole agitation of the money-lending class was turned against the Government. There was no institution in India which was so strongly impregnated with the money-lending influence as the National Congress.

MR. CAINE: I cannot accept that statement.

*LORD G. HAMILTON said he did not expect the hon. Member to accept it. He would look very carefully after the Bill. It was not intended to enable the Bombay Government to impose hard terms on the occupiers, but to try and give them a chance of getting on their legs again.

MR. CAINE: All I ask is that there shall be no hurry in passing this Bill. It is an important measure, and there are appearances about it which I do not like.

*LORD G. HAMILTON said he would take care that the matter was thoroughly considered, and that whatever was done in this case should not be a bar to any future financial legislation for the purpose of curtailing alienation in other parts of India.

Question put, and agreed to.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it appears by the Accounts laid before this House, that the Total Revenue of India for the year ending on the 31st of March, 1900, was £68,637,164; that the Total Expenditure in India and in England charged against Revenue was £65,802,541; that there was a surplus of Revenue over Expenditure of £2,774,623; and that the Capital Outlay on Railways and Irrigation Works not charged against Revenue was £3,035,672.;(Secretary Lord George Hamilton.)

Resolution to be reported.

NAVAL WORKS BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

MILITARY WORKS BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

BERWICKSHIRE COUNTY TOWN BILL [Lords.]

Order for resuming Adjourned Debate on Third Reading [15th August] read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

COUNTY COUNCILS (BYELAWS) BILL [Lords.]

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

In pursuance of the Order of the House of the 22nd day of July last, Mr. Speaker adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at five minutes after Eleven of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Saturday, 17th August, 1901.

The House met at Ten of the clock.

PETITIONS.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Llangynider; and Hanley; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL AND ROYAL DECLARATION BILL.

Petitions against, from Ayr; and Benhar Moor; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EARLY CLOSING OF SHOPS.

Paper [communicated 16th August] to be printed. [No. 369.]

BETTING.

Paper [communicated 16th August] to be printed. [No. 370.]

BRITISH SHIPS (DESSERTION OF SEAMEN ABROAD).

Return [presented 16th August] to be printed. [No. 371.]

SECONDARY EDUCATION.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th May; Sir Ughtred Kay-Shuttleworth]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 372.]

CHINA, No. 7 (1901).

Copy presented, of Correspondence respecting the Imperial Railway of North China [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) ACT, 1899.

Copy presented, of Report of the Director of the Dublin Institutions of Science and Art to the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction for Ireland [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS.

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table;

List of the Bills, Reports, Estimates, and Accounts and Papers printed by order of the House, and of Papers presented by Command, Session 1901, with a General Alphabetical Index thereto, 27th Parliament, Second Session, 1st Edward VII., 23rd January, 1901, to 17th August, 1901; to be printed. [No. 373.]

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;BOER PRISONERS AT ST. HELENA;GODEFROY'S CASE.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether in the case of the killing of Godefroy at St. Helena an investigation before a coroner was demanded by the Boer prisoners, which demand was refused; and, if so, can he state why it was refused; whether at the military inquiry which did take place the friends of Godefroy were represented, and whether his representatives were allowed to cross-examine the military witnesses; whether the committee of Boer prisoners who communicated with the Governor in reference to this incident have sent in any statement; and, if so, whether such statement was considered by the court which conducted the inquiry; and whether he will allow the Member for East Mayo to have access to any correspondence which has passed between the camp committee, the Governor, and the President of the Court in reference to the shooting of Godefroy, and to the official record of the proceedings of the court.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I am sorry my answers have not come down from the War Office, but I will communicate with the hon. Gentleman in the course of the sitting.

DORDRECHT EXECUTION;COMPULSORY ATTENDANCE OF BURGHERS.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he has

now obtained information, as promised, from South Africa, and if he can communicate to the House what were the exceptional circumstances connected with the compulsion of British colonists to witness the execution of their countrymen at Dordrecht; who gave the order for such compulsion, if it was sanctioned by the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa, and, if not, whether the officer responsible for it has been punished; whether these colonists were convicted criminals or prisoners, under what penalty did they attend, and what object was gained by such compulsion.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir; the information has not yet arrived.

VOLUNTEER CAMP ALLOWANCES.

SIR ANDREW AGNEW (Edinburgh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, in connection with the scheme under which Volunteers are to be obliged to attend a camp every other year, whether it is proposed either to increase their rate of pay or to give separation allowance in the case of married men, so that Volunteers belonging to the wage-earning classes may be enabled to attend camp without having to incur a serious pecuniary loss.

LORD STANLEY: This question only appeared on the Paper this morning, and I am not prepared to answer it. It raises a large subject.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): Has the noble Lord anything further to add to the answer he gave yesterday?

LORD STANLEY: I am afraid I have not.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Then I will call attention to the matter on the Appropriation Bill.

MALTA.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the petition from the elected members of the Council of Government of Malta to the House of Commons was presented on the 13th instant, and that such presentation was notified in the usual manner in the official report of the day's proceedings on the following day; whether he has since read the petition; and whether, in view of the state of affairs in Malta at present, he is prepared to grant the Commission prayed for.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.):

The petition to which the hon. Member refers has been, I understand, presented to the House. I have not myself seen it, but that is of no consequence, because I am fully acquainted with the arguments used by the elected members, all of which are

printed in the Blue-book which has been laid upon the Table. There is no necessity therefore for any commission of inquiry into the circumstances. But I ought to add that under no circumstances whatever would His Majesty's Government consent to give greater power to the so-called elected members, who represent, I believe, only something like 2 per cent. of the population of Malta. In fact, having regard to the way in which the powers already conferred upon them have been abused, it may be a matter for subsequent consideration whether we should not go back to the Constitution of Malta as it existed before 1887, and under which the Maltese enjoyed full liberty and prosperity.

MR. DILLON: I was living in Malta in 1871. Is the right hon. Gentleman aware

that there is widespread discontent?

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman extend the franchise?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The right hon. Gentleman has fully answered the question on the Paper.

IRISH LADY'S ESTATE IN MADRID.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that in the case of an Irish lady (Miss Mary Teresa Barry) who died in Madrid on the 15th June, 1899, leaving considerable property in that city, a Dublin solicitor, acting for the next-of-kin, communicated with Sir H. M. Durand, British Ambassador at Madrid, so far back as 29th June last asking for information about the property of the deceased, and subsequently cabled requesting a reply and offering to defray the expense of procuring the information, and that no reply has yet been given; whether he can say if Sir H. M. Durand received such communications, and, if so, why he did not reply; and will he see that Sir H. M. Durand, or the person whose duty it is to interest himself for the protection of the property of British subjects in Madrid, will give immediate attention to this matter.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): This is not the first time the hon. Member has put this question. I am sorry I have been unable to give him satisfaction. The letter has probably been written by now. There is no occasion for any hurry.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Did I not place in the noble Lord's hands a letter dated two months back which said it was of the greatest importance the matter should be attended to at once? Why not telegraph to the Minister responsible for protecting the interests of British subjects?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The hon. Member may rest assured that the matter shall have every attention.

CHINA; ANGLO-RUSSIAN DISPUTE AT TIENTSIN.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I wish to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs why the China Railway Papers are not included in the Papers on China just issued.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I am sorry that they are not included in the Blue-book. I have done my best to hurry them forward, but, unfortunately, have not succeeded, largely through, I fear, my own fault. I only read them this morning.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION BILL.

MR. CLANCY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, as finally amended, will be reprinted; and, if not, whether he will cause a sufficient number of copies of the Bill as so amended to be printed for the use of working men's institutes and clubs in the United Kingdom.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): Certainly, Sir, the Act will be reprinted. As to the distribution, each Member has, I understand, a right to a considerable number of copies, which, I take it, will be sufficient for hon. Gentlemen to supply to institutions in their constituencies.

MR. CLANCY: It has been amended since it was introduced. Will it be reprinted in its final form; and, if so, are hon. Members entitled to the full number of copies of reprints?

*MR. RITCHIE: Certainly; it was amended in the Lords, and it must, therefore, be reprinted now it has become an Act. I will inquire as to the number of copies available for each Member.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Will the right hon. Gentleman expedite the printing of the Act?

*MR. RITCHIE: I will see what I can do.

PENRHYN QUARRY DISPUTE.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the proceedings of the Joint Police Committee for Carnarvon on Thursday last, when the members of the subcommittee appointed by that body to deal with the Bethesda difficulty repudiated the statement made by the Chief Constable that they had instructed that officer to requisition the aid of the military; whether he has also observed that the members of that sub-committee state that they had not even been called together before such a requisition was despatched by the Chief Constable to consider the necessity for such a step being taken; and whether he will request the Chief Constable to furnish him with an explanation of his statements to the Government.

*MR. RITCHIE said he had not had time to make inquiry, but of course he would do so. He would, however, point out to the hon. Member that it was not the sub-committee who requisitioned the military, but a magistrate, who, he understood, was chairman of the joint committee. That gentleman called the military in after a meeting of the sub-committee.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: It was stated by the First Lord of the Treasury that the sub-committee authorised and sanctioned it.

*MR. RITCHIE: Of course it is very often possible to use a phrase which may be misunderstood.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I looked it up in The Times.

*MR. RITCHIE: I am responsible for the statement made by the first Lord, as the right hon. Gentleman got his information from me. It is quite clear that the sub-committee had no power whatever to call in the military, nor had the chief constable power to do so. It was a magistrate who called them in, and that magistrate was chairman of the joint committee.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' BILL.

*SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Board of Education whether the Elementary School Teachers' Bill, relating to the tenure of office by teachers, and in which both teachers and educationists take the greatest interest, having been withdrawn late last night, it will be introduced again early next session.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I am afraid I am not in a position to give any pledge as to the legislation for next session. The matter will, no doubt, receive the attention of His Majesty's Government.

LABOURERS' COTTAGE SCHEMES IN COUNTY DONEGAL.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Donegal I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that sites for labourers' cottages in the Castlefin Electoral Division (Strabane District No. 2), county Donegal, were approved of by the Local Government Board inspector for two labourers named John Doherty and Michael Devine, who have since been evicted by the farmers for whom they worked by reason of their applications to the district council for cottages, and are at present residing in cabins unfit for

human habitation; and, seeing the delay that has taken place in these cases, will the Local Government Board take steps to expedite the erection of the cottages as recommended by the council.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Provisional Order in respect of these cottages is in the press, and will be issued without delay.

NORTH DUBLIN DISPENSARY DISTRICT; MEDICAL OFFICERS' SALARIES.

MR. CLANCY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that, though the North Dublin Board of Guardians agreed to grant an increase of salary to the two medical officers of the North Dublin Dispensary district, the Local Government Board refused to sanction such increase; and whether he will state the reasons why the Board so refused, while sanctioning similar increases to the medical officers of the South Dublin Union.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Board did not see its way to approve of the proposed increases of salary, as the salaries already paid to these gentlemen were larger than the average salaries paid in other districts throughout Ireland, and also £20 a year in excess of the salaries paid to medical officers in the South Dublin city districts. The effect of the increases since sanctioned in the salaries of the medical officers of the South Dublin Union has merely been to bring up the salaries of these officers to the same level as the salaries paid to their colleagues in the North Dublin Union.

POLICE INTERFERENCE WITH UNITED IRISH LEAGUE MEETINGS.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he proposes to give instructions to the police force in Ireland to desist from taking down the names and otherwise interfering with persons attending meetings of the United Irish League while Parliament is not sitting.

MR. WYNDHAM: The police do not interfere with meetings of the League unless they have good reason to believe that the object of a meeting is the advocacy of illegal practices. The same policy will be adopted when Parliament is not sitting.

WESTBOURNE NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant a Return of the correspondence in the case of the West-bourne National Schools, Roll Nos. 12926 and 12927, District 10, county Down, embracing a letter from the teachers to Board in May, 1899, reports of inspectors thereon, the order of the National Board made on

reports of their inspectors, and any further correspondence since on this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: It would be contrary to practice to publish the reports of the Board's inspectors, which are confidential documents; and I regret I am unable, therefore, to consent to the suggested Return.

TALLAGHT PETTY SESSIONS;CHARGE OF DAMAGING KYNOCH'S PROPERTY.

MR. CLANCY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the prosecution at the Tallaght (county Dublin) Petty Sessions, on the 26th July last, of two men named Michael Lawlor and Thomas Behan, on the charge of having damaged a gate lock and chain, alleged to be the property of Kynoch and Company, Limited; whether he is aware that the accused were arrested and the prosecution instituted by the police; and whether it is customary for such action to be taken by the police, in view of the avowal by the accused that what they did was done expressly to assert a public right of way which, according to them, had been violated by Kynoch and Company; and whether any instructions will be issued to the Irish Constabulary that in all such cases they are not to assume the function's of prosecutors till the rights of the contending parties have been judicially determined.

MR. WYNDHAM said that as the case was sub judice he was prevented expressing any opinion as to the propriety of the action of the police.

MR. CLANCY: I only want to know was there any precedent for the police acting as they did.

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot answer such a question without indicating what action they took, and I am not prepared to do that. Technically an act of damage was done in order to maintain a claim of right of way; whether it was necessary I am not prepared to say.

MR. CLANCY: I will draw attention to the matter on the Appropriation Bill.

IRISH EGG AND BUTTER TRADE.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in the interests of the Irish butter and egg trade, he would request the Department of Agriculture of Ireland to appoint a representative in England to safeguard these branches of Irish trade in the same way that other European countries have their produce looked after.

MR. WYNDHAM: The duty of protecting the interests of Irish produce both in transit and on sale in Great Britain, as well as Ireland, has been assigned to the inspectors of the Department. Should experience establish the necessity of having a special officer resident in this country for the purpose the Department will be prepared to take that course. The matter is receiving close attention.

CAMOLIN DISTURBANCES.

MR. DONAL SULLIVAN (Westmeath, S.): On behalf of the hon. Member for North Louth, I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, although Sir Robert Paul is the resident magistrate for the southern portion of county Wexford, Mr. Albert Meldon, R.M., who lives at Bray, county Wicklow, visited the town of Wexford on Monday, and having seen the Sessional Crown Solicitor, signed warrants for the arrest of ten farmers, near Camolin, who were arrested after 3 a.m. on Tuesday morning charged with

demolishing a preacher's

hut at Camolin on 21st June; is he aware that Mr. Meldon, R.M., held a special court at Gorey to try the prisoners, and on whose authority the Crown Solicitor prosecuted them without allowing them time to obtain legal assistance, not withstanding that they, nearly two months before, were tried on the same charge at Ferns Petty Sessions, when informations were refused by the local justices; will he explain why these men were arraigned before the stipendiary magistrate instead of by summons, and is he aware that the stipendiary refused a longer adjournment than to Friday, although the prisoners were without legal advice, and is it the intention of the Crown to depart from the ordinary practice of not trying bailed prisoners at next winter assizes.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have not the full information necessary for a proper answer to this question. The Bench, I believe, was equally divided, and the usual course was taken under those circumstances. Sir Robert Paul, having sat on the Bench in the first instance, said he preferred some other resident magistrate to take the matter up.

DUBLIN POSTAL OFFICIALS' GRIEVANCES.

The following three Questions were put by;

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that Messrs. Arrd, Beatty, Bleech, O'Reilly, Harris, sorting clerks employed in the General Post Office, Dublin, received only 18s. per week starting pay, while Messrs. Mullen, O'Loughlin, Kelly, Daly, Walsh, Farrar, who entered the Dublin Office after the same examination, and under the same conditions, received 20s. per week; and whether, in view of the fact that the Tweedmouth recommendations did not refer to any of the above officers as future entrants under the new scheme outlined in their report, further inquiry will be instituted with a view of redressing the alleged grievances of the officers affected.

To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the duty scheme introduced in the Dublin Sorting Office last April has not given effect, as intended, to the Tweedmouth recommendation, that officers performing split duties should have an interval of nine clear hours at their own homes, that since the introduction of this scheme there has been an increase in extra duties, and that almost all officers performing extra duties are called upon to give a triple attendance, and whether the Postmaster General would consider the making of an arrangement whereby a continuous eight hours attendance could be given.

To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that ten of the twenty-one officers employed on the Dublin and Queenstown T.P.O. receive a trippage allowance of but 3s. per hour, while the remaining eleven obtain 7s. for every day or fraction thereof; that all are called upon to perform the same class of duties, and have to meet with the same expenses, and that the ten officers travelling at reduced trippage allowance have stated by memorial that it is insufficient; and is he aware that on a certain occasion the expenditure to barely sustain exceeded the allowance, and will he state whether the Postmaster General refused to be personally

interviewed by two of their number, and if it is intended to remedy in any way the alleged grievance.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I will cause an answer to these questions to be sent to the hon. Member.

TRALEE MAILS.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that, prior to the amalgamation of the Waterford and Limerick with the Great Southern and Western Railways, the Post Office authorities directed or sanctioned the running of special trains for the conveyance of His Majesty's mails from Limerick Junction to Tralee, via Limerick, Newcastle West and Listowel, when the connections failed at Limerick Junction; and whether, owing to the frequent disconnections of mail trains at Limerick Junction of late, the Post Office will take immediate action so as to prevent the arrival of mails being eight hours late at all points from Limerick to Tralee.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am making inquiries, and will forward the answer to the hon. Gentleman.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

[THIRD READING.]

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I desire to bring under the attention of the House a question, very narrow, perhaps, but yet one of the gravest public importance, and looking back at the history of Ireland for the last ten or twenty years, in my opinion it would be impossible to think of any question of more vital importance, affecting as it does the confidence of the people of Ireland in the fair administration of the law. It will be in the recollection of every Member of the House who has taken any interest in Irish affairs that from time to time, for many years past, statements have been made and rumours have been spread that there existed in Ireland an infamous system which, if it was not openly sanctioned by the highest authorities, was at least winked at and encouraged by powerful subordinate officials; a system utterly opposed and odious to the law and practice of this country, namely, the system of allowing police agents to organise and manufacture crime in Ireland. Of course the Government always repudiate all responsibility for such proceedings, but nevertheless the fact remains, that in the minds of the public in Ireland the belief exists; a widespread belief; that this is an accepted and adopted system amongst police officers in Ireland.

Now, Sir, a case has recently occurred, the particulars of which are fresh in the minds of most Members in the House; a case surrounded by circumstances of the most mysterious character and most far-reaching influence. I refer to the case of the dismissal of Sergeant Sheridan and Constable Mahony from the Royal Irish Constabulary force. The facts of this case can be very briefly stated. On the 1st January this year, Sergeant Sheridan and Constable Mahony, stationed at Mullagh, County Clare, arrested a tramp named Ryan on the charge of having been caught red-handed in the act of

posting threatening notices. Subsequently Ryan was found to have two threatening notices in one of his pockets; he was brought before the magistrates, and the case was adjourned from one petty sessions to another, until finally Ryan was discharged and allowed to go free on the ground that the evidence against him was insufficient. Soon after, marvellous to report, Sergeant Sheridan and Constable Mahony were dismissed from the police force, apparently in disgrace, and deprived of their right of pension. No charge was preferred against them, and they were therefore left absolutely helpless as regards clearing their character. Sheridan immediately demanded a public sworn inquiry. The annals of the police force afforded a precedent for such a course, for a few years ago a Constable Maloney, stationed in the county Wicklow, who was discharged from the force under similar circumstances, demanded such an inquiry, which was at first refused, but was subsequently granted, with the result that Maloney was exonerated from the charges against him, and reinstated in the force. Therefore the demand made in the present case by Sergeant Sheridan was in accordance with the practice previously recognised. He asked for the inquiry on the ground that he was dismissed wrongly and on a false charge, and that the tramp Ryan was really guilty of having the threatening notices in his possession. In presenting his demand he put before his superior officers a totally different theory of what occurred in the case. But the demand was refused. The question was raised in the House, and it is important to examine the reason that was given for the refusal. We were told that "the evidence by which they attempted to substantiate the charges against Ryan was contradictory and unsatisfactory," and it was also said that "there was no evidence to show that the charges were concocted or that the charges were true, and that there was not enough of evidence to secure conviction." I come now to one of the points I wish to emphasise. Was it not a rather strong measure to dismiss two police officers in disgrace and reduce them to beggary without affording them an opportunity of clearing themselves if they could? In my experience it is absolutely without precedent in the history of the Irish police force to dismiss two members of it on the simple ground that their evidence was insufficient to procure conviction. I am not stating what may be in my own mind. I am repeating what the Government stated in this House. That in itself is one of the mysterious circumstances in the case.

I now come to another stage in these strange proceedings. The case remained in the position I have described until quite recently. These officers came to me and to other Members of this House and asserted most positively that they were victims of a conspiracy, that they were perfectly innocent, and that the man Ryan admitted to them while in the barrack that he was guilty of having the notices in his possession. These men actually begged me to bring the case under the notice of the Government, so that they might have at least the justice of a public inquiry, and I did so, with the result that I could get no satisfactory reply, beyond what I have already stated. The inquiry, which I think in common justice they ought to have, was refused, but why? What are the Government afraid of? If the men have misbehaved themselves, their position will be all the worse. If they have not, then they ought to be cleared of suspicion. This attempt to

hide all information and to shirk all investigation is another of the mysterious circumstances of the case. The inquiry, if it served no other purpose, would set at rest the rumours in circulation about the action and conduct of the police. I have received many letters in reference to this case, not only from the locality in which this occurrence took place, but from other parts of the county Clare and from the county Leitrim, where Sheridan was at one time or another stationed, and in all of these

letters I am told it is the firm conviction of the public in those places that Sheridan for many years had been engaged in organising crime and obtaining the conviction of innocent people, and I say that this affords a strong additional ground for an inquiry, for even if those impressions are utterly unfounded it would be of the utmost importance to remove them once for all from the minds of the public. Coming to the next stage in the case, I learned that, while the Government were refusing to hold an inquiry publicly as we demanded, they were prosecuting an elaborate secret inquiry behind the backs of Sheridan and all others interested into the previous history of the transactions in which Sheridan was engaged in his capacity as a police officer. I got a letter from a man in the county Leitrim informing me that this inquiry was going on. I think it is an extraordinary thing that you refuse a man a public inquiry when he demands it, and when there is a precedent for it, and at the same time go behind his back and without his knowledge bring the whole machinery of the detective force into operation, and give him no chance of defending himself. What was the result of this secret inquiry? The result was that it bore out fully, in the judgment of the Government, the sinister rumours to which I have already alluded. The Chief Secretary himself has told us that this man Sheridan had not only sinned in the case of Ryan, but that he was a cunning, unscrupulous scoundrel. That was an appalling admission. This police officer, who was dismissed in disgrace, had been engaged for a period extending over seven or eight years in a steady, systematic conspiracy for the manufacture of crime and for the conviction of innocent men, and had actually succeeded in sending several to gaol for lengthened terms of imprisonment. That is a terrible record. And to make it worse, this man Sheridan was not acting alone. Both in the county Leitrim and at Hospital, in the county Clare, he was acting in co-operation with other police officers, who are still in the service of the Crown, and still probably carrying on the same nefarious work.

I want to know what the intentions of the Government are with regard to Sheridan's confederates in the force? Admitting the Government view that Sheridan, the Chief Secretary said, has deceived the Government and sent innocent men to gaol, what will the Government do in regard to his confederates, who are still active in Ireland? I think we are entitled to a full disclosure in this matter. It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the subject. In order to illustrate the gravity of the case I will take the history of one out of the many victims whom this man Sheridan, on the admission of the Government, sent to gaol on concocted charges and for long terms of imprisonment. I take first the case of Dan McGoohan, in the county Leitrim. This Sergeant Sheridan some three or four years ago charged this man McGoohan with having committed the

peculiarly cowardly, disgusting, and abominable outrage of cutting off the tails of cows. McGoohan was a respectable young farmer, and when this atrocious outrage was laid to his charge the magistrates, on the evidence of Sheridan and another policeman, committed him for trial to Sligo Winter Assizes, and there a most dramatic incident occurred. The first jury empanelled to try the case was a mixed jury, and they disagreed, whereupon the judge spoke rather violently, and announced that owing to this failure of justice the jury list would be called again under fines of £;20. On the second occasion sixty Catholic jurors were ordered to stand aside, and a jury picked from the Protestants and Orangemen of Sligo was sworn to re-try the case;

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): How do you know they were Orangemen?

MR. DILLON: No others would have convicted an innocent man on concocted evidence. The jury was shamefully packed, and McGoohan was found guilty and sentenced to two years imprisonment with hard labour. To add to the dramatic interest of this trial, a policeman named Sullivan was tried on the same day at the same assizes, on the charge of conspiring to create crime;a charge that was first brought against him by a Member of this House, Mr.

William O'Brien, and a charge which the Crown was forced reluctantly to take up. What happened? In the case against Sullivan, who was charged with inciting one man to murder another, the Crown made no effort whatever to procure a conviction. The Crown made it plain that they did not desire a conviction. But in the case against McGoohan, all the machinery of the Crown was put in motion, and sixty Catholic jurors were ordered to stand by. Is not that a dramatic illustration of the way in which justice is administered in Ireland. All the assistance of the Crown was given to Sheridan to convict the poor man McGoohan; all the powers of the Crown were pushed to their utmost extremity in the selection and packing of the jury, and thus Sheridan was enabled to attain his object; while, on the other hand, in the case against Sullivan, who was a policeman charged with manufacturing crime, the Crown made no effort to secure a conviction, and Sullivan was acquitted. For their services in the McGoohan case Sergeant Sheridan and Constable Reed got £;5 reward and promotion in the force. But the matter does not end there. A friend of mine, writing from Leitrim, mentions a significant circumstance in connection with Sheridan's stay in that county. He says:;"When Sheridan came to this district a series of outrages broke out, and lasted while he remained, and when he left the outrages absolutely ceased." Does not that reveal a very terrible condition of affairs? It is not the only evidence against Sheridan. Another man stated at the private inquiry instituted by the right hon. Gentleman that Sheridan asked him to get up a party and break into the house of a man named Curran, who, it was said, openly alleged that Sergeant Sheridan, and not McGoohan, was the man who cut off the tails of the cows in the case to which I have already referred. The man whom Sheridan tried to induce to commit this crime was on bad terms with Curran, and obviously Sheridan's object was to kill two birds with one stone;namely, to revenge himself on Curran for stating that he (Sheridan) committed the outrage for which poor McGoohan was convicted and at the same time organise a fresh crime to enable him to show his ability as a police officer to secure another £;5 reward

and further

promotion. Is not that a nice revelation of the condition of things to which the country is reduced? At the trial in Sligo McGoochan strongly protested his innocence, and when Sheridan's comrade, Constable Reed, was called to give evidence he besought him in the name of God to tell the truth, but Reed only corroborated his sergeant's testimony. At the trial Sheridan gave his evidence most satisfactorily, and everybody saw that he was an able man; but Reed broke down, and his evidence at the second trial was inconsistent with his evidence at the preliminary investigation. McGoochan was convicted wrongly, and sent to gaol for two years, and Reed is still in the police force. McGoochan has since been released, and the Crown are so convinced of his innocence that they are now prepared to give him compensation. I hope it will be substantial compensation. The first thing McGoochan did on being released was to go before a magistrate and swear an affidavit that he was innocent.

Now, I ask, what is going to be done with these two men who, I say, are not only guilty of the abominable crime for which McGoochan was convicted, but guilty also of organising other outrages? Are they to be allowed to go scot-free? I say it is impossible for the Government to refuse us an investigation. This is not an isolated case. All the evidence, including the Government's own admission, goes to show that Sheridan's guilt did not stop at the Leitrim case, but that he was engaged during his entire stay in the county in organising a series of outrages. Another curious coincidence is that the police barrack at which Sheridan was stationed was about to be removed when this outrage was committed. I believe that the practice is not at all uncommon in Ireland when the district is a peaceful one, and the danger arises of a reduction in the police force, these outrages are organised to give opportunity to the police of obtaining promotion for themselves, and, from the political point of view, of blackening the name and fame of the country.

I now come to the cases at Hospital, cases which, although perhaps not quite so dramatic, are equally significant, and in which compensation is to be given. The first is the case of a man; I forget

his name now; who was convicted for firing a rick of hay and sentenced to a long term of imprisonment. The man died a few months after his release. At the time of his trial he protested his innocence, and now it is admitted by the Crown that he was wrongfully convicted and subjected to the most cruel of all sentences; worse than penal servitude; namely, two years hard labour.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): It was penal servitude.

MR. DILLON: I was not quite sure about that. At all events, it killed him. Now his mother is to be compensated. He protested all along his innocence, and he is admitted to have been the victim of a foul conspiracy. There was another case in which a police officer co-operated with Sheridan, and he is still in the force. Another man was convicted in Hospital. He pleaded guilty. This poor fellow, knowing the impossibility of obtaining justice in Ireland, was actually advised by his solicitor to plead guilty, although he knew he was innocent. He did so, and so got off with some small sentence. I commend this to the notice of the House. The innocent man who pleads guilty gets only six months; the innocent man

who defends himself gets three years penal servitude! Is it not a nice state of affairs for any civilised country? I believe in the next case also the man was admitted to be innocent. I see that the Chief Secretary admits that, but of course I do not know that; I have to feel my way along, for I received my facts from Ireland. The police committed outrages for the purpose of convicting those men and getting promotion. They accuse innocent men, and these men, in view of the impossibility of being acquitted by a packed jury, are advised to plead guilty so as to get a light sentence, and they do so! In the case of poor McGoohan the same advice was given to him by the solicitor who appeared for him. He said, "What chance have you before a Sligo packed jury?" But to his credit McGoohan refused, and said, if he was going to his grave for it, he would not admit an offence of which he was not guilty. I put it to hon. Members, is not that an awful state of things in a country supposed to be civilised, that innocent men are advised to plead guilty because the police are prepared to swear against them? How the Government can have the face, in view of the state of the public mind in Ireland, to refuse a public inquiry into all the details of this case surpasses my understanding. That is not the whole of the conspiracy. It is only the leakage, the sudden revelation, as if by a flash of lightning, of the system which we believe has been going on for years. It brings my mind back to the case, famous, or rather infamous, in its day, when, on the eve of a suppressed meeting, I addressed the men of Clare, and in connection with which one of those infamous police agents was paid by the police, as he admitted in court, to organise one of those moonlight outrages. It was drawn out of him in court that his character was wholly infamous, that there could not be a more hideous life history, and yet he was in the pay of the police for ten years! It was brought out in evidence by the district inspector examining him at the preliminary investigation, that two days after I addressed the meeting he spoke to the people, and said: "You have heard Mr. Dillon's speech; are you not going to follow it up by action?" And that he sought to make it out that he was a kind of informal agent of mine, evidently for the purpose of bringing me into it. And it was admitted by this man that he had been paid ten shillings by the police to organise this outrage; that he went to a publichouse and got so drunk that he fell in the street, was discovered there by the police, brought back to the barrack, put to bed, made sober, and was given another half sovereign, and sent out again to organise this outrage. It was put into his mouth that the motive was, "That it was necessary to carry out Mr. Dillon's views." These are the things which occur from time to time.

There is a belief in Ireland that this system is winked at, and I say it is the duty of the Government to clear up this whole matter in all its ramifications. Sergeant Sheridan begged me to put his case before the House of Commons. He says he is the victim of a prolonged conspiracy on the part of his officer, District-Inspector Irwin (?), who was a confederate of the infamous French; I dare say the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary remembers French; who was the head of the Irish Detective Department, and was one of the most infamous men who ever served any Government, who organised a conspiracy for the commission of unnatural crimes, and was convicted

and sentenced for that offence. Irwin stood by him throughout his trial, and was one of his chief confidants throughout his defence, and he was also one of the chief agents of The Times in the infamous Pigott case. Sheridan is, it seems, a man who, as the Government admitted, was organising crimes. He says this man Ryan really had the notice in his pocket, that he was the secret agent of the Government going about the country organising crime, and was in the act of posting this notice in pursuance of a conspiracy for crime. I see the Chief Secretary laughs at that. I do not know myself whether there is a word of truth in it, but why should it not be as true as the Clare case? The Chief Secretary is new to Irish administration. Let him remember that in the Clare case the police themselves, and the Crown Prosecutor, admitted that this man had been in their pay for ten years. Ryan disappeared from the public view, being discharged as an innocent man. Sheridan says he dropped upon the wrong man and got into disfavour with the authorities. Do not imagine that I support that statement at all. I support neither statement, but I say that a more monstrous transaction it would be impossible to conceive, and that the Government cannot possibly hope to face Irish public opinion upon this matter until the whole machinery of the law is cleared of the disgrace which attaches to it. I press the Government for an inquiry. What are you going to do with this police officer still in the force who acted with Sheridan? Will the Government, in addition to a public inquiry, have a searching inquiry into the police force itself? Will the Chief Secretary give us a pledge that he will undertake to satisfy himself that this system of agent provocateur is not still going on in Ireland, and if it is, will he put a stop to it? It is an odious and horrible system, and would not be tolerated for a moment in this country. I

am sorry it has been allowed for generations in Ireland. So long as it is tolerated there, so long will it be impossible for the Government to secure respect for the administration of the law.

MR. WYNDHAM: I think the House will agree that at this late period of the session it is only right that I should at once reply to the speech to which we have just listened. The hon. Member said that there was a great deal of mystery about this case. So far as I am concerned, there is none. I will ask the House to listen while I state the action which the Government has taken and the ground on which they base that action. The hon. Member says it was necessary to clear up these mysteries. Yes; but I very much regret that in presenting his case he should have thought it necessary to rake up the crimes and scandal of French fifteen years ago, to attack the Orangemen, and to drag into the case allegations for which there is no foundation. I think it would have been far better if he had confined himself to the particular case of Sheridan, and I propose to follow that course. So far as the hon. Member did so, he balances between two views, one that Sheridan himself is the victim of a widespread conspiracy, the other, that as a detective officer he has been instrumental in procuring the conviction of four innocent men. Now, I have no hesitation in saying that he did procure the conviction of four innocent men, but I will ask the House to follow me whilst I treat this case historically, as it came to my own knowledge. It is not mysterious, but it is much the most unpleasant and

distressing case with which I have been brought into contact during the period I have been Irish Secretary. I do not intend to claim, and I am not entitled to claim, that the Government has taken the best course. Opinions may be divided as to that, but I do claim that there was no course which could be wholly satisfactory. If we had proceeded by the prosecution of Sergeant Sheridan, he would have inevitably been acquitted. There was no evidence upon which we could have put him on his trial, because the evidence against him was his own depositions. Your witness was gone when he was put into the box, because your witness was identical with your criminal. Prosecution would, therefore, have been abortive. Had Sheridan been put upon his trial, his innocence would have been established, and, therefore, so far as the case of Ryan was concerned, he would have been kept in high position in the force, with a record of great ability and dexterity and success in detective operations, and no reparation could have been given to the victims, assuming that they were victims, as I think that they were. The hon. Member says that McGoochan is cleared. I, too, say he is, but the hon. Member is labouring between two views; MR. DILLON: I said that I had no material for judging. I laid the two views before the House.

MR. WYNDHAM: In my opinion there were two things to be done. One was to get at the bottom of the truth, to find out the truth of what had been going on; the other was to make reparation to the victims of villainy, if villainy had been practised. I come back to the point of the case against Ryan, whom, I understand, Sheridan represents to be a cunning agent. Ryan was really a poor old tramp about sixty-five years of age, tottering, debilitated, and nearly blind. Sheridan arrested him upon a charge of affixing a threatening notice to a gate. Sheridan's evidence as given on deposition broke down, and it was clear from an inspection of the spot that he could not have seen the actions that he stated he had seen from the place that he said he had observed them from. So that it was clear to the Crown that Sheridan was fabricating evidence and improving the case, if there was a case, and it was clear that Ryan should not be convicted. It was also clear that if you reversed the process and put Sheridan upon his trial he would not be convicted. There was no legal evidence on which the charge could be brought home. But the Crown has a right to dismiss a police officer if they believe it is for the good of the service and of the public, and it has a right to do so without giving any reasons for it. Sheridan was dismissed from the force because it was clear that he was not conducting the charge in a straightforward manner.

But I was not satisfied with that. I took that course because I wished to clear the force of Sheridan. There were two other courses. One was to put him on his trial. If I had done that his reputation would have been whitewashed. The other one was to say, "There is no real evidence against this man, though it was true he had made a mess of the case, and we will therefore transfer him to another district and leave him there." If that course had been followed the hon. Member could not have made his speech, because the statements he made about the other cases are only known to him in consequence of the secret departmental investigation which I ordered to take place. The other constable, Mahony should

have had the courage to disown Sheridan and tell the truth, but he had not the moral courage. Then I looked up the records of all the cases in which men had been convicted upon the evidence of this sergeant, and I directed that a secret and most searching investigation should be made of all these cases. That was the policy which I adopted, not thinking it was a wholly satisfactory ending to so melancholy a business, but sincerely believing that it was the best course to pursue if I was to arrive at the truth. If I instituted a public inquiry (I do not blame the hon. Member for suggesting that course) the young policemen who were unduly under the influence of this wicked and most able man would not have given any evidence if they had been called upon to do so. One of the first maxims of the law is that a witness need not say anything which would incriminate himself, and they would have been, of course, warned to that effect, and, although this is not a wholly satisfactory way, if you wish to get at the bottom of such an evil as this, you must have a secret inquiry, and acquire some evidence by the distasteful process of telling them that if they tell the truth they shall not suffer for it, and I believe it was the only course by which public reparation could be made to Bray, or, rather, for I am sorry to say that he is dead, to his mother, to Patrick Murphy, and to Daniel McGoohan. I say that these three men were convicted upon evidence that I do not believe, and evidence which I can demonstrate to be false. But it was not evidence which was obviously false on the face of it. Sheridan was not only an immoral and a wicked man, but an extraordinarily clever man; but when suspicion was aroused, and when I looked into these three previous convictions, I was struck by the extraordinary fact that in each one of the cases Sergeant Sheridan went out to find a particular crime, and then found it.

MR. DILLON: That is not at all an uncommon thing in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: I beg the hon. Member's pardon. If this had happened once it would have been a strange coincidence; if it happened twice it would be a matter for incredulity; but as it happened three times it brought conviction to my mind that Sergeant Sheridan invented the crime and then discovered it. That is true in all these cases. In a case of burning hay he was coming down a road with a young police officer, who believed in him explicitly, because he was considered so able a detective. He observed a light. It was clear, after the inquiry, that no one could have located that light; but Sheridan suggests to this young police constable that the light is at a particular place on Quinlan's farm. They then arrest a man near the spot, and afterwards find that the hay has been burned. The same concatenation of events occurs in another case involving the maiming of cattle. Someone is arrested, and they come to the place and the cattle are found maimed. There is the same sequence of events also in the case of the donkey being stabbed. I do not ask if the House will accept my word; I know they will do so; but my judgment. I have carefully stated the result of these searching inquiries. It is clear to me that there were three gross miscarriages of justice; it is clear also that, with one exception, the young policemen were not Sheridan's confederates in a criminal conspiracy. They were under his influence, and they had not the moral courage, when the time came, to stand up and say, "This man's account of what took place does not agree accurately with what is in

my recollection." They believed they were serving under a brilliant detective officer, and it is not outside the history of detective work that such men at length become fascinated by crime. That is what happened in this case. Sheridan, the clever detective officer, became a villain in exercising his profession, and influenced and dazzled some young men by the force of his character and his ability. I could not have arrived at the truth of the matter unless I had this statement by all these young fellows. We said, "Give the whole truth, and if you do you won't suffer by it." We got it. The force is rid of Sheridan; three innocent men have had reparation done to them; those dependent upon the fourth have received compensation. I believe that by the course pursued this result could alone have been achieved. It would have been easier to hold a public inquiry, but you could not have arrived at the truth and made reparation. I leave the course that has been pursued to the judgment of the House.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): I am sure that no one on the Nationalist benches will deny that the right hon. Gentleman has acted with very great courage in this matter. He has given a most able defence of the judgment which he formed of this case. He has acknowledged with courageous frankness three gross miscarriages of justice. But it is necessary to point out that in dealing with this matter we are dealing with a system old, hoary, and well-established in Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman shakes his head. But the fact is that the Irish Members had been fighting this system for many years before he occupied his present office, or, indeed, before he was in Parliament at all. This is not a question affecting one particular Administration; it is a system which has obtained under different Governments; Tory and Liberal Administrations have alike had their victims. Let hon. Members recall the case of Bryan Kilmartin if they wish to recognise how literally true that statement is. From 1880 to 1885 there was a Liberal Administration in power, Lord Spencer was Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and Sir George Trevelyan was Chief Secretary. Session after session Kilmartin's case was raised. He had been sent to penal servitude for ten years for shooting at a man with intent to murder. He had always protested his innocence, and even when we were able, years after, to produce the dying deposition of a man who confessed to being the author of the crime, we were met by the suggestion that such depositions were not always to be trusted, and that they were as frequently the manifestations of fraud as the revelation of truth. What happened? There was a change of Ministry. Lord Carnarvon became Viceroy, and the facts were again gone into. The worst of the administration of the law in Ireland is that it has too often been treated as a party issue, and unjust verdicts have been defended, because a reversal might be inconvenient to the party in power. Lord Carnarvon went to Ireland, Kilmartin was released, and his innocence established, and when Lord Carnarvon went to the west of Ireland the man who drove his car was the same man Kilmartin, who had served five years penal servitude. We do not raise this as a party question, but simply to show that these gross miscarriages of justice are as possible under one Administration as another. Let us for a moment consider what are the admitted facts. A man is sentenced to

two years imprisonment upon a horrible charge of mutilating a cow. He serves his two years, but is found to be convicted unjustly, and sentenced unjustly.

Another man is unjustly sentenced to three years penal servitude, and serves his sentence, and is murdered by his sentence. The third case is that of a man who, admittedly innocent, pleads guilty, because he is advised by his solicitor that there is no hope for him, and so gets off with a lighter sentence. Does not that throw a strange light on the administration of justice in Ireland? Are things like this possible in France? When the Dreyfus case was at its height in France, and the press of this country was pouring a perfect Niagara of vituperation upon, not only the military tribunals, but even other tribunals in France, I felt it my duty to privately ask Englishmen, "Do you think it impossible that this could have taken place anywhere else?" and I think I said in this House that such conspiracies were very successful in Ireland. But here is the difference. In France the whole nation was torn to pieces, the form of government was tottering, and there was an outbreak of passion almost equal to civil war; all over the question of whether an unpopular man, a member of an unpopular race, had been fairly tried. I fail to see any such moral uprising against the Dreyfus cases of Ireland. I would point out to the right hon.

Gentleman the terrible risks of trial by packed juries. Sheridan would have been powerless without the Attorney General, because when Sheridan brought his case against McGoohan there was a mixed jury; McGoohan was tried by a jury of his peers, and that jury was able to form what is now admitted to be a correct judgment of the case, and he was not convicted. Then came the Attorney General, or those acting in accord with him or under his instructions, and when McGoohan was tried again sixty men were ordered to stand aside. McGoohan was then tried upon the evidence of this perjured police-sergeant by a jury of his political and religious opponents. Trial by a packed jury is most dangerous in cases of a class war or a state of national struggle, the terrible danger about it being the result of these trials. It is only natural when a man is tried by men of another political creed or religious faith, even if there be no case against the man, to find a case. That system of administering justice must stand condemned. The net moral is, can a system of government be right under which these things are possible. The fact of the matter is, the right hon. Gentleman is the victim of circumstances. He is the victim of a system which has been going on for centuries, and which is a scandal to this country.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.) said he was extremely reluctant to intervene in any debate on the last day of the session, but he felt compelled to make a few observations, having regard to what had been said by hon. Gentlemen opposite. He had been an Orangeman for over half a century, and he desired to point out that it was part of the obligation taken by Orangemen when they first joined the Orange Society not to wrong any man on account of his religious opinions. Charges had

been brought against the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland in this House which the right hon. Gentleman was perfectly able and competent to deal with. One of those charges was that he encouraged outrageous ruffianism on the part of Orangemen in the north of Ireland. A more unfounded charge had never

been made within the four walls of the House of Commons. There had been rioting in Ireland, and an Orangemen or two may have been in it, but recently the Grand Orange Lodge of Belfast had passed a resolution against these outrages, and against interference with the liberty of the subject in Belfast. More than half a million of men were banded together to maintain the integrity of the Empire in the Orange Society, and he firmly believed that if hon. Members opposite could divest themselves of some of their extraordinary prejudices they would do justice to the principles of the Orange organisation, which was as noble a body as ever was formed in the Empire. An attack had been made upon the administration of justice in Ireland, and it had been stated that it was impossible to obtain justice from a Protestant jury where the person arraigned was a Roman Catholic. He would only give his own experience. He was an Orangeman in 1868, and in that year was placed in the dock charged with taking part in an Orange procession. A jury was empannelled on that occasion, many of whom were Orangemen, and all of whom he thought were Protestant. That jury did their duty, and although he was an Orangeman they convicted him. Subsequently the Act under which he had been convicted was repealed. In 1872 he, being in Canada, was thanked by a body of Irishmen for having helped to obtain this extension of freedom, and Mr. John O'Farrell, head of the Fenian organisation in Canada, proposed to serenade him. While Nationalists in this House protested against what they regarded as injustice, they would do well to protest also against the language of some people opposed to British rule. He alluded particularly to the recent recommendations by O'Donovan Rossa to set fire to English towns in order to obtain what he called justice to Ireland. That suggestion was made at a meeting of Irishmen in

Chicago, with Mr. Michael Davitt as one of the speakers.

MR. DILLON remarked that, though Mr. Davitt had spoken in Chicago, he was not at the meeting to which Mr. Johnston referred.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON: If the hon. Member disclaims this suggestion to set fire to English towns, I gladly accept his disclaimer.

MR. DILLON: That is very unfair. I might as well ask the hon. Member whether he repudiates a desire to murder his constituents.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON had no wish to hurt the feelings of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and if he had done so he sincerely regretted it.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.) said that he did not intend to deal with the speech just delivered further than to say that neither one of the four hon.

Members representing Belfast had thought it his duty to denounce from his place in this House the outrages in Belfast.

*MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON said that Colonel Saunderson, the Grand Master of the Orangemen of Belfast and the chairman of the Irish Unionist party in this House, had repudiated them on behalf of the Irish Unionists.

MR. CLANCY said that might or might not be, but he noted that not a single hon. Member representing Belfast had repudiated these outrages in Belfast. He associated himself with the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool in saying that the Chief Secretary for Ireland had acted in a manner which commanded the approval of the Irish party, the spirit he had shown in his reply

to the hon. Member for East Mayo being very different from the spirit displayed on other occasions. He thought on such an occasion as this it should be admitted that the right hon. Gentleman had gone a very great way in discharging properly the functions of his office. He also associated himself with the expression of opinion which had fallen from the hon. Member the Member for the Scotland Division that

this was a matter of system, and if hon. Members had looked at the questions on the Notice Paper of to-day they would find two further illustrations of the working of that system in Ireland. The first illustration was that of a case with regard to right of way. It appeared that in his constituency a right of way had been exercised by certain persons over certain property, that an English company had recently acquired the property, and they had put up a gate with a lock to it to prevent the people from further exercising the right of way which was alleged to exist. It was an unimportant matter, and he only referred to it for the purpose of illustrating the method of the Government in Ireland. One or two persons went deliberately and smashed the gate and the lock as protest. That was a common thing to do in England under such circumstances. It was the way in which one had to assert a public right which had been invaded. Under those circumstances what would have been done in England would be that the person who said he had been injured would have been left to use his legal remedy, and he would have brought a civil suit in the county court or the High Court to establish his right, and then, if he established his right, if anybody subsequently interfered with that right that person would be sued or a criminal prosecution would be brought against him. What was the case in Ireland?;he did not insinuate for a moment that the Chief Secretary or the Attorney General directed it to be done. In this case the police arrested the two men who broke the lock of the gate, although those men avowed that their reason for doing it had been to preserve a public right, and they prosecuted them at the petty sessions. He was told that the case was under appeal, and he did not intend to take advantage of his position as a Member of Parliament to do what he would not do outside the House. He expressed no opinion on the case, and the only point to which he wished to direct attention was that the police in Ireland from long custom believed this was the right thing to do in the interests of the Government, and in this case they had set themselves up to do what Kynoch and Co., the English company in question, would not have done in England. The other case was where ten men, only two months before, were tried on a certain charge. On that occasion the informations asked for were refused by the local justices. If that had occurred in England further proceedings would have been stayed, and no more would have been heard of the case; but in Ireland, two months afterwards, the resident magistrate went to Wexford, had an interview with the Crown solicitor, as a result of which he issued warrants for the arrest of the ten men, and two or three days afterwards sat alone, without a jury, and tried the case by himself. He would not even allow an adjournment of more than a day or two to allow the accused to obtain legal assistance. Would such a thing be tolerated in England for a moment? If such a thing had been mentioned before the war as having occurred in the

Transvaal, notice would have been taken of it in this House, and the case would have been referred to by the Colonial Secretary in no measured terms. What he wished to know was, who ordered the resident magistrate to go down and have a private conversation with the Crown solicitor at Wexford? If anybody had told him to do so they were guilty of a very grave irregularity. If he was not told to do so, was it not very singular that this man should go down and do a thing of this kind? If an ordinary magistrate, the chairman of a county council elected by a popular vote, had done a thing of this kind, how long would he have held his position? Those were the illustrations to which he alluded, and there he left them. He only mentioned them to show that in the minds of the Irish people the idea was deeply impressed that the law was administered in favour of a class in the interests of the Government, that the law was pursued to the utmost in some cases and eased in others, and such an impression as that was bound to bring discredit on the administration of the law in Ireland.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central) called attention to the large increase and efficiency of the Volunteers. They now numbered 277,000 men, 98 per cent. of whom were efficient. The Secretary of State for War had said in the course of his observations during the session that he would sooner have fewer men, but more efficient. The War Office should be very careful not to promulgate schemes for increasing the efficiency of the Volunteers which would have a tendency greatly to reduce the numbers of the force. Those serving in the Volunteer force were anxious to support the authorities in making the force more efficient. He recognised that he was at a considerable disadvantage owing to the heavy domestic calamity which had befallen the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, but as this was the only opportunity when this question could be raised, he hoped he would be forgiven for bringing it before the House at this time. On the 22nd of July there was laid upon the Tables of both Houses a scheme relating to this matter. By the merest accident he had been able to obtain a copy of it through the courtesy of one of the officials of the library. It had not been issued to Members of the House, and was only obtainable in the House of Lords' Vote Office. He had a copy of the scheme, and he earnestly hoped the Financial Secretary would mention to his colleague the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State the points which he now desired to submit to his consideration. The Volunteer force were anxious to do everything possible to support the authorities, and in the present Inspector-General; General Turner; they had a man of great tact, most anxious to do everything possible not only to increase the efficiency of the force, but to do so in every possible way. He did not know who was responsible for the new scheme of efficiency, but there were some matters connected with it which required the special attention of the Secretary of State. The scheme represented a considerable increase in the requirements of the Volunteer force, but they would endeavour to carry it out. He called particular attention to the tenth paragraph, which said; "No corps or individual Volunteer will be exempted from attending camp for two consecutive years."

He desired to see that order amended. If that order was persisted in, it would

have a most detrimental effect upon the Volunteer force. Every commanding officer in the force was anxious to do everything he could to get his men to camp, but exceptional circumstances arose, not only in the case of men, but in the case of corps, which rendered it impossible for Volunteers to go into camp. In the case of individuals sickness and the disabilities arising from family affairs and civil employment ought to be taken into consideration. The country was greatly indebted to employers of labour for the encouragement they had given to the Volunteer movement, and if a condition of things arose in which employers preferred men who were not Volunteers to men who were Volunteers it would be a most unfortunate thing for the defence of the country and for the Volunteer force. The Government itself did not encourage Volunteers in their employ in attending camps. They had had great difficulty in getting men to attend at all; and if that was so in the case of the Government, how much more was it the fact in the case of private employers. He earnestly urged upon the War Office the inexpediency of pressing this matter unduly, because if they did press it the result would be lamentable. He urged that at the end of Clause 10 some words should be added to this effect; "Unless with the special authority of the officer commanding the brigade upon the recommendation of the commanding officer of the Volunteers."

If that were done he did not think there would be much to object to in the scheme. But in regard to the question of going into camp there was another subject to consider. The War Office also said that a Volunteer must not go into camp before he had gone through his course of musketry, but, as some regiments went into camp in Whit-week, they could only obtain a hurried course of instruction in musketry, which was valueless, and if this order was insisted upon it would do harm to the Volunteer force instead of good. He did not know who was responsible for this scheme, but he hoped the attention of the Secretary of State would be given to the matters to which he had referred. In connection with keeping up the musketry efficiency of the Volunteer force, the War Office must obtain suitable sites for rifle ranges. The Volunteers of the country were most anxious to increase their efficiency, but the War Office must not insist upon what was impossible. Let the power of exemption from attendance in camp for two consecutive years be exercised, that some of the best and most zealous men might not be turned "neck and crop" out of the Volunteer force because, owing to their individual circumstances, they were unable to comply with War Office requirements. With regard to sites for ranges, there should be a distinction between the case of urban corps, which had great difficulty in obtaining sites, and country corps, whose ranges were often close at hand.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) drew the attention of the Financial Secretary to the War Office to the executions in Cape Colony, and asked whether, when the report of the executions was received, it would be circulated among Members of Parliament. He requested the noble Lord at the same time to inform Members as to the principle upon which the authorities acted in calling upon burghers to attend the executions and the promulgation of sentences. Were all the inhabitants summoned, or only a certain number? If a number were selected,

what were the principles of selection that guided the authorities? These were things the House of Commons ought to know. It had been stated that only disloyalists were called upon to attend the executions. Did that mean all those who did not approve the policy of the war, or, those who were charged with treason, or simply suspects? Another point on which information was necessary was as to what had been the effect of these executions. Had the effect been deterrent or the reverse? An English minister in South Africa had written to him to say that these executions were the best means of recruiting the Boers, and anyone who knew the character and the disposition of the Dutch must be aware that such would be the effect. It was perfectly apparent that the Boers had recruited very largely in Cape Colony since the executions. He thought the House was entitled to have information on these points. That was all he desired to ask the noble Lord.

Then, he wished to draw the attention of the Home Secretary to the statements made at a recent meeting of the Carnarvonshire Joint Police Committee. The First Lord of the Treasury during the Penryn debate assured the House of Commons that a sub-committee of that body, consisting of magistrates and county councillors, had requested the War Office to send the military down to Bethesda. This statement from the Leader of the House made a great impression, because an impartial body, consisting of county councillors as well as magistrates, carried weight. On Thursday, however, the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury was indignantly repudiated by the joint committee, who declared that the sub-committee had nothing to do with the calling in of the military. They showed that the chief constable came to them, having made up his mind distinctly that he would have the military, and that they had neither sanctioned nor authorised it. The only member of the joint committee who defended the action of the chief constable was Lord Penryn, while the lord lieutenant of the county criticised the calling in of the military by a magistrate from outside. The chief constable was an upright and sincere man, but he was also a nervous man. He was not a Welshman, and when he heard a crowd booing in a language he did not understand, he seemed to think a riot would follow.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon) said when he and the First Lord of the Treasury referred to this matter on a previous occasion they spoke upon the information supplied by the chief constable, which justified the position they then took up. In his letter to the Home Office the chief constable said a meeting of the sub-committee had approved his action, and authorised him to inform the officer commanding the troops that military aid might shortly be required, and to ask that troops should be held in readiness. The chairman also had appointed the chairman of the standing joint committee, who was also a magistrate, to sign the requisition for troops if necessary. That was the state of things when circumstances arose which in the opinion of the chief constable justified him in again calling the subcommittee with a view for sending for troops. On July 31st the chief constable wrote to the Home Office stating that he had attended a meeting, previously called, of the sub-committee referred to in his former letter, and that, after expressing his reasons for thinking a military force necessary, he had forwarded

a requisition signed by the chairman to the general officer commanding the North-Western District. That did not say that the sub-committee authorised the chief constable in calling for the military, but it justified the interpretation which he and his right hon. friend had put upon the letter. Having regard to the previous letter, they were justified in assuming that the sub-committee assented to the calling for troops. Of course, he would now ask the chief constable for an explanation. In a case of this kind the Home Secretary did not receive the requisition, and the responsibility rested, not with the subcommittee or joint committee, but first of all with the chief constable. It was his duty, if he thought that the peace could not be preserved without the aid of troops, to take the necessary steps to obtain military assistance, and that was by communicating, not with the Home Office, which was no party in the matter, but with the general officer commanding in the district, through the magistrate, having first obtained the signed order from the magistrate. The military, of course, would not come on the demand of the chief constable. The magistrate in this case was appointed by the sub-committee to take action when action became necessary. Upon the point whether there was a difference of opinion between the sub-committee and the chief constable he would communicate with the latter.

*MR. WILLIAM JONES (Carnarvonshire, Arfon) said at the meeting of the joint police committee, held on the previous Thursday, many members criticised the action taken in this matter as being wholly irregular, and the Lord Lieutenant commented in very strong terms on the locus of the sub-committee, and said that it had acted ultra vires, the only persons qualified to sign the requisition being the mayor or the magistrate having jurisdiction in the district. The chairman of the Bangor Bench held the same view.

*MR. RITCHIE was understood to say that was not so.

*MR. WILLIAM JONES: At all events, the feeling of the joint police committee after deliberating yesterday was that the chief constable acted in an unnecessary way, that the sub-committee went beyond its jurisdiction, and that any requisition for military force should be signed by the magistrate acting in the district.

*MR. RITCHIE said that was quite a wrong view; any magistrate in the county had jurisdiction.

*MR. WILLIAM JONES said that that was a straining of the point, for according to the law lucidly explained the other day by his right hon. friend the Member for East Fife, it could not be too clearly understood that the local magistrates were the keepers of the peace. The requisition for the attendance of the military must proceed from the local magistrates, and from them alone.

*COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle) said he desired to make one or two remarks with regard to what fell from the hon. and gallant Member for Central Sheffield. The impression he received from the speech of his hon. and gallant friend was that it was proposed that the responsibility for the exemption of individual volunteers from attending camp should be thrown on the general officer commanding the district. That was a proposal to which he could not agree. If there was one thing which the War Office should do it was to keep general officers free from being overloaded by detail work of this nature, as the time

at their disposal was already insufficient for their legitimate work of inspection and training of the troops in their commands, under an efficient system of decentralisation and responsibility. His view of the matter was that the administration of details with regard to both the Militia and the Volunteers should be taken out of the hands of general officers commanding districts and put into the hands of the heads of brigades, which should be formed by reducing the number of regimental districts and putting them into brigades, each brigade having at its

head a brigadier with proper staff, charged with the special duty of supervising the efficiency of the Militia, the Volunteers, and Army Reserve, within the limit of his district command, and being responsible for the same to the general officer, of whose command two or three brigades would form a subordinate part.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) raised the question of allotting to Irish manufacturers and traders a fair proportion of the contracts for supplies to troops in Ireland. There were 20,000 troops located in Ireland; the country had to pay a very large sum towards their up-keep, and some of the supplies necessary ought to be obtained in Ireland. He suggested that depots and stores should be established in Ireland. It was in the interests of economy and the welfare of Ireland that there should be such establishments in that country. It was disgraceful that, when such things as boots or shoes were required, orders were immediately sent to Woolwich for them, and they were not obtained in Ireland. That was not a system with which the Commander-in-Chief in Ireland was in sympathy. The Duke of Connaught adopted the view that it would be greatly to the well-being of Ireland if it had a share of the War Office contracts. It had been said that the amount of work to be done would not be sufficient to justify the establishment of a depot in Ireland, but it had been conclusively proved that such an establishment would be as greatly to the advantage of the Army as to the country, and he certainly thought that it was only right that a certain amount of the money which was spent on the maintenance of the troops in Ireland should be spent in that country. Within his own recollection the canteens for the use of the troops in Ireland were supplied by Irish brewers and distillers, but recently all that had been changed. The noble Lord had stated that he had no control over that, but he would ask the right hon. Gentleman to go a little further and make a recommendation to the commanding officers upon this question. COLONEL ROYDS (Rochdale) said he wished to supplement what had fallen from the hon. and gallant Member for

Central Sheffield in regard to Volunteers going into camp, and in regard to the condition of the northern Volunteers. He was sure the House was desirous that no unnecessary conditions should be placed in the way of increasing the efficiency on numbers of the Volunteers. At the beginning of the session he put a question to the Secretary of State for War on the subject of class firing before Volunteers went into camp, and asked that the special circumstances attaching to any particular corps should be considered in order that the capitation grant might be obtained. Some members of the Volunteer battalion of which he was honorary colonel went out this year, but were unable to obtain the necessary qualification to entitle them to the capitation grant. He wished to point out

that there was a great difference between Volunteers who went into camp at this time of the year and those who went out at Whitsuntide. It was impossible for the Volunteers who had to go out at Whitsuntide to qualify, and to put their recruits through the necessary musketry instruction, before they went out. In Lincolnshire they had a very bad climate. In his own district, where his battalion was raised, it rained two days out of three, and in the limited period between the time when they could recruit men and the time they went into camp it was physically impossible to enable them to qualify according to the War Office order. He therefore asked that there should be some consideration given, under these special circumstances, to enable these men to qualify, so that they might receive the capitation grant.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.) said the House had listened to hon. Members who had addressed it as officers of the Volunteers; he wished to state his view as a private, and to call attention to the hardship of attending camp. He had attended a camp during the last two-years and had found the process very exhausting. He did not think that in asking for some relaxation of the regulations as to camp attendances they were proposing anything likely to be against the efficiency of the Volunteer force, and he therefore hoped the Financial Secretary would give favourable consideration to the appeal.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton) said he was sure hon. Members would agree that he could not possibly give them anything but a sympathetic answer; but he could not on the present occasion undertake that all the particular grievances of the Volunteers which had been referred to should be at once remedied. His right hon. friend the Secretary for War, in introducing his Army scheme, speaking of the Volunteers, said that what was wanted was quality rather than quantity. Efficiency must be insisted upon, and if that resulted in a diminution of numbers he did not think the country would suffer any loss. The regulations had been put forward with a view to securing efficiency, by getting out of the Volunteers as much work as was possible, and at the same time as little work as was consistent with national safety. There was no intention of adhering to them as hard and fast rules, and if it were found that in any place the shoe pinched something would be done to remedy it. As he said, he could not give a pledge that the requests which had been made would be complied with; but he had it from his right hon. friend the Secretary for War to say that in the autumn he would bring together all the objections which had been raised to his scheme with regard to the Volunteers, and lay them, not before a committee, but before those who were best able to advise him, and that in every case in which it was found that the objections could be met without loss of efficiency they would be met in the fullest and frankest manner. The answer to the questions of the hon. Member for Carnarvon must depend upon the reports. The hon. Member asked whether the reports when they were received would be published. That was a question for the Secretary for War to decide. He could not give a pledge on his behalf. With regard to the hon. Member's other question, whether there had been an extension of Boer recruiting in Cape Colony, he certainly had seen no information on the point, and he did not believe there was any, but if there were any information

of the kind which could be legitimately made public he would supply it to the hon. Gentleman. In answer to the hon. Member for the College Green Division of Dublin he had

to say that, while there must be one central depot for Army contracts, powers were given to the general officer commanding in each district to buy necessary supplies in the district. As canteens were intended for the men, and were paid for by the men, their tastes must alone be considered in the liquors supplied.

MR. NANNETTI said he was quite certain that Dublin porter would satisfy the tastes of the men. What he feared was that the Government officials overruled their tastes.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.) urged that there should be a reform in the administration of the Labourers Acts in Ireland. He concurred with the hon. Member for College Green that Irish workers were not well treated, and he pointed out that unless the flow of emigration was to continue some change must be made. In working the Labourers Acts there was too great a tendency to adhere to technicalities, with the result that schemes were very hard to carry through. He appealed to the Chief Secretary to apply a remedy in this respect.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.) referring to the state of affairs in Malta, and to an answer given to a question put by him thereon earlier in the day, said that no one could be blind to the fact that the situation at this moment was very grave. It had been produced, as he considered, to a great extent by the action of the Colonial Secretary in ignoring the petition presented to the House of Commons by the elected members of the Council of Government. Had similar treatment been meted out to any English-speaking colony, he did not believe that the House would have listened in silence to the reply of the right hon. Gentleman. He hoped that the Maltese would protest against the way in which they had been treated, and that they would resist the imposition of taxation and the attempt to force the English language on them.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I do not know on whose authority or at whose instigation the hon. Gentleman has taken up this question. The hon. Member certainly does me considerable injustice when he

accuses me of any want of courtesy either to the elected members or to anybody else. No petition whatever has been addressed to me. A short time ago I told the hon. Member that no petition had arrived at the Colonial Office, but I now understand from the question the hon. Member put this morning that he referred to a petition addressed to the House of Commons. I may tell the hon. Member that I am far too busy to read any petitions to the House of Commons. I was not aware that any petition had come from the elected members, but that does not prevent me from being thoroughly acquainted with their views and arguments. The Government are not forcing any language on the Maltese people against their will. On the contrary, we are securing to them the liberty to make their own choice, and it is only because that choice seems to have been against the feelings of the elected members, who are chiefly lawyers, that this agitation has arisen. The elected members, in their desire to revenge themselves on the Imperial Government for the action they had taken, have refused all taxes. Of

course it is perfectly absurd to allow that kind of thing to go on, as it has a most injurious effect on the industries and prosperity of Malta. Where Imperial interests in the shape of the health of the island and the security of a great fortress are concerned, the Government have thought it necessary to intervene; and I do not believe there will be any serious or lengthened objection to what we have done.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Consoli-dated Fund (Appropriation) Bill; Naval Works Bill; Military Works Bill, without amendment.

That they have also agreed to the Amendment to City and Brixton Railway Bill [Lords], without amendment.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and the Royal Assent was given to a number of Bills. (See page 1289.)

And afterwards His Majesty's Most Gracious Speech was delivered to both Houses of Parliament by the Lord High Chancellor (in pursuance of His Majesty's Commands).

Then a Commission for proroguing the Parliament was read.

After which the Lord Chancellor said;

My Lords and Gentlemen,;

"By virtue of His Majesty's Commission, under the Great Seal, to us and other Lords directed, and now read, we do, in His Majesty's Name, and in obedience to His Commands, prorogue this Parliament to Tuesday the fifth day of November next, to be then here holden; and this Parliament is accordingly prorogued to Tuesday the fifth day of November next.

End of the Second Session of the Twenty-seventh Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in the First Year of the Reign of His Majesty King Edward VII.

APPENDIX I.

PUBLIC BILLS

DEALT WITH IN VOLUME XCIX.

Those marked thus * are Government Bills. The figures in parentheses in the last column relate to the page in this volume. "[H.L.]" following the title indicates that the Bill originated in the Lords.

(A.) HOUSE OF LORDS.

Title of Bill.

Brought in by

Progress.

*Agricultural Rates Act, 1896, etc., Continuance

Lord Balfour of Burleigh

Read 1a 8 August (14); Read 2a 12 August (399); Committee, Report, 13 August (578); Read 3a 15 August (864); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Burgh Sewerage, Drainage and Water Supply (Scotland)

Lord Balfour of Burleigh

Read 1a 14 August (731), Read 2a 15 August (885); Committee, Report, Read 3a 16 August (1136); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Colonial Acts Confirmation

Earl of Onslow

Read 1a 14 August (731); Read 1a 15 August (884); Committee, Report, Read 3a 16 August (1136); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Congested Districts Board (Ireland)

Earl of Denbigh

Read 1a 13 August (587); Read 2a 15 August (864); Committee, Report, Read 3a 16 August (1136); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)

Earl Waldegrave

Read 1a 2a and 3a 17 August (1277); Royal Assent (1289)

*Customs Duties (Isle of Man)

Marquess of Salisbury

Read 1a 14 August (731); Read 2a 15 August (884); Committee, Report, Read 3a 16 August (1136); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*East India Loan (Great Indian Peninsula Rail-way Debentures)

Earl Hardwicke

Read 1a 15 August (864); Read 2a and 3a 16 August (1132); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

Education (No. 2)

Duke of Devonshire

Royal Assent 9 August (249)

Education (Scotland)

;

Royal Assent 9 August (249)

Expiring Laws Continuance

Lord Ashbourne

Read 1a 2a and 3a 16 August (1137); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

Title of Bill.

Brought in by

Progress.

*Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation

Lord Belper

Read 1a 14 August (731); Read 2a, Committee, Report, Read 3a 15 August (866); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Fisheries (Ireland)

Lord Ashbourne

Read 1a, 2a, and 3a 16 August (1137); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Larceny

;

Royal Assent 9 August (249)

*Light Railways (No. 2)

Earl of Dudley

Read 1a, 2a, and 3a 16 August (1137); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Loan

Marquess of Salisbury

Read 2a 8 August (10); Read 3a 9 August (254); Royal Assent 17 August (1289)

*Local Government (Ireland)

Lord Ashbourne

Read 1a 15 August (864); Read 2a and 3a 16 August (1136); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Lunacy (Ireland) [H.L.]

Lord Ashbourne

Commons Amendments considered 15 August (890); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Marriages Legalisation [H.L.]

Lord Belper

Commons Amendments considered, 16 August (1137); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Merchant Shipping (Foreign Ships) [H.L.]

Earl of Dudley

Read 1a 16 August (1132)

*Military Works

Lord Raglan

Read 1a, 2a, and 3a 17 August (1278); Royal Assent (1290)

*Militia and Yeomanry

Lord Raglan

Read 3a 8 August (10); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*National Gallery (Purchase of adjacent land)

Marquess of Salisbury

Read 1a 13 August (587); Read 2a, Committee, Report, Read 3a 15 August (865);
Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Naval Works

Earl of Selborne

Read 1a, 2a, and 3a 17 August (1278); Royal Assent (1290)

*Pacific Cable

Earl of Onslow

Read 1a 14a August (731); Read 2a 15 August (883): Committee, Report, Read 3a 16
August (1136); Royal Assent, 17 August (1290)

*Patent Law Amendment [H.L.]

Earl of Dudley

Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

Public Libraries [H.L.]

Lord Windsor

Commons Amendments considered 15 August (890) Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

Title of Bill.

Brought in by

Progress.

*Public Works Loans

Earl Waldegrave

Read 1a 2a, and 3a 16 August (1137); Royal Assent 17th August (1290)

Purchase of Land (Ireland) (No. 2)

Earl Spencer

Read 1a 14 August (731); Read 2a and 3a 15 August (883); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Registration of Births and Deaths

Lord Kenyon

Read 1a 15 August (864); Read 2a and 3a 16 August (1132); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Royal Titles [H.L.]

Marquess of Salisbury

Royal Assent 17 August (1289)

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children

Bishop of Rochester

Read 1a 15 August (864); Read 2a and 3a 16 August 1133; Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Valuation (Ireland)

Lord Ashbourne

Read 1a, 2a and 3a 16 August (1137); Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

*Youthful Offenders

Lord Belper

Read 1a 14 August (731); Read 2a, Committee, Report, Read 3a 15 August (884);

Royal Assent 17 August (1290)

(B.) HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Title of Bill.

Brought in by

Progress.

*Alkali, &c., Works Regulation [H.L.]

Mr. Walter Long

Withdrawn 14 August (860)

*Berwickshire County Town [H.L.]

Mr. A. Graham Murray

Third Reading (adjourned) 14 August (860); 15 August (1125); Bill Withdrawn 16 August (1276)

*Burgh Sewerage, Drainage, and Water Supply (Scotland)

Mr. A. Graham Murray

Consideration, Read 3o 13 August (727)

Clubs Registration (Scotland)

Mr. Cameron Corbett

Read 1o 9 August (310)

*Colonial Acts Confirmation

Sir R. Finlay

Read 2o 12 August (576); Committee, Report, Read 3o 13 August (728)

*Congested Districts Boards (Ireland)

Mr. Wyndham

Committee, Report, Read 3o 12 August (573)

*Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)

Mr. J. W. Lowther
 Read 1a 12a August (573); Road 2o 15 August (978); Committee, Report, 16 August (1197); Read 3o 17 August. (1306).
 Title of Bill.
 Brought in by
 Progress.
 County Councils (Byelaws) [H.L.]
 Mr. H. Hobhouse
 Withdrawn 16 August (1276)
 *Customs Duties (Isle of Man)
 Mr. Austen Chamberlain
 Committee, Report, 12 August (575); Consideration, Read 3o 13 August (728)
 *Dublin Corporation
 Mr. Wyndham
 Withdrawn 14 August (832)
 *East India Loan (Great Indian Peninsula Railway Debentures)
 Lord G. Hamilton
 Read 2a 12 August (566); Committee, Report, 13 August (724); Read 3o 14 August (858)
 *Elementary School Teachers
 Sir J. Gorst
 Withdrawn 16 August (1276)
 *Expiring Laws Continuance
 Mr. Austen Chamberlain
 Read 2o 14 August (848); Committee, Report, Read 3o August 15 (1111)
 *Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation
 Mr. Ritchie
 Consideration 12 August (503); Consideration, Third Reading 13 August (649);
 Lords Amendments considered 16 August (1197)
 *Fisheries (Ireland)
 Mr. Wyndham
 Committee, Report, 14 August (822); Consideration, Read 3o 15 August (1128)
 *Light Railways (No. 2)
 Mr. Gerald Balfour
 Read 1o 13 August (724); Read 2a 14 August (853); Committee, Report, Read 3o 15 August (1124)
 *Local Government (Ireland)
 Mr. Wyndham
 Read 2o 13 August (726); Report, Read 3o 14 August (834)
 *Lunacy (Ireland) (H.L.)
 ;
 Read 2o 12 August (574); Committee, Report, 13 August (727); Consideration, Read 3o 14 August (832)
 *Marriages Legalisation (H.L.)
 Mr. Jesse Collings
 Committee, 12 August (574); Committee, 13 August (725); Committee, Report, 14

August (859); Consideration, Read 3o 15 August (1125)

*Military Works

Mr. Brodrick

Read 2o 14 August (795); Committee, Report, 15 August (1098); Read 3o 16 August (1276)

*Naval Works

Mr. Pretymann

Read 2o 14 August (735); Committee, Report, 15 August (1097); Read 3o 16th August (1276)

*Pacific Cable

Mr. Austen Chamberlain

Read 2o 12 August (479) Committee, Report, Read 3o 13 August (627)

Title of Bill.

Brought in by

Progress.

*Patent Law Amendment [H.L.]

;

Read 1o 12 August (455); Read 2o 13 August (727); Committee, Report, Read 3o 14 August (859)

*Prisons (Scotland) [H.L.]

;

Withdrawn 12 August (575)

Public Libraries [H.L.]

Lord Balfour

Consideration, Read 3o 14 August (860)

*Public Works Loans

Mr. Austen Chamberlain

Read 2o 12 August (574); Committee 13 August (725); Committee, Report, 14 August (849); Read 3o 15 August (1123)

Purchase of Land (Ireland) (No. 2)

Col. Nolan

Consideration, Read 3o 13 August (727)

Registration of Births and Deaths

Mr. Grant Lawson

Read 2o 12 August (575); Committee, Report, 13 August (726); Consideration, Read 3o 14 August (859)

*Royal Titles [H.L.]

Mr. A. J. Balfour

Read 2o 12 August (455); Committee, Report, 13 August (616); Read 3a 14 August (852)

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children

Mr. Crombie

Consideration, Read 3o 14 August (837)

Sunday Trading (Scotland)

Mr. Cameron Corbett

Read 1a 9 August (310)

*Supreme Court of Judicature (Appeals) [H.L.]

Sir R. Finlay

Withdrawn 12 August (575)

*Valuation (Ireland)

Mr. Wyndham

Read 2o 14 August (819); Committee, Report, Read 3o 15 August (1126)

Waiters, Waitresses and Bar Attendants.

Mr. Nannetti

Read 1a 13 August (616)

*Youthful Offenders

Mr. Ritchie

Consideration 12 August (574); Consideration, Read 3o 13 August (728).

APPENDIX II

HOUSE OF COMMONS. SESSION 1901.

LIST OF RULES, ORDERS, &c., which have been presented during the Session, and are required by Statute to lie for an appointed number of Days upon the Table of the House.

[Continuation of List given in preceding Volume.]

Title of Paper.

Date from which the Period runs.

Period to lie upon the Table.

Supreme Court of Judicature (Ireland) Act, 1877 (Rules); Copy of an additional Rule and Schedule made by the Lord Chancellor and the Land Judge [40 and 41 Vic., c. 57, s. 69].

8 August

100 sitting days

INDEX TO THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

[AUTHORISED EDITION].

ELEVENTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1901.

AUGUST 8; AUGUST 17.

EXPLANATION OF ARRANGEMENT AND ABBREVIATIONS.

Bills: Read First, Second, or Third Time =1R., 2R., 3R. [c.] = Commons.

[l.] = Lords. Amendt. = Amendment. Os. = Observations. Qs. = Questions. As. = Answers. Com. = Committee. Con. = Consideration. Where in the Index * is added with Reading of a Bill, or a Vote in Committee of Supply, it indicates that no Debate took place on that Stage of the Bill, or on that Vote. Subjects discussed in Committee of Supply are entered under their headings, and also under Members' Names, without reference to the actual Vote before the Committee.

A

Aberdeen

Seaton Links, Military Camp

Q. Mr. Bryce; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 902.

Aberystwith

"Queen Bee" Fatality; Registration of Pleasure Boats

Q. Mr. G. Kenyon; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 9 282.

Abingdon Market

Swine Fever Outbreak;Isolation Order

Q. Mr. Mansfield; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 16, 1159.

Accidents

Factories and Workshops;Returns, Notice of Accidents, etc.

References to in Debate on the Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment Bill, Aug. 12, 509, 510, 511.

Railway Accidents, see Railways; also Railway Servants.

Aden

British Military Expedition to destroy Fort built by Turks in Haushabi Territory

Os. Earl Spencer, Earl Hardwicke, Aug. 13, 585.

Adjournment of the House

Motions for Adjournment to discuss Matters of Urgent Public Importance;Return

Ordered, Aug. 12, 414; Presented, Aug. 13, 590.

Admiralty

First Lord;Earl of Selborne.

Secretary;Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Civil Lord;Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Adulteration of Food and Drugs

Butter, see that title.

Afforestation

Ireland, see that title.

Africa

Animals, Preservation of Rare Animals;Big Game Preserves near Mount Elgin;Sir H.

Johnston's Representation

Q. Mr. Dillon; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 12, 426.

Africa, East

British Protectorate;Report of H.M. Commissioner Presented, Aug. 14, 733; Aug. 15, 862.

Order in Council (Lands) Presented, Aug. 12, 399, 410.

Uganda Railway, see that title.

Africa, South

Colonies and Protectorates, Application of Fugitive Offenders Act to;Order in

Council Presented, Aug. 12, 399, 411.

Telegraphic Communication;Agreement with Eastern and South African Telegraph Company, Aug. 13, 728.

Concluding Agreement without waiting for Report of Cable Committee

Q. Sir E. Sassoon; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 290.

Transvaal, Orange River Colony, Cape Colony, etc., see those titles.

Africa, West

Cables, Purchase by French Government;Deviating so as to avoid Bathurst and Accra

Q. Sir C. Dilke; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 13, 597.

Sierra Leone, see that title.

Waima Incident, see that title.

Agnew, Sir A. [Edinburgh, S.]

Volunteers' Camp Training Allowances, Aug. 17, 1296.

Agrarian Offences, Ireland
 Incendiary Fires, Number of, etc;Return
 Q. Mr. Flynn; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 604.
 Sligo, see that title.
 Agricultural Banks
 India, see India.
 Agricultural Education
 Science and Art Expenditure, Proportion Spent in Agricultural Grants
 Q. Mr. Jeffreys; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 8, 53.
 Agricultural Rates Act. (1896, etc.) Continuance Bill
 I. 1R.* Aug. 8, 14.
 2R., Aug. 12, 399.
 Com.* Aug. 13, 578.
 3R.* Aug. 15, 864.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Agricultural Rates Act (1893, etc.) Continuance Bill
 Debate on Second Reading (Lords) Aug. 12, 399.
 Agricultural Land, Differential Treatment of, 400, 408.
 Basis of Taxation;Personal Property v. Real Property, 401, 407.
 Clerical Tithe Owners, Amount of Rates paid by, 403.
 Distribution of Relief, 403, 406.
 Town and Country, Comparisons of Rates in, 404.
 Petitions, Aug. 9, 266; Aug. 13, 588.
 Agriculture
 Returns;Details showing Land at Present unaccounted for as Non-agricultural
 Q. Mr. F. W. Wilson; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 15, 918.
 Albion Steam Coal Company Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Alcoholic Beverages
 Production and Consumption in Europe, United States, and British Colonies;Return
 Presented, Aug. 12, 413.
 Aldeburgh Corporation Water Bill
 c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 8, 14.
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Alexandria
 Trade Report Presented, Aug. 8, 4.
 Alkali, etc., Works Regulation Bill
 c. Bill Withdrawn, Aug. 14, 860.
 Allen, Mr. C. P. [Gloucester, Stroud]
 Merchant Service;Ballast, Under Ballasting, Circular issued to surveying
 Officers, Aug. 15, 914.
 Wotton-under-Edge Post Office, Making R.S.O., etc., Aug. 13, 601.
 Allotments, Scotland
 see title Highlands and Islands of Scotland.
 Alsace Lorraine
 Action of the Germans with regard to the Franc tireurs

Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 998; Sir C. Dilke, 1002; Mr. Asquith, 1040.
Ambrose, Dr. R. [Mayo, W.]
Supply; New Closure Bill; Chairman's Interpretation, Aug. 8, 146.
Ambulance Wagons
South African War; Improvement of Ambulances
Q. Mr. Round; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 13, 594.
America
see United States.
"Ancona"
Crew, Treatment of; Master, etc., Assaulting Crew
Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1157.
Andover
Parliamentary By-Election; New Writ, Aug. 9, 255.
Anglo-American Oil Company
Belfast; Discharge of Roman Catholic Workmen, see Belfast.
Animals
Diseases of Animals Acts, see that title, also Names of Diseases.
Antrim
Discharging Firearms
Q. Mr. Murphy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 442.
Labourers' Cottages, Delays in settling Schemes
Os. Mr. Macartney, Aug. 9, 317; Mr. Wyndham, 330.
Arab Labour
Rhodesia, see that title.
Arabia
British Military Expedition to destroy Fort built by Turks in Haushabi Territory
Os. Earl Spencer, Earl Hardwicke, Aug. 13, 585.
Ardmore Abbey Church
Preservation of Ruins
Q. Mr. O'Shee; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 445.
Argentina
Foot-and-Mouth Disease Regulations; Proposed Removal of Restrictions.
Q. Mr. Ormsby-Gore; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 16, 1159.
Arlesey Gas Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
Armagh
Post Office; Promotions, Special Allowances, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Campbell; A. Mr. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 304.
Roads; County Surveyor controlling Repairs, Complaints, etc.
Q. Mr. J. Campbell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 935.
Arms (Ireland) Act, 1881
see Peace Proclamation Act.
Army
Secretary of State; Rt. Hon. St. John Brodrick.
Under Secretary; Lord Raglan.
Financial Secretary; Lord Stanley.

Annual Return;Date of Issue

Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 278.

Army List;Evidence of the Status and Rank of Officers

Q. Col. Legge; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 903.

Civil Power, Military Aid to, see Penrhyn Quarry Dispute.

Coaling Stations;Naval or Military Control

Q. Mr. E. Robertson; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 13, 596.

Contracts

Irish Firms

Allotting to Irish Manufacturers, etc., a fair Proportion of the Contracts for Supplies for Troops in Ireland

Os. Mr. Nannetti, Aug. 17, 1332, 1335; Lord Stanley, 1335.

Beer Contracts for Troops at the Curragh given to Burton Brewery Company

Q. Mr. Delany; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 5, 34.

Examining Samples of Articles at Arbour Hill Receiving Depot, etc.

Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. Nannetti; As. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 902.

Meats, see that sub-heading.

Expenditure

Application of surpluses to meet Excesses, Com., Aug. 8, 187; Report, Aug. 12, 567; Aug. 9, 389.

Discussing in Committee, what was understood to be a formal matter

O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 8, 190.

Colonial Contributions, see Colonies;Defence of the Empire.

Military Works

Allocation of Money and Amount spent from 1897–1901

Q. Mr. H. Lewis; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 903.

Financial Policy;Ways and Means, etc.

Debate on Military Works Bill, Aug. 14, 796, 799, 802, 805, 806, 808, 811.

Unexpended Balances

Os. Mr. Dillon, Aug. 14, 811; Mr. O'Mara, Aug. 15, 1101.

Gambling on H.M. Transports;Case of Officer from South Africa

Q. Mr. Mansfield; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1146.

Garrison Regiments, Royal, Formation of;Present Position, etc.

Q. Sir C. Dilke; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 901.

Guns;German Field Guns, Purchase of Application of Surpluses on grants to purchase Guns, etc.

Qs. Sir C. Dilke, Mr. Dillon; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 13, 594.

Defects, Inspection, etc.

Q. Major Evans-Gordon; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 420.

Horses, see that title.

India, see that title.

Labourers' Wages at Naval Ports

Q. Mr. Kearley; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 36.

Meat Contracts;Supply of Foreign Meat

Qs. Mr. Spear, Mr. Field; As. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 274.

Medical Department and Medical Service.

Civil Surgeons Serving with the Army;Salary
Q. Dr. Thompson; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 422.
Report of Committee
Q. Major Rasch; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 277.
Retired Officers;Titles
Q. Dr. Thompson; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 422.
Officers
Retired Officers;Re-employment
Cavalry Officers;Outfit allowance
Q. Col. Legge; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 35.
Seniority and Pay
Q. Col. Legge; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 35, 36.
Status and Rank
Q. Col. Legge; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 903.
Pay, Regulations, Non-effective Pay and Allowances;List of Exceptions Presented,
Aug. 16, 1130, 1139.
Pensions
Belfast Workhouse, Destitute Veterans in;Military Funeral refused, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1144.
M'Gowan, W.;Destitute Veteran in Workhouse
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 422.
Mackie, T., Withdrawal of Pension
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 13, 594.
Rodgers, J., Case of
Q. Mr. Tully; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1143.
Special Pensions;Return Presented, Aug. 8, 5.
Recruits
Total Number since Jan., 1901, etc.
Q. Mr. A. Lee; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 278.
Under-age Recruits;Allegations against Recruiting Sergeants
Q. Mr. E. Robertson; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 420.
Remounts, see title Horses;Army.
Reserve;Further Regulations relating to, Presented, Aug. 15, 863.
Rifle Ranges, see that title.
Seaton Links, Aberdeen, see title Aberdeen.
Secrecy and Mystery as to Defence Works, withholding information on the grounds
of conveying knowledge to Foreign Governments
Os. Mr. Haldane, Aug. 14, 804; Mr. Dillon, 810; Mr. C. Hobhouse, 814; Mr. H.
Lewis, Aug. 15, 1104.
South African War, see that title.
Volunteers, see that title.
Water Corps, Royal, Formation of;Proposals in Scientific Journal
Q. Sir M. Foster; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1145.
Woolwich Arsenal;Foremen, Proposed Pensions, etc.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1144.
Works, see subheading Expenditure, also Military Works Bill.

Yeomanry, see that title.

Army Estimates

Votes Closed in a Class under new Supply Rule, Aug. 8, 177; Report, Aug. 9, 379.

Arnold-Forster, Mr. H. O.; Secretary to the Admiralty [Belfast, W.]

China Operations; Medals and Clasps for Naval Forces, Aug. 15, 904.

Courts-Martial; Revision of Findings, Sentences taking Effect at once, etc., Aug. 8, 37.

Dockyards; Joiners' Wages, Aug. 8, 38.

Gunnery Instruction; Capt. Scott's Method of Training, etc., Aug. 8, 40.

Manœuvres

Leave to Officers and Men, Aug. 13, 596.

Press Correspondents, Refusal to allow Correspondents to be present, Aug. 16, 1148.

Report; Including Statement of Claims referred to Umpires, etc., Aug. 16, 1148.

Ordnance Corps; Employment of Chief Warrant Officers, Aug. 8, 40.

Portsmouth Dockyard Joiners' Wages; Proposed Increase, Aug. 16, 1147.

Prize Money, Unclaimed; List of Claimants, Aug. 16, 1147.

Ships

Colours for Battleships; Experiments with Grey Paints, Aug. 12, 423.

Non-effective Warships, Striking off List, Aug. 13, 595.

"Victoria and Albert"; Return to Portsmouth, Defects, etc., Aug. 13, 596.

Victualling; Bribery, alleged, Publishing Information given before Departmental Committee, Aug. 8, 39.

Art Schools

National Competition of Schools of Art; Exhibitions, Unsuitable time and place

Q. Mr. Peel; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 9, 283.

Ascension

Submarine Cable; Contract between H.M. Government and Eastern Telegraph Company ratified, Aug. 13, 728.

Ashbourne, Lord; Lord Chancellor of Ireland.

Birds; Protection of Wild Birds in Ireland, Aug. 8, 12.

Congested Districts Board (Ireland) Bill, 2R. Aug. 15, 864.

Gun Licences (Ireland); Enforcement of Act of 1870, Aug. 8, 13.

Land Commission, Ireland

Fixing "True Value"; Return, Aug. 8, 11.

Walker v. Gosford, Re-hearing, Aug. 8, 12.

Land Purchase, Ireland; Returns Relative to Transactions, Aug. 13, 585.

Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 17, 1288.

Queen's University in Ireland; Ex-Professor's Claims for Compensation for Loss of Office, Aug. 15, 888.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. H. [Fife, E.]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1036.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 654, 655, 689.

"Globe" Newspaper; Article entitled "Irish Rowdies," Question of Privilege, Aug.

15, 968, 975.

South African War, Situation in South Africa; Lord Kitchener's Surrender Proclamation, etc., Aug. 15, 1036; for details, see South African War.

Athlone Barracks

Gasworks used by Private Contractor to supply Railway Company, etc.

Q. Mr. Sullivan; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 77.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. J.; Attorney-General for Ireland [Londonderry, N.]

Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Bill, Lords Amendments., Aug. 9, 259, 262.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1093.

Copyright Infringement Cases; Penalties in England and Ireland, etc., Aug. 16, 1182.

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 823, 824, 825, 826, 829.

Local Government Board (Ireland) Administration, Aug. 9, 339, 340.

Revising Barristers, Appointment of; Political Opinions, Aug. 13, 609.

Valuation (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1127.

Attorney-General

Rt. Hon. Sir R. Finlay.

Attorney-General for Ireland

Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.

Auditor-General's Department

see Comptroller and Auditor-General's Department.

Australia

Immigration; Educational Test

Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 434.

Austria-Hungary

Horses, Purchase of, for South Africa; Charges of Corruption against British Officers

Os. Mr. Dillon, Aug. 8, 214; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 216.

Inquiry, Publication of Evidence

Q. Sir J. B. Maple; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 36.

Trade Reports Presented, Aug. 9, 253; Aug. 16, 1129.

Auditing Department, Ireland

Audit Office Officials, Employing permanently in Dublin

Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 946.

Automatic Couplings

see Railways.

B

Bailieborough

Rural Postmen's Pay.

Q. Mr. Crean; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 447.

Bakehouses

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment Bill, Debate, Aug. 12, 564, 565.

Balcarres, Lord [Lancashire, Chorley]

Piccadilly Widening, Aug. 15, 922.

Westminster Abbey and the Coronation Ceremony; Removal of Screen from below the Organ, Aug. 15, 922.

Balfour, Capt. C. B. [Middlesex, Hornsey]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 714.
 Balfour, Right Hon. A. J.; First Lord of the Treasury [Manchester, W.]
 Bishopric of Southwark Bill; Facilitating Progress of, etc., Aug. 13, 614.
 Business of the House; Course of Business, etc., Aug. 8, 81; Aug. 9, 309; Aug. 12, 453; Aug. 13, 616; Aug. 16, 1188.
 Church Discipline Bill, Facilitating Progress of, Aug. 13, 615.
 Coal, Commission on; Delay in appointing, Aug. 9, 309.
 Coaling Stations; Naval or Military Control, Aug. 13, 597.
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 984, 1045, 1091.
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 550; Aug. 13, 687.
 Finance Business of the House; Supply, Aug. 9, 309; Aug. 16, 1187.
 Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 831.
 "Globe" Newspaper; Article entitled "Irish Rowdies," Question of Privilege, Aug. 15, 963, 975.
 Hague Conference; Terms of Convention, etc., Aug. 15, 954.
 Ireland
 Geological Survey; Transferring to the Department of Agriculture proposed, Aug. 15, 953.
 Historical Manuscripts
 Commission proposed, Aug. 9, 308.
 Representation of Ireland on the Manuscripts Commission, Aug. 15, 953.
 Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 813.
 Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 791.
 Pacific Cable Board; Entering into Contract before obtaining Sanction of Parliament, etc., Aug. 16, 1186.
 Parliamentary Procedure
 Navy and Army Expenditure; Application of Surpluses to Meet Excesses, Committee; Discussing what was understood to be a journal matter, Aug. 8, 190.
 Ways and Means; Discussing Preliminary Resolutions, Appropriation Bill Resolution, Aug. 8, 233.
 Parliamentary Representation of Ireland and Scotland, Inequality between, etc., Aug. 9, 307.
 Personal Property (Contributions to Local Taxation) Return, Aug. 15, 954.
 Royal Declaration Bill; Postponing till next Session, Aug. 8, 80.
 Royal Titles Bill, 2R. Aug. 12, 455; Com., Aug. 13, 619, 627.
 Russell, Earl of; Trial for Bigamy, Fees of Law Officers of the Crown, Aug. 8, 80.
 Salmon Fisheries Commission; Report, Date of Issue, Aug. 12, 452.
 South African War
 Kitchener's, Lord, Proclamation, Facilities for moving Resolution, etc., Aug. 13, 593.
 Situation in South Africa; Lord Kitchener's Surrender Proclamation, etc., Aug. 15, 1045; for details, see South African War.
 Teachers' Tenure Bill, Facilitating Progress of, etc., Aug. 9, 308; Aug. 13,

615.

Balfour of Burleigh, Lord; Secretary for Scotland

Agricultural Rates Act (1896, etc.) Continuance Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 399.

Burgh, Sewerage, Drainage and Water Supply (Scotland) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 886.

Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W.; President of the Board of Trade (Leeds, Central).

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1076, 1088, 1091.

Fisheries; Cullercoats, Dispute off, Aug. 15, 911.

Ireland

Bantry Bay Foreshore Rights, Aug. 8, 75; Aug. 12, 451; Aug. 13, 611; Aug. 15, 944.

Sale to Mr. Leigh White, alleged, Aug. 15, 945.

Carlingford Lough; Overcrowding on Steam Launches, Aug. 12, 451.

Harbour Board Revenues, Inadequacy of, etc., Aug. 8, 77.

Lough Foyle; Erection of Gas and Bell Buoy at Tuns Bank, Aug. 15, 946.

Sligo Bay; Lights at Bowmore, proposed, Aug. 12, 452; Aug. 15, 944.

Light Railways (No. 2) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 855.

Patent Laws, Amendment of; Assimilating Laws to those of France and Germany, Aug. 15, 915.

Merchant Shipping

Accident to Seamen on the "Devon," Aug. 16, 1158.

"Ancona"; Treatment of Crew, Aug. 16, 1157.

Ballast; Under Ballasting, Circular to Surveying Officers, Aug. 15, 914.

Committee, Appointment of, Aug. 12, 427.

Discipline; Imprisonment of Firemen on the "Mab," Aug. 15, 912; Aug. 16, 1157.

Food; "Colony," Insufficient Food alleged, case of J. M'Donald, Aug. 16, 1156.

"Gathorne" S.S.; Death of Fireman, etc., Aug. 16, 1158.

"Numidian" S.S.; Arrest of W. Morrison at Montreal, Pay, etc., Aug. 8, 46.

"Primrose Hill," Loss of; Compensation for Families of Officers and Men, Aug. 12, 428.

Stokers, Charges of Drunkenness and Desertion against, by the Orient Steam Navigation Co., Aug. 15, 914.

Unseaworthy Ships; "Louisiana," Aug. 15, 913.

Patent Law Amendment Bill, 3R., Aug. 14, 859.

Railway Servants

Accidents

Fenny Compton Shunting Fatality, Aug. 12, 428.

Returns, Increase in Number of Accidents, Aug. 12, 429.

Hours of Labour, Number of Accidents, etc., Aug. 15, 1088.

Railways

Automatic Couplings, Companies adopting, Aug. 12, 429.

London Bridge Railway Fatality; Communication Cord out of Order, Aug. 16, 1155.

Rates; Preferential Rates for Foreign Produce, Aug. 8, 47; Aug. 13, 599.

Steam Trawlers; Incompetency of Masters, etc., Aug. 9, 280.

Sub-Inspectors, Appointments of, Aug. 16, 1159.

Ballast

Under Ballasting of Ships, Circular to Surveying Officers

Q. Mr. C. Allen; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 914.
Ballyhaunis
Charges against Police; Prosecution of Youths for Boohing at a Landgrabber
O. Mr. J. O'Donnell, Aug. 15, 1061.
Prosecution at; Police Interference with Witnesses alleged
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1168.
Ballymote
Arrest of J. Gilmartin by Police
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 68.
Balmeny
District Council and the Labourers' Acts; Refusing Application, etc.
O. Mr. Macartney, Aug. 9, 317.
Banagher
Fair, Forestalling at, etc.
Q. Mr. T. Healy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 603.
Sanitation; Compelling Urban Council to carry out Improvements
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 71.
Banbury, Mr. F. G. [Camberwell, Peckham].
Factory and Workshops Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 715, 717.
Bank Holidays Acts Amendment Bill
Petitions, Aug. 14, 732.
Bankruptcy
General Annual Report Presented, Aug. 9, 254, 267.
Bantry
White Estate, see that title.
Bantry Bay
Foreshore Rights; Sale to Bantry Estates Trustees
Qs. Mr. Gilhooly, Mr. T. M. Healy; As. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 8, 75; Aug. 12, 451;
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 13, 610; Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 944.
Sale to Mr. L. White, alleged, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 945
Barracks
Construction of, Expenditure on, etc.
Military Works Bill Debate, Aug. 14, 797.
Huts v. Barracks
O. Mr. C. Warner, Aug. 14, 798.
Naval Barracks; Policy of Constructing, Amount of Accommodation Necessary, etc.
O. Sir J. Colomb, Aug. 14, 767.
Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
Barrowford Light Railway
Order Presented, Aug. 8, 4, 17.
Barry, Miss
Madrid Estate, see Madrid.

Barry, Mr. E. [Cork Co., S.]
Martin, Mr., County Court Valuer; Valuing Farm for Landlord alleged, Aug. 16, 1173.
Rosscarbery Mails; Day Mail Service from Clonakilty proposed, Aug. 16, 1185.
Skibbereen Land Commission; Major Cronsedale, Aug. 12, 441.
Bates, Postman
Special Leave; Refunding Pay
Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1162.
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. Hicks; Chancellor of the Exchequer [Bristol, W.]
Coal
Commission, Constitution of, Aug. 8, 45.
Export Duty; Remissions
Amount of; Expediting Repayment, Aug. 8, 46.
Pre-Budget Contracts, Aug. 15, 909
Crown Quit Rents, Investment of Redemption Money, Aug. 8, 74.
Post Office Savings Bank; Withdrawals exceeding Deposits, Reserve, etc., Aug. 8, 45.
Sugar; Import Duty, Rebates on Contracts in December, 1900, proposed, Aug. 16, 1153.
Beatty, Nurse
see Hackney Union.
Beer
Army Contracts; Curragh Camp, see Army.
Belfast
Disturbances; Conflicts between Roman Catholics and Orangemen, etc.
Os. Mr. J. O'Donnell, Aug. 15, 1058; Mr. Clancy, Aug. 17, 1324.
Discharge of Roman Catholic Workmen on the ground that the Employers could not protect them from attacks
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 926; Aug. 16, 1181.
Queen's Island Disturbances, Measure for preserving the Public Peace.
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 925.
Postal Arrangements; Sunday Delivery proposed
Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. W. Johnston; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 306.
Queen's College, Appointment of Professors; Limited Period of Appointment
O. Mr. Macartney, Aug. 15, 1074.
Valuation
Burial Grounds, Valuation of
Q. Mr. Field; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 444.
Valuation (Ireland) Bill, see that title.
Workhouse, Destitute Veterans in; Military Funeral Refused, etc.
Q. Mr. O'Doherty; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1144.
Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Bill
c. Lords Amendments., Aug. 8, 14; Aug. 9, 255.
l. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
Bell, Mr. R. [Derby]
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1075, 1090.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 556.
 London Bridge Railway Fatality; Communication-cord out of Order, Aug. 16, 1155.
 Railway Servants; Hours of Labour, Excessive Hours, Number of Accidents, etc.,
 Aug. 15, 1075.
 Railway Sub-Inspectors, Appointment of, Aug. 16, 1158.
 Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 839.
 Belligerent Rights
 Conference invited by Russian Government in 1874; Attitude of the Smaller and
 Weaker Powers.
 Harcourt, Sir W., on, Aug. 15, 982.
 Franco-German War; Action of the Germans, etc.
 Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 998; Sir C. Dilke, 1002; Mr. Asquith, 1040.
 South African War, see that title; Surrender Proclamation, etc.
 Belper, Lord
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 866,
 872, 878, 883.
 Benefices Act, 1898
 Return Presented, Aug. 15, 895.
 Berehaven Harbour Scheme
 Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill, see that title.
 Bermuda
 Military Works Expenditure
 O. Mr. Tully, Aug. 15, 1106.
 Berwickshire County Town Bill
 c. 3R., Aug. 14, 860; Aug. 15, 1125.
 Bill withdrawn, Aug. 16, 1276.
 Bethesda
 Penrhyn Quarry Dispute, see that title.
 Bethlem Hospital Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Betting
 Guernsey Bookmakers transferring business from Holland; Advertisements in English
 Newspapers, etc.
 Q. Mr. H. J. Wilson; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 15, 910.
 Public Betting, Increase in; Select Committee Report, Message to the Lords for
 Copy of, Aug. 15, 864, 896.
 Bhownaggee, Sir M. M. [Bethnal Green, N.E.]
 India; Financial and Economic Position, Lord George Hamilton's Statement, Aug.
 16, 1224; for details, see India.
 Biggleswade Water Board Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Bignold, Mr. A. [Wick Burghs]
 Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14 831.
 Bills
 Parliamentary Procedure, see that title.
 Private Bills; Private Members' Business, Return Ordered, Aug. 12, 416; Presented

Aug. 13, 590.

Public Bills;Return Ordered, Aug. 12, 415;Presented, Aug. 13, 590.

Birds

Protection of Wild Birds in Ireland

Q. Earl of Mayo; A. Lord Ashbourne, Aug. 8, 12.

Birmingham (City) Tramways Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Births, Marriages, and Deaths

England;Registrar-General's Annual Report Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 411.

Ireland;Annual Report of Registrar-General Presented, Aug. 16, 1129, 1139.

Scotland;Registrar-General's Annual Report Presented, Aug. 14, 733; Aug. 15, 861.

Bishopric of Southwark Bill

Facilitating Progress of, etc.

Q. Mr. M'Arthur; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 13, 614.

Blackburn Corporation Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Blackpool and Garstang Light Railway

Order Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 17.

Blair, William, Case of

Petition for Inquiry, Aug. 15, 892.

Blenheim Garden Party

Saturday Sitting of the House;Blenheim Garden Party standing in the way of
Os. Mr. Dillon, Aug. 8, 191; Mr. Channing, 193; Mr. W. Redmond, 194; Mr. T. M.
Healy, 242.

Blundell, Col. H. B. H. [Lancashire, Ince]

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 553.

Bohemia

Trade Report Presented, Aug. 9, 253.

Boilers

Explosions;Report on Working of Acts of 1882 and 1890 Presented, Aug. 8, 4, 19.

Naval Ships, see Navy.

Boland, Mr. J. [Kerry, S.]

Brehon Laws, Publication of;Progress, Aug. 16, 1182.

Castle Cove Rural Postman's Pay, Aug. 12, 447.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., Aug. 17, 1336.

Education;Hand and Eye Training Classes, Teachers in Remote Districts, Aug. 16,
1178.

Eglington, T., Ex-soldier and Postman;Proposed Pension, Aug. 13, 603.

Malta

Language Agitation, Aug. 17, 1330.

Political Situation

Commission of Inquiry into the System of Government, etc., Aug. 15, 907.

Petition from Elected Members of Council, etc., Aug. 17, 1296.

Sneem Pier;Erection of Goods Store, etc., Aug. 16, 1183.

Bolster, Dr.

Charges against Nurse Joyce, see Shillelagh Union.

Bolton

Licensing Appeal Case.

Borough Magistrates taking part in Proceedings

Q. Mr. C. P. Scott; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 15, 911.

Non-Representation of Prosecution by Council, etc.

Q. Mr. C. P. Scott; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 12, 427.

Bombay

Land Revenue Code Amendment Bill

O. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1220, 1275.

Opposition to; Preservation of Tenant Rights of Cultivators

Q. Mr. H. Roberts; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1149.

Bookmakers in Guernsey

Transfer of Business from Holland to Guernsey

Q. Mr. H. J. Wilson; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 15, 910.

Boscawen, Mr. Griffith; Parliamentary Charity Commissioner [Kent, Tunbridge]

Cloudesley Estate Fund; Transfer to Official Trustees, etc., Aug. 16, 1166.

Bournemouth Corporation Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Bowles, Mr. Gibson [Lynn Regis]

Gibraltar Harbour Works Scheme; Danger to Dock in time of War, etc., Aug. 14, 775.

Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 735, 736, 741, 742, 743, 755, 756, 774, 780, 789.

Boycotting, Ireland

see Names of Places.

Bradford

Labour Dispute; Arrest of Members of Trade Union at Midnight, etc.

Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 16, 1154.

Bradford Corporation Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Bray and Murphy

Arrest of, see Sheridan, Sergeant.

Brehon Laws

Publication of; Progress

Q. Mr. Boland; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1182.

Bridewell Hospital Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Bridlington and North Frodingham Light Railway

Order Amending Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 18.

Brighton Corporation Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Bristol

Muller's Orphanage; Death of L. Filer, Non-attendance of Doctor, etc.

Q. Mr. Hay; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 12, 430.

Bristol Corporation (Docks and Railways, etc.) Bill

c. 3R.* Aug. 9, 265.
 l. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 12, 397.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
 Broadhurst, Mr. H. [Leicester]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 542, 548.
 "Globe" Newspaper;Article entitled "Irish Rowdies," Question of Privilege, Aug. 15, 972.
 Naval Contracts;Sub-letting Contracts, Aug. 8, 38.
 South African War;Coloured Men with British Army, Number of, Aug. 8, 35.
 Broadstairs and St. Peters Water and Improvement Bill
 l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Bryce, Rt. Hon. J. [Aberdeen, S.]
 Aberdeen, Seaton Links;Proposed Military Camp, Aug. 15, 902.
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1020, 1031.
 Light Railways (No. 2) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 856.
 South African War
 Opponents of the War;Indifference to Greatness of England, alleged, Aug. 15, 1030.
 Situation in South Africa;Lord Kitchener's Surrender Proclamation, Aug. 15, 1020;for details, see South African War.
 Bubonic Plague
 Local Government Board Reports and Papers on, Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 20.
 Bull, Mr. W. J. [Hammersmith]
 Hackney Union;Nurse Beatty detained as Lunatic, Papers relating to, Aug. 15, 910.
 Burgh Sewerage, Drainage and Water Supply (Scotland) Bill
 c. Con.* and 3R., Aug. 13, 727.
 l. 1R.* Aug. 14, 731.
 2R. Aug. 15, 885.
 Com.* and 3R.* Aug. 16, 1136.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Burke, Mr. Haviland [King's County, Tullamore]
 Rhode United Irish League Meeting;Action of Police Sergeant, Aug. 12, 438.
 Burmah
 Rangoon Cantonment;Public Works Department taking over Private Houses without paying full value
 Q. Mr. Keswick; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 15, 906.
 Burney, Sergeant-Major
 South African War;Claim against War Office, etc.
 Q. Mr. Jeffreys; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 31.
 Burnley
 Weaving Sheds;Operatives' Wages, Deductions for Oiling Machinery
 Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 13, 598.
 Burns, Mr. John [Battersea]
 Alkali, etc., Works Regulation Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 860.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 509, 541, 554, 563, 564, 565; Aug. 13. 683, 687, 696, 698, 710.

Business of the House

Course of Business;Mr. Balfour's Replies, etc., Aug. 8, 81; Aug. 9, 309; Aug. 12, 453; Aug. 13, 616; Aug. 16, 1188.

Days occupied by Government and Private Members;Return Ordered, Aug. 12, 416; Presented, Aug. 13, 590.

Devolution System;Discussion on Important Matters, Inadequate Discussion, Devolution as a Remedy

Os. Earl Spencer, Aug. 17, 1278; Earl of Selborne, 1282.

Naval and Military Works Bills;Bringing on at the end of the Session, Complaints, see Naval and Military Works Bills.

Butter

Adulteration;Milk and Water artificially introduced, Action of the Board of Agriculture

Q. Mr. Moore; A. Mr. Banbury, Aug. 15, 918.

Standards Committee;Publication of Evidence

Qs. Mr. Joyce, Mr. O'Shaughnessy; As. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 16, 1160.

Buxton, Mr. Sydney [Tower Hamlets, Poplar]

Piccadilly, Widening of, Aug. 8, 55.

C

Cable Communication

Africa, South;Agreement between H.M. Government and Eastern and South African Telegraph Company, Aug. 13, 728.

Concluding Agreement without waiting for Report of Cable Committee, etc.

Q. Sir E. Sassoon; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 290.

Africa, West, Purchase of Cables by French Government;Deviating so as to avoid Bathurst and Accra

Q. Sir C. Dilke; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 13, 597.

Ascension and Sierra Leone;Agreement between H.M. Government and Eastern Telegraph Company ratified, Aug. 13, 728.

Pacific Cable, see that title.

Caicos Island

Report for 1900 Presented, Aug. 8, 4.

Caine, Mr. W. S. [Cornwall, Camborne]

India;Financial and Economic Position, Lord George Hamilton's Statement, Aug. 16, 1237;for details, see India.

Royal Titles Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 621.

Cairo

Fox-hunting Incident near Mr. Blunt's Estate, see Egypt.

Caithness

Allotments in;Refusal of Applications

Q. Mr. Harmsworth; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 15, 924.

Caldwell, Mr. J. [Lanark, Mid.]

Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Bill, Lords Amendts., Aug. 8, 14.

Dumbarton Disturbances;Treatment of Rev. W. Mickimmin, Aug. 15, 923.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 706, 710.

Marriages Legalisation Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 725, 723; Aug. 14, 859.

Camolin

Disturbances; Trial of Farmers by Stipendiary Magistrate, etc.

Q. Mr. D. Sullivan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1303.

Campbell, Mr. J. [Armagh, S.]

Armagh

Post Office; Promotions, Special Allowances, etc., Aug. 9, 304.

Roads; County Surveyor controlling Repairs, Complaints, etc., Aug. 15, 935.

Russell, Earl of, Trial for Bigamy; Fees of Law Offices of the Crown, Aug. 8, 80.

Campbell-Bannermann Rt. Hon. Sir H. [Stirling Burghs]

Business of the House; Course of Business, Aug. 8, 81.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 543, 549, 550.

Royal Titles Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 458.

Canada

Cattle Importation

Restrictions; Petitions, Aug. 9, 266.

Return 1890–1900

Q. Mr. Crombie; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 15, 919.

Cancer

Tuberculosis Commission; Cancer Investigations, proposed

Q. Mr. J. More; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 16, 1161.

Canney, Mr. L.

Typhoid, the Destroyer of Armies; Water Corps proposed

Q. Sir M. Foster; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1145.

Canterbury, Archbishop of

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 876.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, 2R., Aug. 16, 1135.

Cape Colony

Constitution, Suspension of

O. Mr. Bryce, Aug. 15, 1027.

Shooting of Native; Proposed Trial of Capt. Cox

Q. Mr. Channing; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 270.

South African War, see that title.

Capital Punishment

"Drop" Regulations; Death not instantaneous, alleged

Q. Dr. Thompson; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 16, 1153.

Cappamore

National School Teacher; Salary

Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 938.

Cappawhite

Evictions; Case of T. Franklin, Failure to serve Notice, etc.

Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 443.

Carden, Sir J.

Game Coverts;Mr. Bruen and others shooting on Public Road
Qs. Mr. K. O'Brien, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Roche; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 440.
Cardiff
Foreign Animals Wharves;Orders relating to presented, Aug. 15, 863, 893.
Cardiff Railway Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
Carew, Mr. J. L. [Meath, S.]
Tuberculosis, Communicability from Animals to Man;Appointment of Royal
Commission, Aug. 8, 52.
Carlingford Lough
Steam Launches, Overcrowding of;Complaints, etc.
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 12, 451.
Carmarthenshire
Postal Arrangements;Daily Delivery in Brechfa, etc., proposed
Q. Mr. L. Morgan; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 432.
Rabies;Date of last Case, Withdrawing Muzzling Order proposed
Q. Mr. L. Morgan; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 9, 283.
Carnarvonshire
County Council;Constitution of Sub-Committee
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 8, 50.
Carrick-on-Suir
Workhouse, Utilising portion of for Harmless Lunatics, proposed
O. Mr. O'Shee, Aug. 9, 334.
Castle Cove
Rural Postman's Pay
Q. Mr. Boland; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 447.
Casualties;Shipping
Casualties on, or near Coasts or in Rivers and Harbours of the United Kingdom,
etc.;Abstract of Returns Presented, Aug. 15, 862, 894.
Cattle and Live Stock
Canada, see that title.
Diseases, see their names.
Causton, Mr. R. K. [Southwark, W.]
Peabody Buildings;Trustees refusing Otter of Southwark Borough Council to
Collect Rates, etc., Aug. 15, 916.
Cavan, County Cavan, etc.
Amalgamation of Granard Union, etc., Major Fair, Selection of, to hold Inquiry
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 931.
Court House, Right of County Council to Transact Business in;Action of High
Sheriff
Qs. Mr. M'Govern, Mr. Flavin; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 301; Q. Mr. M'Govern; A.
Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 605.
Cavan and Leitrim Railway
Post Office Subsidy for Conveyance of Mails
Q. Mr. M'Govern; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 952.
Cayzer, Sir C. W. [Barrow-in-Furness]

Cairo Fox-hunting Incident, Aug. 8, 44; Aug. 15, 908.
 Cecil, Lord Hugh [Greenwich]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 716.
 "Globe" Newspaper;Article entitled "Irish Rowdies," question of Privilege, Aug. 15, 976.
 Cecil, Mr. E. [Ashton Manor]
 Secondary Education, Organisation of;Control of Pupil Teacher Centres, Aug. 8, 53.
 Censorship of the Press
 South African War, see that title.
 Census, Ireland
 Boy copyists, Employment of;Appointment of Female Clerk, etc.
 Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 436; Aug. 16, 1180.
 Central London Railway (No. 2) Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Chairman of Committees
 Rt. Hon. J. W. Lowther.
 Rulings, Questioning, see Speaker;Chairman's Rulings.
 Chairman of Committees (Lords)
 Earl of Morley.
 Chamberlain, Mr. Austen;Financial Secretary to the Treasury [Worcestershire, E.]
 Army and Navy Expenditure;Application of Surpluses to meet Excesses, Com., Aug. 8, 203, 215, 221.
 Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Bill, Lords Amendts., Aug. 9, 258.
 Cable Communication;Eastern and South Africa Telegraph Company, completion of Arrangement;Report of Cable Committee, Aug. 9, 290.
 Carmarthenshire Postal Arrangements;Daily Delivery in Brechfa, etc., proposed, Aug. 12, 432.
 Comptroller and Auditor-General's Department, Total Cost;Total Sum Audited, Aug. 15, 921.
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1029.
 Customs Duties (Isle of Man) Bill, Com., Aug. 12, 575, 576.
 Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 848.
 Government Departments and Free Postage;Including Naval Store, Deptford, Aug. 9, 288.
 Guns, Purchase of German Field Guns;Application of Surpluses on Grants to Purchase Guns, etc., Aug. 13, 595.
 Income Tax Abatements;Establishing claim year by year, Aug. 9, 290.
 Ireland
 Armagh Post Office;Promotions, Special Allowances, etc., Aug. 9, 305.
 Auditing Department;Employing Audit Office Officials permanently in Dublin, Aug. 15, 947.
 Bailieborough Rural Postman's Pay, Aug. 12, 447.
 Belfast Postal Arrangements;Sunday Delivery, Aug. 9, 306.
 Brehon Laws, Publication of;Progress, Aug. 16, 1182.
 Canal, Royal;Report of Inspector, Aug. 9, 304.

Castle Cove;Rural Postman's Pay, Aug. 12, 448.
Cavan and Leitrim Railway Company, Post Office Subsidy for conveyance of Mails, Aug. 15, 952.
Clonmel Mails;Delays, forwarding Mails from Thurles direct, Aug. 8, 79.
Cork and Fermoy Railway, Construction of
Correspondence between Fish guard Company and Treasury, Publication of, Aug. 9, 303.
Repayment of £;93,000, etc., Aug. 16, 1176.
Donegal Postal Service;Improvements proposed, Aug. 15, 948.
Downpatrick Mails;Postal Arrangements at Ardglass and Killough, Improvement of, etc., Aug. 13, 612.
Dublin Postal Official's Grievances, Aug. 17, 1305.
Examinations for Male Sorters, Holding in Dublin, proposed, Aug. 8, 56.
Inniskeen Postmastership;Dismissal of Fitzpatrick, etc., Aug. 12, 448; Aug. 13, 611; Aug. 16, 1184.
Irish-speaking Sorting Clerks, Appointment of, Aug. 16, 1184.
Kerry Mails;Sunday Delivery in Ballyduff and Asdee, Aug. 15, 949.
Londonderry Railway Station;Erection of Suitable Buildings, Aug. 15, 950.
Mail Service;English Night Mails, Delay in Arrival at Kingstown, Aug. 8, 79.
Navan Post Office;Suitable Premises, Aug. 9, 307.
Post Office Savings Bank;Keeping Irish Accounts in Dublin Proposed Aug. 15, 947.
Postmasterships;Appointment of English Officers in Ireland, Aug. 8, 78.
Rathkeale Mails;Delay in Arrival from Dublin, Aug. 12, 450.
Rosscarbery Mails;Day Mail Service from Clonakilty Proposed, Aug. 16, 1185.
Rural Postmen;Bank Holiday Privileges, Aug. 16, 1186.
Shercock;Mail Cars leaving for Carrickmacross in time for 6.13 p.m. Train Proposed, Aug. 15, 949.
Tipperary Mail Delays from Dublin Aug. 15, 951.
Tralee Mails;Delay in Arrival from Limerick, Aug. 17, 1306.
Isle of Man, Public Revenue in 1900–1, etc., Aug. 9, 284.
Money Orders
German and British Systems, Aug. 9, 286.
Turkey to United Kingdom;Reduction of Charge proposed, Aug. 9, 285.
Pacific Cable Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 479, 483, 492, 493; Com., Aug. 13, 628, 632, 637, 642, 643, 645, 648.
Parcels Post
Delays;Obtaining Receipt for Parcels, Aug. 15, 921.
Postage Rate from Turkey to United Kingdom, Aug. 9, 286.
Postage Stamps;Colour of new Penny Stamp, Aug. 9, 288.
Postal Order System, Extending to Salonica, Smyrna, etc., Aug. 9, 285.
Postmen
Coats;Buttoning from Neck to Waist, Aug. 8, 55.
Colchester Postman's Stripe Grievance, Aug. 16, 1163.
Dishonesty, Dismissals for, Aug. 9, 289.
Good Conduct Stripes
Full Time Duty, etc., Aug. 16, 1163.

Unestablished Linesmen and Mechanics, Aug. 15, 920.
 Special Leave Regulations;Case of Postman Bates, Aug. 16, 1162.
 Tonbridge;Petition for Increase of Pay, Aug. 16, 1165.
 Public Works Loans Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 850, 851; 3R., Aug. 15, 1123.
 Scotland
 Laurencekirk Postmastership;Appointment to Vacancy, Aug. 9, 289.
 Thurso and Bettyhill Mail Car Service, Contract for, Aug. 12, 433.
 Servants' Registries at Country Post Offices, proposed, Aug. 12, 431.
 South African War;Meat Contracts, etc., Aug. 8, 217.
 Telegrams
 Charge Anomalies;Names of Places, Aug. 12, 431; Aug. 16, 1163.
 Redirection Charge, Aug. 12, 431.
 Telegraph Service
 Guarantees;Extension of Telegraphs, Aug. 9 288.
 Liverpool Telegraphists' Promotion Grievances, Aug. 16, 1165.
 Telegraphist with five years' Service;Petition for Increase of Pay, Aug. 12, 433.
 Telephone Service, London;Negotiations with National Telephone Company, etc., Aug. 9, 287; Aug. 15, 920.
 Wotton-under-Edge Post Office;Making R.S.O., etc., Aug. 13, 602.
 Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J.;Secretary of State for the Colonies [Birmingham, W.]
 Africa, West;Purchase of Cables by French Government, Deviating Cables so as to avoid Bathurst, etc., Aug. 13, 597.
 Australia, Immigration to;Educational Test, Aug. 12, 425.
 Cape Colony;Shooting of Native, Trial of Capt. Cox, proposed, Aug. 9, 271.
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 986, 992, 1002, 1003, 1004; 3R., Aug. 17, 1336.
 Jamaica;Laws, Arrest of Persons for Prædial Larceny, Flogging, etc., Aug. 15, 906.
 Malta
 British Flag, Hauling down, etc., Aug. 15, 908.
 Language;English Language Agitation, Aug. 17, 1336.
 Petition from Elected Members of Council, etc., Aug. 15, 907; Aug. 17, 1296.
 Rhodesia;Immigrant and Native Labour, Regulation of, Aug. 8, 24.
 South African Land Settlement;Expenditure, Scheme of, Aug. 8, 26; Aug. 9, 271.
 South African War
 Native Compounds;Employment of British Soldiers to enforce Native Labour Contracts, Aug. 9, 269.
 Situation in South Africa;Lord Kitchener's Surrender Proclamation, etc., Aug. 9, 269; Aug. 15, 992, 1002, 1003, 1004.
 (for details, see South African War.)
 Transvaal
 Customs and Trade Regulations of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Aug. 15, 897.
 Johannesburg Refugee Owners of House Property;Exemption from Rent, etc., during enforced Absence, Aug. 8, 25.

Mining Contracts and Leases; Lord Kitchener's Proclamation, Aug. 12, 418.
Trinidad; Government Schools, Closing of, etc., Aug. 9, 280.
Watford and District Tramways Bill, 3R., Aug. 15, 892.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
Lord James of Hereford.
Chancellor of the Exchequer
Rt. Hon. Sir M. Hicks-Beach.
Channing, Mr. F. A. [Northamptonshire, E.]
Cape Colony; Shooting of Native, Trial of Capt. Cox, etc., Aug. 9, 270.
Ptomaine Poisoning by Decomposed Cream; Improper use of Preservatives, Aug. 8, 51.
Saturday Sitting of the House and the Blenheim Garden Party, Aug. 8, 193.
South African War
Army Service Corps; War Rewards for Warrant Officers, etc., Aug. 12, 421.
Native Compounds; Employment of British Soldiers to enforce Native Labour Contracts, Aug. 9, 269.
Rebels, Execution of; Compulsory Attendance of Burghers. Aug. 9, 272.
Surrender; Lord Kitchener's Proclamation, Aug. 9, 269.
Chaplains
South African War, see that title.
Charities
Durham, County of; Return Presented, Aug. 12, 414.
Lancaster, County of; Return Presented, Aug. 12, 414.
London; Return Presented, Aug. 12, 414.
Montgomery, County of; Return Presented, Aug. 12, 414.
Wilts, County of; Return Ordered, Aug. 9, 268; Presented, Aug. 15, 896.
Charity Commission
Cloudesley Estate Fund, Transfer to Official Trustees, etc.
Q. Mr. Lough; A. Mr. G. Boscawen, Aug. 16, 1166.
Chatham
Graveyards, Condition of
Q. Mr. H. J. Wilson; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 15, 916.
Naval Works
Os. Earl Spencer, Earl of Selborne, Aug. 17, 1289.
Statement (Mr. Pretymann), Aug. 14, 746.
Chester Corporation Tramways Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
Chief Secretary for Ireland
Rt. Hon. G. Wyndham.
China
Anti-Foreign Rising; Further Correspondence relating to Presented, Aug. 13, 578, 590.
Customs Duty, Increase of; Exemption of Contracts made prior to Date of Signature
Q. Mr. Yerburch; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 16, 1151.
Naval Forces
Issue of Medals and Clasps

Q. Sir J. Colomb; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 15, 904.
 Strength of, and Casualties incurred during operations of 1900; Return Ordered,
 Aug. 15, 896.
 Northern Railway
 Correspondence respecting the Imperial Railway of North China Presented, Aug.
 17, 1277, 1294.
 Omission of Railway Papers
 Q. Sir C. Dilke; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 17, 1298.
 Terms of Settlement; Action of British Minister
 Q. Mr. Norman; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 12, 425.
 Trade Reports Presented Aug. 8, 4.
 China Manufacture
 Continental Manufacturers; Rumoured Conference
 Q. Mr. Coghill; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 16, 1153.
 Christ's Hospital (London) Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Church Discipline
 Petition for Alteration of Law, Aug. 12, 410.
 Church Discipline Bill
 Facilitating Progress of
 Q. Mr. C. M'Arthur; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 13, 614.
 City and Brixton Railway Bill
 c. Con.* Aug. 12, 409.
 3R.* Aug. 15, 891.
 I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 16, 1129.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
 Civil Disturbances
 Military Aid, see Penrhyn Quarry Dispute.
 Civil Servants
 Retirement at age of 65; Treasury Minute stating circumstances under which
 certain Civil Servants have been retained beyond that age; Copy ordered Aug. 12,
 418; Presented, Aug. 13, 589.
 Clancy, Mr. J. J. [Dublin Co., N.]
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., Aug. 17, 1324.
 Court Houses, Ireland, Control, Aug. 8, 122.
 Dalkey; Revision Court, proposed, Aug. 8, 67.
 Dublin Dispensary District, North; Medical Officers' Salaries, Aug. 17, 1301.
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill
 Lords Amendts., Aug. 16, 1199.
 Reprinting, Distribution of Copies, etc., Aug. 17, 1298.
 Law and Justice Administration, Ireland, Charges against, Aug. 17, 1324.
 Local Government Board, Ireland, Administration; Defects of Local Government Act,
 etc., Aug. 8, 119.
 Local Government (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 835, 836.
 Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 842.
 Tallaght Petty Sessions; Charge of damaging Kynoch's Property, Action of Police,

etc., Aug. 17, 1302.
Clanricarde Estate, Ireland
Tenants, Dispute with; Farms remaining empty, etc.
O. Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Aug. 15, 1054.
Clayton-Bulwer Treaty.
see Nicaragua Canal.
Clerks of the Crown and Peace.
Ireland, Clerks holding office during pleasure of Lord Chancellor
Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 938.
Clonmel.
Mails, Delay in Arrival, Forwarding Mails direct from Thurles
Q. Mr. Condon; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 79.
Closure of Debate.
Standing Order 25; Return Ordered, Aug. 12, 414; Presented, Aug. 13, 590.
Supply; Votes in Classes, New Closure Rule, see Supply.
Cloudesley Estate Fund.
Transfer to Official Trustees, etc.
Q. Mr. Lough; A. Mr. G. Boscawen, Aug. 16, 1166.
Clubs Registration (Scotland) Bill.
c. 1R.* Aug. 9, 310.
Clyde.
Mussel Beds, Sub-lease to Dr. Fullerton; Submitting to Town Councils for
Approval, etc.
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 16, 1165.
Clyde Valley Electrical Power Bill.
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
Coakley, Mr.
Appointment as Teacher of Irish in Middleton School; Ratifying Appointment.
Q. Capt. Donelan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1173.
Coal
Commission
Constitution, etc.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; A. Sir M. H. Beach, Aug. 8, 45.
Delay in Appointment; Geological Survey Investigation at South Kensington, etc.
Q. Mr. D. A. Thomas; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 9, 309.
Export Duty; Remissions
Amount up to August; Expediting Repayment
Qs. Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. Renwick; As. Sir M. H. Beach, Aug. 8, 46.
Date of Repayment, etc.
Q. Sir T. Doxford; A. Sir M. H. Beach, Aug. 15, 909.
Coaling Facilities
British Navy
Q. Mr. E. Robertson; A. Mr. Pretymann, Aug. 13, 596.
Expenditure on; Naval Works Bill Statement (Mr. Pretymann), Aug. 14, 748.
Os. Mr. Lough, Aug. 14, 762; Sir J. Colomb, 765; Earl Spencer, Aug. 17, 1280;
Earl of Selborne, 1283.

United States Navy, New Policy
 Os. Mr. Pretyman, Aug. 14, 750; Mr. Lough, 763; Sir J. Colomb, 766.
 Coaling Stations
 Naval or Military Control
 Q. Mr. E. Robertson; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 13, 596.
 Cochrane, Mr. T. H. [Ayrshire, N]
 Militia Returned Milita from South Africa; Pay, Aug. 9, 276.
 Parliamentary Representation of Scotland and Ireland, Inequality between; Select
 Committee proposed, Aug. 9, 307.
 Coetzee
 Rebels in South Africa
 see South African War; Rebels.
 Coffee
 Imports into the principal Countries in Europe, United States, and British
 Colonies; Statement with Statistical Tables ordered, Aug. 14, 732, Presented,
 Aug. 16, 1138.
 Coghill, Mr. D. H. [Stoke-upon-Trent]
 China Manufactures; Rumoured Conference of Continental Manufacturers, Aug. 16,
 1153.
 Light Railways (No. 2) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 855, 856.
 Piccadilly, Widening of, Aug. 15, 922.
 Cohen, Mr. B. [Islington, E.]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 540,
 566.
 India, Financial and Economic Position, Lord G. Hamilton's Statement, Aug. 16,
 1250; (for Details, see India)
 Colchester
 Postman's Stripe Grievance
 Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1163.
 Colne and Trawden Light Railways
 Order Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 17.
 Colomb, Sir J. [Great Yarmouth]
 China, Naval Forces; Issue of Medals and clasps, Aug. 15, 904.
 Defence Works, Policy of, Expenditure on, etc., Aug. 14, 799.
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 548.
 Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 799, 800, 801; Con., Aug. 15, 1100.
 Naval Barracks, Construction of; Expenditure on, etc, Aug. 14, 800.
 Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 764, 769.
 Colonial Acts Confirmation Bill
 c. 2R., Aug. 12, 576.
 Con.* and 3R.* Aug. 13, 728.
 l. 1R.* Aug. 14, 731.
 2R.* Aug. 15, 884.
 Com.* and 3R.* Aug. 16, 1136.
 Royal Assent Aug. 17, 1290.
 Colonial Office

Secretary of State; Rt. Hon. J. Chamberlain.

Parliamentary Secretary; Earl of Onslow.

Colonies

Annual Reports Presented, Aug. 8, 4.

British Indian Subjects, Treatment of

O. Sir M. Bhownaggee, Aug. 16, 1227.

Defence of the Empire; Contributions in aid of Expenditure

Military Works

O. Mr. H. Lewis, Aug. 15, 1104.

Naval Expenditure

O. Mr. T. M. Healy, Sir J. Colomb, Aug. 14, 768, 769.

Import Duties, Rates, Levied, etc.; Return Ordered, Aug. 9, 269; Presented, Aug. 12, 413.

Reports for 1900 Presented, Aug. 15, 863, 894.

Royal Assent to Colonial Acts; Return Presented, Aug. 15, 895.

Statistical Abstracts from 1886 to 1900, Presented, Aug. 8, 6, 19.

"Colony"

Sailing Ships; Insufficient Food alleged, case of J. M'Donald.

Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1155.

Committees

Commons Select Committees, Number, etc.; Return Ordered, Aug. 12, 415; Presented, Aug. 13, 590.

Companies

Joint Stock Companies, see that title.

Winding up; General Annual Report Presented, Aug. 9, 254, 267.

Compensation for Damage to Crops, etc., Bill

Petitions, Aug. 9, 266.

Comptroller and Auditor-General's Department

Total Cost; Total Sum Audited

Q. Mr. W. Jones; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 921.

Condon, Mr. T. J. [Tipperary, E.]

Clonmel Mails; Delays, forwarding Mails from Thurles direct, Aug. 8, 79.

Congested Districts Board (Ireland) Bill

c. Com. Aug. 12, 573.

l. 1R.* Aug. 13, 587.

2R. Aug. 15, 864.

Com.* and 3R.* Aug. 16, 1136.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill

c. 1R.* Aug. 12, 573.

2R.* Aug. 15, 978.

Com. and Report,* Aug. 16, 1197.

3R. Aug. 17, 1306.

l. 1R., 2R., and 3R.* Aug. 17, 1277.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1289.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bills

Procedure;Discussing Preliminary Resolutions
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 8, 233.
Constabulary, Royal Irish
Ballymote;Arrest of J. Gilmartin by Police
Q. Mr. O'Dowd; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 68.
Charges against;Organising and Manufacturing Crime, alleged
Debate on Consolidated Fund Bill, Aug. 15, 1056; Aug. 17, 1306.
Ballyhaunis, Prosecution at;Police Interference with Witnesses, alleged
Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1168.
Sheridan, Sergeant, see Sheridan.
Sullivan, Sergeant, see Sullivan.
Thurles;Death from Police Violence alleged
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1181.
Dromod Meeting, Prohibition of, by Police Sergeant
Q. Mr. Daly; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 604.
Fund;Amount on Division into Benefit and Reward Branches, etc.
Q. Mr. Field; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 927.
Injuries
Compensation for;Return
Q.Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 927.
Members Injured during past twenty years, Amount of Compensation, etc.;Return
Presented, Aug. 12, 413.
Tallaght Petty Sessions;Charge of Damaging Kynoch's Property, Action of Police,
etc.
Q. Mr. Clancy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1302.
United Irish League Meetings, see Names of Places.
Contagious Diseases, Animals
see Names of Diseases.
Contempt of Court
Imprisonment for;Case of M'Elligott
Qs. Mr. M'Govern, Mr. Dillon; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1172.
Coonagh
French's, Col., Estate;Sale of Land to Tenants
Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 70.
Cooper's Hill College
Report of Board of Visitors;Presenting to Parliament
Q. Mr. Trevelyan; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 12, 423.
Copyright
Irish Copyright Infringement Cases;Penalties in England and Ireland, etc.
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; A. Mr. Atkinson, Aug. 16, 1182.
Corbett, Mr. T. L. [Down, N.]
Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 667.
Corea
Trade Report Presented, Aug. 9, 253.
Cork;County Cork, etc.
Labourers' Cottages;Rejection of Applications, etc., Kelly's, W., Application

Q. Mr. Sheehan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 939.
Labourers' Cottages; Rejection of Applications, etc., Millstreet Union
Q. Mr. Flynn; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 439; Q. Mr. Sheehan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 928.
Cork, Blackrock and Passage Railway Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 251.
Cork and Fermoy Railway
Correspondence relating to, between Fishguard Company and Treasury; Publication of
Qs. Mr. Flynn, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. T. M. Healy; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 303.
Repayment of £93,000; Postponement,
Qs. Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. J. Redmond; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1176.
Coronation
Westminster Abbey; Removal of Screen
Q. Lord Balcarres; A. Mr. Douglas, Aug. 15, 922.
Corporal Punishment
Elementary Infant Schools; Prohibiting Corporal Punishment
Q. Dr. Macnamara; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 13, 600.
Cotton Cultivation
India; Improving Quality of Cotton, etc.
Q. Mr. Harwood; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 8, 41.
Counting the House
No Motion for a Count could be made on the last day of Supply
O. Mr. Chairman, Aug. 8, 122.
County Councils
Transferring and Uniting Parishes under Section 59 of the Local Government Act of 1888; Orders Presented, Aug. 16, 1130, 1139.
County Councils (Byelaws) Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, Aug. 16, 1276.
County Courts
Plaints and Sittings; Return Presented, Aug. 12, 411.
County Court Valuers (Ireland)
see Land Commission.
Couplings
Automatic Couplings, see Railways.
Court Houses, Ireland
Cavan, see that title.
Control of; Dispute as to the use of Court Houses
Os. Mr. Clancy, Aug. 8, 121; Mr. Rentoul, 129; Mr. Daly, Aug. 9, 312.
Courts-Martial
Navy, see that title
South African War, see that title.
Cox, Capt.
Trial of, proposed; Ordering Cape Policeman to Shoot Native, &c.
Q. Mr. Channing; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 270.

Cranborne, Visc.; Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs [Rochester]
Africa; Big Game Preserves; Sir H. Johnston's Representation, etc., Aug. 12, 426
China
Papers relating to; Omission of Railway Papers, Aug. 17, 1298.
Terms of Settlement, Aug. 12, 425.
Trade, Customs Duty, Increase of; Exemption of Contracts prior to Date of
Signature, Aug. 16, 1151.
Egypt; Fox-hunting Incident near Mr. Blunt's Estate, Assault on British Officers
by Natives, Aug. 8, 43; Aug. 9, 280; Aug. 15, 908.
Appeal; Date fixed for hearing, Aug. 12, 426.
Germany, Tariff Bill; Raising Duty on English Imports, Aug. 15, 908.
Madrid, Irish Lady's Estate; Communications with Sir M. Durand, etc., Aug. 15,
946; Aug. 16, 1152; Aug. 17, 1298.
Nicaragua Canal; Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Reply to Lord Lansdowne's Dispatches
etc., Aug. 15, 909.
Persia; Customs Tariff, Modification proposed, Aug. 8, 45.
Thibetan Embassy to Russia, Aug. 12, 425.
Waima Arbitration; Delays, etc., Aug. 16, 1152.
Crean, Mr. E. [Cork, S.E.]
Baillieborough Rural Postmen's Pay, Aug. 12, 447.
Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 834.
Mail Service; English Night Mails, Delay in Arrival at Kingstown, Aug. 8, 79.
Cremer, Mr. W. R. [Shoreditch, Haggerston]
Hague Conference, Terms of Convention, etc.; Laying on the Table, Aug. 15, 954.
Small Pox Hospitals, London; Number of Cases, 1898–1900, Vaccination,
etc., Aug. 15, 917.
Criminal Lunatics
Inebriate Reformatories, Transference of Lunatics to Local Asylums; Maintenance
Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 8, 48.
Criminals
Irish Criminals, Arrest of; County Liability for Expenses
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1174.
Cripps, Mr. C. A. [Lancashire, Stretford]
Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 717.
Crombie, Mr. J. W. [Kincardineshire]
Canadian Cattle Importation, 1890–1900; Return, Aug. 15, 919.
German Tariff Bill; Raising Duty on English Imports, Aug. 15, 908.
Laurencekirk Postmastership; Appointment to Vacancy, Aug. 9, 289.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 838, 841, 842,
843, 846, 847.
Steam Trawlers, Scotland; Incompetency of Masters, etc., Aug. 9, 280.
Cromer Water Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 251.
Cromer, Visc.
New Peer; Introduced in the House of Lords, Aug. 8, 1.
Cronsedale, Major

Land Commissioner in Skibbereen, etc.

Q. Mr. E. Barry; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 441.

Crops

Compensation for Damage to Crops, etc., Bill, see that title.

Crown Quit Rents

see Ireland;Quit Rents.

Crown Rights

Foreshores, see that title, also Bantry.

Cullen, Dr.

Case of

O. Mr. T. M. Healy, Aug. 8, 107.

Cullercoats

Fishery Dispute

Q. Mr. Harris; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 911.

Cullinan, Mr. J. [Tipperary, S.]

Donegal, Co.;Labourers' Cottage Schemes, Erection of Cottages, Delays, etc., Aug. 17, 1300.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1116.

Local Government Board, Ireland, Administration;Delay in Settling Labourers'

Cottages Schemes, etc., Aug. 8, 99, 116.

National School No 7245, District 46;Dispute between School Manager and Teacher, Aug. 12, 444.

Public Works Loans Bill 3R., Aug. 15, 1123.

Roads, Ireland;Employment of Direct Labour, Preparing Schemes, &c., Aug. 16, 1169.

Tipperary;Mail Delays from Dublin, Aug. 15, 951.

Currency

India, see that title.

Customs

Report of Commissioners for 1901 Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 412.

Customs Duties

see Import Duties, also names of Foreign Countries.

Customs Duties (Isle of Man) Bill

c. Com., Aug. 12, 575.

Con.* 3R.* Aug. 13, 728.

l. 1R.* Aug. 14, 731.

2R.* Aug. 15, 884.

Com.* and 3R.* Aug. 16, 1136.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Cyprus

Revenues;Return Ordered, Aug. 16, 1140.

D

Dalkey

Revision Court, proposed

Qs. Mr. Mooney, Mr. Clancy; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 67.

Daly, Mr. J. [Monaghan, S.]

Army Horses; Report of Committee, Witnesses from Ireland, Aug. 9, 276.
Dromod Meeting; Prohibition of, by Police-Sergeant, Aug. 13, 604.
Inniskeen Postmastership; Dismissal of Fitzpatrick, etc., Aug. 12, 448; Aug. 13, 611; Aug. 16, 1183.
Labourers' Cottages, Delays, Rejection of Applications, etc., Aug. 8, 132; Aug. 9, 313, 316.
Local Government Board (Ireland) Administration; Mismanagement of Local Affairs, etc., Aug. 9, 312.
Monaghan Assistant County Surveyors; Appointment of Deputies, etc., Aug. 9, 294; Aug. 15, 936.
Omagh Labourers' Cottage; Income Tax Demands, Aug. 8, 66.
Roman Catholic Chaplains; Rewards for War Services, Aug. 8, 32.
Shercock; Mail Cars leaving for Carrickmacross in time for 6.13 p.m. Train, proposed, Aug. 15, 949.
Unions, Amalgamation of, Aug. 15, 933.
Dalziel, Mr. J. H. [Kirkcaldy Burghs]
Army and Navy Expenditure; Application of Surpluses to meet Excesses Com., Aug. 8, 192, 199.
Davenport, Mr. W. Bromley [Cheshire, Macclesfield]
Yeomanry; Returned Yeomen from South Africa, Pay Arrears, Aug. 8, 33.
Dawra
Court House, Right of District Councils to use Court House for Execution of Duties
Q. Mr. M'Govern; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 298.
Deane v. Boyle
see Truck Act Prosecution.
Death Duties
Indian Fiscal System; Raising Revenue by Death Duties, Proposed
Q. Sir E. Sassoon; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 9, 279.
Deaths
Registrar-General's Report, see title Births, Marriages, and Deaths.
Debtors (Scotland) Act, 1880
Prosecutions under; Case of S. Wolffe, Abandonment of Prosecution, etc.
Q. Mr. Parkes; A. Mr. S. Dickson, Aug. 13, 602.
Defence of the Empire
Colonial Contribution, see Colonies.
Defence Works
Naval Works Bill Debate, Aug. 14, 735.
Policy of; Expenditure on, etc., Colomb, Sir J., on, Aug. 14, 799.
Secrecy and Mystery as to; Withholding information on the ground of conveying knowledge to Foreign Governments
Os. Mr. Haldane, Aug. 14, 804; Mr. Dillon, 810; Mr. C. Hobhouse, 814; Mr. H. Lewis, Aug. 15, 1104.
Delany, Mr. W. [Queen's Co., Ossory]
Army Contracts, Ireland; Beer Contracts for Troops at the Curragh given to Burton Brewery Company, Aug. 8, 34.

Deportation of Paupers

see Paupers.

Deptford

Foreign Animals Wharves;Orders relating to, Presented, Aug. 15, 863, 893.

Naval Store;Correspondence free of Postage proposed

Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 288.

Derby Corporation Bill

c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 12, 408.

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.

Devonport Corporation (Gas) Bill

l. Report,* Aug. 8, 1.

3R.* Aug. 12, 397.

c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 14, 731.

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.

Diamond National School Teacher

Walters, Mr. W.;Retiring Gratuity

Q. Mr. Macartney; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 609.

Dickson, Mr. C. Scott;Solicitor-General for Scotland [Glasgow, Bridgeton]

Paupers, Deportation from Scotland to Ireland;Case of M. M'Auley, Aug. 13, 613.

Wolffe, S., Prosecution under Debtors' Act, 1880;Abandoning Proceedings, etc., Aug. 10, 602.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles [Gloucester, Forest of Dean]

Africa, West, Purchase of Cables by French Government;Deviating Cables so as to avoid Bathurst and Accra, Aug. 13, 597.

Army

Garrison Regiments, Royal;Present Position, etc., Aug. 15, 901.

Guns, Purchase of German Field Guns;Application of Surpluses on Grants to purchase Guns, Aug. 13, 594.

China, Papers relating to;Omission of Railway Papers, Aug. 17, 1298.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation Bill) 2R., Aug. 15, 1002, 1004.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 503, 504, 505, 509, 531, 537, 538, 539, 544, 547, 550, 553, 561, 563; Aug. 13, 655, 693, 697, 698, 701, 713, 714; Lords Amendts., Aug. 16, 1197, 1199.

Expediting Printing, Aug. 17, 1299.

Gibraltar Dock and Harbour Works;Danger to in time of War, etc., Aug. 14, 789.

Jamaica Laws;Flogging, etc., Aug. 15, 906.

Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 795.

Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 741, 786.

Naval Ships;Colours for Battleships, Experiments with Grey Paints, Aug. 12, 423.

Rhodesia;Arab Labour, Sanction of H.M. Government, etc., Aug. 8, 22.

South African War

Kitchener's, Lord, Despatches;Distribution among Members, Aug. 12, 419.

Situation in South Africa;Lord Kitchener's Surrender Proclamation, etc., Aug. 15, 1002;(for details, see South African War).

Dillon, Mr. John [Mayo, E.]

African Big Game Preserves;Sir H. Johnston's Representation, etc., Aug. 12, 426.

Army Guns, Purchase of German Field Guns;Application of Surpluses on Grants to purchase Guns, etc., Aug. 13, 595.
 Army and Navy Expenditure;Application of Surpluses to meet Excesses, Com., Aug. 8, 204, 214, 220.
 Berwickshire County Town Bill, 3R., Aug. 15, 1125, 1126.
 Blenheim Garden Party and the Saturday Sitting of the House, Aug. 8, 191.
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1069, 1070; 3R., Aug. 17, 1306, 1317, 1319, 1324.
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Resolution, Aug. 8, 234, 243.
 Constabulary, Royal Irish;Charge of Organising and Manufacturing Crime, etc., Aug. 11, 1306.
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Com. Aug. 13, 662, 663, 673, 677.
 "Globe" Newspaper;Article entitled "Irish Rowdies," question of Privilege, Aug. 15, 977.
 Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 833.
 M'Elligott;Imprisonment for Contempt of Court, Aug. 16, 1173.
 Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 808, 810, 813; Com., Aug. 15, 1098, 1107.
 Pacific Cable Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 495; Com., Aug. 13, 631.
 Royal Titles Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 464, 470; Com., Aug. 13, 627; 3R., Aug. 14, 852.
 Sheridan, Sergeant, Dismissal of;Public Inquiry, Proposed, Aug. 16, 1175.
 South African War
 Boer Prisoners
 St. Helena;Shooting of Godefroy, Aug. 9, 271; Aug. 15, 898; Aug. 17, 1295.
 Concentration Camps;Howick, Keeping Account of Rations and Clothing issued, etc., Aug. 15, 900.
 Natives
 Kruitzinger's, Gen., Threat;Instructions to Lord Kitchener, Aug. 8, 27.
 Military Employment of, Aug. 8, 34.
 Position of British Troops;Laying Maps on the Table proposed, Aug. 15, 900.
 Vlakfontein;Boers killing British wounded, Gen. Dixon's Despatch, Aug. 8, 27; Aug. 15, 899.
 Supply, Procedure under new Closure Rule
 Alteration in the Method of putting the Question, Aug. 8, 140, 145, 146.
 Including Votes which had not been submitted for Consideration in Committee of Supply, etc., Aug. 8, 159, 160; Aug. 9, 363.
 Valuation (Ireland) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 819; Com., Aug. 15, 1127.
 Diseases of Animals
 Foreign Animals Wharves at Deptford and Cardiff;Orders relating to, Presented, Aug. 15, 863, 893.
 Divisions
 Number, etc.;Return ordered, Aug. 12, 415;Presented, Aug. 13, 590.
 Total number in each Session 1888–1901, Return ordered, Aug. 8, 22.
 Dock Labourers
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment Bill, Debate, Aug. 13, 695.

Docks for Naval Ships

Multiplication of Docks abroad;Patching up ships only at such Docks

O. Sir J. Colomb, Aug. 14, 766.

Dockyards

Joiners' Wages

Q. Mr. E. J. C. Morton; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 8, 37; Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A.

Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 16, 1146.

Dogs

Rabies

Carmarthenshire;Date of last Case, Withdrawing Muzzling Order, proposed

Q. Mr. L. Morgan; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 9, 283.

Irish Dogs

Importation to England, Proposed Removal of Restrictions

Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. Lough; As. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 9, 302; Qs. Mr. Field, Mr. J.

Redmond, Mr. Sheehan; As. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 15, 943.

Rabies in Ireland;Number of Cases since January, 1901, etc.

Q. Mr. Duffy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 443.

Donaghmore Churchyard

Desecration of

Q. Mr. J. Redmond; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 932.

Doncaster Tithe Trust Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Donegal, County Donegal, etc.

Labourers' Cottage Schemes;Erection of Cottages, Delays, etc.

Q. Mr. Cullinan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1300.

Postal Service;Improvements Proposed

Q. Mr. O'Doherty; A. Mr. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 948.

Donelan, Capt. A. J. C. [Cork, E.]

Crown Quit Rents, Investment of Redemption Money, Aug. 8, 75.

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 824, 825.

Irish Language teaching in Irish Schools Ratifying Appointment of Mr. Coakley,
Aug. 16, 1173.

Irish-speaking Sorting Clerks, Appointment of, Aug. 16, 1184.

Re-afforestation in Ireland;Treasury Grant, Aug. 8, 66.

Doogan, Mr. P. C. [Tyrone, E.]

Mail Service;English Night Mails;De-Delay in Arrival at Kingstown, Aug. 8, 78.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers;First Commissioner of Works [Kent, St. Augustine's]

House of Commons, Bathrooms for Members;Increasing Number of, Aug. 13, 600.

Piccadilly, Widening of, Aug. 8, 55; Aug. 15, 922.

Victoria and Albert Museum;Amount Spent under first Contract, Completing

Foundations, etc., Aug. 8, 54.

Westminster Abbey, Coronation Ceremony;Removal of Screen, Aug. 15, 922.

Dover Corporation Bill

I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 8, 2.

Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 251.

Dover Harbour Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Downpatrick
 Mails;Postal Arrangements at Ardglass and Killough, Improvement of, etc.
 Q. Mr. Rentoul; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 13, 612.
 Doxford, Sir W. T. [Sunderland]
 Coal;Export Duty, Remissions, Date of Repayment, etc., Aug. 15, 909.
 Drift Survey
 Ireland;Soil Maps proposed
 Q. Mr. Field; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 13, 610.
 Dromod
 Meeting, Prohibition of by Police Sergeant
 Q. Mr. Daly; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 604.
 Dublin
 Dispensary District, North;Medical Officers' Salaries
 Q. Mr. Clancy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1301.
 Lost Property in Cabs and Cars;Sale of Unclaimed Property, Rewards for Finders, etc.
 Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1168.
 Mountjoy Convict Prison;Complaints against Principal Warder Murray
 Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 295.
 National Gallery;Report for 1900 Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 20.
 Parks and Gardens;Return Presented, Aug. 13, 589.
 Pathological Laboratory;County Councils contributing towards
 Q. Mr. W. Johnston; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 63.
 Postal Officials' Grievances
 Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 17, 1304.
 Science and Art Institutions;Report Presented, Aug. 17, 1277, 1294.
 Veterinary College;Qualifications of Students
 Q. Mr. Flavin; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1180.
 Dublin, Archbishop of
 Irish Board of Education, Resignation of Dr. Walsh, see Education;Ireland.
 Dublin Corporation Bill
 c. 2R. and Bill Withdrawn, Aug. 14, 832.
 Dublin (Equalisation of Rates) Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Dudley, Earl of;Secretary Board of Trade
 National Gallery, (Purchase of Adjacent Land) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 865, 866.
 Duffy, Mr. W. J. [Galway, S.]
 Galway Proclaimed Meeting, Aug. 15, 941.
 Kinvara Harbour, Improvement of;
 Accumulation of Sand and Mud, Aug. 12, 445.
 Receiver of Tolls taking Measures, etc., Aug. 13, 607.
 More Island;Transfer to Borrisokane Union, Application of Ratepayers, Aug. 9, 299.
 Rabies in Ireland;Number of Cases since Jan., 1901, etc., Aug. 12, 443.
 Dumbarton

Disturbances;Treatment of Rev. W. Mickimmin

Q. Mr. Caldwell; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 15, 923.

Durham, County of

Inquiry into Charities;Return presented, Aug. 12, 414.

E

Early Closing of Shops

see Shops.

East India

see India

East India (Great Indian Peninsula Railway Debentures) Bill

c. 2R.* Aug. 12, 566.

Com.* Aug 13, 724.

3R.* Aug. 14, 858.

l. 1R.* Aug. 15, 864.

2R.* and 3R.* Aug. 16, 1132

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Eastern Telegraph Company

Telegraphic Contracts in South Africa, Ascension and Sierra Leone;Agreement with H.M. Government, Aug. 13, 728.

Conclusion of Agreement without waiting for Report of Cable Committee, etc.

Q. Sir E. Sassoon; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 290.

Easton and Church Hope Railway Bill

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Edinburgh

Football in the Streets;Sentences on Boys

Q. Mr. C. Grant; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 12, 434.

Edinburgh Corporation Order Confirmation Bill

l. 3R.* Aug. 8, 3.

Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.

Education

President;Duke of Devonshire.

Vice-President;Right Hon. Sir J. E. Gorst.

Art Schools, see that title.

Attendance at School in inclement weather;Not Marking Registers, etc.

Q. Dr. Macnamara; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 13, 601.

Board of;Report for 1900–01 Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 410.

Corporal Punishment in Infant Schools, Prohibition of

Q. Dr. Macnamara; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 13, 600.

Exemptions;Illegal Exemptions granted by the Walsall School Board

Q. Mr. Flynn; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 9, 283.

Higher Grade Schools, Statistics of Higher Grade Schools conducted by School Boards;Return ordered, Aug. 14, 732; Presented, Aug. 15, 894.

Holywell Schools, Re-opening;Establishment of School Board

Q. Mr. Fenwick; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 8, 53.

Ireland

Board of National Education;Resignation of Archbishop Walsh

Memorandum of Proceedings presented, Aug. 16, 1139.

Publication of Minutes

Q. Mr. J. Redmond; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 61; Aug. 15, 927.

Books

Blackie and Co., Messrs.; Bookbinders' Society's Complaints

Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 58.

Charges against the Book Department; Resolutions of teachers, etc.

Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 293.

Memorandum of Commissioners

Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 3, 59.

Grants, Amount of School Grant, etc. 1892–3; Return Ordered and Presented, Aug. 14, 734.

Hand and Eye Training Classes; Teachers in remote Districts, Holding Special classes in Dublin in September and October, proposed

Q. Mr. Boland; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1178.

Irish Language, see that title.

Londonderry and the Education Act;

Appointment of School Attendance Committee

Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 58.

National School Teachers, see that title.

Spearstown, see that title.

Westbourne National Schools; Return of Correspondence, etc.

Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1302.

London School Board Teachers' Superannuation; Treatment of Non-Teaching Staff

Q. Mr. Flavin; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 16, 1167.

Prestatyn Board School; Erection of New School, Reconsidering Decision, etc.

Qs. Mr. Yerburgh, Mr. G. Kenyon; As. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 15, 925.

Science and Art Expenditure; Proportion Spent in Agricultural Grants

Q. Mr. Jeffreys; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 8, 53.

Scotland

Secondary and Technical Education

Report for 1901 Presented, Aug. 13, 577, 589.

Secondary Education, Organisation of; Control of Pupil Teacher Centres, etc.

Q. Mr. E. Cecil; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 8, 53.

Secondary and Technical Education

Counties and County Boroughs possessing, Constitution and Bate of Recognition by Hoard of Agriculture; Return Presented, Aug. 17, 1294.

Teachers' Tenure Bill, see that title.

Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (Barnes, etc.) Bill

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.

Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill

c. Recommitted, Aug. 8, 16.

Report from Select Committee, Aug. 9, 266.

Con.* and 3R.* Aug. 12, 409.

l. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 15, 861.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Education (No. 2) Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
Education (Scotland) Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
Egg and Butter Trade, Ireland
Irish Representative in England, proposed
Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1303.
Eglington, T.
Ex-Soldier and Postman; Pension proposed
Q. Mr. Boland; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 603.
Egypt
Barracks, Expenditure under Military Works Bill
Os. Mr. Lough, Aug. 14, 802; Mr. C. Warner, Aug. 15, 1105; Mr. J. Dillon, 1107.
Fox-hunting Incident near Mr. Blunt's Estate; Assault on British Officers by
Natives
Appeal, Date fixed for hearing
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 12, 425.
Flogging Greeks in Enclosure
Q. Sir C. Cayzer; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 15, 908.
Imprisonment of Servants, etc.
Q. Mr. Taylor; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 9, 280.
Remission of Sentence, proposed
Qs. Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Taylor, Sir C. Cayzer; As. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 8, 42.
Trade Reports Presented, Aug. 8, 4; Aug. 9, 253.
Electoral Disabilities (Military Service) Act
Extension to 1901.
Q. Mr. C. Grant; A. Sir R. Finlay, Aug. 12, 433.
Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 8) Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 9) Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 12) Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
Electric Supply Undertakings
Local Authorities and Companies; Return Presented Relating to Authorised
Undertakings, Aug. 13, 589.
Elementary School Teachers Bill
c. Bill Withdrawn, Aug. 16, 1276.
Elementary School Teachers Bill
Date of Second Reading, etc.
Q. Dr. Macnamara; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 13, 615.
Re-introducing next Session

Q. Sir A. Rollit; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 17, 1300.
 Elland Gas Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Emigration and Immigration
 Australia, Immigration; Educational Test
 Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 424.
 Ireland; Number of Emigrants in May June, and July, 1900–1
 Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 933.
 Emmott, Mr. A. [Oldham]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 556.
 Indian Income Tax; Amount collected from Incomes between Rs. 500 and 1,000, etc.,
 Aug. 8, 40.
 Endowments
 London Charitable Endowments; Return Presented, Aug. 12, 414.
 Engineers
 Cooper's Hill College, see that title.
 Enniskillen
 Boundaries; Protestant and Roman Catholic Representation on Local Bodies
 Q. Mr. Jordan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 74.
 Esmonde, Sir T. G. [Wexford, N.]
 Historical Manuscripts Commission; Irish Representative, Aug. 15, 953.
 Local Government Board, Ireland; Administration, Defects of Local Government Act,
 etc., Aug. 8, 83, 112; Aug. 9, 332.
 Records, Irish, Publication of; Proposed Irish Record Commissioner, etc., Aug. 9,
 307.
 Esquimault
 Military Works Expenditure
 O. Mr. H. Lewis, Aug. 15, 1105.
 Essex, Central Light Railway
 Order Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 18.
 Evans, Sir F. H. [Maidstone]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 696.
 Telegraphists with five years' Service; Petition for increase of Pay, Aug. 12,
 433.
 Evictions, Ireland
 Campaign Tenants, Condition of
 O'Connor, Mr. T. P., on, Aug. 15, 1051; Mr. Wyndham's Reply, 1071.
 Cappawhite; Case of T. Franklin, Failure to serve Notice, etc.
 Q. Mr. Landon; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 443.
 Executions
 see Capital Punishment.
 Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
 c. 2R.* Aug. 14, 848.
 Com. and 3R., Aug. 15, 1111.
 I. 1R., 2R., 3R.* Aug. 16, 1137.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Explosions

Boiler Explosions; Report on Working of Acts of 1882 and 1890 Presented, Aug. 8, 4, 19.

F

Factories and Workshops

Burnley Weaving Sheds, see Burnley.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill

c. Con., Aug. 12, 503.

Con. and 3R., Aug. 13, 649.

l. 2R. and 3R., Aug. 15, 866.

c. Lords Amendts., Aug. 16, 1197.

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill

Debate on Consideration, Aug. 12, 503; Consideration and Third Reading

(Commons), Aug. 13, 649; and Second Reading (Lords), Aug. 15, 866.

Accidents, Returns and Notice of 509, 510, 511.

Bakehouses, Underground; Certificate of Sanitary Fitness by existing Bakehouses, etc., 564, 565.

Defeat of the Government, 528, 868, 871, 882.

Dock Labourers, Extension of Bill to; Compensation, etc., 695, 883.

Electric Works, Application of the Act to, 715, 716.

Employees, Lists of; Date of Sending to Inspectors, etc., 701, 702.

Fire Exits and Escapes, etc., Provision of, 506, 507.

Fish Curing, etc., Trade, Exemption of, 547, 548, 549, 867.

Home Work and Domestic Workshops, 711, 712, 713, 714.

House of Lords; Introducing Bill at the End of the Session, Protest, 869, 871, 875, 880.

Laundries in Religious and Charitable Institutions, Inspection of, 650, 654, 655, 657, 659, 662, 664, 667, 668, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 677, 680, 681, 683, 687, 689, 718, 719, 868, 869, 872, 876, 878, 882.

Machinery in Motion

Cleaning under, 505, 506.

Working near, 504, 505.

Medical Officers, Position and Duties, 709, 710.

Overtime, Reduction in, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 714, 715.

Ships; Inflammable Paint, Accidents from use of, 696.

Saturday Half-holiday; Closing Textile Factories at Twelve instead of One o'clock proposed, 512, 514, 519, 520, 522, 523, 524, 526, 531, 532, 533, 534, 869.

Women and Young Persons; Employment and Double Employment Regulations, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544.

Petitions, Aug. 12, 410.

Reprinting; Distribution of Copies, etc.

Qs. Mr. Clancy, Sir C. Dilke; As. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 17, 1298.

Separating Consolidating from Amending Clauses, proposed, etc.

Qs. Sir H. Vincent, Mr. Nannetti; As. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 8, 47.

Fair, Major

Cavan Co. Local Government Inquiries; Selection of Major Fair
 Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 931.
 Partiality towards Landlords, alleged O. Mr. Reddy, Aug. 9, 333.
 Famine
 see India.
 Farrar's Estate, Ballyvarra
 Sale of Land to Tenants; Dismissal of Petition, etc.
 Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 70.
 Farrell, Mr. J. P. [Longford, N.]
 Cavan Co., Local Government Inquiries; Selection of Major Fair, Aug. 15, 931.
 O'Brien Estate; Purchase of Holdings, Aug. 15, 931.
 Fee Fund of House of Lords
 Account Presented, Aug. 13, 589.
 Fenny Compton
 Shunting Fatality, Cause of, etc.
 Q. Mr. C. Grant; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 12, 428.
 Fenwick, Mr. C. [Northumberland, Wansbeck]
 Holywell Schools, Reopening; Establishment of School Board, Aug. 8, 53.
 Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. [Manchester, N.E.]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 713.
 Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Con., Aug. 838, 840.
 Fermanagh
 Boundaries; Protestant and Roman Catholic Representation on Local Bodies
 Q. Mr. Jordan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 73.
 Electoral Divisions; Proposed Change, etc.
 Q. Mr. M'Govern; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 442.
 Field, Mr. W. [Dublin, St. Patrick]
 Army Contracts
 Ireland; Examining Samples of Articles at Arbour Bill Receiving Depôt,
 etc., Aug. 15, 902.
 Meat Contracts; Supply of Foreign Meat, Aug. 9, 274.
 Belfast Valuation Lists; City Burial Grounds, Aug. 12, 444.
 Constabulary, Royal Irish; Fund, Amount on Division into Benefit and Reward
 Branches, etc., Aug. 15, 927.
 Crown Quit Rents, Investment of Redemption Money, Aug. 8, 74.
 Dogs, Importation of Irish Dogs to England; Proposed Removal of Restrictions,
 Aug. 9, 302; Aug. 15, 943.
 Drift Survey, Ireland- Soil Maps proposed, Aug. 13, 610.
 Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 825, 826.
 Geological Survey, Ireland; Transferring Control of Work to Department of
 Agriculture proposed, Aug. 15, 953.
 Harbour Board Revenues, Ireland, Inadequacy of, etc., Aug. 8, 77.
 Indian Budget, Date of taking; Famine Commission Report, Aug. 8, 41.
 Local Government Board, Ireland
 Administration; Defects of Local Government Act, Aug. 8, 125, 128; Aug. 9, 337.
 Scientific Research, Grant proposed, Aug. 12, 444.

Lunatic Asylums; Trade Warders going on Duty after Day's Work, etc., Aug. 15, 940.
 Pacific Cable Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 630, 639.
 Post Office Savings Bank; Withdrawals exceeding Deposits, Reserve, etc., Aug. 8, 45.
 Railway Rates; Preferential Rates for Foreign Produce, Aug. 8, 47; Aug. 13, 599.
 Tuberculosis; Royal Commission, Appointment of, Aug. 15, 915.
 Fever Hospitals
 Ireland; Return Presented, Aug. 13, 578.
 Field Glasses
 South African War; Glasses captured by Boers, Compensation Claims
 Q. Mr. Goulding; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 277.
 Financial Relations between England and Ireland
 Ireland's Contribution towards the Navy
 O. Mr. T. M. Healy, Aug. 14, 768.
 Finigan and Muldowney
 Imprisonment of; Proposed Release of
 Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 72.
 Finlay, Sir R. B.; Attorney-General [Inverness Burghs]
 Colonial Acts Confirmation Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 576.
 Electoral Disabilities (Military Service) Removal Act, 1900; Extension to 1901, Aug. 12, 434.
 Marriages Legalisation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 725, 726; Aug. 14, 859.
 First Lord of the Admiralty
 Earl Selborne.
 First Lord of the Treasury
 Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.
 Fish Curing Trade
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment Bill Debate, Aug. 12, 547, 548, 549.
 Fisheries
 Clyde Mussel Beds, see Clyde.
 Cullercoats Fishery Disputes
 Q. Mr. Harris; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 911.
 Ireland
 Inspector of Fisheries; Appointment to Vacancy
 Q. Mr. Flynn; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1169.
 Mackerel Fisheries, see that title.
 Salmon Fisheries Commission; Report, Date of Issue
 Q. Mr. C. Lowther; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 12, 452.
 Fisheries (Ireland) Bill
 c. Com., Aug. 14, 822.
 Con.* and 3R.* Aug. 15, 1128.
 l. 1R., 2R., and 3R.* Aug. 16, 1137.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Fishermen
 Ireland; Labourers' Cottages Act, Administration

Os. Mr. Sheehan, Aug. 8, 95; Mr. Wyndham, 117; Q. Mr. Sheehan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 296.

Fiume

Trade Report Presented, Aug. 16, 1129.

Flannery, Sir Fortescue [Yorkshire, Shipley]

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 681.

Railway Servants;Accidents Returns Increase of Accidents, Aug. 12, 428.

Railways;Automatic Couplings, Companies Adopting, Aug. 12, 429.

Flavin, Mr. M. J. [Kerry, N.]

Cavan Court House, Right of County Council to transact business in;Action of High Sheriff, Aug. 9, 302.

Dublin Veterinary College.;Qualifications of Students, Aug. 16, 1180.

Kerry, Co.

House Valuations, Increase of, Aug. 15, 937.

Mails;Sunday Delivery in Ballyduff and Asdee, Aug. 15, 949.

Killorglin;United Irish League Meeting, Protection of Mrs. Shea, etc., Aug. 16, 1170.

Local Government Board, Ireland, Administration;Kerry County Council Officials' Salaries, etc., Aug. 8, 110.

London School Board Teachers' Superannuation;Treatment of non-teaching Staff, Aug. 16, 1167.

South African War;Vlakfontein Boers killing British Wounded, Gen. Dixon's Despatch, Aug. 15, 900.

Tara Hill, Preservation of, Aug. 13, 608.

Tipperary;Mail Service from Dublin, Delays, Aug. 15, 952.

Tralee Mails;Delay in Arrival from Limerick, Aug. 17, 1305.

Flynn, Dr.

Administration of Office as Medical Inspector of the Local Government Board, Ireland, Attack on Dr. Flynn

Debate in Com. of Supply, Aug. 8, 86, 122, 130.

Flynn, Mr. J. C. [Cork, N.]

Agrarian Offences Return;Number of Incendiary Fires, Aug. 13, 604.

Business of the House;Saturday Sitting Aug. 8, 82.

Cork and Fermoy Railway, Construction of;Correspondence between Fishguard Company and Treasury, Publication of, Aug. 9, 303.

Fishery Inspectorship;Appointment to Vacancy, Aug. 16, 1169.

Mackerel Industry and Congested Districts Board;Contract, etc., Aug. 15, 929.

Malta;Government by Order in Council, Aug. 15, 907.

Millstreet Union Labourers' Cottages;Rejection of Applications, Aug. 12, 439

National School Teachers' Salaries Roll No. 7138, District No. 52;Delay in Payment of Salary, Aug. 12, 439.

Pacific Cable Board;Entering into Contract before obtaining Sanction of Parliament, etc., Aug. 16, 1186.

Pacific Cable Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 479, 493; Com., Aug. 13, 629, 638, 644.

Public Works Loans Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 849, 851.

South African Concentration Camps, Bloemfontein;Health of Children, Medical

Officers' Report, Aug. 16, 1141.
Walsall School Board;Illegal Exemptions, Aug. 9, 283; Aug. 13, 600.
Food Preservatives
Ptomaine Poisoning by Decomposed Cream;Improper use of Preservatives
Q. Mr. Channing; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 8, 51.
Foot-and-Mouth Disease
Argentina;Proposed Removal of Restrictions
Q. Mr. Ormsby-Gore; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 16, 1159.
Football in the Street
Edinburgh, Sentences on Boys
Q. Mr. C. Grant; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 12, 434.
Foreign Jurisdiction Act, 1890
Orders in Council Presented, Aug. 12, 399, 410.
Foreign Office
Secretary of State;Marquess of Lansdowne.
Under Secretary;Visc. Cranborne.
Foreshores
Crown Rights and Interests
Bantry, see that title.
Treasury Minute directing application of Moneys, etc., Presented, Aug. 8, 6, 20.
Forestry
Afforesting in Ireland, see Ireland.
Foster, Sir Michael [London University]
Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 709.
Water Corps, Royal, Formation of;Proposals in Scientific Pamphlet, Aug. 16, 1145.
Foster, Sir Walter [Derby, Ilkeston]
Local Government Board, Ireland, Administration;Burden of work thrown on the House of Commons by the Act of 1898, etc., Aug. 9, 318.
South African War;Return of Troops, Order of Return, Aug. 9, 275.
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir H. H. [Wolverhampton, E.]
Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 806.
France
Africa, West;Purchase of Cables, Deviating so as to avoid Bathurst and Accra
Q. Sir C. Dilke; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 13, 597.
Waima Arbitration;Delays, Payments to Sufferers pending Settlement, etc.
Q. Mr. Mansfield; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 16, 1151.
Franco-German War
Belligerent Rights, see Alsace-Lorraine.
Frankfort-on-Main
Trade Report Presented, Aug. 8, 3.
Frederick, Empress of Germany
Death of;Address of Condolence to King Edward, Motion (Marquess of Salisbury), Aug. 8, 6.
King's Answer, Aug. 9, 251, 255.
"Freeman's Journal"

Correspondent in South Africa, see South African War;Censorship, etc.

French's, Col., Coonagh Estate

Sale of Land to Tenants

Q. Mr. Lunden; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 70.

Freshwater, Yarmouth, and Newport Railway Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Fugitive Offenders Act

Order in Council applying Act to South African Colonies and Protectorates

Presented, Aug. 12, 399, 411.

G

Galway

Land Purchase;Land Judges' Court Delays

Killclooney Estate, see that title.

Licensing Act Prosecution;Resident Magistrates leaving Bench, etc.

Qs. Mr. Johnston, Mr. Morris; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 62.

Proclaimed Meeting

Q. Mr. Duffy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 941.

Queen's College;Annual Report Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 413.

Gambling

Transports;Prevalence of Gambling on H.M. Transports, Case of an Officer from South Africa

Q. Mr. Mansfield; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1146.

(see also Betting.)

Gardens

see Parks and Gardens.

Gas Undertakings

Local Authorities;Return Presented, Aug. 9, 267.

"Gathorne," s.s.

Fireman, Treatment of;Inquiry

Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1157.

Genoa

Trade report Presented, Aug. 8, 3.

Geological Survey, Ireland

Transferring Control of Work to Department of Agriculture, proposed

Q. Mr. Field; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 15, 953.

Germany

Frederic, Empress, see that title.

Guns, Purchase of, for British Army, see Army;Guns.

Meyerbach, Herr, German War Correspondent;Arrest as Spy, etc.

Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 901.

Money Order Systems, German and British;Taking Money to House of Addressee, etc.

Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 286.

Tariff Bill

Raising Duty on English Imports.

Q. Mr. Crombie; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 15, 908.

Translation Presented, Aug. 15, 862, 894.

Trade Reports Presented, Aug. 8, 3.

Gibraltar

Harbour Works Scheme Inquiry

Bowles, Mr., Statement on Naval Works Bill, Aug. 14, 775.

Debate on Naval Works Bill, Aug. 14, 740, 742, 744, 755, 760, 771.

Naval Works under Works Bill of 1901, Statement (Mr. Pretyma), Aug. 14, 743.

Gilhooly, Mr. J. [Cork, Co., W.]

Bantry Bay Foreshore Rights, Aug. 8, 75; Aug. 12, 451; Aug. 13, 610.

Criminals, Arrest of Irish Criminals; County Liability for Expenses, Aug. 16, 1174.

White Estate, Bantry; Sale of Land to Tenants, Delays, Aug. 8, 62; Aug. 12, 437.

Glasgow Corporation (Tramways and General) Order Confirmation Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.

Glasgow and South-Western Railway Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

"Globe" Newspaper

Article entitled "Irish Rowdies";

Question of Parliamentary Privilege Motion (Mr. J. Redmond), Aug. 15, 955.

Attendance of Editor and Publisher at the Bar of the House, Aug. 16, 1189.

Godefroy

Boer Prisoner at St. Helena, see South African War; Prisoners.

Golborne Gas Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Gold Currency

India, see that title.

Gordon, Maj. W. Evans [Tower Hamlets, Stepney]

Army; Guns, Purchase of German Field Guns, Defects, etc., Aug. 12, 420.

Gordon, Mr. J. [Londonderry, S.]

Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Bill

Lords Amendts., Aug. 9, 260.

Gordon, Mr. J. E. [Elgin and Nairn]

India

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company; Annuities, Method of Calculating Rate of Interest, etc., Aug. 15, 904.

Financial and Economic Position, Lord G. Hamilton's Statement, Aug. 16, 1258, 1272; for Details, see India.

Gore, Mr. Ormsby [Lincoln, Gainsborough]

Argentina; Foot-and-Mouth Disease Regulations, Proposed Removal of Restrictions, Aug. 16, 1159.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. E.; Vice-President of the Board of Education [Cambridge University].

Attendance at School in Inclement Weather; Not Marking Registers, etc., Aug. 13, 601.

Corporal Punishment in Elementary Schools, Aug. 13, 601.

Drift Survey, Ireland; Soil Maps, Proposed, Aug. 13, 610.

Educational Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill Recom., Aug. 8,

16.

Elementary School Teachers' Bill; Re-introducing next Session, Aug. 17, 1300.
Holywell Schools, Re-opening;; Establishment of School Board, Aug. 8, 54.
London School Board Teachers' Superannuation; Treatment of Non-teaching Staff,
Aug. 16, 1167.

National Competition of Schools of Art, Holding at Dead Season of the Year,
etc., Aug. 9, 283.

Prestatyn Board School, Erection of New School; Reconsidering Decision, etc.,
Aug. 15, 925.

Science and Art Expenditure; Proportion Spent on Agricultural Grants, Aug. 8, 53.

Secondary Education, Organisation of; Control of Pupil Teacher Centres, Aug. 8,
53.

Walsall School Board; Illegal Exemptions, Aug. 9, 284; Aug. 13, 600.

Gosford, Lord

Walker v. Lord Gosford, see that title.

Gothenburg

Trade Report Presented, Aug. 9, 253.

Goulding, Mr. E. A. [Wilts, Devizes]

Field Glasses captured by Boers; Compensation Claims, Aug. 9, 277.

Government Laboratory

Report for 1901 with Appendices Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 411.

Grand Juries, Ireland

see Jury System.

Grant, Mr. Corrie [Warwickshire, Rugby]

Edinburgh, Football in Street; Sentences on Boys, Aug. 12, 434.

Electoral Disabilities (Military Service) Removal Act, 1900; Extension to 1901,
Aug. 12, 433.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 702.

Fenny Compton Shunting Fatality, Aug. 12, 428.

Vaccination

Conscientious Objectors; Case of W. Venables, Aug. 12, 426.

Leeds; Case of E. M. Child, Aug. 8, 52.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway

Selecting Method of Repayment by deciding on Annuities; Rate of Interest Blunder

Q. Mr. J. E. Gordon; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug 15, 904; Os. Mr. J. E. Gordon,
Aug. 16, 1258; Lord G. Hamilton, 1271.

Taking over by Indian Government, Effect of, on the Railway Account

O. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1214.

Great Southern and Western Railway

Conveyance of Irish Produce; Fish Rates

Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 65.

Great Southern and Western Railway Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Great Western Railway

Fenny Compton Shunting Fatality

Q. Mr. C. Grant; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 12, 428.

Greene, Mr. H. D. [Shrewsbury]
 Army Annual Returns; Date of Issue, Aug. 9, 278.
 Isle of Man; Public Revenue in 1900–1, etc., Aug. 9, 284.
 Naval Courts-martial; Revision of Findings, Sentences taking effect at once, etc., Aug. 8, 37.
 South African War; Courts-martial, Revision of Sentences, Sentence taking effect at once, Aug. 9, 274.
 Greenock Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
 c. 3R.* Aug. 8, 15.
 l. 1R.* Aug. 9, 252.
 3R.* Aug. 15, 861.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Greenwich Hospital and Travers Foundation
 Statement of Income and Expenditure Presented, Aug. 14, 860.
 Groves, Mr. J. G. [Salford, S.]
 Naval Manœuvres; Leave to Officers and Men, Aug. 13, 595.
 Guernsey
 Bookmakers transferring Business from Holland; Advertisements in English Newspapers, etc.
 Q. Mr. H. J. Wilson; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 15, 910.
 Gully, Rt. Hon. W. C.
 see Speaker.
 Gun Licences
 Ireland; Enforcing Act of 1870
 Q. Earl of Mayo; A. Lord Ashbourne, Aug. 8, 13.
 Gunnery Instruction
 see Navy.
 Guns
 Army, see that title.
 Gurdon, Sir Brampton [Norfolk, N.]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 667.
 H
 Hackney Union
 Beatty, Nurse, Detention as Lunatic; Guardians declining to produce papers
 Q. Mr. Bull; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 15, 910.
 Hague Conference
 Laws and Customs of War Proposals; Rights belonging to Population of Invaded Country, etc., Harcourt, Sir W. on, Aug. 15, 985.
 Terms of Convention, etc.; Laying on the Table
 Q. Mr. Cremer; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 15, 954.
 Haldane, Mr. R. B. [Haddington]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 544, 554; Aug. 13, 710.
 Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 804.
 Halsbury, Earl of; Lord Chancellor.
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 879.

Royal Declaration Bill;Protest against, Motion to Suspend Standing Order, Aug. 15, 889, 890.

Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord George;Secretary of State for India[Middlesex, Ealing] Army;Mounted Infantry, New Scheme;Cost of Accommodation, etc., Aug. 12, 424.

Bombay Land Revenue Bill, Opposition to, etc., Aug. 16, 1150.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1031.

Cooper's Hill College;Report of Board of Visitors, Presenting to Parliament, Aug. 12, 424.

Cotton Cultivation;Improving Quality of Cotton, etc., Aug. 8, 41.

Famine Commission Report;Delay in Publication, Aug. 16, 1149.

Finance

Annual Financial Statement, Aug. 16, 1199;Reply to Questions and Criticism, 1270 (for details, see India).

Death Duties, Raising Revenue by means of, proposed, Aug. 9, 279.

Financial Year;Ending on December 31, proposed, Aug. 9, 279.

Income Tax;Amount collected from Incomes between Rs. 500 and Rs. 1000 etc., Aug. 8, 41.

India Office;Auditor and Assistant Salaries, etc, Aug 15, 905.

Railways

Congestion at Howrah Goods Station, Calcutta, Aug. 16, 1150.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company, Annuities;Method of Calculating Rate of Interest, etc., Aug. 15, 904.

Rangoon, Cantonment of;Public Works Department taking over Private Houses without Paying Full Value, Aug. 15, 906.

Rhodesia, Arab Labour for, Aug. 8, 22.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. W.;President of the Board of Agriculture [Preston]

Agricultural Returns, non-agricultural area, Accounting for, etc., Aug. 15, 919.

Butter Standards Committee;Publication of Evidence, Aug. 16, 1160.

Canadian Cattle Importation, 1890–1900;Return, Aug. 15, 919.

Dogs

Irish Dogs, Importation to England, proposed Removal of Restrictions, Aug. 9, 303; Aug. 15, 943.

Rabies in Carmarthenshire;Date of last case, Withdrawing Muzzling Order proposed, Aug. 9, 283.

Foot-and-Mouth Disease, Argentina;Proposed Removal of Restrictions, Aug. 16, 1160.

Milk;Departmental Committee, Adopting Recommendations, etc., Aug. 15, 919.

Ordnance Survey

Ireland;Work in connection with Land Judge's Court;Amount received 1900–01, etc., Aug. 9, 302.

Wales;Revision of Ordnance Maps, Aug. 9, 282.

Swine Fever

Abingdon Market Outbreak;Isolation Order, Aug. 16, 1159.

Lincolnshire;Closing Markets of Spalding, etc., Aug. 16, 1161.

Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William [Monmouthshire, W.]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 978, 994, 995, 1001.

Rhodesia

Arab Labour for, Aug. 8, 24.

Native and Immigrant Labour, Regulation of, Aug. 8, 24.

South African War

Natives;Gen. Krutzinger's Threat, Instructions to Lord Kitchener, Aug. 8, 27.

Situation in South Africa;Lord Kitchener's Surrender Proclamation, etc., Aug.

15, 978, 994, 995.

(for Details, see South African War).

Hardie, Mr. Keir [Merthyr Tydvil]

Bradford Labour Dispute;Arrest of Members of Trade Union at Midnight, etc., Aug.

16, 1154.

Carnarvonshire County Council;Constitution of Sub-Committee, Aug. 8, 50.

Clyde Mussel Beds;Sub-lease to Dr. Fullerton, etc., Aug. 16, 1165.

Mackie, T.;Withdrawal of Pension, Aug. 13, 594.

Penrhyn Quarry Dispute;Military Aid to Civil Power, Aug. 8, 49.

Police;Houses of Parliament, Remuneration for late Sittings of the House, Aug.

16, 1154.

Portsmouth Dockyard Joiners' Wages;proposed Increase, Aug. 16, 1146.

Postmen;Good Conduct Stripes, Pull Time Duty for Unestablished Service; Aug. 16, 1162.

South African War

Insuring Soldiers' Lives;Officer of Royal Welsh Fusiliers, etc., Aug. 16, 1142.

Reilly, Private, Death of;Pay Arrears, etc., Aug. 16, 1143.

Woolwich Arsenal;Foremen, Proposed Pensions, etc., Aug. 16, 1144.

Hardwicke, Earl of;Under-Secretary of State for India.

Aden, Military Expedition to destroy Fort built by Turks in Haushabi Territory, Aug. 13, 585.

Harmsworth, Mr. R. L. [Caithness]

Caithness, Allotments in;Refusal of Applications, Aug. 15, 924.

Navy

Manœuvres;Report, Aug. 16, 1148.

Non-effective Warships, Striking off List, Aug. 13, 595.

Harpenden District Gas Bill

I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 8, 3.

Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 251.

Harris, Mr. F. L. [Tynemouth]

Cullercoats Fishery Dispute, Aug. 15, 911.

Harrogate Corporation Bill

c. Con.* Aug. 8, 15.

3R.* Aug. 12, 408.

I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 13, 577.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.

Harrogate Water Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Harwood, Mr. G. [Bolton]

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 505,

514, 525.

India, Cotton Cultivation;Improving Quality of Cotton, etc., Aug. 8, 41.

Haslett, Sir J. [Belfast, N.]

Public Works Loans Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 851.

Valuation (Ireland) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 822.

Hay, Mr. C. G. [Shoreditch, Hoxton]

Bristol, Muller's Orphanage;Death of L. Filer, Non-attendance of Doctor, etc., Aug. 12, 430.

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur [Walsall]

Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 796.

Headley Estate, Co. Kerry

Expediting Sale of Holdings

Q. Mr. Murphy; A. Mr. Wyndham Aug. 16, 1171.

Healy, Mr. T. M. [Louth, N.]

Alkali, etc., Works Regulation Bill Com., Aug. 14, 860.

Banagher Great Fair, Forestalling at etc., Aug. 13, 603.

Bantry Bay Foreshore Rights, Aug. 8, 75, 76; Aug. 12, 452; Aug. 15, 944.

Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Bill, Lords Amendts., Aug. 8, 14; Aug 9, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 262.

Berwickshire County Town Bill, 3R., Aug. 15, 1125.

Business of the House;Belfast Rating Bill, Aug. 8, 82.

Carlingford Lough;Overcrowding on Steam Launches, etc., Aug. 12, 451.

Clerks of the Crown and Peace, Clerks to;Holding Office during pleasure of Lord Chancellor, Aug. 15, 938.

Congested Districts Board (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 12, 573.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1093.

Cork and Fermoy Railway, Construction of

Correspondence between Fishguard Company and Treasury, Publication of, Aug. 9, 304.

Repayment of £;93,000, etc., Aug. 16, 1176.

Customs Duties (Isle of Man) Bill, Com., Aug. 12, 575, 576.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 531, 533, 542, 543, 549, 556, 562, 564; Aug. 13, 701, 702, 704, 711, 713, 714, 716, 718; Lords Amendts., Aug. 16, 1197, 1198.

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14 824, 827, 830.

"Globe" Newspaper;Article entitled "Irish Rowdies," Question of Privilege, Aug. 15, 970.

Inniskeen Postmastership;Dismissal of Fitzpatrick, etc., Aug. 12, 449; Aug. 13, 611.

Law and Justice Administration, Ireland;Evangelistic Platform at Wexford Case, Aug. 15, 1093.

Light Railways (No. 2) Bill, 2R. Aug. 14, 855.

Local Government Board, Ireland, Administration;Defects of Local Government Act, etc., Aug. 8, 102, 110, 111.

Local Government (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 836.

Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 727; Con., Aug. 14, 833.

Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 816.
Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 768, 769, 771.
Patent Law Amendment Bill, 3R., Aug. 14, 859.
Public Works Loans Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 850; 3R., Aug. 15, 1123.
Royal Declaration Bill, Postponing till next Session, Aug. 8, 80.
Royal Titles Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 622, 623.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 847.
Saturday Sitting;Blenheim Garden Party, Aug. 8, 242.
Valuation (Ireland) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 821; Aug. 15, 1126, 1128.
Watford and District Tramways Bill, 3R., Aug. 15, 892.
Heaton, Mr. J. Henniker [Canterbury]
Government Departments and Free Postage;Including Naval Store, Deptford, Aug. 9, 288.
Money Orders
German System, Aug. 9, 286.
Turkey;Charges for sending Money Orders to the United Kingdom, Aug. 9, 285.
Pacific Cable Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 486, 488, 496, 497.
Parcels Postage Rate from Turkey to United Kingdom, Aug. 9, 286.
Postage Stamps;Colour of New Penny Stamp, etc., Aug. 9, 287.
Postal Order System, Extending to Salonica, Smyrna, etc., Aug. 9, 284.
Servants' Registries at Country Post Offices proposed, Aug. 12, 430.
Telegrams, Charge Anomalies;Names of Places, Aug. 12, 431; Aug. 16, 1163.
Telegraph Service Vote;Facilities for Discussion, Aug. 9, 308.
Telephone Service, London;Negotiations with National Telephone Company, etc., Aug. 9, 287.
Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
Highlands and Islands of Scotland
Allotments
Caithness;Refusal of Applications
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 15, 924.
Ross-shire, Taking Land Compulsorily on Lease;Refusal of Application
Q. Mr. Weir; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 9, 291.
Stornoway;Refusal of Applications
Q. Mr. Weir; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 9, 291.
Hinksford Highway
Encroachment;Complaints against Seisdon Rural District Council
Q. Col. Webb; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 9, 281.
Historical Manuscripts
see title Records;Historical Manuscripts, etc.
Historical Manuscripts Commission
Irish Representative
Qs. Sir T. Esmonde; Mr. T. O'Donnell; As. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 15, 953.
Hobhouse, Mr. Charles [Bristol, E.]
Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 814.
Holywell Schools

Re-opening; Establishment of School Board

Q. Mr. Fenwick; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 8, 53.

Hong Kong

Coaling Facilities for the Navy

Statement (Mr. Pretyman), Aug. 14, 750.

Dockyard, Transferring to Kaulung

Os. Mr. Pretyman, Aug. 14, 744; Mr. E. Robertson, 756; Earl Spencer, Aug. 17, 1280; Earl of Selborne, 1284.

Home Office

Secretary of State; Rt. Hon. C. T. Ritchie.

Under Secretary; Rt. Hon. Jesse Collings.

Hope, Mr. J. Fitzalan [Sheffield, Brightside]

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 664.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 846.

Horses

Army

Purchase of Horses in Austria-Hungary, see Austria-Hungary.

Report of Committee; Witnesses from Ireland

Q. Mr. Daly; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 270.

United States, Horse Industry in; Report Presented, Aug. 9, 254.

Houldsworth, Sir W. H. [Manchester, N.W.]

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 526.

Humber Commercial Railway and Dock Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

I

Ilkeston and Heanor Water Board Bill

c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 8, 14.

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Imperialism

Opponents of the War in South Africa; Indifference to greatness of England
alleged

Bryce, Mr., on, Aug. 15, 1030.

Import Duties

Colonies; Rates Levied, etc.; Return Ordered, Aug. 9, 269; Presented, Aug. 12, 413.

Germany, see that title.

Rates of Import Duties levied in European Countries, United States and Japan on
produce and manufactures of the United Kingdom; Statement Presented, Aug. 15,
862, 894.

Imports and Exports

Exports exceeding Imports; Commercial Prosperity of the United States,

Illustration

O. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1212.

India, see that title; Trade.

Income Tax

Abatements; Establishing Claim year by year

Q. Mr. Kennedy; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 290.
 India;Amount collected from Incomes between Rs. 500 and 1,000, Raising existing Exemptions, etc.
 Q. Mr. Emmott; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 8, 40.
 Ireland;Omagh Labourers' Cottages;Income Tax Demands
 Qs. Mr. Murnaghan, Mr. Daly; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 66.
 India
 Secretary of State;Rt. Hon. Lord G. Hamilton.
 Under Secretary;Earl of Hardwicke.
 Agricultural Banks, see sub-heading Land Banks.
 Agriculture;Area under Cultivation yield per acre, etc.
 Os. Lord George Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1211; Mr. Caine, 1246.
 Army
 Expenditure;Troops Withdrawn for Service outside India, etc.
 Hamilton's, Lord George, Statement, Aug. 16, 1203.
 O. Mr. Caine, Aug. 16, 1241.
 Reduction of Establishment;Permanent Reduction
 Os. Mr. Caine, Aug. 16, 1241; Lord G. Hamilton, 1274.
 Reforms
 Additional Military Expenditure
 O. Sir M. M. Bownaggee, Aug. 16, 1226.
 Imperial Cadet Corps
 O. Sir M. M. Bownaggee, Aug. 16, 1226.
 Medical Service
 O. Sir M. M. Bownaggee, Aug. 16, 1226.
 Mounted Infantry Regiments, Cost of Accommodation, etc.
 Q. Mr. H. J. Wilson; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 12, 424.
 Bombay Land Revenue Bill, see that title.
 British Indian subjects in Colonies, Unfair Treatment
 O. Sir M. M. Bownaggee, Aug. 16, 1227.
 British Rule;Justice was the foundation of British Authority in India, and not Force
 Os. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1223; Sir M. Bownaggee, 1229.
 Burmah, see that title.
 Capital;Introduction of European Capital
 O. Sir E. Vincent, Aug. 16, 1269.
 Condition of the People
 Hamilton's, Lord G., Statement, Aug. 16, 1208.
 O. Mr. Caine, Aug. 16, 1243.
 Cotton Cultivation;Improving Quality of Cotton, etc.
 Q. Mr. Harwood; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 8, 41.
 Crop Prospects
 O. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1206.
 Currency Question
 Gold Currency Policy, Result of
 Hamilton's, Lord G., Statement, Aug. 16, 1217.

Profit on Coinage of Rupee

Hamilton's, Lord G., Statement, Aug. 16, 1204, 1218.

Total Import of Gold and Silver into India

O. Sir E. Vincent, Aug. 16, 1267.

Curzon's, Lord, Services, Appreciation of Os. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1221;

Sir M. Bhownaggee, 1225; Mr. Caine, 1237; Mr. H. Roberts, 1255.

Education

Reform of Education System, etc.,

Os. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1221; Sir M. Bhownaggee, 1234, 1236.

Technical and Industrial Education

O. Sir M. Bhownaggee, Aug. 16, 1230.

Famine Commission Report; Delay in Publication

Q. Mr. H. Roberts; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1149.

Famine

Effect of, on Finance of India

Hamilton's, Lord George, Statement, Aug. 16, 1200

O. Mr. Caine, 1238.

Grant-in-Aid Agitation in 1900; Wisdom of Resisting

Hamilton's, Lord George, Statement, Aug. 16, 1200, 1205.

Parliamentary Grant would have done much to prevent Loss of Life

Os. Mr. Caine, Aug. 16, 1242; Lord G. Hamilton, 1273.

Macdonald's, Sir A., Report

O. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1219.

Mortality

Os. Mr. Caine, Aug. 16, 1243; Lord G. Hamilton, 1274.

Preventive Schemes

Os. Mr. Caine, Aug. 16, 1245; Mr. H. Roberts, 1255; Mr. Leamy, 1264.

Finance

Annual Financial Statement (Lord George Hamilton), Aug. 16, 1199.

Death Duties, proposed

Q. Sir E. Sassoon; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 9, 279.

Increase in Expenditure; "Costliness and Folly of borrowing from Feudatory States"

O. Mr. Caine, Aug. 16 1239.

Land Assessments, see that sub-heading.

Relations between the two Exchequers

O. Lord George Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1205.

Revenue Accounts Ordered to be referred to Committee of the whole House (Lord G. Hamilton), Aug. 9, 310.

Financial Year; Ending on Dec. 31, proposed

Q. Mr. H. Roberts; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 9, 278.

Frontier Policy; New Policy

Os. Sir M. Bhownaggee, Aug. 16, 1225; Mr. H. Roberts, 1257.

Gold Currency, see sub-heading Currency Question.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway, see that title.

Income Tax; Amount collected from Incomes between Rs. 500 and 1,000, Raising

existing Exemptions, etc.

Q. Mr. Emmott; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 8, 40.

Imports and Exports, see sub-heading Trade.

Industries, Development of;Improvement in Technical and Industrial Education.

Bhownaggee, Sir M., on, Aug. 16, 1230

O. Lord G. Hamilton, 1236.

Intoxicating Liquors, Sale of;Excise Policy of Government

O. Mr. Caine, Aug. 16, 1249.

Irrigation Works, Expenditure on

Hamilton's, Lord G., Statement, Aug. 16, 1213, 1216, 1273

Os. Mr. Caine, Aug. 16, 1246; Mr. Cohen, 1252.

Land Banks, Establishment of

Qs. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1220; Sir M. Bhownaggee, 1227.

Land Assessments and the Paying Capacity of the Cultivator

Hamilton's, Lord G., Statement, Aug. 16, 1220.

Land Revenue

Bombay Code Amendment Bill

Os. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1220, 1275; Mr. Caine, 1247; Mr. H. Roberts, 1256.

Agitation against the Bill was a Money Lender's Agitation

O. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1275.

Hamilton's, Lord, G. Statement, Aug. 16, 1217.

O. Mr. Caine, Aug. 16, 1246.

Money Lender and the Land Occupier;Restrictions on Power of Alienation by Occupier, Experiment

Os. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1220, 1275; Mr. Caine, 1247.

Parliamentary Facilities for Discussion of Indian Affairs

Os. Mr. H. Roberts, Aug. 16, 1256; Mr. Leamy, 1263.

Railways

Administration Report for 1900, Presented, Aug. 12, 399, 412.

Congestion of Traffic at Howrah Goods Station, Calcutta

Q. Mr. H. Roberts; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1150.

Development of, Expenditure on Raising of Loans, etc.

Hamilton's, Lord G., Statement, Aug. 16, 1207.

Flow of British Capital into India

O. Mr. Cohen, Aug. 16, 1254.

Great Indian Peninsula Railway, see that title.

Scinde and Eastern Bengal Railways, Purchase Contract, Misinterpretation on Part of Bank of England, alleged

Os. Mr. J. E. Gordon, Aug. 16, 1262; Lord George Hamilton, 1271.

State and Guaranteed Railways Rolling Stock Material and Stores Supplied, 1896–1900;Return Ordered, Aug. 13 590, Presented Aug. 16, 1140.

Trade;Excess of Exports over Imports, etc.

Os. Lord George Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1209, 1212; Sir E. Vincent, 1268.

India Office

Auditor and Assistant;Salaries, etc.

Q. Mr. W. Jones; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 15, 905.
 Industrial Schools
 see tide Reformatories and Industrial Schools.
 Inebriate Reformatories
 Criminal Lunation transferred to Local Asylums Maintenance
 Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 8, 48.
 Inland Revenue
 Report of Commissioners for 1901 Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 411.
 Inniskeen
 Postmastership; Dismissal of Fitzpatrick, etc.
 Qs. Mr. Daly, Mr. T. M. Healy; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 448; Aug. 13, 611; Q. Mr. Daly; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1183.
 Insurance
 South African War; Insuring Soldiers' Lives, Officer of Royal Welsh Fusiliers, etc.
 Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Lord Stanley. Aug. 16, 1142.
 International Law
 Belligerent Rights, see that title, also South African War.
 Ireland
 Lord Lieutenant; Earl Cadogan.
 Chief Secretary; Rt. Hon. G. Wyndham.
 Attorney-General; Rt. Hon. J. Atkinson.
 Solicitor-General; Mr. D. P. Barton.
 Lord Chancellor; Lord Ashbourne.
 Afforesting
 Supplying Trees free of Cost to Owners of Land, Proposed
 Q. Mr. M'Govern, A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 941.
 Treasury Grant
 Q. Capt. Donelan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 66
 Agrarian Offences, Return; Incendiary Fires
 Q. Mr. Flynn; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 604.
 Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department; Return, Date of Issue, etc.
 Q. Mr. Moore; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 935.
 Antrim, Co.; Discharging Firearms
 Q. Mr. Murphy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 442.
 Ardmore Abbey Church; Preservation of Ruins
 Q. Mr. O'Shee; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 445.
 Armagh Post Office; Promotions, Special Allowances, etc.
 Q. Mr. J. Campbell; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 304.
 Army Contracts for Troops in Ireland, see Army.
 Athlone Barracks Gasworks, Use of by Private Contractor, etc.
 Q. Mr. Sullivan; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 77.
 Auditing Department; Employing Audit Office Officials permanently in Dublin
 Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 946.
 Bailieborough Rural Postmen's Pay
 Q. Mr. Crean; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12 447.

Ballyhaunis, Prosecution at; Police Interference with Witnesses, alleged
 Q. Mr. J. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1168.
 Ballymote; Arrest of J. Gilmartin by Police
 Q. Mr. O'Dowd; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 68.
 Banagher, see that title.
 Banbridge Sanitation; Compelling Urban Council to carry out Improvements
 Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. Wyndham Aug. 8, 71.
 Bantry Bay, see that title.
 Barracks, Construction of
 O. Mr. Lough, Aug. 14, 803.
 Barry's, Miss, Estate at Madrid, see Madrid.
 Beer Contracts for Curragh Camp, see title Army; Contracts.
 Belfast, see that title.
 Birds; Protection of Wild Birds
 Q. Earl of Mayo; A. Lord Ashbourne, Aug. 8, 12.
 Board of Education, see title Education; Ireland.
 Bolster, Dr., see title Shillelagh.
 Boycotting, see Names of Places.
 Brehon Laws, Publication of; Progress
 Q. Mr. Boland; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1182.
 Camolin Disturbances; Trial of Farmers by Stipendiary Magistrate, etc.
 Q. Mr. D. Sullivan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1303.
 Cappamore National School Teacher; Salary
 Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 938.
 Cappawhite Evictions; Case of T. Franklin, Failure to Serve Notice, etc.
 Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 443.
 Carden's, Sir J., Game Coverts; Mr. Bruen and others Shooting on Public Road
 Qs. Mr. K. O'Brien, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Roche; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 440.
 Carlingford Lough, Steam Launches on; Overcrowding, Complaints, etc.,
 Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 12, 451.
 Castle Cove; Rural Postman's Pay
 Q. Mr. Boland; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 447.
 Cavan, see that title.
 Census; Employment of Boy Copyists, Appointment of Female Clerk, etc.
 Qs. Mr. Nannetti; As., Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 436; Aug. 16, 1180.
 Clanricarde Estate; Dispute with Tenants, Farm remaining Empty, etc.
 O. Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Aug. 15, 1054.
 Clerks of the Crown and Peace, Clerks to; Holding Office during pleasure of Lord
 Chancellor
 Q. Mr. T. M. Healy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 938.
 Clonmel Mails, Delay in Arrival; Forwarding Mails from Thurles direct
 Q. Mr. Condon; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 79.
 Copyright Infringement Cases; Penalties in England and Ireland, etc.
 Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; A. Mr. Atkinson, Aug. 16, 1182.
 Cork and Fermoy Railway, see title Cork
 County Councils; Local Government Board Administration, Defects of Local

Government Act, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply, Aug. 8, 83; Aug. 9, 312.
County Court Valuers, see Land Commission.
Court Houses, Control of; Dispute as to the use of Court Houses
Os. Mr. Clancy, Aug. 8, 121; Mr. Rentoul, 129.
Qs. Mr. M'Govern; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 298, 301; Aug. 13, 605.
Cavan, see that title.
Dawra, see that title.
Criminals, Arrest of; County Liability for Expenses
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1174.
Crown Officials serving on Grand Juries; Mr. Knight at Monaghan, etc.
Q. Mr. P. White; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 446.
Cullen, Dr., Case of
O. Mr. T. M. Healy, Aug. 8, 107.
Curragh Camp; Beer Contract, see title Army; Contracts.
Dalkey; Proposed Revision Court
Qs. Mr. Mooney, Mr. Clancy; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 67.
Diamond National School Teacher, Mr. W. Walters; Retiring Gratuity
Q. Mr. Macartney; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 609.
Direct Labour, Employment of, on Roads, see title Roads.
Dogs, see that title.
Donaghmore Churchyard, Desecration of
Q. Mr. J. Redmond; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 932.
Donegal, see that title.
Downpatrick Mails; Postal Arrangements at Ardglass and Killough, Improvement of, etc.
Q. Mr. Rentoul; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 13, 612.
Dromod; Prohibition of Meeting by Police Sergeant, etc.
Q. Mr. Daly; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 604.
Egg and Butter Trade; Irish Representative in England proposed
Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1303.
Emigration; Number of Emigrants in May, June, and July, 1900; 1.
Q. Mr. C. O'Kelly; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 933.
Enniskillen, see that title.
Evictions, for collective heading, see that title.
Farrar's Estate, Ballyvarra; Sale of Land to Tenants, Dismissal of Petition, etc.
Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 70.
Fermanagh, see that title.
Financial Relations, see that title.
Finegan and Muldowney, Prisoners; Release of
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 72.
Fisheries, for collective heading see Fisheries.
Fishermen; Housing Rural Fishermen
Os. Mr. Sheehan, Aug. 8, 95; Mr. Wyndham, 117.
Q. Mr. Sheehan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 296.
Flynn, Dr., see Flynn.

French's, Col., Coonagh Estate;Sale of Land to Tenants
 Q. Mr. Lundo; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 70.
 Galway, see that title.
 Geological Survey;Transferring Control of Work to Department of Agriculture,
 proposed
 Q. Mr. Field; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 15, 953.
 Government Servants becoming Charge on Ratepayers;Case of T. Eglington
 Q. Mr. Boland; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 603.
 Gun Licences;Enforcement of Act of 1870
 Q. Earl of Mayo; A. Lord Ashbourne, Aug. 8, 13.
 Harbour Board Revenues, Inadequacy of, etc.
 Q. Mr. Field; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 8, 77.
 Headley Estate, Co. Kerry;Sale of Holdings
 Q. Mr. Murphy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1171.
 Historical Manuscripts, see titles Brehon Laws, Records, etc.
 Income Tax, see that title.
 Industrial Schools;for collective heading, see title Reformatories and
 Industrial Schools.
 Inniskeen, see that title.
 Joyce, Nurse, see title Shillelagh.
 Jury System, see that title.
 Kerry, see that title.
 Killclooney Estate, see that title.
 Kilkenny Magistracy;Appointment of Nationalist Magistrate
 Q. Mr. O'Mara; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 435.
 Killmaclassar District;Charges against the Police
 O. Mr. J. O'Donnell, Aug. 15, 1063.
 Killorglin United Irish League Meeting;Protection of Mrs. Shea, etc.
 Qs. Mr. Macartney, Mr. Flavin; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1170.
 Kinvara Harbour, see that title.
 Labourers' Cottages;for collective heading; see that title.
 Land Commission;for collective heading, see that title.
 Land Purchase, see that title, also Land Judges Court and Names of Estates.
 Land Question;Plan of Campaign, Condition of People on the Campaign Estates,
 Restoring to their holdings, etc.
 Debate on Appropriation Bill, Aug. 15, 1051, 1071.
 Law and Justice Administration;Charges against Constabulary, etc.
 Debate on Appropriation Bill, Aug. 15, 1055; Aug. 17, 1306.
 Leitrim, see that title.
 Light Railway, see title Railways.
 Limerick, see that title.
 Liscannor Harbour, Improvement of;Grant proposed
 Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 434.
 O. Mr. W. Redmond, Aug. 14, 792.
 Loans for Public Works, Rate of Interest;Mr. Flynn's proposed new Clause to the
 Public Works Loans Bill, Aug. 14, 849.

Loans written off Assets of Local Loans Fund 1896–1900;Return Ordered, Aug. 9, 269;Presented, Aug. 12, 412.

Local Government Hoard, for collect beading, see that title.

Local Government Elections, Publishing Notices in Local Newspapers

Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1167.

Local Government Officials, Number, etc.;Return Presented, Aug. 12, 413.

Londonderry, see that title.

Lough Foyle;Erection of Gas and Bell Buoy at Tuns Bank

Q. Mr. O'Doherty; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 945.

Louth Land Court Appeals;Hearing in Drogheda or Dundalk

Q. Mr. Nolan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 438.

Luggacurran Estate;Condition of Campaign Tenants

O. Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Aug. 15, 1053.

Lunacy;Annual Report Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 412.

Lunatic Asylums, for collective heading see that title, also Names of Places.

M'Elligott;Imprisonment for Contempt of Court

Qs. Mr. M'Govern, Mr. Dillon; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1172.

Mackerel Fisheries, see that title.

Macroom Labourers' Cottages Scheme;Application for Cottage on Mrs. Manning's Lands, etc.

Q. Mr. Sheehan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 297.

Magistrates and Justices of the Peace, for collective heading, see that title.

Mail Service, for collective heading, see title Post Office.

Malicious Injury, Claims for;Omagh, Increase in Number of Claims, Police Investigating Cases, etc.

Q. Mr. Murnaghan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 295.

Martin, Mr., County Court Valuer;Valuing Farm for Landlord, alleged

Q. Mr. E. Barry; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1173.

Medicines;Local Government Board Contracts

Q. Sir T. Esmonde, Aug. 8, 86.

Millstreet Union, see title Cork.

Monaghan, see that title.

More Island Transfer to Borrisokane Union;Application of Ratepayers

Q. Mr. Duffy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 299.

Mountjoy Convict Prison, see title Dublin.

National Gallery;Report for 1900 Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 20.

National School Teachers, for collective heading, see that title.

Naval Works, Expenditure on, in Ireland, Irish Grievance

Os. Mr. T. M. Healy, Aug. 14, 769, 816.

Navan Post Office;Suitable Premises

Q. Mr. Kennedy; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 306.

Nurses, Employment of, in Workhouses, see title Workhouses.

O'Brien Estate;Purchase of Holdings Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 931.

Omagh, see that title.

Orangemen;Attack on

Os. Mr. J. O'Donnell, Aug. 15, 1058, 1065; Mr. W. Johnston, Aug. 17, 1322.
 Belfast, see that title.
 Ordnance Survey, Work in connection with Land Judge's Court; Amount received 1900–1, etc.
 Q. Mr. Moore; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 9, 302.
 Parliamentary Representation; Inequality between Scotland and Ireland, etc.
 Q. Mr. Cochrane; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 9, 307.
 Paupers, Deportation of, from Scotland; Case of M. M'Auley
 Q. Mr. Moore; A. Mr. S. Dickson, Aug. 13, 613.
 Peace Preservation Act, 1881, Repeal proposed
 Os. Mr. O'Doherty, Aug. 15, 1112; Mr. Wyndham, 1114.
 Phibbs, Mr., see title Sligo.
 Piers and Harbours, for collective heading see that title.
 Plan of Campaign, see sub-heading Land Question.
 Poor Rate Collection; Increase in Salaries of Collectors, etc.
 O. Mr. T. M. Healy, Aug 8, 107.
 Portumna Railway, Re-equipment; Treasury Grant, proposed
 Q. Mr. Roche; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 435.
 Post Office, for collective heading see that title.
 Postmasterships; Appointment of English Officers in Ireland, etc.
 Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 78.
 Queen's College, Galway; Annual Report Presented, Aug. 12, 394, 413.
 Queen's University; Ex-Professor's Claims for Compensation for loss of Office.
 Os. Earl Spencer, Lord Ashbourne, Aug. 15, 886.
 Quit Rents, Redemption Money; Investment of
 Qs. Mr. Field, Capt. Donelan; As. Sir M. H. Beach, Aug. 8, 74.
 Rabies, see title Dogs.
 Railways, for collective heading see that title.
 Rashenny Railway Station; Erection of Goods Shed
 Q. Mr. O'Doherty; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1171.
 Rates; Grievances, Tenants of Houses rated at £;4 and under
 Q. Mr. Sheehan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 69.
 Rathkeale Mails; Delay in Arrival from Dublin.
 Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Joyce; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 449.
 Representative Peers, see that title.
 Revising Barristers, Appointment of Assistant Barristers; Political Opinions.
 Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Atkinson, Aug. 13, 609.
 Roads, for collective heading see title Roads.
 Rosscarbery Mails; Day Mail Service from Clonakilty, proposed
 Q. Mr. E. Barry; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1185.
 Royal Canal; Report of Inspector, Laying on the Table, proposed
 Q. Mr. Kennedy; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 304.
 Rural Postmen; Bank Holiday Privileges
 Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1186.
 Sale of Intoxicating Liquors Act, 1878, Omission from Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed,

Tully's, Mr., Motion, Aug. 15, 1111.
 Sallybank National School Teacher's Salary
 Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 60.
 Science and Art Institutions, Dublin; Report Presented, Aug. 17, 1277, 1294.
 Scientific Investigations; Position of County Councils
 Os. Mr. Field, Aug. 9, 338; Mr. Atkinson, 342.
 Shercock; Mail Cars leaving for Carrickmacross in time for 613 p.m. Train,
 proposed
 Q. Mr. Daly; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 949.
 Sheridan, Sergeant, see Sheridan.
 Shillelagh, see that title.
 Skibbereen Land Commission; Major Cronsedale
 Q. Mr. E. Barry; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 441.
 Sligo, see that title.
 Sneem Pier, Erection of Goods Store, etc.
 Q. Mr. Roland; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1183.
 Speerstown National School, see that title.
 Supreme Court of Judicature; Additional Rules and Schedule Presented, Aug. 8, 6,
 21.
 Surveyors; County and Assistant Surveyors, etc., Salaries, Qualifications, etc.
 Debate in Com. of Supply, Aug. 8, 88, 102; Aug. 9, 313, 326, 330, 343.
 Monaghan, Tyrone, and Wexford, see those titles.
 Surveys; Drift Survey, Soil Maps proposed
 Q. Mr. Field; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 13, 610.
 Tallaght Petty Sessions; Charge of damaging Kynoch's Property, Action of Police,
 etc.
 Q. Mr. Clancy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1302.
 Tara Hill; Prevention of Excavations
 Qs. Mr. P. White, Mr. Flavin; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 608.
 Tarbert and Kilrush Steamer, Calling at Glin, proposed
 Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 68.
 Thurles, Death from Police Violence, alleged
 Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1181.
 Tipperary, see that title.
 Tobercurry, Boycotting at
 Q. Col. M'Calmont; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 607.
 Town Tenants; Perpetuity of Tenure, etc., Legislation proposed
 Q. Mr. Sheehan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 929.
 Tralee Mails; Delay in Arrival from Limerick
 Q. Mr. Flavin; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 17, 1305.
 Trim Union Finance; Debit and Credit Balances, each Division contributing due
 Proportion, etc.
 Q. Mr. Kennedy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 298.
 Truck Act Prosecutions; Deane v. Boyle, Remission of Costs
 Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 933.
 Tyrone Assistant Surveyors; Increase of Salary

Q. Mr. Murnaghan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 292.
 Union Jack, Hauling down on Steamship "Pilot"
 Q. Mr. W. Johnston; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 446.
 United Irish League
 Meetings; Charges against the Police Debate on Appropriation Bill, Aug. 15, 1055.
 Police Interference with Meetings; Instructions to Police
 Q. Mr. Murphy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1301.
 Rhode, Meeting at; Action of Police Sergeant
 Q. Mr. Haviland-Burke; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 438.
 Shea, Mrs., Protection of
 Qs. Mr. Macartney, Mr. Flavin; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1170.
 Valuation of Property for Rating Purposes
 Belfast Valuation Lists; City Burial Grounds
 Q. Mr. Field; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 444.
 House Property in Kerry, see title Kerry; County Kerry, etc.
 Walker v. Lord Gosford, see title Land Commission.
 Walsh, Archbishop, see title Education; Ireland.
 Westbourne National Schools; Return of Correspondence, etc.
 Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1302.
 White Estate, see that title.
 Wild Birds, see sub-heading Birds.
 Workhouse Infirmaries and Fever Hospitals; Return Presented, Aug. 13, 578.
 Irish Language
 Teaching in Irish Schools
 Coakley, Mr., Ratifying Appointment of
 Q. Capt. Donelan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1173.
 Fees
 Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 57.
 Irish Parliamentary (Nationalist) Party
 "Globe" Newspaper Article entitled "Irish Rowdies," see "Globe" Newspaper.
 Isle of Man
 Public Revenue in 1900; Application of Funds
 Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 284.
 Italy
 Trade Reports Presented, Aug. 8, 3.
 J
 Jamaica
 Law; Arrest of Persons for Petty Larceny, Flogging, etc.
 Q. Sir C. Dilke; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 906.
 James of Hereford, Lord; Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 875, 877, 879, 880.
 Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 729, 730.
 Youthful Offenders Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 884.
 Jameson Raid
 Effect of, in bringing about South African War

O. Mr. Markham, Aug. 15, 1011.
Japan
Trade Reports Presented, Aug. 8, 3; Aug. 14, 731.
Jeffreys, Mr. A. F. [Hants, N.]
Burney's, Sergeant-Major, Claim; Pay Arrears, etc., Aug. 8, 31.
Science and Art Expenditure; Proportion spent on Agricultural Grants. Aug. 8, 53.
Johannesburg Refugees
see Transvaal.
Johnston, Mr. W. [Belfast, S.]
Belfast Postal Arrangements; Sunday Delivery, Aug. 9, 306.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., Aug. 17, 1310, 1322, 1324.
Dublin Pathological Laboratory, County Councils contributing towards, Aug. 8, 63.
Galway; Licensing Act Prosecution, Resident Magistrate leaving Bench, etc., Aug. 8, 62.
Justice, Ireland, Attack on Administration; Charges against Orangemen, etc., Aug. 17, 1322.
Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 727.
Pacific Cable Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 492.
"Pilot"; Hauling down Union Jack, Aug. 12, 446.
Royal Titles Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 623.
Joint Stock Companies
Return Ordered, Aug. 8, 21; Presented, Aug. 9, 267.
Jones, Mr. D. B. [Swansea District]
Transvaal Mining Leases; Lord Kitchener's Proclamation, Aug. 12, 418.
Jones, Mr. W. [Carnarvon, Arfon]
Auditor-General's Department; Total Cost, Total Sum Audited, etc., Aug. 15, 921.
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., Aug. 17, 1331.
India Office; Auditor and Assistant, Salaries, etc., Aug. 15, 905.
Penrhyn Quarry Dispute; Military Aid to Civil Authorities, Aug. 8, 50; Aug. 17, 1331, 1332.
Woods and Forests, Office of; Vote, Facilities for Discussion next Session, Aug. 16, 1187.
Jordan, Mr. J. [Fermanagh, S.]
Enniskillen Boundaries; Protestant and Roman Catholic Representation on Local Bodies, Aug. 8, 74.
Fermanagh Boundaries; Protestant and Roman Catholic Representation on Local Bodies, Aug. 8, 73.
Local Government Board (Ireland) Administration, Aug. 9, 325.
Spearstown National School struck off Roll; Teacher's Pension, Aug. 8, 64; Aug. 9, 300.
Joyce, Mr. M. (Limerick)
Butter Standards Committee; Publication of Evidence, Aug. 16, 1160.
Egg and Butter Trade, Ireland; Irish Representative in England, proposed, Aug. 17, 1303.
Limerick; Mails, Delay in Arrival, Aug. 12, 450.

Merchant Shipping

"Devon";Accident to Seaman, Aug. 16, 1158.

"Gathorne," S.S.;Death of Fireman etc., Aug. 16, 1157.

"Louisiana," S.S.;Unseaworthiness of, Jettisoning Portion of Cargo, etc., Aug. 15, 912.

"Mab";Fireman, Imprisonment of, Inquiry, etc., Aug. 15, 912.

South African War;Courts-Martial, Heavy Sentences on Minister Fusiliers, Aug. 9, 273.

Joyce, Nurse

see Shillelagh Union.

Jury System

Ireland;Grand Juries, Crown Officials on, Mr. Knight at Monaghan

Q. Mr. P. White; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 446.

K

Kearley, Mr. H. E. [Devonport]

Labourers' Wages at Naval Forts, Aug. 8, 36.

Navy

Gunnery Instruction;Capt. Scott's Method of Training, etc., Aug. 8, 40.

Ordnance Corps;Employment of Chief and Warrant Officers, Aug. 8, 40.

Victualling;Alleged Bribery, Publishing Information given before Departmental Committee, Aug. 8, 38.

Kennedy, Mr. P. J. [Westmeath, N.]

Canal, Royal, Ireland;Report of Inspector, Aug. 9, 304.

Income Tax Abatements;Establishing Claim year by year, Aug. 9, 290.

Local Government Board (Ireland) Administration, Aug. 9, 342.

Navan Post Office;Suitable Premises, Aug. 9, 306.

Trim Union Finance, Aug. 9, 298.

Kenyon, Mr. G. T. [Denbigh]

Aberystwith;"Queen Bee" Fatality, Registration of Pleasure Boats, Aug. 9, 282.

Prestatyn School Board;Erection of New School, Reconsidering decision, etc., Aug. 15, 925.

Kenyon, Mr. J. [Lancashire, Bury]

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 519.

Kerry;County Kerry, etc.

Headley's Estate, see that title.

House Valuations, Increase of,

Q. Mr. Flavin; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 937.

Land Appeals;Delays

Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 940.

Mails;Sunday Delivery in Ballyduff and Asdee

Q. Mr. Flavin; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 949.

Railway and Harbour Guarantees;Returns Presented, Aug. 12, 413.

Returns, Date of Publication

Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1179.

Keswick, Mr. W. [Surrey, Epsom]

Rangoon Cantonment;Public Works Department taking over Private Houses without

paying full value, Aug. 15, 906.
Keyham Naval Works
Statement (Mr. Pretymann) Aug. 14, 746.
Kilkenny
Magistracy; Appointment of Nationalist Magistrate
Q. Mr. O'Mara; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 435.
Killclooney Estate
Sale of Land to Tenants
Qs. Mr. Roche; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 63; Aug. 15, 926.
Killmaclassar District
Police, Charge against
O. Mr. J. O'Donnell, Aug. 15, 1063.
Killorglin
United Irish League Meeting; Protection of Mrs. Shea, etc.
Qs. Mr. Macartney, Mr. Flavin; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1170.
Kilmarnock Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
l. 3R.* Aug. 8, 3.
Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
"King of all the Britains"
Rosebery's, Lord, Suggestion with reference to the Royal Titles Bill.
Os. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 12, 456; Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, 459.
King's Speech
Prorogation of Parliament, Aug. 17, 1291.
Kinvara Harbour
Improvement of
Qs. Mr. Duffy; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 445; Aug. 13, 607.
Kirkcaldy and Dysart Water Order Confirmation Bill
l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
L
Laboratory, Government
Report for 1901 with Appendices Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 411.
Labour Department of Board of Trade
Trade Unions; Report for 1900 Presented, Aug. 14, 733.
Workmen's Co-operative Societies; Report with Statistical Tables Presented, Aug. 16, 1129, 1138.
Labour Dispute
Bradford, see that title.
Labourers' Cottages, Ireland
Cork, see that title.
Delays, Rejection of Application, System of Inspection, etc.
Debate in Com. of Supply Aug. 8, 92, 117; Aug. 9, 314, 327, 336, 339, 341.
Donegal Co.; Erection of Cottages, Delays, etc.
Q. Mr. Cullinan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1300.
Limerick; Reconsidering Applications
Q. Mr. Lunden; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 69.
Macroom Scheme; Application for Cottage on Mrs. Manning's Lands, etc.

Q. Mr. Sheehan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 297.
Omagh;Income Tax Demands
Qs. Mr. Murnaghan, Mr. Daly; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 66.
Lambert, Mr. G. [Devon, S. Molton]
South Africa Land Settlement Scheme;Expenditure, Aug. 8, 25; Aug. 9, 271.
South African War;Reinforcements, Mobile Forces, Aug. 9, 273.
Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway
Hours of Labour of Railway Servants;Excessive Hours
Os. Mr. Bill, Aug. 15, 1077; Mr. G. Balfour, 1088.
Lancaster, County of
Inquiry into Charities;Return Presented, Aug. 12, 414.
Polling Districts, Re-division;Order presented, Aug. 14, 734; Aug. 15, 863.
Land
Compulsory Acquisition for Public Works;Bills dealing with, introduced in the
House of Lords at the end of the Session;Relaxation of Standing Order, etc.
Os. Earl of Morley, Aug. 14, 730; Aug. 15, 865.
Land Commission (Ireland)
Fixing "Time Value," etc.;Return
Os. Visc. Templeton, Lord Ashbourne, Aug. 8, 11.
French's, Col., Coonagh Estate;Sale of Land to Tenants
Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 70.
Kerry Land Appeals;Delays
Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 940.
Killcloony Estate, see that title.
Louth Land Court Appeals;Hearing in Drogheda or Dundalk
Q. Mr. Nolan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 438.
O'Brien Estate
Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 931.
Returns Relative to Transactions under Land Purchase Legislation, etc.
Motion (Visc. Templetown), Aug. 13, 578.
Skibbereen;Major Cronsdales, Land Commissioner, etc.
Q. Mr. E. Barry; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 441.
Valuers;County Court Valuers, etc.,
Martin, Mr.;Valuing Farm for Landlord, alleged
Q. Mr. E. Barry; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1173.
Return Presented, Aug. 12, 413.
Test of Qualifications
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 72.
Walker v. Lord Gosford;Re-hearing
Os. Visc. Templetown, Lord Ashbourne, Aug. 8, 12.
Land Judges' Court, Ireland,
Delays in Sale of Land to Tenants, etc.,
Headley Estate, Co. Kerry;Sale of Holdings,
Q. Mr. Murphy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1171.
White Estate
Q. Mr. Gilhooly; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 437.

Farrar's Estate, Ballyvarra; Sale of Land to Tenants, Dismissal of Petition, etc.
Q. Mr. Landon; A. Mr. Wyndham Aug. 8, 70.
Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1887
Return respecting Presented, Aug. 13, 578
Land Registry
Work done under various Acts; Return Presented, Aug. 8, 20.
Land Purchase, Ireland
Compulsory Land Purchase Bill proposed; Tipperary Rent Appeals
Q. Mr. Landon; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 71.
Guarantee Fund; Allocation of Money, Return, etc.
Q. Mr. Landon; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 608.
Returns Relative to Transactions under Land Purchase Legislation, etc.
Motion (Visc. Templetown), Aug. 13, 578.
Shares of Counties in Guarantee Fund, Loans applied for, etc.; Return Presented,
Aug. 14, 734; Aug. 17, 1277.
Lansdowne, Marquess of
Irish Estate, see Luggacurran Estate.
Larceny Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
Lascars
see Seamen.
Laundries
Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, see that title.
Laurencekirk
Postmastership; Appointment to Vacancy
Q. Mr. Crombie; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 289.
Law Courts; High Court of Justice, etc.
Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland; Additional Rule and Schedule, Presented,
Aug. 8, 6, 21.
Law Officers of the Crown
Fees with reference to Earl Russell's Trial, see Russell.
Lawrence, Mr. J. [Monmouth Boroughs]
Patent Laws, Amendment of; Assimilating Laws to those of France and Germany, Aug.
15, 914.
Laws
Ancient Laws of Ireland, see Brehon Laws
Leamy, Mr. E. [Kildare, N.]
Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 664.
India, Financial and Economic Position, Lord G. Hamilton's Statement, Aug. 16,
1263 (for details, see India).
Parcels Post Delays; Obtaining Receipt for Parcels, Aug. 15, 921.
South African War; Execution of Rebels at Dordrecht, Compulsory Attendance of
Burghers, Aug. 8, 29; Aug. 16, 1142.
Lee, Mr. Arthur [Hants, Fareham]
Army Recruits; Total Number since January, 1901, etc., Aug. 9, 278.
Leeds

Vaccination;Case of E. M. Child, Inspector's Report
 Q. Mr. C. Grant; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 8, 52.
 Leeds Churches Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
 Leeds Corporation (General Powers) Bill
 c. 3R.* Aug. 8, 15.
 I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 9, 252.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Leeds Corporation Water Bill
 c. 3R.* Aug. 8, 15.
 I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 12, 397.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Legge, Col. H. [St. George's, Hanover Square]
 Army;Re-employment of Retired officers, Cavalry Officers;Outfit Allowance, Aug.
 8, 35.
 Rank and Status of Reserve Officers, Aug. 15, 903.
 Seniority and Pay, Aug. 8, 35, 36.
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 705.
 Leitrim
 Intimidation;Prosecution at Kiltyclogher Petty Sessions
 Q. Mr. O'Dowd; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1176.
 Leitrim, Earl of
 Representative Peer for Ireland, Aug. 8, 1; Aug. 9, 251.
 Leveson-Gower, Mr. F. S. [Sutherland]
 Thurso and Bettyhill Mail Car Service, Contract for, Aug. 12, 432.
 Lewis, Mr. Herbert [Flint Boroughs]
 Military Works Acts;Amount expended on Defence Works, Barracks, etc.,
 1900–1, Aug. 15, 903.
 Military Works Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1101, 1103.
 Naval Works Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1097.
 Woods and Forests, Office of;Vote, Facilities for Discussion next Session, Aug.
 16, 1187.
 Lichfield
 Rifle Range
 Q. Mr. C. Warner; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 277.
 O. Mr. C. Warner, Aug. 14, 798.
 Light Railways
 see Railways.
 Light Railways (No. 2) Bill
 c. 1R.* Aug. 13, 724.
 2R., Aug. 14, 853.
 Com and 3R., Aug. 15, 1124
 I. 1R., 2R. and 3R.* Aug. 16, 1137.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Lights and Lighthouses
 Ireland

Lough Foyle;Erection of Gas and Bell Buoy at Tuns Bank
 Q. Mr. O'Doherty; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 945.
 Sligo Bay;Lights at Bowmore, proposed
 Q. Mr. O'Dowd; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 12, 452; Q. Mr. M'Killop; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 944.
 Limerick
 Labourers' Cottages;Rejection of Applications
 Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 69.
 Poor Rate Collectors;Local Government Board requiring New Bond, etc.
 Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 930.
 Lincolnshire
 Swine Fever Outbreak;Closing Markets of Spalding, etc.
 Q. Mr. Mansfield; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 16, 1160.
 Liquor Traffic and Liquor Licensing Laws
 Alcoholic Beverages;Production and Consumption in Europe, United States, and British Colonies, Return Presented, Aug. 12, 413.
 Bolton Licensing Appeal;Non-representation of Prosecution by Counsel, etc.
 Q. Mr. C. P. Scott; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 12, 427.
 Refusal of Licences during 1900;Return Presented, Aug. 14, 734.
 Liscannor Harbour
 Improvement of;Grant proposed
 Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 434.
 O. Mr. W. Redmond, Aug. 14, 792.
 Liverpool
 Telegraphists, Promotion Grievances
 Q. Mr. T. P. O'Connor; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1164.
 Water Mains;Damage caused on Farm at Huyton, Compensation Claims
 Q. Col. Walker; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 8, 51.
 Lizard Light Railway
 Extension of Time;Order Amending Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 18.
 Llanelly Harbour Bill
 c. Report,* Aug. 8, 16.
 3R.* Aug. 12, 408.
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
 Lloyd-George, Mr. D. [Carnarvon, etc.]
 Army Expenditure, Increasing to a perilous Extent, Aug. 14, 805.
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1000, 1031, 1048; 3R., 1329.
 Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 805, 807.
 National Telephone Company;Arrangement with Government, Aug. 15, 920.
 Penrhyn Quarry Dispute;Military Aid to Civil Authority, Authority requisitioning Military, etc., Aug. 8, 49; Aug. 17, 1299, 1329.
 South African War;Rebels, Execution of;Compulsory Attendance of Burghers, Aug. 12, 418; Aug. 17, 1329.
 Situation in South Africa;Lord Kitchener's Surrender Proclamation, etc., Aug. 15, 1031;(for details, see South African War).

Loan Bill

I. 2R.* Aug. 8, 10.

3R.* Aug. 9, 254.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1289.

Loans

Written off Loans;Return showing the written off Assets of Local Loans Fund, 1896–1900, Aug. 9, 269; Aug. 12, 412.

Local Government Board

Annual Report Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 19.

Bubonic Plague;Reports and Papers on Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 20.

Report of Medical Officer for 1900–1901 Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 20.

Local Government Board, Ireland.

Administration;Defects of the Local Government Act, etc.

Debate in Com. of Supply, Aug. 8, 83; Aug. 9, 311.

Additional Cost of Additional Work, etc., 106, 108.

Advertising and Printing Expenses, 326, 327.

Asylums, Amount spent on, 87, 113.

Auditing of Accounts, Cost, etc., 87, 113.

Bagnall's, Mr., Appointment, 103.

Book-keeping, Economy in, 315, 326.

Book-keeping by County Council, New System, 101, 314, 326.

Burden of Work created for the House of Commons;System of Devolution needed, 320.

Constitution of the Local Government Board, 99.

Cork;Number of Clerks, etc., 105.

Correspondence;"Ridiculous" Amount of Correspondence, etc., 85, 106, 108.

Court Houses, Use of, Disputes, 121, 129.

Cullen, Dr., Case of, 107.

Expenditure, Increase in Rates, 86, 111, 313.

Fishermen's Dwellings, 95, 117.

Flynn, Dr.;Contracts for Medicines, etc., 86, 122, 130.

Kerry County Council, Increase in Salary of Secretary, etc., 131.

Labourers' Acts Administration, 92, 108, 117, 121, 130, 132, 314, 327.

Lunatics, Housing harmless Lunatics, 334, 339.

Minutes of County Councils' Proceedings;Demand for Copies, 85, 112.

Nurses, Employment of, in Workhouses;Employment of Nuns, proposed, etc., 87, 101, 114, 314, 322, 324, 328, 332.

Officials' Salaries, Increase in, 87.

Poor Rate Collection;Increase in Salary of Collector, 107.

Scientific Investigations, 338, 342.

Shillelagh Union, Dr. Bolster's Charges against Nurse Joyce, 122.

Surveyors, Qualifications, Salaries, Disputes, etc., 88, 102, 110, 126, 320, 326, 330, 343.

Tyrone County Council;Increase in County Surveyor's Salary, 313.

Wexford County Council;Number of Meetings, etc., 83.

Workhouses, Increase in Accommodation, 100.

Scientific Research, Grant proposed
 Q. Mr. Field; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 444.
 Local Government Elections, Ireland
 Publishing Notices in Local Newspapers
 Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1167.
 Local Government Officials, Ireland
 Number, etc.; Return Presented, Aug. 12, 413.
 Local Government (Ireland) Bill
 c. 2R.* Aug. 13, 726.
 Com., and 3R., Aug. 14, 834.
 l. 1R.* Aug. 15, 864.
 2R. and 3R. Aug. 16, 1136.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 7) Bill
 l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
 Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 11) Bill
 l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
 Local Government Provisional Orders (Housing of the Working Classes) (No. 2) Bill
 l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
 Local Government Provisional Order (Port) Bill
 l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
 Local Taxation
 England; Account 1900–1901, Return Presented, Aug. 13, 589.
 Ireland
 Limerick Poor Rate Collectors; Local Government Board requiring new Bond, etc.
 Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 934.
 Local Government Board Administration, Increase in Rates, etc.
 Debate in Com. of Supply, Aug. 8, 83.
 Peabody Buildings; Trustees refusing Offer of Southwark Borough Council to Collect Rates, etc.
 Q. Mr. Causton; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 15, 916.
 Personal Property; Contributions to Local Rates, Return
 Q. Mr. Strachey; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 15, 954.
 Foreign Countries; Return Ordered, Aug. 15, 897.
 Scotland
 Account, Return showing total payments for 1900–1901 Presented, Aug. 16, 1129, 1138.
 Return for 1899–1900 Presented, Aug. 16, 1132, 1138.
 Report of Commission
 Q. Mr. Nicol; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 9, 291.
 Local Taxation Licences
 Return Presented, Aug. 12, 411.
 Loch Leven Water Power Bill
 l. 3R.* Aug. 9, 252.
 c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 13, 588.

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
 London
 Charitable Endowments;Return Presented, Aug. 12, 414.
 Defence of, Expenditure on, &c.
 Os. Mr. Dillon, Aug. 14, 813; Aug. 15, 1099.
 Policy Abandoned
 Os. Lord Stanley, Sir J. Colomb, Aug. 15, 1099, 1100.
 Parks and Gardens;Return Presented, Aug. 13, 589.
 London Bridge
 Railway Fatality;Communication Cord out of Order
 Q. Mr. Bell; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1155.
 London County Council (General Powers) Bill
 I. Report,* Aug 8, 2.
 3R.* Aug. 12, 397.
 c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 14, 731.
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
 London County Council (Tramways and Street Widenings) Bill
 I. 3R.* Aug. 12, 397.
 c. Lords Amendts.* Aug 14, 731.
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
 London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894
 Accounts, etc.;Return Ordered, Aug. 13, 591; Presented Aug. 15, 894.
 London School Board
 Teachers' Superannuation;Treatment of non-teaching Staff
 Q. Mr. Flavin; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 16, 1167.
 London Telephone Service
 see Telephone Service
 London, Tilbury and Southend Railway Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 London United Tramways Bill
 c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 9, 265
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
 London and India Docks (New Works) Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Londonderry
 Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Bill;Mr. T. M. Healy's Objection t Lords
 Amendts., Aug. 9, 256.
 City and County Infirmary, Nurses trained in;Recognising as eligible for
 Appointments to Workhouse Infirmaryes
 Q. Mr. O'Doherty; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1172.
 Education Act;Appointment of School Attendance Committee
 Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 58.
 Railway Station;Erection of Suitable Buildings
 Q. Dr. Thompson; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 950.
 Long, Col. C. W. [Worcestershire, Evesham]
 Royal Declaration Bill;Postponing till next Session, Aug. 8, 80.

Long, Rt. Hon. Walter; President of the Local Government Board; [Bristol, S.]
Aberys with; "Queen Bee" Fatality, Registration of Pleasure Boats, Aug. 9, 282.
Bristol, Muller's Orphanage; Death of L. Filer, Non attendance of Doctor,
& c., Aug. 12, 430.
Butter Adulteration; Conviction of Messrs. Pearks & Co., & c., Aug. 15,
918.
Chatham Graveyard, Condition of, Aug. 15, 916.
Liverpool Water Mains; Compensation Claims, Aug. 8, 51.
Peabody Buildings, Rates; Trustees refusing Offer of Southwark Borough Council to
collect Rates, & c., Aug. 15, 916.
Post Office Legislation; Issue of Circular explaining Acts, & c., Aug. 9, 281.
Ptomaine Poisoning by Decomposed Cream; Improper Use of Preservatives, Aug. 8,
51.
Seisdon Rural District Council, Complaints against, & c., Aug. 9, 281.
Smallpox; Metropolitan Hospitals, Number of Cases, 1898 & 1900, Vaccination,
& c., Aug. 15, 917.
Tuberculosis; Communicability of Bovine Tuberculosis to the Human Species
Commission, Aug. 8, 52; Aug. 15, 915; Proposed Cancer Investigation, Aug. 16,
1162.
Vaccination at Leeds; Case of E. M. Child, Aug. 8, 52.
Long Eaton Gas Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
Lord Advocate for Scotland
Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.
Lord Chancellor
Earl of Halsbury.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland
Lord Ashbourne.
Lord Chief Justice of England
Baron Alverstone.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland
Earl Cadogan.
Lost Property
Dublin Cabs and Cars; Sale of Unclaimed property, Rewards for Finders, & c.
Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1168.
Lough, Mr. T. [Islington, W.]
Business of the House, Supply, Aug. 9, 309.
Cloudesley Estate Fund; Transfer to Official Trustees, etc., Aug. 16, 1166.
Dogs, Irish Dogs, Importation to England; Proposed Removal of Restrictions, Aug
9, 303.
Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 712,
717.
Light Railways (No. 2) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 855.
Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 801.
Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 758, 760, 787.
Postmen; Dismissals for Dishonesty, Aug. 9, 289.

Lough Foyle

Erection of Gas and Bell Buoy at Tuns Bank

Q. Mr. O'Doherty; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 945.

Lough Swilly Railway

Londonderry Railway Station;Erection of Suitable Buildings

Q. Dr. Thompson; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 950.

"Louisiana," s.s.

Unseaworthiness of;Jettisoning Portion of Cargo, etc.

Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 912.

Louth

Land Court Appeals;Hearing in Drogheda or Dundalk

Q. Mr. Nolan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 438.

Lowestoft Corporation Bill

I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 8, 2.

Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 251.

Lowther, Mr. Claude [Cumberland, Eskdale]

Salmon Fisheries Commission;Report, Date of Issue, Aug. 12, 452.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. James [Kent, Thanet]

Piccadilly, Widening, Aug. 8, 55.

Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W.;Chairman of Committees [Cumberland, Penrith]

Bills;Amendments in the wrong place, Aug. 14, 822.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Resolution;Discussion on, Aug. 8, 241, 242, 243.

Irrelevant Observations, Aug. 15, 1106.

Supply;Procedure under New Closure Rule

Alteration in Method of Putting the Question, Aug. 8, 140, 145, 146.

Including Votes which had not been submitted for consideration in Committee of Supply;"Submitted for Consideration" did not mean "Proposed from the Chair," etc. Aug. 8, 159, 160, 161, 162.

Watford and District Tramways Bill, 3R., Aug. 15, 891, 893.

Luggarcurran Estate

Campaign Tenants, Condition of

O. Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Aug. 15, 1053.

Lunacy (Ireland) Bill

c. 2R.* Aug. 12, 574.

Com., Aug. 13, 727.

Con. and 3R., Aug. 14, 832.

I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 15, 890.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Lunacy, Ireland

Expenses, Com., Aug. 12, 575;Resolution Reported, Aug. 13, 726.

Lunatics and Lunatic Asylums

Criminal Lunatics from Inebriate Reformatories;Maintenance

Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 8, 48.

Ireland

Annual Report Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 412.

Housing of Harmless Lunatics

Os. Mr. O'Shee, Aug. 9, 334; Mr. Field, 339.

Local Government Board Administration

Debate in Com. of Supply, Aug. 8, 87.

Trade Warders going on Duty after Day's Work, etc.

Qs. Dr. Thompson, Mr. Field; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 940.

Scotland

Annual Report of Commissioners Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 411.

London, Mr. W. [Limerick, E.]

Cappamore National School Teacher; Salary, Aug. 15, 938.

Cappawhite Evictions; Case of T. Franklin, Failure to Serve Notice, etc., Aug. 12, 443.

Farrar's Estate, Ballyvarra; Sale of Land to Tenants, Dismissal of Petition, etc., Aug. 8, 70.

French's, Col., Coonagh Estate; Sale of Land to Tenants, Aug. 8, 70.

Land Purchase, Ireland; Guarantee Fund, Allocation of Money, Return, Aug. 13, 608.

Limerick Labourers' Cottages; Rejection of Applications, Aug. 8, 69.

Roads; Direct Labour, Provisional Order, etc., Aug. 15, 940.

Sheridan, Sergeant, Dismissal of; Arrest of Bray and Murphy, compensation, Aug. 16, 1174.

Tipperary Rent Appeals; Compulsory Land Purchase Bill, proposed, Aug. 8, 71.

Lurgan, Lord

Took the Oath, Aug. 13, 577.

M

"Mab," s.s.

Fireman, Imprisonment of; Inquiry

Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 912.

Steward assaulted by Master; Refusal to allow Steward to make complaint to H.M. Consul, etc.

Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1156.

McArthur, Mr. C. [Liverpool, Exchange]

Bishopric of Southwark Bill, Facilitating Progress of, etc., Aug. 13, 614.

Church Discipline Bill, Facilitating Progress of, Aug. 13, 614.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 695, 704, 705.

Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. E. [Antrim, S.]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1074.

Diamond National School Teacher, Mr. Walters; Retiring gratuity, Aug. 13, 609.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 692, 718, 719.

Killorglin United Irish League Meeting; Protection of Mrs. Shea, etc., Aug. 16, 1170.

Labourers' Cottages, Ireland; Administration of Acts by the Local Government Board, Aug. 9, 316.

National Teachers, Ireland; Residual Grant Grievance, Aug. 15, 1074.

Queen's College, Belfast; Appointment of Professors, Limited Period of
 Appointment, Aug. 15, 1074.
 McCalmont, Col. J. [Antrim, E.]
 Tobercurry, Boycotting at, Aug. 13, 607.
 M'Elligott
 Imprisonment for Contempt of Court
 Qs. Mr. M'Govern, Mr. Dillon; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug 16, 1172.
 M'Govern, Mr. T. [Cavan, W.]
 Afforesting, Ireland; Supplying Trees free of Cost to Owners of Land, proposed,
 Aug. 15, 941.
 Cavan Court House, Right of County Council to transact Business in; Action of
 High Sheriff, Aug. 9, 301; Aug. 13, 605.
 Cavan and Leitrim Railway Company; Post Office Subsidy for Conveyance of Mails,
 Aug. 15, 952.
 Dawra Court House; Right of District Council to use, &c., Aug. 9, 298.
 Fermanagh Electoral Divisions; Proposed Change, etc., Aug. 12, 442.
 M'Elligott; Imprisonment for Contempt of Court, Aug. 16, 1172.
 M'Gowan, W.
 Destitute Army Veteran; Pension Claim
 Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 422.
 Machinery
 Cleaning Machinery in Motion, etc.; Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment Bill
 Debate, Aug. 12, 504, 505, 506.
 McKenna, Mr. R. [Monmouth, N.]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 670,
 671, 674.
 South African War; Execution of Rebels, Compulsory Attendance of Burghers, Aug.
 9, 273.
 Mackerel Industry, Ireland
 Congested Districts Board; Contract Price per 100 in 1899–1901, etc.
 Qs. Mr. Flynn; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 929, 930.
 Mackie, T., Private
 Army Pension, Withdrawal of
 Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 13, 594.
 M'Killop, Mr. W. [Sligo, N.]
 Sligo Harbour; Lights at Bowmore, Establishment of, proposed, Aug. 15, 944.
 Macnamara, Dr. T. J. [Camberwell, N.]
 Education
 Attendance at School in Inclement Weather; Not marking Register, etc., Aug. 13,
 601.
 Corporal Punishment in Elementary Schools, Aug. 13, 600.
 Elementary School Teachers Bill; Date of Second Reading, etc., Aug. 13, 615.
 Education Board Provisional Orders Confirmation (London) Bill, Recom. Aug. 8,
 16.
 Teachers' Tenure Bill, Facilitating Progress of, Aug. 9, 308.
 MacNeill, Mr. Swift [Donegal, S.]

Chairman's Rulings, Questioning, Aug. 9, 365.
Copyright Infringement Cases;Penalties in England and Ireland, etc., Aug. 16, 1182.
M'Gowan, W., Destitute Veteran;Pension Claim, Aug. 12, 422.
Royal Titles Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 460.
South African War
Censorship;"Freeman's Journal," Seizure of Correspondents' Manuscripts, etc., Aug. 12, 419; Aug. 16, 1140.
German War Correspondent, Arrest of, as Spy, etc., Aug. 15, 901.
Rebels, Execution of;Compulsory Attendance of Burghers, Aug. 8, 29, 31.
Surrender, etc.;Lord Kitchener's Proclamation, Facilities for Moving Resolution, etc., Aug. 13, 593.
Supply, Procedure under New Closure Rule;Including Votes which have not been submitted for Consideration in Com. of Supply, etc., Aug. 8, 161, 162.
Truck Act Prosecutions;Deane v. Boyle, Remittance of Costs, Aug. 15, 933.
Macroom
Labourers' Cottages Scheme;Application for Cottage on Mrs. Manning's Land, etc. Q. Mr. Sheehan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 297.
Madrid
Irish Lady's Estate;Communications with Sir M. Durand, etc.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 15, 946; Aug. 16, 1152; Aug. 17, 1297.
Magazines
Naval Expenditure on
O. Mr. Pretyman, Aug. 14, 747.
Magistrates
Ireland;Appointment of Nationalist Magistrate at Kilkenny
Q. Mr. O'Mara; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 435.
Magoohan, D.
Conviction on Evidence of Sergeant Sheridan;Inquiry
Q. Mr. Tully; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 943.
Majendie, Mr. J. H. A. [Portsmouth]
Prize Money, Unclaimed;List of Claimants, Aug. 16, 1147.
Malcolm, Mr. Ian [Suffolk, Stowmarket]
Piccadilly, Widening, Aug. 8, 54; Aug. 15, 922, 923.
Malicious Injury, Ireland
see Ireland.
Malta
Annual Report Presented, Aug. 15, 863, 894.
Breakwater Construction
Os. Earl Spencer, Lord Selborne, Aug. 17, 1280, 1283.
Naval Works Bill Debate, Aug. 14, 747, 757, 761, 765, 767.
British Flag, Hauling down, etc.
Q. Mr. P. O. Brien; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 907.
Language;English Language Agitation
Os. Mr. Boland, Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 17, 1336.

Political Situation

Petition of Members of Council for Commission of Inquiry, Aug. 13, 588

Qs. Mr. Boland, Mr. Flynn; As. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 907; Q. Mr. Boland;

A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 17, 1296

Manchester Corporation Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Manchester and Liverpool Electric Express Railway Bill

c. 3R.* Aug. 9, 265.

I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 13, 577.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.

Manœuvres

Navy, see that title.

Mansfield, Mr. H. [Lincoln, Spalding]

Gambling on H.M. Transports, Aug. 16, 1146.

Swine Fever

Abingdon Market Outbreak;Isolation Order, Aug. 16, 1159.

Closing Spalding Markets, etc., Aug. 16, 1160.

"Victoria and Albert";Return to Portsmouth, Defects, etc., Aug. 13, 596.

Volunteers, Camp Training;Increasing Grants, Aug. 12, 422.

Waima Arbitration;Delays, etc., Aug. 16, 1151.

Maple, Sir J. B. [Camberwell, Dulwich]

Army Horses, Purchase in Austria-Hungary;Inquiry, etc., Aug. 18, 36.

Markham, Mr. A. B. [Notts, Mansfield]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R. Aug. 15, 1008.

South African War, Situation in South Africa;Lord Kitchener's Surrender

Proclamation, etc., Aug. 15, 1008;for details, see South African War.

Marriages

Registrar-General's Report, see title Births, Marriages and Deaths.

Marriages Legislation Bill

c. Com.* Aug. 12, 574; Aug. 13, 725.

Report, Aug. 14, 859.

Con.* and 3R.* Aug. 15, 1125.

I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 16, 1137.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Martin, Mr.

County Court Valuer;Valuing Farm for Landlord, alleged.

Q. Mr. E. Barry; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1173.

Massey-Mainwaring, Mr. W. F. [Finsbury, Central]

Victoria and Albert Museum;Amount spent under first Contract, Completing

Foundations, etc., Aug. 8, 54.

Mayo, Co.

Constabulary, Royal Irish, Charges against O. Mr. J. O'Donnell, Aug. 15, 1060.

Mayo, Earl of

Birds;Protection of Wild Birds in Ireland, Aug. 8, 12.

Gun Licences (Ireland);Enforcement of Act of 1870, Aug. 8, 13.

Measures

see Weights and Measures

Meat

Army Contracts

Supply of Foreign Meat

Qs. Mr. Spear, Mr. Field; As. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 274.

Supply of Meat to Troops in South Africa, see South African War; Meat.

Mellon, H.

Under-age Recruit in South Africa; Punishment for Sleeping on Duty

Q. Mr. E. Robertson; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 420.

Members of Parliament

Names of Members returned to Parliament from 1885 to 1900; Return Ordered, Aug. 13, 591; Presented, Aug. 16, 1138.

Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 13, 599.

Merchant Shipping Service

Absent without Leave; Case of W. Morrison

Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 8, 46.

Accident to Seaman on the "Devon"

Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1158.

Ballasting of Ships; Issue of Circular

Q. Mr. C. Allen; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 914.

Casualties on, or near Coasts, or in Rivers and Harbours of the United Kingdom, etc.; Abstract of Returns Presented, Aug. 15, 862, 894.

Committee, Appointment of

Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 12, 427.

Compensation for Injuries and Loss of Life at Sea; Loss of the "Primrose Hill"
see "Primrose Hill."

Desertions, Number of, etc.; Return Ordered, Aug. 8, 21; Presented, Aug. 16, 1138.

Detention of Ships as unsafe or by reason of Defective Condition; Return Ordered, Aug. 8, 4, 19.

Food, Insufficient Rations; "Colony," Case of J. M'Donald

Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1155.

Orient Line; Conduct of Stokers, etc., see Orient.

Treatment of Crews

"Ancona"

Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1157.

"Gathorne"

Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1157.

Imprisonment of Firemen on the "Mab"

Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 912.

"Mab"; Steward assaulted by Master, Refusal to allow Steward to make complaint to H.M. Consul, etc.

Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1156.

Unseaworthy Ships, alleged; "Louisiana"

Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 912.

(see also Seamen)

Merchant Shipping (Foreign Ships) Bill

I. 1R.* Aug. 16, 1132.
 Metropolitan District Railway Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Metropolitan Electric Supply Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Metropolitan Hospitals
 Small-pox Hospitals;Number of Cases, 1898–1900, Vaccination, etc.
 Q. Mr. Cremer; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 15, 917.
 Metropolitan Police
 Houses of Parliament Police;Remuneration for Late Sittings of the House
 Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 16, 1154.
 Westminster Roman Catholic Procession;Police Protection
 Q. Col. Sandys; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 15, 597.
 Mexican War
 Guerilla Warfare
 O. Sir C. Dilke, Aug. 15, 1005.
 Mexico
 Trade Report Presented, Aug. 14, 731.
 Meyerbach, Herr
 German War Correspondent;Arrest of, as Spy in South Africa, etc.
 Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 901.
 Mildmay, Mr. F. B. [Devon, Totnes]
 Johannesburg Refugee Owners of House Property;Exemption from Rent, etc., during enforced absence, Aug. 8, 25.
 Military Works Act
 Amount expended on Defence Works, Barracks, etc., 1900–1
 Q. Mr. H. Lewis; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 903 (see also Army;Expenditure)
 Military Works Bill
 c. 2R., Aug. 14, 795.
 Com., Aug. 15, 1098.
 3R.* Aug. 16, 1276.
 I. 1R., 2R., and 3R.* Aug. 17, 1278.
 Royal Assent, Aug 17, 190.
 Military Works Bill
 Bringing on at the end of the Session
 Os. Sir J. Colomb, Aug. 14, 799; Mr. Lough, 801; Sir H. Fowler, 808.
 Militia
 Recruits;Number raised in 1901
 Q. Mr. A. Lee; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 278.
 Regulations relating to, Presented, Aug. 15, 863.
 Returned Militia from South Africa;Pay and Gratuity
 Q. Mr. Cochrane; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 276.
 Militia and Yeomanry Bill
 I. 3R.* Aug. 8, 10.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Milk

Departmental Committee; Adopting Recommendations, etc.
Q. Mr. Strachey; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 15, 919.
Millstreet Union
Labourers' Cottages, see Cork.
Milner, Lord
South African Policy
Os. Mr. Markham, Aug. 15, 1010; Mr. Pirie, 1015.
Mines
Accidents, Persons employed, etc.; General Report and Statistics Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 411.
General Report and Statistics for 1900 Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 411.
Mombasa-Victoria Railway
see Uganda Railway
Monaghan
Assistant County Surveyors; Appointment of Deputies etc.
Qs. Mr. Daly; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 294; Aug. 15, 936.
Assizes; Crown Officials on Irish Grand Juries, Case of Mr. Knight
Q. Mr. P. White; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 446.
Mond Gas Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 251.
Money Orders
German and British Systems; Taking Money to Houses of Addressees
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 286.
Turkey, see that title
Montgomery, County of
Inquiry into Charities; Return Presented, Aug. 12, 414.
Moon, Mr. E. R. P. [St. Pancras, N.]
Volunteers; Hardship of attending Camp, Aug. 17, 1334.
Mooney, Mr. J. J. [Dublin Co., S.]
Dalkey; Revision Court, proposed, Aug. 8, 67.
Moore, Mr. W. [Antrim, N.]
Agricultural Board (Ireland); Return, Date of Issue, etc., Aug. 15, 935.
Butter Adulteration; Conviction of Messrs. Pearks & Co., etc., Aug. 15, 918.
Local Government Board, Ireland; Administration, Housing of the Labouring
Classes; Complaints against Sanitary Authorities, etc., Aug. 8, 98.
National School Teachers, Classes for Teachers; Claims for Travelling Expenses,
Aug. 16, 1178.
Ordnance Survey, Ireland; Amount received for work in connection with Land
Judges' Court, etc., Aug. 9, 302.
Paupers, Deportation from Scotland to Ireland; Case of M. M'Auley, Aug. 13, 613.
Moore, Mr. R. J. [Shropshire, Ludlow]
Tuberculosis; Communicability of Bovine Tuberculosis to the Human Species,
Commission; Proposed Cancer Investigation, Aug. 16, 1161.
More Island
Transfer to Borrisokane Union, Application of Ratepayers, etc.
Q. Mr. Duffy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 299.

Morgan, Mr. J. L. [Carmarthen, W.]
 Carmarthenshire Postal Arrangements; Daily Delivery in Breclifa, etc., proposed, Aug. 12, 432.
 Ordnance Survey, Wales; Revision of Ordnance Maps, Aug. 9, 282.
 Rabies in Carmarthenshire; Date of last case, Withdrawing Muzzling Order proposed, Aug. 9, 283.
 Morley, Earl of; Chairman of Committees
 National Gallery (Purchase of Adjacent Land) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 865.
 Parliamentary Procedure; Compulsory taking of Land for constructing Works, Time allowed for lodging Petitions; Relaxation of Standing Order, Aug. 14, 730; Aug. 15, 865.
 Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 730.
 Private Bills; Amendment of Standing Orders, Aug. 8, 3.
 Morris, Mr. M. H. F. [Galway]
 Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 824.
 Galway, Licensing Act Prosecution, Aug. 8, 63.
 Morton, Mr. E. J. C. [Devonport]
 Dockyards; Joiners' Wages, Aug. 8, 37.
 Moss, Mr. S. [Denbighshire, E.]
 Light Railways (No. 2) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 857.
 Mountjoy Convict Prison
 Murray, Principal Warder, Complaints against
 Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 295.
 Muller's Orphanage
 see Bristol.
 Munster Fusiliers
 Court; Martial in South Africa; Heavy Sentences
 Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 273.
 Murnaghan, Mr. G. [Tyrone, Mid]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 703.
 Local Government Board, Ireland, Administration; Assistant Surveyors, Increase in Salaries, etc., Aug. 9, 320
 Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 832, 833.
 Omagh
 Claims for Malicious Injury, Increase in Number, etc., Aug. 9, 295.
 Labourers' Cottages; Income Tax Demands, Aug. 8, 66.
 Tyrone Assistant Surveyors; Increase of Salary, Aug. 9, 292.
 Murphy, Mr. J. [Kerry, E.]
 Antrim Co.; Discharging Firearms, Aug. 12, 442.
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., Aug. 17, 1336.
 Headley Estate, Co. Kerry; Sale of Holdings, Aug. 16, 1171.
 Labourers' Acts, Ireland, Administration; Delay in Carrying out Schemes, etc., Aug. 17, 1335.
 Local Government Board, Ireland, Administration; Attack on Dr. Flynn, etc., Aug. 8, 129.
 United Irish League; Police Interference with Meetings, Aug. 17, 1301.

Murray, Right Hon. A. G.; Lord Advocate [Buteshire]

Allotments:

Caithness; Refusal of Applications, Aug. 15, 924.

Ross-shire; Taking Land compulsorily on Lease, Refusal of Application, Aug. 9, 292.

Stornoway; Refusal of Applications Aug. 9, 291.

Berwickshire County Town Bill, 3R. Aug. 15, 1125, 1126.

Clyde Mussel Beds; Sub-lease to Dr. Fullerton, etc., Aug. 16, 1166.

Dumbarton Disturbances; Treatment of Rev. W. Mickimmin, Aug. 15, 923.

Edinburgh, Football in Streets; Sentences on Boys, Aug. 12, 434.

Local Taxation; Report of Commission. Aug. 9, 291.

Mussel Beds

Clyde Beds, Sub-lease to Dr. Fullerton; Submitting to Town Councils for approval, etc.,

Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 16, 1165.

N

Nannetti, Mr. J. P. [Dublin, College Green]

Army Contracts and Irish Firms; Allotting to Ireland a fair Proportion of Contracts for Supplies, etc., Aug. 15, 902; Aug. 17, 1332, 1335.

Books for National Schools; Bookbinders' Society's Complaints, Aug. 8, 58.

Burnley Weaving Sheds; Operatives' Wages, Deductions for Oiling Machinery, Aug. 13, 598.

Census, Ireland; Employment of Boy Copyists, Appointment of Female Clerk, etc., Aug. 12, 436; Aug. 16, 1180.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., Aug. 17, 1333, 1336.

Dublin

Lost Property in Cabs and Cars; Sale of Unclaimed Property, Rewards for Finders, Aug. 16, 1168.

Mountjoy Convict Prison; Complaints against Principal Warder Murray, Aug. 9, 295.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Aug. 8, 48; Con., Aug. 13, 703.

Merchant Shipping

"Ancona"; Treatment of Crew, Aug. 16, 1157.

"Mab," S.S.; Steward assaulted by Master, etc., Aug. 16, 1156.

"Numidian" S.S.; Arrest of W. Morrison at Montreal, Pay, etc., Aug. 8, 46.

National Competition of Schools of Art

Holding at dead Season of the Year, etc.,

Q. Mr. Peel; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 9, 283.

National Debt

Aggregate Gross Liabilities and Gross and Net Expenditure Annually; Return Presented, Aug 12, 412.

National Gallery

Ireland; Report for 1900 Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 20.

Purchase of Adjacent Land, Expenses; Resolution Reported, Aug. 12, 574.

National Gallery (Purchase of Adjacent Land) Bill

c. Com.* Aug. 12, 574.

l. 1R.* Aug. 13, 587.
 2R. and 3R., Aug. 15, 865.
 c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 16, 1188.
 l. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 National School Teachers Ireland
 Classes for Teachers; Claims for Travelling Expenses
 Q. Mr. Moore; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1178.
 Residual Grant
 O. Mr. Macartney, Aug. 15, 1074.
 Balance of Grant, Payment of
 Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 57.
 Chartered Accountants, Appointment of, proposed
 Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1179.
 Retiring Gratuity, Diamond School; Mr. W. Walters
 Q. Mr. Macartney; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 609.
 Salaries
 Cappamore Teacher
 Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 938.
 Roll No. 7138, District No. 52; Delay in Payment of Salary
 Q. Mr. Flynn; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 439.
 Sallybank Teacher
 Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 60.
 School No. 7245, District 46; Dispute between Local Manager and Teacher
 Q. Mr. Cullinan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 444.
 National Telephone Company
 Negotiations with Post Office as to London Telephone Service, etc.
 Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 287; Q. Mr. Lloyd-George; A.
 Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 920.
 Natives
 Employment of, in Warfare, see South African War.
 Naval Ports
 War Office Labourers' Wages
 Q. Mr. Kearley; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 36.
 Naval Works Bill
 c. 2R., Aug. 14, 735.
 Com. and Report, Aug. 15, 1097.
 3R.* Aug. 16, 1276.
 l. 1R. and 2R. and 3R., Aug. 17, 1278.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Naval Works Bill
 Bringing on at the end of the Session
 Os. Mr. E. Robertson, Aug. 14, 752; Sir C. Dilke, 786; Earl Spencer, Aug. 17,
 1278; Earl of Selborne, 1281; Lord Tweedmouth, 1286; Lord Ashbourne, 1288.
 (for details as to Work, etc., see titles Coaling Facilities, Gibraltar, etc.)
 Navan
 Post Office; Suitable Premises

Q. Mr. Kennedy; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 306.

Navy

First Lord; Earl of Selborne.

Secretary; Mr. H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Civil Lord; Mr. E. G. Pretyman.

Barracks, Policy of Constructing, etc.

O. Sir J. Colomb, Aug. 14, 767.

Brick-and-Mortar Policy

O. Mr. G. Bowles, Aug. 14, 775.

China, Naval Forces in; Issue of Medals and Clasps

Q. Sir J. Colomb; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 15, 904.

Coaling Stations and Coaling Facilities, see those titles.

Contracts, Sub-letting Contracts; Informing Government of Conditions

Q. Mr. Broadhurst; A. Mr. Pretyman, Aug. 8, 38.

Courts-Martial

Number held and Punishments inflicted in 1900; Return Presented, Aug. 8, 20; Aug. 9, 253.

Revision of Findings, Sentences taking Effect at once, etc.

Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 8, 37.

Deptford Naval Store; Correspondence free of Postage, proposed

Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 288.

Docks and Dockyards, see those titles; also Names of Docks and Dockyards.

Expenditure

Application of Surplus to meet Excesses, Com., Aug. 8, 187; Report, Aug. 9, 389; Aug. 12, 567.

Discussing in Com. what was understood to be a formal matter

O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 8, 190.

Colonial Contributions

Os. Mr. T. M. Healy, Sir J. Colomb, Aug. 14, 768, 769.

Naval Works; Finance Policy, Ways and Means, &c.

Balance Sheet

O. Mr. E. Robertson, Aug. 14, 752.

Debate on Naval Works Bill, Aug. 14, 735, 737, 752, 759, 768.

Loans and Votes, Distinction between

Os. Mr. Pretyman, Aug. 14, 737; Mr. T. M. Healy 768; Mr. G. Bowles, 773, Sir H. Fowler, 806; Mr. Dillon, 811.

Memorandum; Total Estimated Expenditure, etc.

O. Mr. E. Robertson, Aug. 14; 752.

Statement of Accounts, 1895–1901

Q. Mr. O'Mara; A. Mr. Pretyman, Aug. 13, 597.

Greenwich Hospital and Travers Foundation; Statement of Income and Expenditure Presented, Aug. 14, 860.

Gunnery Instruction; Capt. Scott's Method of Training, etc.

Q. Mr. Kearley; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 8, 40.

Health of the Navy; Statistical Report for 1900 Presented, Aug. 8, 20; Aug. 9, 253.

Ireland;Expenditure on Naval Works, see Ireland.
Manœuvres
Leave for Officers and Men
Q. Mr. Groves; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 13, 595.
Press Correspondents;Refusal to allow Correspondents to be present.
Q. Col. Sandys; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 16, 1147.
Report;Including Statement of Claims referred to Umpires, etc.
Qs. Mr. Yerburgh, Mr. Harmsworth; As. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 16, 1148.
Ordnance Corps;Employment of Chief and Warrant Officers
Q. Mr. Kearley; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 8, 40.
Prize Money, Unclaimed;List of Claimants
Q. Mr. Majendie; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 16, 1147.
Account Presented, Aug. 8, 21; Aug. 9, 254.
Rations, see subheading Victualling.
Savings Banks;Deposits, etc., Accounts Presented, Aug. 8, 20; Aug. 9, 254.
Ships
Colours for Battleships;Experiments with Grey Paints
Q. Sir C. Dilke; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 12, 423.
Non-effective Warships, Striking off List
Q. Mr. Harmsworth; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 13, 595.
Torpedo Panic and the "Brick and Mortar" Naval Works Policy
O. Mr. G. Bowles, Aug. 14, 775.
"Victoria and Albert," see that title.
Victualling Rations, Meal Hours, etc., Committee
Bribery, alleged;Publishing Evidence given before Departmental Committee
Q. Mr. Kearley; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 8, 38.
Report of Committee, Presented, Aug. 15, 863, 895.
Works, Expenditure on, etc., see Sub-heading Expenditure, also Naval Works Bill.
Navy Estimates
Votes taken in Classes under New Closure Rule, Com., Aug. 8, 173; Report, Aug. 9, 375.
Nelson Light Railways
Order Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 17.
New Writ
Hants, County (Western or Andover Division), Aug. 9, 255.
Newport (Isle of Wight) Gas Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
Newspapers
"Freeman's Journal," see that title.
"Globe" Newspaper, see that title.
Naval Manœuvres;Refusal to allow Correspondents to be present
Q. Col. Sandys; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 16, 1147.
South African War;Press Censorship, see South African War;Censorship.
Nicol, Mr. D. N. [Argyll]
Local Taxation, Scotland;Report of Commission, Aug. 9, 291.
Nicaragua Canal

Clayton-Bulwer Treaty;Reply to Lord Lansdowne's Despatch, etc.
 Q. Mr. Perks; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 15, 909.
 Nolan, Col. J. P. [Galway, N.]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendments Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 713.
 Nolan, Mr. J. [Louth, S.]
 Louth Land Court Appeals;Hearing in Drogheda or Dundalk, Aug. 12, 438.
 Tonbridge Postmen's Petition for Increase o Pay, Aug. 16, 1165.
 Norman, Mr. H. [Wolverhampton, S.]
 China;Terms of Settlement, Action of British Minister, Aug. 12, 425.
 Thibetan Mission to Russia, Aug. 12, 425.
 North British Railway Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
 Northumberland, Duke of
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill 2R., Aug. 15, 871, 882.
 "Numidian" s.s.
 Arrest of W. Morrison at Montreal;Pay, etc.
 Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 8, 46.
 Nurses
 Irish Workhouses, see Workhouses.
 O
 O'Brien, Mr. K. [Tipperary, Mid]
 Carden's, Sir J., Game Coverts;Mr. Bruen and others Shooting on Public Road, Aug. 12, 440
 Thurles;Death from Police Violence, Alleged, Aug. 16, 1181.
 O'Brien, Mr. P. [Kilkenny]
 Auditing Department, Ireland;Employing Audit Office Officials permanently in Dublin, Aug. 15, 946.
 Banbridge Sanitation;Compelling Urban Council to Carry out Improvements, Aug. 8, 71.
 Constabulary, Royal Irish;Compensation for Injuries;Return, Aug. 15, 927.
 Dublin Postal Official's Grievances, Aug. 17, 1304.
 Finigan and Muldowney, Prisoners;proposed release, Aug. 8, 72.
 House of Commons, Bath-rooms for Members, Increasing Number of, Aug. 13, 599.
 Land Court Valuers;Text of Qualifications, Aug. 8, 72.
 Local Government Elections, Ireland;Publishing Notices in Local Newspapers, Aug 16, 1167.
 Madrid;Irish Lady's Es ate, Communication with Sir M. Durand, etc., Aug. 15, 946; Aug. 16, 1152; Aug 17, 1297.
 Malta;British Flag, Hauling down, etc., Aug. 15, 907.
 Post Office Examinations for Male Sorters in London;Number of Irish Candidates, etc., Aug. 8, 56.
 Post Office Savings Bank, Keeping Irish Accounts in Dublin proposed, Aug. 15, 947.
 Postmasterships;Appointment of English Officers in Ireland, Aug. 8, 78.
 O'Brien Estate

Purchase of Holdings

Q. Mr. J. P. Farrell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 931.

O'Connor, Mr. J. [Wicklow, W.]

Education;Book Department;Memorandum of Commissioners, Aug. 8, 59.

Local Government Board, Ireland, Administration;Shillelagh Union, Charge against Nurse Joyce, etc., Aug. 8, 122.

Postmen

Coats;Buttoning from neck to waist, Aug. 8, 55

Colchester Postman's Stripe Grievances, Aug. 16, 1163.

Rural Postmen;Bank Holiday Privileges, Aug. 16, 1186.

Special Leave Regulations, Case of Postman Bates, Aug. 16, 1162.

South African War;Military Operations at Waterkloof, Aug. 8, 31.

O'Connor, Mr. T. P. [Liverpool, Scotland]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1051; 3R., Aug. 17, 1320.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 695, 718.

Land Question, Ireland;Condition of the Campaign Tenants, etc. Aug. 15, 1051.

Law and Justice, Ireland;Conspiracies against Innocent Persons, charges against Constabulary, etc, Aug. 17, 1320.

Liverpool Telegraphists' Promotion Grievances, Aug. 16, 1164.

O'Doherty, Mr. W. [Donegal, N.]

Belfast Workhouse, Destitute Veterans in, etc., Aug. 16, 1144.

Donegal Postal Service;Improvements proposed, Aug. 15, 948.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 848, 849,; Com. Aug. 15, 1112, 1116.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 711.

Light Railways (No. 2) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 858.

Londonderry Infirmary, Nurses trained in;Recognising as eligible for Appointments to Workhouse Infirmarys, Aug. 16, 1172.

Lough Foyle;Erection of Gas and Bell Buoy at Tuns Bank, Aug. 15, 945.

Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 833.

Military Works Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1105.

Rashenny Railway Station;Erection of Goods Shed, Aug. 16, 1171.

Royal Titles Bill, Aug. 13, 621.

O'Donnell, Mr. J. [Mayo, S.]

Ballyhaunis Prosecution;Police Interference with Witnesses, alleged, Aug. 16, 1168.

Constabulary, Royal Irish;Charges of Organising and manufacturing Crime. Aug. 15, 1055.

O'Donnell, Mr. T. [Kerry, W.]

Belfast Postal Arrangements;Sunday Delivery, Aug. 9, 306.

Education;Book Department, Charges Against;Resolutions of Teachers, etc., Aug. 9, 293.

Great Southern and Western Railway, Conveyance of Irish Produce;Fish Rates, Aug. 8, 65.

Historical Manuscripts Commission;Irish Representative, Aug. 15, 953.

Irish Language, Teaching in Irish Schools; Fees, Aug. 8, 57.
 Irish-Speaking Sorting Clerks, Appointment of, Aug 16, 1183.
 Kerry
 Land Appeals; Delays, Aug. 15, 940.
 Returns; Date of Publication, Aug. 16, 1179.
 Londonderry and Education Act; Appointment of School Attendance Committee, Aug. 8, 58.
 National School Teachers; Balance of Residual Grant, Aug. 8, 57; Aug. 16, 1179.
 Westbourne National Schools; Correspondence, Aug. 17, 1302.
 O'Dowd, Mr. J. [Sligo, S.]
 Ballymote; Arrest of J. Gilmartin by Police, Aug. 8, 68.
 Leitrim, Intimidation Prosecutions at Kiltyclogher Petty Sessions, Aug. 16, 1176.
 Sligo Co., Agrarian Disturbances; Proceedings at Ballymote Petty Sessions, Aug. 15, 942.
 Sligo Bay; Lights at Bowmore, proposed, Aug. 12, 452.
 O'Kelly, Mr. C. [Mayo, N.]
 Emigration; Number of Emigrants in May, June, and July, 1900–1901, Aug. 15, 933.
 Omagh
 Labourers' Cottages; Income Tax Demands
 Qs. Mr. Murnaghan, Mr. Daly; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 66.
 Malicious Injury, Claims for; Increase in Number, Police Investigating Cases, etc.
 Q. Mr. Murnaghan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 295.
 Relieving Officer; Surcharge in respect of Outdoor Relief
 O. Mr. Murnaghan, Aug. 9, 322.
 O'Mara, Mr. J. [Kilkenny, S.]
 Army and Navy expenditure; Application of Surpluses to meet Excesses, Com., Aug. 8, 201, 221.
 Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1117.
 Kilkenny Magistracy; Appointment of Nationalist Magistrate, Aug. 12, 435.
 Light Railways (No. 2) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 853, 858.
 Military Works Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1101.
 Naval Expenditure; Statement of Accounts, 1895–1901, Aug. 13, 597.
 Pacific Cable Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 488 Com. Aug. 13, 627, 637, 641, 643, 646.
 Royal Titles Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 476.
 Oporto
 Trade Reports Presented, Aug. 16, 1129.
 Orange River Colony
 Administrative Questions and Questions affecting jointly Transvaal and Orange River Colony, see Transvaal.
 Ordnance Survey
 Ireland; Work done in connection with Land Judges' Court, Amount received 1900–1901, etc.
 Q. Mr. Moore; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 9, 302.

Wales;Revision of Ordnance Maps

Q. Mr. L. Morgan; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 9, 282.

Orient Steam Navigation Company

Stokers, Charges against, etc.

Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 914.

O'Shaughnessy, Mr. P. J. [Limerick, W.]

Butter Standard Committee;Publication of Evidence, Aug. 16, 1160.

Limerick Poor Rate Collectors;Local Government Board requiring New Bond, etc., Aug. 15, 930.

Rathkeale Mails;Delay in arrival from Dublin, Aug. 12, 449.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 844.

Tarbert and Kilrush Steamer Calling at Glin, proposed, Aug. 8, 68.

O'Shee, Mr. J. J. [Waterford, W.]

Ardmore Abbey Church;Preservation of Ruins, Aug. 12, 445.

Local Government Board (Ireland) Administration, Aug. 9, 334.

P

Pacific

United States Coaling Stations

O. Mr. Pretyman, Aug. 14, 751.

Pacific Cable

Board, Formation of;Entering into Contract before obtaining Sanction of Parliament, etc.

Q. Mr. Flynn; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1186.

Vote for;Facilities for Discussion

Q. Sir E. Sassoon; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 9, 308.

Pacific Cable Bill

c. 2R., Aug. 12, 479.

Com. and 3R., Aug. 13, 627.

l. 2R., Aug. 15, 883.

Com. and 3R.* Aug. 16, 1136.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Paisley District Tramways Order Confirmation Bill

c. 2R.,* Aug. 12, 409.

Con.* Aug. 13, 588.

3R.* Aug. 14, 732.

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Paisley Police and Public Health Bill

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Parcels Post

Delays;Obtaining Receipts for Parcels

Q. Mr. Leamy; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 921.

Turkey, see that title.

Parkees, Mr. E. [Birmingham, Central]

Wolffe, S., Prosecution of, under Debtors (Scotland) Act, 1880;Abandoning Proceedings, etc., Aug. 13, 602.

Parks and Pleasure Gardens

London and Dublin;Return Presented, Aug. 13, 589.
Parliament
House of Commons
Adjournment Motions, see title Adjournments.
Bathrooms for Members, Increasing Number of proposed
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. Douglas, Aug. 13, 599.
Business of the House, see that title.
House of Lords
Fee Fund Account Presented, Aug. 13, 589.
New Peer Introduced;Viscount Cromer, Aug. 8, 1.
Representative Peers for Ireland, see that title.
Salary, Pay, Pension or Allowance;Return Presented, Aug. 8, 6.
Took the Oath.
Lurgan, Lord, Aug. 13, 577.
Swansea, Lord Aug. 9, 251.
Police;Remuneration for late Sittings of the House
Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 16, 1154.
Prorogation of Parliament, Aug. 17, 1296, 1338.
Sittings and Adjournments of the House, see those titles.
Standing Orders, see that title.
Parliamentary Control
Public Expenditure
Naval Works Expenditure Debate, Aug. 14, 735, 738, 754, 759, 772, 773.
Practice of Voting huge Sums of Money without Discussion.
O. Earl Spencer, Aug. 17, 1278; Earl of Selborne, 1282.
Parliamentary Elections
Expenses, General Election;Return Presented, Aug. 14, 734.
Return;Names of Members, Names of County, etc., from 1885;Return Ordered, Aug. 13, 591.
Parliamentary Procedure
Appropriation Bills;Preliminary Resolutions, Discussing
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 8, 233.
Navy and Army Expenditure, Application of Surpluses to meet Excesses;Discussing
in Committee what was understood to be a formal matter
O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 8, 190.
House of Lords
Compulsory Taking of land for Constructing Works, Introducing at End of
Session;Relaxation of Standing Order, etc.
Os. Earl of Morley, Aug. 14, 730; Aug. 15, 865.
Supply, see that title.
Parliamentary Representation
Ireland;Inequality between Scotland and Ireland, Appointment of Select
Committee, proposed
Q. Mr. Cochrane; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 9, 307.
Parliamentary Time
Distribution of, Days occupied by Government and Private Members;Return Ordered,

Aug. 12, 416; Presented, Aug. 13, 590.

Patent Law Amendment Bill

c. 1R.* Aug. 12, 455.

2R.* Aug. 13, 727.

Com.* and 3R. Aug. 14, 859.

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Patent Laws

Amendment of; Assimilating Laws to those of France and Germany

A. Mr. J. Lawrence; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 914.

Pathological Laboratory

Dublin; County Council contributing towards Laboratory

Q. Mr. W. Johnston; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 63.

Paupers

Deportation of Irish Paupers from Scotland; Case of M. M'Auley.

Q. Mr. Moore; A. Mr. S. Dickson, Aug. 13, 613.

Peabody Buildings

Rates; Trustees refusing Offer of Southwark Borough Council to collect Rates, etc.

Q. Mr. Causton; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 15, 916.

Peace Conference

see Hague Conference

Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1881

Repeal proposed

Os. Mr. O'Doherty, Aug. 15, 1112; Mr. Wyndham, 1114.

Pearks and Co., Messrs.

Conviction of; Butter Adulteration

Q. Mr. Moore; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 15, 918.

Peel, Mr. W. R. W. [Manchester, S.]

National Competition of Schools of Art; Holding at dead Season of the Year, etc., Aug. 9, 283.

Yeomanry Officers; Placing on Equality with Militia Officers as regards

Precedence, etc., Aug. 9, 275.

Penrhyn Quarry Dispute

Military Aid to Civil Authority

Recall of Troops

Qs. Mr. K. Hardie, Mr. Lloyd-George, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. W. Jones; As. Mr.

Ritchie, Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 49.

Requisitioning Military

Os. Mr. Lloyd-George, Aug. 17, 1329; Mr. Ritchie, 1330; Mr. W. Jones, 1331.

Constitution of Sub-Committee of Carnarvonshire County Council

Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 8, 50.

Police Sub-Committee; Statements

Q. Mr. Lloyd-George; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 17, 1299.

Pensions

Army, see that title.

Perks, Mr. R. W. [Lincolnshire, Louth]

Nicaragua Canal; Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Reply to Lord Lansdowne's Despatch, etc., Aug. 15, 909.

Persia

Customs Tariff; Modification proposed

Q. Sir E. Sassoon; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 8, 45.

Trade Report Presented, Aug. 8, 4.

Personal Property

Contributions to Local Taxation Abroad; Address for Return setting out System employed Abroad, Aug. 15, 897.

Petitions

Public Petitions; Return Ordered, Aug. 12, 415; Presented, Aug. 13, 590.

Pewsey and Salisbury Light Railway

Order Amending, Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 18.

Phibbs, Mr.

see Sligo.

Philippines

United States War; South African War, Analogy with reference to Lord Kitchener's Surrender Proclamation

Chamberlain, Mr. J., on, Aug. 15, 999

Os. Mr. Bryce, Aug. 15, 1024.

Piccadilly

Widening of

Removal of Cab Stand, Pavement, etc., proposed

Qs. Lord Balcarras, Mr. Coghill, Mr. Malcolm; As. Mr. Douglas, Aug. 15, 922.

Suspension of Work, proposed

Qs. Mr. Malcolm, Mr. S. Buxton, Mr. J. Lowther; As. Mr. Douglas, Aug. 8, 54.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.

Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill

c. 1R.* Aug. 9, 265.

2R.* Aug. 12, 409.

I. 1R.* Aug. 12, 397.

2R.* Aug. 14, 729.

Com.* and 3R.* Aug. 15, 861.

c. Lords Amendments.* Aug. 16, 1137.

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Piers and Harbours

Ireland

Harbour Board Revenues, Inadequacy of, etc.

Q. Mr. Field; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 8, 77.

Kinvara Harbour, see that title.

Liscannor Harbour, Improvement of; Grant proposed

Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 434.

Sneem Pier; Erection of Goods Store, etc.

Q. Mr. Boland; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1183.

Return Ordered from the Authorities of Harbours of the United Kingdom, etc.,

Aug. 13, 592.

Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. R. [Lancashire, Newton]

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 520, 522.

"Pilot"

Hauling down Union Jack

Q. Mr. W. Johnston; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 446.

Pirie, Mr. D. V. [Aberdeen, N.]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1015.

South African War

Rebels, Execution at Dordrecht; Compulsory Attendance of Burghers, Aug. 8, 28; Aug. 15, 899; Aug. 16, 1141; Aug. 17, 1295.

Situation in South Africa; Lord Kitchener's Proclamation etc., Aug. 15, 1015 (for details, see South African War).

Pitcairn Islands

Condition of Islanders; Correspondence Presented, Aug. 9, 253, 268.

Plague

Bubonic Plague; Local Government Board Report and Papers on, Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 20.

Platt-Higgins, Mr. F. [Salford, N.]

Post Office Employees' Good Conduct Stripes; Unestablished Linesmen and Mechanics, Aug. 15, 920.

Plan of Campaign, Ireland

see Ireland; Land Question.

Pleasure Boats

Aberyswith; "Queen Bee" Fatality, Registration of Boats

Q. Mr. G. Kenyon; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 9, 282.

Police

see Metropolitan Police.

Police Superannuation (Scotland) Bill

c. Report,* Aug. 14, 734.

Polling Districts

Lancaster, County of; Order Presented, Aug. 14, 734; Aug. 15, 863.

Pontefract

Locomotive Explosion

Os. Mr. Bell, Aug. 15, 1085; Mr. G. Balfour, 1090.

Poor Rates, Ireland

Increase of Salaries of Collectors, etc.

O. Mr. T. M. Healy, Aug. 8, 107.

Port Said and Suez

Trade Report Presented, Aug. 2, 253.

Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway Bill

c. 3R.* Aug. 9, 265.

I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 12, 397.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.

Portsmouth Dockyard

Joiners' Wages

Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 16, 1146.

Portugal

Trade Report Presented, Aug. 16, 1129.

Portumna Railway

Re-engagement; Treasury Grant, proposed

A. Mr. Roche; Q. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 435.

Post Office

Postmaster-General; Marquess of Londonderry.

Representative in House of Commons; Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

Carmarthenshire Postal Arrangements; Daily Delivery to Brechfa, etc., proposed

Q. Mr. L. Morgan; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 432.

Employees

Examinations for Male Sorters in London; Number of Irish Candidates, etc.

A. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 56.

Good Conduct Stripes; Unestablished Linesmen and Mechanics

Q. Mr. Platt-Higgins; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 920.

Postmen, see that title.

Ireland

Armagh; Promotions, Special Allowances, etc.

Q. Mr. J. Campbell; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 304.

Bailieborough; Rural Postmen's Pay

Q. Mr. Crean; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 447.

Belfast Postal Arrangements; Sunday Delivery, proposed

Qs. Mr. T. O'Donnell, Mr. W. Johnston; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 306.

Cavan and Leitrim Railway Company; Post Office Subsidy for Conveyance of Mails

Q. Mr. M'Govern; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 952.

Clonmel Mails, Delay in Arrival; Forwarding Mails direct from Thurles

Q. Mr. Condon; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 79.

Donegal Postal Service; Improvements proposed

Q. Mr. O'Doherty; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 948.

Downpatrick Mails; Postal Arrangements at Ardglass and Killough, Improvement of, etc.

Q. Mr. Rentoul; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 13, 612.

Dublin Postal Officials' Grievances

Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 17, 1304.

English Night Mail; Delay in arrival at Kingstown

Qs. Mr. Doogan, Mr. Crean; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 78.

Examinations for Male Sorters, Holding in Dublin, proposed

Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 56.

Inniskeen, see that title.

Irish-speaking Sorting Clerks, Appointment of

Qs. Capt. Donelan, Mr. T. O'Donnell; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1184.

Kerry Mails; Sunday Delivery in Ballyduff and Asdee

Q. Mr. Flavin; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 949.

Navan Post Office; Suitable Premises

Q. Mr. Kennedy; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 306.
Postmasterships;Appointment of English Officers in Ireland, etc.
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 78.
Postmen, see that title.
Rathkeale Mails, Delay in arrival from Dublin
Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Joyce; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 449.
Rosscarbery Mails;Daily Mail Service from Clonakilty, proposed
Q. Mr. E. Barry; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1185.
Shercock;Mail Cars leaving for Carrickmacross in time for 6.13 p.m. Train,
proposed
Q. Mr. Daly; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 949.
Tipperary, see that title.
Tralee Mails;Delay in Arrival from Limerick
Q. Mr. Flavin; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 17, 1305.
Isle of Man, Revenue derived from Post Office
Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 284.
Laurencekirk Postmastership;Appointment to Vacancy
Q. Mr. Crombie; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 289.
Legislation;Issue of Circular explaining Acts, etc.
Q. Col. Stopford-Sackville; A. Mr. Long. Aug. 9, 281.
Money and Postal Orders, see those titles.
Postage Stamps, see that title.
Report of Postmaster-General Presented, Aug. 12, 394, 412.
Servants' Registries at Country Post Offices, Proposed
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 430.
Telegraph Service, see that title.
Telephone Service, see that title.
Turkey, see that title.
Wotton-under-Edge Post Office;Making R.S.O., etc.
Q. Mr. C. Allen; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 13, 601.
Post Office Savings Bank
Irish Accounts, Keeping in Dublin, proposed
Q. Mr. P. O'Brien; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 947.
Withdrawals exceeding Deposits;Reserve
Q. Mr. Field A. Sir M. H. Beach, Aug. 8, 45.
Postage
Free Postage in Government Departments;Including Naval Store Department,
Deptford
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 288.
Postage Stamps
Colour of Penny Stamps;Royal Scarlet or Red Colour proposed
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 287.
Postal Orders
Salonika, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 284.
Postmaster General

Marquess of Londonderry.

Postmen

Coats;Buttoning from Neck to Waist

Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 55.

Dishonesty, Dismissals for, 1897–1900

Q. Mr. Lough; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 289.

Good Conduct Stripes

Colchester Postman's Grievance

Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1163.

Full Time Duty for unestablished Service

Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1162.

Ireland;Rural Postmen

Bank Holiday Privileges

Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1186.

Castle Cove;Postman's Pay

Q. Mr. Boland; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 447.

Pay, Petition for Increase of Pay;Tonbridge

Q. Mr. Nolan; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1165.

Special Leave Regulations;Case of G. W. Bates

Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1162.

Powell, Sir F. S. [Wigan]

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 510.

Power, Mr. P. J. [Waterford, E.]

Colonial Acts Confirmation Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 576.

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 822, 826, 828, 829, 832.

Local Government Board (Ireland) Administration, Aug. 9, 333.

Pacific Cable Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 640.

Prestatyn

Board School;Erection of new School, Reconsidering Decision, etc.

Qs. Mr. Yerburgh, Mr. G. Kenyon; As. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 15, 925.

Pretyman, Mr. E. G.;Civil Lord of the Admiralty [Suffolk, Woodbridge]

Contracts;Sub-letting Contracts, Aug. 8, 38.

Expenditure;Statement of Accounts, 1895–1901, Aug. 13, 597.

Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 735, 741, 742, 753, 754, 757, 759, 760, 762, 771, 780 (for details, see under Navy).

Coaling Facilities at Naval Ports, Aug. 13, 596.

"Primrose Hill"

Loss of;Compensation for Families of Officers and Men

Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 12, 428.

Prisoners

Ireland (see Names of Prisoners).

Prisons (Scotland) Bill

c. Bill Withdrawn, July 12, 575.

Private Bills

House of Lords, Standing Orders;Amendments

Motion (Earl of Morley), Aug. 8, 3.

Private Members' Business;Return Ordered, Aug. 12, 416; Presented, Aug. 13, 590.
Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899
Additional and Amending General Orders for Regulation of Proceedings under Act
presented, Aug. 15, 863, 895.
Private Members' Business
Return Ordered, Aug. 12, 416; Presented Aug. 13, 590.
Privilege, Breach of
"Globe" Newspaper and the Irish Nationalist Party, see "Globe" Newspaper.
Prize Money
Navy
Receipt and Expenditure, Account Presented, Aug. 8, 21; Aug. 9, 254.
Unclaimed Money;List of Claimants
Q. Mr. Majendie; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 16, 1147.
Prorogation of Parliament
King's Speech, etc., Aug. 17, 1291, 1338
Ptomaine Poisoning
Decomposed Cream;Improper Use of Preservatives, etc.
Q. Mr. Channing; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 8, 51.
Public Bills
Return Ordered;Aug. 12, 415; Presented, Aug. 13, 590
Public Income and Expenditure
see Revenue and Expenditure.
Public Libraries Bill
c. Con.* and 3R.* Aug. 14, 860.
l. Commons Amendts., Aug. 15, 890.
Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
Public Petitions
see Petitions.
Public Works Loans Bill
c. 2R.* Aug. 12, 574.
Com., Aug. 13, 725; Aug. 14, 849.
3R., Aug. 15, 1123.
l. 1R., 2R., and 3R.* Aug. 16, 1137.
Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
Purchase of Land (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
c. Con.* and 3R.* Aug. 13, 727.
l. 1R.* Aug. 14, 731.
2R. and 3R., Aug. 15, 883.
Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
Q
Quarries
Accidents, Persons Employed, etc.;General Report and Statistics Presented, Aug.
12, 398, 411.
General Report and Statistics for 1900 Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 411.
"Queen Bee"
Fatality at Aberystwith;Registration of Pleasure Boats

Q. Mr. G. Kenyon; A. Mr. Long, Aug 9, 282.
 Queen's College, Galway
 Annual Report Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 413.
 Queen's Island, Belfast
 Preservation of Public Peace
 Q. Mr. J. Redmond; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 925.
 Queen's University (Ireland)
 Ex-Professor's Claims for Compensation for loss of Office
 Os. Earl Spencer, Aug. 15, 886; Lord Ashbourne, 888.
 Queensland
 Asiatic Labour Bill; Unfair Treatment of British-Indian Subjects in the Colonies
 O. Sir M. Bhownaggee, Aug. 16, 1227.
 Questions in the House
 Total Number of Questions on Notice Paper in each Session
 1888–1901; Return Ordered, Aug. 8, 22.
 Quit Rents
 Crown Quit Rents, Ireland; Investment of Redemption Money
 Qs. Mr. Field, Capt. Donelan; As. Sir M. H. Beach, Aug. 8, 74.
 R
 Rabies
 see Dogs.
 Railway Servants
 Accidents
 Shunting Fatalities; Fenny Compton
 Q. Mr. C. Grant; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 12, 428.
 Increase in; Prevention of, &c.
 Os. Mr. Bell, Aug. 15, 1082; Mr. G. Balfour, 1089.
 Return
 Q. Sir F. Flannery; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 12, 428.
 Inspectors' Reports, Despatch in Publishing
 Os. Mr. Bell, Aug. 15, 1087; Mr. G. Balfour, 1091.
 Hours of Labour
 Administration by Board of Trade of the Hours Act of 1893, etc.
 Debate on Appropriation Bill, Aug. 15, 1075.
 Board of Trade Report Presented. Aug. 9, 254, 267.
 Railways
 Accidents; General Report and Returns Presented, Aug. 14, 733; Aug. 15, 862.
 London Bridge Fatality; Communication Cord out of Order
 Q. Mr. Bell; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1155.
 Automatic Couplings, Companies Adopting
 Q. Sir F. Flannery; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 12, 429; Os. Mr. Bell, Aug. 15, 1084; Mr. G. Balfour, 1089.
 Capital, Traffic, and Expenditure for 1900; General Report to Board of Trade Presented, Aug. 8, 6, 19.
 Compensation for Damage to Crops, etc., Bill, see that title.
 Ireland

Conveyance of Irish Produce on Great Southern and Western Railway; Fish Rates
 Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 65.
 Cork and Fermoy Railway, see title Cork.
 Kerry, see that title.
 Londonderry Railway Station; Erection of Suitable Buildings
 Q. Dr. Thompson; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 950.
 Portumna Railway; Re-equipment, Treasury Grant proposed
 Q. Mr. Roche; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 435.
 Rashenny Railway Station; Erection of Goods Shed
 Q. Mr. O'Doherty; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1171.
 Light Railways
 Ireland; Administration of Act in Ireland, Complaints
 Debate on Light Railways (No. 2) Bill, Aug. 14, 853.
 Orders Presented, Aug. 8, 4, 17.
 Salary of Commissioners, Com., Aug. 12, 506; Report, Aug. 13, 723.
 Rates; Preferential Rates for Foreign Goods
 Qs. Mr. Field; As. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 8, 47; Aug. 13, 599.
 Sub-inspectors, Appointment of
 Q. Mr. Bell; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1158.
 Rangoon Cantonment
 Public Works Department taking over Private Houses without paying full Value
 Q. Mr. Keswick; A. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 15, 906.
 Rasch, Major F. C. [Essex, Chelmsford]
 Army Medical Department; Report of Committee, Aug. 9, 277.
 Rashenny Railway Station
 Erection of Goods Shed
 Q. Mr. O'Doherty; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1171.
 Rathkeale Mails
 Delay in Arrival from Dublin
 Qs. Mr. O'Shaughnessy, Mr. Joyce; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 449.
 Re-afforestation
 Ireland, see that title; Afforesting.
 Records, Historical Manuscripts, etc.
 Historical Manuscripts Commission, see that title.
 Ireland
 Brehon Laws, see that title.
 Publication of Historical Manuscripts; Irish Commission, Appointment of, proposed
 Q. Sir T. Esmonde; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 9, 307.
 Reddy, Mr. M. [King's County, Birr]
 Local Government Board Inspectors; Conduct of Maj. Fair, Aug. 9, 333.
 Redmond, Mr. John [Waterford]
 Army and Navy Expenditure; Application of surpluses to meet Excesses, Com., Aug.
 8, 189
 Postponement of Resolution, proposed, Aug. 9, 396.
 Belfast
 Queen's Island; Preservation of Public Peace, Aug. 15, 925.

Roman Catholic Employees; Discharge by Anglo-American Oil Company, Aug. 15, 926;
 Aug. 16, 1181.
 Berwickshire County Town Bill, 3R., Aug. 14, 860; Aug. 15, 1125.
 Business of the House; Course of Business, Aug. 8, 81.
 Carden's, Sir J., Game Coverts; Mr. Bruen and others Shooting on Public Road,
 Aug. 12, 440.
 Colonial Acts Confirmation Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 576.
 Cork and Fermoy Railway, Construction
 Correspondence between Fishguard Company and Treasury, Publication, Aug. 9, 303.
 Repayment of £93,000, etc., Aug. 16, 1177.
 Dogs; Importation of Irish Dogs to England, Proposed Removal of Restrictions,
 Aug. 15, 943.
 Donaghmore Churchyard, Desecration of, Aug. 15, 932.
 Education, Board of; Resignation of Archbishop Walsh
 Publication of Minutes, Aug. 8, 61.
 Second Memorandum, Laying on the Table, Aug. 15, 927.
 Egypt; Fox-hunting Incident on Mr. Blunt's Estate at Cairo, Assault on British
 Officers by Natives, Aug. 8, 42, 43.
 Appeal, Date fixed for hearing, Aug. 12, 425.
 Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1111.
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 718.
 Fisheries (Ireland Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 825, 827, 831.
 "Globe" Newspaper; Article entitled "Irish Rowdies," Question of Privilege
 Motion, Aug. 15, 955, 965, 966.
 Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 834.
 Tipperary; Mail Delays from Dublin, Aug. 15, 951.
 Watford and District Tramways Bill, 3R., Aug. 15, 891, 892.
 Redmond, Mr. William [Clare, E.]
 Australia, Immigration to; Educational Test, Aug. 12, 424.
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Resolution, Aug. 8, 231.
 Inebriate Reformatories; Criminal Lunatics transferred to Local Asylums,
 Maintenance, Aug. 8, 48.
 Liscannor Harbour, Improvement of; Grant, proposed, Aug. 12, 434.
 Members of Parliament; Return, Aug. 13, 599.
 Merchant Shipping
 "Colony"; Insufficient Food, alleged, Case of J. M'Donald, Aug. 16, 1155.
 Committee, Appointment of, Aug. 12, 427.
 Orient Steam Navigation Company; Stokers, Prosecution for Mutiny, Discharge
 Certificates, etc., Aug. 15, 914.
 "Primrose Hill, Loss of; Compensation for Families of Officers and Men, Aug. 12,
 428.
 Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 792.
 Revision Barristers, Appointment of; Political opinions, Aug. 13, 609.
 Royal Titles Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 471; Com., Aug. 13, 616.
 Sallybank National School Teachers' Salary, Aug. 8, 60.
 Saturday Sitting and the Blenheim Garden Party, Aug. 8, 194.

Reformatories and Industrial Schools
 Ireland; Report of Inspector for 1900, Presented, Aug. 8, 4.
 Registration of Births and Deaths Bill
 c. 2R. Aug. 12, 575.
 Com.* Aug. 13, 726.
 Con.* and 3R.* Aug. 14, 859.
 l. 1R.* Aug. 15, 864.
 2R.* and 3R.* Aug. 16, 1132.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Reilly, Private:
 Death in South Africa; Pay, Arrears, etc.
 Q. Mr. Keir Hardie; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1143.
 Renshaw, Mr. C. B. [Renfrew, W.]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 508, 512, 531, 533, 537, 540, 543, 551, 556, 563; Aug. 13, 668, 699, 701, 709.
 Rentoul, Mr. J. A. [Down, E.]
 Downpatrick Mails; Postal Arrangements at Ardglass and Killough, Improvement of, etc., Aug. 13, 612.
 Local Government Board, Ireland, Administration; Defects of Local Government Act, Aug. 8, 128.
 Renwick, Mr. G. [Newcastle-on-Tyne]
 Coal Export Duty; Remissions, Aug. 8, 46.
 Representative Peers for Ireland
 Leitrim, Earl of, Aug. 8, 1; Aug. 9, 251.
 Revenue and Expenditure; Finance System, etc.
 Army and Navy Expenditure, see titles Army and Navy.
 Isle of Man; Revenue from Crown Lands, Post Office, etc.
 Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 284.
 Net Public Income and Expenditure; Return Presented, Aug. 9, 267.
 Parliamentary Control, see that title.
 Taxes and Imposts, Collection of; Return Presented, Aug. 14, 731.
 Revising Barristers, Ireland
 Appointment of Assistant Barristers; Political Opinions
 Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Atkinson, Aug. 13, 609.
 Rhode
 United Irish League Meeting; Action of Police Sergeant
 Q. Mr. Haviland-Burke; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 438.
 Rhodesia
 Arab Labour; Sanction of H.M. Government, etc.
 Qs. Sir C. Dilke, Sir W. Harcourt; As. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 8, 22.
 Immigrant and Native Labour, Regulation of
 Q. Sir W. Harcourt; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 24.
 Rhyl Improvement Bill
 l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Rickett, Mr. J. Compton [Scarborough]
 Trinidad; Closing Government Schools, etc., Aug. 9, 279.

Rifle Ranges

Expenditure on, under Military Works Bill

Os. Mr. C. Warner, Mr. F. W. Wilson, Mr. Tully, Aug. 15, 1105.

New Ranges in 1901; Lichfield Range

Q. Mr. C. Warner; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 277.

Provision of Suitable Rifle Ranges

O. Sir H. Vincent, Aug. 17, 1328.

Military Works Bill Debate, Aug. 14, 798.

Ripon Corporation Bill

I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 8, 2.

Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 251.

Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. T.; Secretary of State for the Home Department [Croydon]

Army and Navy Expenditure; Application of Surpluses to meet Excesses

Postponement of Resolution, proposed, Aug. 9, 397.

Bolton Licensing Appeal; Non-representation of Prosecution by Counsel, etc., Aug. 12, 427; Aug. 15, 911.

Bradford Labour Dispute; Arrest of Member of Trade Union at Midnight, etc., Aug. 16, 1154.

Burnley Weaving Sheds; Operatives' Wages, Deduction for Oiling Machinery, Aug. 13, 598.

Capital Punishment; "Drop" Regulations, Death not instantaneous, alleged, Aug. 16, 1153.

China Manufacture; Rumoured Conference of Continental Manufacturers, Aug. 16, 1153.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., Aug. 17, 1330, 1332.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 503, 504, 506, 507, 508, 510, 511, 512, 524, 525, 532, 534, 538, 539, 543, 544, 548, 551, 561, 563, 564, 565; Aug. 13, 649, 654, 671, 692, 695, 696, 697, 698, 701, 703, 706, 710, 711, 714, 715, 719; Lords Amendts., Aug. 16, 1198, 1199.

Reprinting; Distribution of Copies, etc., Aug. 17, 1298.

Separating Consolidating from Amending Clauses, proposed, etc., Aug. 8, 47.

Guernsey, Bookmakers transferring Business from Holland; Advertisements in English Newspapers, etc., Aug. 15, 910.

Hackney Union; Detention of Nurse Beatty as Lunatic, etc., Aug. 15, 910.

Inebriate Reformatories; Criminal Lunatics transferred to Local Asylums, Maintenance, Aug. 8, 48.

Members of Parliament; Return, Aug. 13, 599.

Metropolitan Police

Houses of Parliament Police; Remuneration for Late Sitzings of the House, Aug. 16, 1154.

Roman Catholic Procession, Westminster; Police Protection, etc Aug. 13, 598.

Penhryn Quarry Dispute; Military Aid

Authority Requisitioning, etc., Aug. 17, 1299, 1330.

Carnarvonshire County Council; Constitution of Sub-Committee, Aug. 8, 50.

Withdrawal of Troops, Aug. 8, 49.

Vaccination; Conscientious Objectors, Case of W. Venables, Aug. 12, 427.

Roads

Ireland; Armagh County Surveyor Controlling Repairs, Complaints, etc.

Q. Mr. J. Campbell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 935.

Direct Labour; Provisional Order, etc.

Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 940.

Q. Mr. Cullinan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1169.

Roberts, Earl

Grant in Recognition of Services in South Africa, Resolution Reported, Aug. 9, 385.

Roberts Mr. B. [Carnarvonshire, Eifion]

South African War; Execution of Rebels at Dordrecht, Coetzee's Case, Aug. 8, 28.

Roberts, Mr. H. [Denbighshire, W.]

India

Bombay Land Revenue Bill, Opposition to; Preservation of Tenant-Rights of Cultivators, Aug. 16, 1149.

Famine Commission Report; Delay in Publication, Aug. 16, 1149.

Financial and Economic Position; Lord G. Hamilton's Statements Aug. 16, 1254 (for Details, see India).

Financial Year, Ending on Dec, 31, proposed, Aug. 9, 278.

Railways; Congestion at Howrah Goods Station, Calcutta, Aug. 16, 1150.

Robertson, Mr. E. [Dundee]

Coaling Stations; Military or Naval Control, Aug. 13, 596.

Naval Works Bill, 2R. Aug. 14, 752, 753, 754, 780, 786.

Coaling Facilities at Naval Ports, Aug. 13, 596.

South African War

Conduct of the War, Future Conduct; Discrimination between large and small Bodies of Enemy, Aug. 8, 27.

Natives, Gen. Kruitlinger's Threat; Instructions to Lord Kitchener, Aug. 8, 26.

Under-age Recruits; Case of H. Mellon, Aug. 12, 420.

Roche, Mr. J. [Galway, E.]

Carden's, Sir J., Game Coverts; Mr. Bruen and others Shooting on Public Road, Aug. 12, 441.

Clanricarde Estate, Tenants' Grievances, Aug. 15, 1092.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1092.

Killclooney Estate, Galway; Sale to Tenants, Aug. 8, 63; Aug. 15, 926.

Portumna Railway, Re-equipment; Treasury Grant, proposed, Aug. 12, 435.

Rochester, Bishop of

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 881.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, 2R., Aug. 16, 1133.

Rogers, J.

Army Pension Claim

Q. Mr. Tully; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1143.

Rolleston, Sir J. F. L. [Leicester]

Transvaal; Customs and Trade Regulations of the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, Aug. 15, 897.

Rollit, Sir A. [Islington, S.]

Elementary School Teachers Bill;Re-introducing next Session, Aug. 17, 1300.
 Roman Catholic Chaplains
 South African War, see that title;Chaplains.
 Roman Catholic Procession
 Westminster;Police Protection, etc.
 Q. Col. Sandys; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 13, 597.
 Rosebery, Earl of
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 877, 880, 881.
 Ross-shire
 Allotments, Taking land on Lease compulsorily;Refusal of Application
 Q. Mr. Weir; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 9, 291.
 Rosscarbery
 Mails;Day Mail Service from Clonakilty, proposed
 Q. Mr. E. Barry; A. Mr. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1185.
 Round, Mr. J. [Essex, Harwich
 Ambulances in South Africa, Improvement of, Aug. 13, 594.
 Royal Assent to Colonial Acts
 Return Presented, Aug. 15, 895.
 Royal Canal
 Ireland;Report of Inspector, laying on the Table, proposed
 Q. Mr. Kennedy; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 304.
 Royal Declaration Bill
 Petitions, Aug. 12, 410; Aug. 13, 589; Aug. 14, 732; Aug. 15, 1137; Aug. 17, 1294.
 Postponing till next Session
 Qs. Col Long, Mr. T. M. Healy; As. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 8, 80.
 Protest against;Motion to suspend Standing Order, Standing Orders not complied with
 Os. Lord Stanmore, Lord Halsbury, Earl Spencer, Aug. 15, 889, 890.
 Royal Titles Bill
 c. 2R., Aug. 12, 455.
 Com. Aug. 13, 616.
 3R. Aug. 14, 852.
 l. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1289.
 Royds, Col. C. M. [Rochdale]
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., Aug. 17, 1333.
 Volunteers, Camp Period;Capitation Grant, etc., Aug. 17, 1333.
 Rugby Water and Improvement Bill
 c. Con., Aug. 8, 15.
 3R.* Aug. 12, 408.
 l. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 13, 577.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
 Russell, Earl
 Trial for Bigamy;Fees of Law Officers of the Crown
 Q. Mr. J. Campbell; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 8, 80.

Russia

Thibetan Embassy to;Aims and Results, etc.

Q. Mr. Norman; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 12, 425.

S

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford [Northants, N.]

Post Office Legislation;Issue of Circulars explaining Acts, etc., Aug. 9, 281.

Telegraph Service Guarantee;Extension of Telegraph Offices. Aug. 9, 288.

Saddles

Purchase of, for South Africa;see South African War.

St Helena

Boer Prisoners, see South African War;Prisoners.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors (Ireland) Act, 1878

Omitting from Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, proposed

Tully's, Mr., Motion, Aug. 15, 1111.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill

c. Con. and 3R. Aug. 14, 837.

l. 1R.* Aug 15, 864.

2R., 3R., Aug. 16, 1133.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill

Petitions, Aug. 8, 17; Aug. 12, 410; Aug. 13, 588; Aug. 14, 732; Aug. 15, 1138;

Aug. 17, 1293.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children (Scotland) Bill

Petitions, Aug. 13, 588.

Salford Corporation Bill

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Salisbury, Marquess of;Prime Minister and Lord Privy Seal

Frederick, Empress, of Germany, Death of;Address of Condolence, Aug. 8, 6.

Salisbury Plain

Barracks, Expenditure on, etc.

Debate on Military Works Bill, Aug. 14, 797.

Sallybank

National School Teachers' Salary

Q. Mr. W. Redmond; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 60.

Salmon Fisheries

Commission;Report, Date of Issue

Q. Mr. C. Lowther; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 12, 452.

Salonika

Postal Order System;Extending to Salonika

Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain Aug. 9, 284.

Sandys, Lieut.-Col. T. M. [Lancashire, Bootle]

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R., Aug. 17, 1332.

Naval Manoeuvres;Press Correspondents, Refusal to allow Correspondents to be present, Aug. 16, 1147.

Roman Catholic Procession, Westminster;Police Protection, etc., Aug. 13, 597.

Volunteers;Camp Attendance Grievance, Aug. 17, 1332.

Sardinia

Trade Report Presented, Aug. 8, 4.

Sassoon, Sir E. [Hythe]

Africa, South-Eastern and South Africa Telegraph Company, Conclusion of Agreement; Report of Cable Committee, Aug. 9, 290.

Indian Fiscal System; Death Duties, proposed, Aug. 9, 279.

Pacific Cable, Vote for; Facilities for Discussion, Aug. 9, 308.

Persia; Customs Tariff, Modification proposed, Aug. 8, 45.

Saturday Sittings of the House

Blenheim Garden Party interfering with

Os. Mr. Dillon, Aug. 8, 191; Mr. Channing, 193; Mr. W. Redmond, 194; Mr. T. M. Healy, 242.

Saunderson, Col. Rt. Hon. E. J. [Armagh, N.]

Factory and Workshops Act Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 712, 719.

Royal Titles Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 469, 472.

South African War; Lord Kitchener's Surrender Proclamation, Facilities for moving Resolution, etc., Aug. 13, 593.

Savings Banks

Navy, see that title.

Post Office Savings Bank, see that title.

Science and Art

Expenditure; Proportion spent in Agricultural Grants

Q. Mr. Jeffreys; A. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 8, 53.

Institutions, Ireland; Report Presented, Aug. 17, 1277, 1294.

Scinde and Eastern Bengal Railway

Purchase Contract; Alleged Misinterpretation on the part of Bank of England

Os. Mr. J. E. Gordon, Aug. 16, 1262; Lord G. Hamilton, 1271.

Scotland

Secretary; Rt. Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

Under Secretary; Sir C. Scott Moncrieff.

Lord Advocate; Rt. Hon. A. G. Murray.

Solicitor-General; Mr. C. Scott-Dickson.

Aberdeen, Seaton Links; Proposed Military Camp

Q. Mr. Bryce; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 902.

Births, Deaths, and Marriages; Registrar-General's Annual Report Presented, Aug. 14, 733.

Caithness, Allotments in; Refusal of Applications

Q. Mr. Harmsworth; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 15, 924.

Clyde Mussel Beds, Sub-Lease to Dr. Fullerton; Submitting to Town Councils for approval, etc.

Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 16, 1165.

Dumbarton Disturbances; Treatment of Rev. W. Mickimmin

Q. Mr. Caldwell; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 15, 923.

Edinburgh, see that title.

Laurencekirk Postmastership; Appointment to Vacancy

Q. Mr. Crombie; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 289.
 Loans written off Assets of Local Loan Fund, 1896–1900;Return Ordered,
 Aug. 9, 269; Presented, Aug. 12, 412.
 Local Taxation, see that title.
 Lunacy;Annual Report of Commissioners Presented, Aug. 12, 398, 411.
 Parliamentary Representation;Inequality between Scotland and Ireland, Select
 Committee proposed, etc.
 Q. Mr. Cochrane; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 9, 307.
 Paupers, Deportation to Ireland;Case of M. M'Auley
 Q. Mr. Moore; A. Mr. S. Dickson, Aug. 13, 613.
 Ross-shire, Allotments in;Taking Land on Lease Compulsorily, Refusal of
 Application
 Q. Mr. Weir; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 9, 291.
 Stornoway Allotments;Refusal of Applications
 Q. Mr. Weir; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 9, 291.
 Thurso and Bettyhill Mail Car Service, Contract for
 Q. Mr. Leveson-Gower; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 432.
 Trawlers;Incompetency of Masters of Steam Trawlers, etc.
 Q. Mr. Crombie; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 9, 280.
 Wolffe, S., Prosecution under Debtors, Act, 1880;Abandoning proceedings, etc.
 Q. Mr. Parkes; A. Mr. S. Dickson, Aug. 13, 602.
 Scott, Mr. C. P. [Lancashire, Leigh]
 Bolton Licensing Appeal;Non-representation of Prosecution by Counsel, etc., Aug.
 12, 427; Aug. 15, 911.
 Seamen
 Compensation for Injuries;"Devon," Death of Seaman
 Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1158.
 Desertions Abroad, Number of, etc.;Return Ordered, Aug. 8, 21;Presented, Aug.
 16, 1138.
 Lascars, Employment of, in British Ships, Restrictions
 O. Sir M. Bhownaggree, Aug. 16, 1228.
 Stokers, Conduct of;Charges made by the Orient Steam Navigation Company against,
 see Orient Steam Navigation Company.
 Treatment of Crews, see Merchant Shipping.
 Secondary Education
 see Education.
 Seisdon Rural District Council
 Complaint against Encroachment on Hincksford Highway, etc.
 Q. Col. Webb; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 9, 281.
 Selborne, Earl of;First Lord of the Admiralty
 Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 17, 1281, 1287, 1289.
 Select Committees
 see Committees.
 Servants' Registries
 Country Post Offices, Registries at, proposed
 Q. Mr. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 430.

Sessional Orders

House of Lords, Suspension of Sessional Order; Pier and Harbour Provisional Order (No. 4) Bill

Os. Lord James of Hereford, Earl of Morley, Aug. 14, 729.

Seven Years' War

Employment of Natives

O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 994.

Sheehan, Mr. D. [Cork Co., Mid]

Dogs, Importation of Irish Dogs to England; proposed Removal of Restrictions, Aug. 15, 943.

Labourers' Acts Administration; Delays, Rejection of Applications, etc., Aug. 8, 92.

Labourers' Cottages; Rejection of Application, etc.

Fishermen; Housing of Rural Fishermen, Aug. 9, 296.

Kelly's, W., Application, Aug. 15, 939.

Mill Street Union; Case of Mahony, Aug. 15, 928.

Macroom; Application for Cottage on Mrs. Manning's Lands, etc., Aug. 9, 297.

Public Works Loans Bill, 3R., Aug. 15, 1124.

Rating Grievances; Tenants of Houses at £;4 and under, Aug. 8, 69.

Town Tenants; Perpetuity of Tenure, etc., Legislation proposed, Aug. 15, 929.

Shercock

Mail Cars leaving for Carrickmacross in time for 6.13 p.m. Train, proposed

Q. Mr. Daly; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 949.

Sheridan, Sergeant

Charges Against, Dismissal, etc.

Os. Mr. J. O'Donnell, Aug. 15, 1059; Mr. Wyndham, 1069; Mr. Tully, 1092; Mr.

Dillon, Aug. 13, 1307; Mr. Wyndham, 1316; Mr. T. P. O'Connor, 1322.

Bray, C., and Murphy, Case of; Compensation

Q. Mr. London; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1174.

Magoohan, D., Case of

Q. Mr. Tully; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 943.

Public Inquiry, proposed

Q. Mr. Dillon; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1175.

Shillelagh Union

Joyce, Nurse; Dr. Bolster's Charges against; Dr. Flynn's Inquiry

Debate in Com. of Supply, Aug. 8, 122.

Shipley Improvement Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Shireoaks, Loughton, and Maltby Railway Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Shops

Early Closing; Message to the Lords for Copy of Report from Select Committee, Aug. 15, 864, 896.

Sierra Leone

Submarine Cable; Contract between H.M. Government and Eastern Telegraph Company ratified, Aug. 13, 728.

Sinclair, Capt. J. [Forfar]
 Yeomanry, Imperial; Fife and Forfar Yeomanry, Pay and Furlough, Aug. 8, 33.
 Sinclair, Mr. L. [Essex, Romford]
 Factory and Workshops Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 506, 510, 511, 512.
 Sittings of the House
 Return Ordered, Aug. 12, 416; Presented, Aug. 13, 590.
 Total Number of Days that House sat, with Date of first and last Sittings in each Session 1888–1901, etc.; Return Ordered, Aug. 8, 22.
 Skibbereen
 Land Commission; Major Cronsdale
 Q. Mr. E. Barry; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 441.
 Sligo, County Sligo, etc.
 Agrarian Disturbances; Proceedings at Ballymote Petty Sessions
 Q. Mr. O'Dowd; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 942.
 Phibbs, Mr.; Boycotting, Police Protection, etc.
 Os. Mr. J. O'Donnell, Aug. 15, 1058; Mr. Wyndham, 1070.
 Sligo Bay
 Lights at Bowmore, proposed
 Q. Mr. O'Dowd; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 12, 452. Q. Mr. M'Killop; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 15, 944.
 Smallpox
 Metropolitan Hospitals; Number of Cases 1898–1900, Vaccination, etc.
 Q. Mr. Cremer; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 15, 917.
 Smethwick Corporation Bill
 I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 8, 2.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 251.
 Smith, Mr. Parker [Lanark, Partick]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 710.
 Sneem Pier
 Erection of Goods Store, etc.
 Q. Mr. Boland; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1183.
 Solicitor-General
 Sir E. Carson.
 Solicitor-General for Scotland
 Mr. C. Scott Dickson.
 South African Crisis
 Negotiations previous to Outbreak of Hostilities; Transvaal Government anxious to avoid War
 Os. Mr. Markham, Aug. 15, 1013; Mr. Pirie, 1015.
 South African Land Settlement
 see Transvaal; Land Settlement.
 South African War
 Ambulance Wagons, Improvement of, etc. Q. Mr. Round; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 13, 594.
 Army Service Corps; War Rewards for Warrant Officers, etc.

Q. Mr. Channing; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 421.
 Belligerents Question; Lord Kitchener's Surrender Proclamation.
 Harcourt, Sir W., on, Aug. 15, 982; Mr. J. Chamberlain's Reply, 996, 998.
 Os. Mr. Bryce, 1021; Mr. Asquith, 1039.
 Boer Forces
 Number in the Field
 O. Mr. Pirie, Aug. 15, 1017.
 Number of Prisoners, see sub-heading Prisoners.
 Barney's, Sergeant-Major, Claim; Pay Arrears, etc.
 Q. Mr. Jeffreys; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 31.
 Cape Colony
 Rebels, see that sub-heading.
 Situation
 Os. Sir. C. Dilke, Aug. 15, 1004; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1035; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1048.
 Censorship; "Freeman's Journal" Correspondent; Seizure of Manuscripts, etc.
 Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill; As. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 419; Aug. 16, 1140.
 Chaplains; Roman Catholic Chaplains, Rewards for War Services
 Q. Mr. Daly; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 32.
 Coetzee, Trial of, see sub-heading Rebels.
 Coloured Men with British Army, Number of
 Q. Mr. Broadhurst; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 35.
 (see also sub-heading Natives.)
 Concentration Camps
 Bloemfontein; Health of Children Medical Officer's Report
 Q. Mr. Flynn; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1141.
 Howick; Keeping Account of Rations and Clothing issued, etc.
 Q. Mr. Dillon; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 900.
 Number of Persons in, etc.; Return Presented, Aug. 16, 1129, 1139.
 Conduct of the War; Future Conduct Discriminating between large and small Bodies of Enemy
 Q. Mr. E. Robertson; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 27.
 Cost of Maintenance of Women and Children; Lord Kitchener's Proclamation, see sub-heading Surrender.
 Courts-Martial
 Munster Fusiliers, Heavy Sentences on
 Q. Mr. Joyce; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 273.
 Revision of Sentences; Sentences taking effect at once
 Q. Mr. H. D. Greene; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 274.
 Derbyshire Regiment, see sub-heading Return of Troops.
 Electoral Disabilities (Military Service) Removal Act, 1900; Extension to 1901
 Q. Mr. C. Grant; A. Sir R. Finlay, Aug. 12, 433.
 Execution of Rebels, see sub-heading Rebels.
 Farm-burning Proclamation
 Harcourt, Sir W., on, Aug. 15, 981; O. Mr. Bryce, 1026.
 Field Glasses Captured by Boers; Compensation Claims

Q. Mr. Goulding; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 277.
 German War Correspondent, Arrest as Spy, etc.
 Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 901.
 Guerilla Warfare
 O. Mr. Bryce, Aug. 15, 1022.
 Mexican War Analogy
 O. Sir C. Dilke, Aug. 15, 1005.
 Insuring Soldiers' Lives; Action of Officer Commanding 3rd Battalion Royal Welsh Fusiliers
 Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1142.
 Kitchener, Lord
 Appreciation of the Great Work which Lord Kitchener had done in South Africa
 O. Mr. Asquith, Aug. 15, 1038.
 Leave of Absence from South Africa, Rumour
 Os. Sir W. Harcourt, Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 989, 993.
 Proclamations, see that sub-heading, also sub-headings Farm-burning, Surrender, etc.
 Meat Contracts for the Troops, Prices, etc.
 Os. Mr. Dillon, Aug. 8, 214; Mr. A. Chamberlain, 217.
 Military Law, see sub-heading Courts-Martial.
 Military Occupation as defined in "Manual of Military Law"; Belligerent Rights
 Question
 O. Sir W. Harcourt, Aug. 15, 986.
 Military Operations; Lord Kitchener's Despatch Presented, Aug. 16, 1130, 1139.
 Despatches; Distribution among Members
 Q. Sir C. Dilke; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 419.
 Native Compounds; Employment of British Soldiers to enforce Native Labour
 Contracts
 Q. Mr. Channing; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 269.
 Natives
 Employment of Aimed Natives
 Q. Mr. Dillon; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 34.
 Debate on the Appropriation Bill, Aug. 15, 979, 994, 1008, 1018.
 Krutzinger's, Gen., Threat to Shoot Armed and Unarmed Natives; Instructions to Lord Kitchener
 Q. Mr. E. Robertson; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 26; Qs. Mr. Dillon, Sir W. Harcourt; As. Lord Stanley, 27.
 Newspaper Methods aggravating Situation in South Africa
 O. Mr. Markham, Aug. 15, 1012.
 Opponents of the War; Indifference to Greatness of England, alleged
 Bryce, Mr., on, Aug. 15, 1030.
 Peace Negotiations; "There were no Peace Negotiations going on"
 O. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 1004.
 Peace Terms; "Reasonable Terms"
 O. Mr. Bryce, Aug. 15, 1028.
 Position of British Troops; Laying Maps on the Table, proposed

Q. Mr. Dillon; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 900.
 Press Censorship, see sub-heading Censorship.
 Prisoners;Boer Prisoners
 Number of (35,000)
 Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug 15, 996; Mr. Pirie, 1017; Mr. Asquith, 1043.
 St. Helena;Shooting of Godefroy
 Qs. Mr. Dillon; As. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 271; Aug. 15, 898; Aug. 17, 1295.
 Pro-Boer Speeches, etc., Effect of, on Prolonging the War
 Os. Mr. Bryce, Aug. 15, 1021; Mr. Lloyd-George, 1032.
 Proclamations
 Policy of, versus Military Operations
 Harcourt, Sir W., on, Aug. 15, 980;Mr. Chamberlain's Reply, 995.
 O. Sir C. Dilke, Aug. 15, 1005.
 (for Particular Proclamations see sub-headings Farm-burning, Surrender, etc.)
 Prolongation of Hostilities;Correspondence relating to, Presented, Aug. 8, 20;
 Aug. 9, 253.
 Punishment for Sleeping on Duty;Case of H. Mellon
 Q. Mr. E. Robertson; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 420.
 Rebels, Execution of, at Dordrecht
 Coetzee's Case;Trial of Rebels by Ordinary Courts, proposed
 Q. Mr. B. Roberts; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 28.
 Compulsory Attendance of Burghers
 Qs. Mr. Pirie, Mr. Leamy, Mr. S. MacNeill; As. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 28.
 Qs. Mr. Channing, Mr. M'Kenna; As. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 272.
 Q. Mr. Lloyd-George; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 418.
 Q. Mr. Pirie; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 899.
 Os. Mr. Pirie. Aug. 15, 1018; Mr. Lloyd-George, Aug. 17, 1329.
 Qs. Mr. Pirie, Mr. Leamy; As. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1141, 1142.
 Q. Mr. Pirie; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 17, 1295.
 Refugees;Owners of House Property, Exemption from Rent, etc., during enforced
 absence
 Q. Mr. Mildmay; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 25.
 Reilly, Private, 1st Battalion Devonshire Regiment, Death of;Pay Arrears, etc.
 Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1143.
 Reinforcements
 Mobile Troops
 Q. Mr. Lambert; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 273.
 Policy of Government
 O. Sir C. Dilke, Aug. 15, 1005.
 Yeomanry, see that sub-heading.
 Return of Troops
 Order of Return;Derbyshire Regiment, etc.
 Q. Sir W. Foster; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 275.
 (see also sub-heading Withdrawal of Troops.)
 Saddles for the Rhodesian Force, Prices paid for
 O. Mr. Dillon, Aug. 8, 214.

Situation in South Africa;Policy of the Government, etc.
 Debate on the Appropriation Bill, Aug. 15, 978, 1003, 1020, 1035, 1047.
 Surrender;Lord Kitchener's Proclamation announcing Sterner Measures against those who do not surrender before September 15
 Q. Mr. Channing; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 269.
 Belligerent Rights Question;"Lord Kitchener's Proclamation was an Innovation in the Laws and Customs of War"
 Harcourt, Sir W., on, Aug. 15, 982;Mr. J. Chamberlain's Reply, 996, 998.
 Os. Mr. Bryce, 1021; Mr. Asquith, 1039.
 Cost of Maintenance of Women and Children should be chargeable against Immovable Property of Burghers in the Field
 Harcourt, Sir W., on., Aug. 15, 988;Mr. J. Chamberlain's Reply, 997. O. Mr. Lloyd George, 1034.
 Debate on the Appropriation Bill, Aug. 15, 982, 1014, 1016, 1021, 1023, 1034.
 Government advising Issue of Proclamation, Extraordinary Coincidence
 Os. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 997, Sir C. Dilke, 1002.
 Resolution (Mr. MacNeill's);Facilities for Discussion
 Qs. Mr. S. MacNeill, Col. Saunderson; As. Mr. A. J. Balfour. Aug. 13, 593.
 Under;Age Recruits;Case of H. Mellon, Punishment for Sleeping on Duty
 Q. Mr. E. Robertson; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 420.
 Vlaktefontein;Shooting of British Wounded, Gen. Dixon's Despatch
 Q. Mr. Dillon; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 27; Qs. Mr. Dillon, Mr. Flavin; As. Lord Stanley, Aug. 15, 899.
 Report from Brigadier-Gen. Dixon Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 21.
 Volunteers;State of Volunteer Service Companies raised in 1900, Report Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 21.
 Waterkloof, Military Operations at
 Q. Mr. J. O'Connor; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 31.
 Withdrawal of Troops Policy
 Os. Sir C. Dilke, Aug. 1003; Mr. Asquith, 1041; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1046.
 Yeomanry;Inferiority of Special Contingent, alleged
 Os. Mr. Asquith, Aug. 15, 1042; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1047.
 South-Eastern and Chatham Railway
 London Bridge Fatality;Communication Cord out of Order
 Q. Mr. Bell; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1155.
 South-Eastern and London, Chatham and Dover Railway Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 South Essex Water Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 South Kensington Museum
 (see Victoria and Albert Museum.)
 South Lancashire Tramways Bill
 c. 3R.* Aug. 8, 15.
 I. Commons Amendt.* Aug. 9, 252.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 South Metropolitan Gas Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
 Southampton and Winchester, Great Western Junction Railway Bill
 I. Report from Select Committee, Aug. 8, 3.
 3R.* Aug. 12, 397.
 c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 14, 731.
 I. Royal Assent, Aug 17, 1291.
 Southport Water (Transfer) Bill
 I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 8, 2.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 251.
 Sovereign's Oath on Accession Bill
 Petitions, Aug. 12, 410; Aug. 13, 589; Aug. 14, 732; Aug. 15, 1138; Aug. 17, 1294.
 Spain
 Madrid;Irish Lady's Estate at, see Madrid.
 Sparks
 Compensation for Damage to Crops, etc., Bill, see that title.
 Speaker;Right Hon. W. C. Gully [Carlisle]
 Appropriation Bill;Legislation could not be discussed, Aug. 15, 1092.
 Chairman's Rulings
 Questioning Decision of the Chairman;There was no way except by Motion, Aug. 9, 366.
 Speaker was not a Court of Appeal from the Chairman, Aug. 9, 364.
 House of Lords;Member reading Speech delivered in the House of Lords, and answering it paragraph by paragraph, Aug. 14, 764.
 Judges, Criticism on, Aug. 15, 1064.
 Lords Amendments;Questions that could not be raised on, Aug. 8, 14; Aug. 9, 256, 257, 258, 259, 261, 262.
 Privilege, Breach of;"Globe" Newspaper and the Irish Members.
 Editor and Publisher at the Bar of the House, Aug. 16, 1193, 1194, 1195.
 No Discussion as to what Action the House should take could arise until the Question had been settled as to whether there had been a Breach of Privilege, Aug. 15, 968.
 Questions;Members putting Questions to Private Members, Resolution re Lord Kitchener's Proclamation, Aug. 13, 593.
 Sovereign;Terms of Disrespect used towards, Aug. 13, 471, 472.
 Supply Procedure under new Closure Rule;Including Votes which had not been submitted for consideration in Committee of Supply, Aug. 9, 363.
 Unparliamentary Language, Aug. 15, 1065.
 Spear, Mr. J. W. [Devon, Tavistock]
 Army;Meat Contracts, Supply of Foreign Beef, Aug. 9, 274.
 Speerstown
 National School struck off Roll;Teacher's Pension
 Q. Mr. Jordan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 64; Aug. 9, 300.
 Spencer, Earl
 Aden, Military Operations near, Aug. 13, 585.
 Agricultural Rates Act (1896, etc.) Continuance Bill, 2R., Aug. 12, 406.

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 869, 879, 881, 883.

Frederick, Empress of Germany, Death of;Address of Condolence, Aug. 8, 8.

Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 17, 1278, 1289.

Parliamentary Control over Expenditure of the Nation, Inadequate Discussion;Devolution of the Powers of Parliament, etc., Aug. 17, 1278.

Purchase of Land (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 883.

Queen's University in Ireland;Ex-professor's Claims for Compensation for Loss of Office, Aug. 15, 886.

Royal Declaration Bill, Protest against;Motion to suspend Standing Order, Aug. 15, 890.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, 2R., Aug. 16, 1135.

Stalybridge, Hyde, Mossley and Dukinfield Tramways and Electricity Board Bill
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Stamps

see Postage Stamps.

Standing Orders

House of Lords

Compulsory taking of Land, Constructing Works;Week for lodging Petitions,
Relaxation of Standing Order

O. Earl of Morley, Aug. 14, 730; Aug. 15, 865.

Private Bills;Amendment of Standing Orders

Motion (Earl of Morley), Aug. 8, 3.

Protest against a Bill, Motion to suspend Standing Order;Standing Orders not
complied with

Os. Lord Stanmore, Earl of Halsbury, Earl Spencer, Aug. 15, 889, 890.

Stanley, Lord;Financial Secretary to the War Office [Lancashire, West Houghton]
Aberdeen, Seaton Links;Proposed Military Camp, Aug. 15, 903.

Annual Return;Date of Issue, Aug. 9, 278.

Army List;Rank of Reserve Officers, Aug. 15, 903.

Athlone Barracks Gasworks, Use of by private Contractor, etc., Aug. 8, 77.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill 3R., Aug. 17, 1335.

Contracts

Ireland

Beer Contracts for Troops at the Curragh given to Burton Brewery Company, Aug.
8, 34.

Examining Samples of Articles at Arbour Hill Receiving Depôt, etc., Aug.
15, 902.

Meat Contracts;Supply of Foreign Beef, Aug. 9, 274.

Garrison Regiments, Royal;Present Position, etc., Aug. 15, 902.

Guns;Purchase of German Field Guns, Defects, etc., Aug. 12, 420.

Horses

Austro-Hungary, Purchase of Horses;Inquiry, Aug. 8, 36.

Report of Committee;Witnesses from Ireland, Aug. 9, 276.

Labourers' Wages at Naval Ports, Aug. 8, 37.

Medical Department

Civil Surgeons;Salary, Aug. 12, 422.
Report of Committee, Aug. 9, 277.
Retired Officers;Titles, Aug. 12, 422.
Military Works Acts;Amount expended on Defence Works, Barracks, etc., 1900–1, Aug. 15, 903.
Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 795, 800, 803, 808, 815; Com., Aug. 15, 1099, 1100, 1102, 1107.
Militia, Returned Militia from South Africa;Pay, Aug. 9, 276.
Officers, Retired Officers;Re-employment
Cavalry Officers;Outfit Allowance, Aug. 8, 35.
Seniority and Pay, Aug. 8, 35, 36.
Penrhyn Quarry Dispute;Military Aid to Civil Power, Aug. 8, 50.
Pensions
Belfast Workhouse, Destitute Veterans, in, etc., Aug. 16, 1144.
M'Gowan, W., Destitute Veteran, Aug. 12, 423.
Mackie, T., Case of, Aug. 13, 594.
Rogers, J., Case of, Aug. 16, 1143.
Recruits;Total Number since Jan., 1901, etc., Aug. 9, 278.
Rifle Ranges;New Ranges in 1901, etc., Aug. 9, 277.
South African War
Ambulance Wagons, Improvement of, Aug. 13, 594.
Army Service Corps;War Rewards for Warrant Officers, etc., Aug. 12, 421.
Burney's, Sergeant-Major, Claim;Pay Arrears, Aug. 8, 32.
Censorship;"Freeman's Journal" Correspondent, Seizure of Manuscripts, etc., Aug. 12, 420; Aug. 16, 1141.
Chaplains, Roman Catholic;Rewards for War Services, Aug. 8, 32.
Coloured Men with British Army, Number of, Aug. 8, 35.
Concentration Camps
Bloemfontein;Health of Children, Medical Officer's Report, Aug. 16, 1141.
Howick;Keeping Account of Rations and Clothing issued, etc., Aug. 15, 900.
Conduct of the War;Future Conduct, Discriminating between large and small Bodies of Enemy, Aug. 8, 27.
Courts-martial
Munster Fusiliers, Heavy Sentences on, Aug. 9, 273.
Revision of Sentences;Sentence taking effect at once, Aug. 9, 274.
Field Glasses captured by Boers;Compensation Claims, Aug. 9, 278.
German War Correspondent, Arrest of, as Spy, etc., Aug. 15, 901.
Insuring Soldiers' Lives, etc., Aug. 16, 1142.
Kitchener's, Lord, Despatches;Distribution among Members, Aug. 12, 419.
Natives
Employment of Armed Natives, etc., Aug. 8, 34.
Kruitinger's, Gen., Threat;Instructions to Lord Kitchener, Aug. 8, 26, 27.
Position of British Troops;Laying Maps on the Table proposed, Aug. 15, 901.
Prisoners;Boer Prisoners at St. Helena;Shooting of Godefroy, Aug. 9, 272; Aug. 15, 898; Aug. 17, 1295.
Punishment for Sleeping on Duty;H. Mellon, Under-age Recruit, Aug. 12, 421.

Rebels, Execution of, at Dordrecht
Coetzee's Case, Aug. 8, 28.
Compulsory Attendance of Burghers, Aug. 8, 29; Aug. 9, 272; Aug. 12, 419; Aug. 15, 899; Aug. 16, 1142; Aug. 17, 1296.
Reilly, Private, Death of; Pay Arrears, etc., Aug. 16, 1143.
Reinforcements; Mobile Forces, Aug. 9, 273.
Return of Troops; Order of Return, Aug. 9, 275.
Vlakfontein; Shooting of British Wounded, Gen. Dixon's Despatch, Aug. 8, 28; Aug. 15, 900.
Waterkloof, Military Operations at, Aug. 8, 31.
Yeomanry; Returned Yeomanry from South Africa, Pay Arrears, Aug. 8, 34.
Transports; Gambling on H.M. Transports, Aug. 16, 1146.
Volunteers
Camp Attendance Regulations, Aug. 17, 1334.
Allowances; Increasing Rate of Pay, etc., proposed, Aug. 12, 422; Aug. 17, 1296.
Giving Power to General Officers to dispense with, Aug. 16, 1145.
Mounted Infantry Companies; Future Position, Aug. 8, 33.
Musketry Regulations; Paucity of Target Accommodation, etc., Aug. 16, 1146.
Water Corps, Royal, Formation of; Mr. L. Canney's suggestion, Aug. 16, 1145.
Woolwich Arsenal; Foremen, proposed Pensions, etc., Aug. 16, 1144.
Yeomanry, Imperial
Fife and Forfar Yeomanry; Pay and Furlough, Aug. 8, 33.
Officers; Placing on Equality with Militia Officers as regards Precedence, etc., Aug. 9, 275.
Stanmore, Lord
Royal Declaration Bill, Protest Against; Motion to suspend Standing Order, Aug. 15, 889, 890.
Statistics
Colonial and other Possessions; Statistical Abstracts from 1886–1900. Presented, Aug. 8, 6, 19.
United Kingdom; Statistical Abstract from 1886–1900. Presented, Aug. 8, 6, 19.
Stirling Corporation Order Confirmation Bill
l. 3R.* Aug. 8, 3.
Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. [Glasgow, College]
Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 542; Aug. 13, 672, 680.
Stockport Corporation Water Bill
l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
Stokers; Merchant Service
Charges against of Drunkenness and Desertion, see Orient Steam Navigation Co.
Stornoway
Allotments; Refusal of Applications
Q. Mr. Weir; A. Mr. A. G. Murray, Aug. 9, 291.
Strachey, Mr. E. [Somerset, S.]

Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 805.
 Milk;Departmental Committee adopting Recommendations, etc., Aug. 15, 919.
 Personal Property (Contributions to Local Taxation);Return, Aug. 15, 954.
 Stratford-upon-Avon, Towcester, and Midland Junction Railway, etc. Bill
 c. Lords Amendts.,* Aug. 8, 15.
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Stratton and Bude Improvement Bill
 c. 3R.* Aug. 8, 15.
 I. Commons Amendts.,* Aug. 9, 252.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
 Submarine Cables
 see Cable Communication.
 Sugar Duty
 Budget Proposals;Rebate on Contracts made in Dec., 1900, proposed
 Q. Mr. Taylor; A. Sir M. H. Beach, Aug. 16, 1152.
 Sullivan, Mr. D. [Westmeath, S.]
 Athlone Barracks Gas Works, Use of by Private Contractor, Aug. 8, 77.
 Camolin Disturbances;Trial of Farmers by Stipendiary Magistrates, etc., Aug. 17,
 1303.
 Sullivan, Sergeant
 Charges against
 Os. Mr. J. O'Donnell. Aug. 15, 1060; Mr. Wyndham, 1069; Mr. Dillon, Aug. 17,
 1310.
 Sunday Trading (Scotland) Bill
 c. 1R.* Aug. 9, 311.
 Supply
 Army and Navy Estimates, see those titles.
 Civil Service and Revenue Departments Estimates
 Irish Votes, Local Government Board;£40,182, Com., Aug. 8, 83; Rep., Aug. 9,
 311.
 Votes Closed in Classes;Class I. to VII., Com., Aug. 8, 139, 143, 149, 153,
 159, 165, 169; Rep., Aug. 9, 351, 355, 359, 363, 367, 371.
 Revenue Departments Estimates, Com., Aug. 8, 181; Rep., Aug. 9, 381.
 Procedure;Votes in Classes, New Closure Rule
 Alteration in the Method of Putting the Question
 Os. Mr. Dillon, Mr. Chairman, Aug. 8, 140, 145, 146.
 Including Votes which had not been submitted for consideration in Committee of
 Supply;"Submitted for consideration" did not mean "Proposed from the Chair,"
 etc.
 Os. Mr. Dillon, Mr. Chairman, Mr. S. MacNeill, Aug. 8, 159, 160, 161, 162; Mr.
 Dillon, Mr. Speaker, Aug. 9, 363.
 Supreme Court of Judicature (Appeals) Bill
 c. Bill withdrawn, Aug. 12, 575.
 Supreme Court of Judicature, Ireland
 Additional Rule and Schedule Presented. Aug. 8, 6, 21.
 Swansea, Lord

Took the Oath, Aug. 9, 251
 Swansea Harbour Bill
 c. Lords Amendts., * Aug. 8, 15.
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Sweden
 Trade Report Presented, Aug. 9, 253.
 Swine Fever
 Abingdon Market, Outbreak at; Isolation Order
 Q. Mr. Mansfield; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 16, 1159.
 Lincolnshire; Closing Markets of Spalding, etc.
 Q. Mr. Mansfield; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 16, 1160.
 T
 Taff Vale Railway Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. [Oxford University]
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 547;
 Aug. 13, 657.
 Tallaght
 Petty Sessions; Charge of damaging Kynoch's Property, Action of Police, etc.
 Q. Mr. Clancy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1302.
 Tara Hill
 Excavations, Prevention of
 Qs. Mr. P. White, Mr. Flavin; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 608.
 Tarbert and Kilrush Steamer
 Calling at Glin, proposed
 Q. Mr. O'Shaughnessy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 68.
 Taxes and Imposts
 Collection of; Return Presented, Aug. 14, 731.
 Taylor, Mr. T. C. [Lancashire, Radcliffe]
 Egypt; Fox-hunting Incident near Mr. Blunt's Estate, Assault on British Officers
 by Natives, Aug. 8, 42, 44; Aug. 9, 280.
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 523,
 554.
 Sugar; Import Duty, Proposed Rebates, Aug. 16, 1152.
 Tea
 Imports into Principal Countries in Europe, United States, and British
 Colonies; Statement with Statistical Tables Ordered, Aug. 14, 732; Presented, Aug.
 16, 1138.
 Telegraph Service
 Addresses; Charge Anomalies, Names of Places
 Qs. Mr. H. Heaton; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 431; Aug. 16, 1163.
 Cable Communication, see that title.
 Guarantees; Extension of Telegraphs
 Q. Col. Stopford-Sackville; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain Aug. 9, 288.
 Liverpool; Promotion Grievances
 Q. Mr. T. P. O'Connor; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1164.

Redirection Charge

Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 431.

Telegraphists with Five Years' Service;Petition for Increase of Pay

Q. Sir F. Evans; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 433.

Vote for;Facilities for Discussion

Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 9, 308.

Telephone Service

London;Negotiations with National Telephone Company, etc.

Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 287.

National Telephone Company, see that title.

Vote for;Facilities for Discussion

Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 9, 308.

Templetown, Visc.

Land Commission, Ireland

Fixing "True Value," Return, Aug. 8, 11.

Walker v. Lord Gosford, Rehearing, Aug. 8, 12.

Land Purchase, Ireland;Returns Relative to Transactions, Aug. 13, 578.

Tenant, Mr. H. J. [Berwickshire]

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con. Aug 12, 504, 522, 533, 534, 539, 540, 552, 564; Aug 13, 659, 662, 663, 674, 677, 717.

Textile Industry

Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment Bill;Proposal to close Factories at 12 o'clock on Saturdays, see Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill.

Thibet

Russia, Embassy to;Object of, etc.

Q. Mr. Norman; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug 12, 425.

Thomas, Mr. D. A. [Merthyr Tydvil]

Coal

Commission

Constitution of, Aug. 8, 45.

Delay in Appointment, etc., Aug. 9, 309.

Export Duty;Remissions, Amount of;Expediting Repayment, Aug. 8, 46.

Penrhyn Quarry Dispute;Military Aid to Civil Power, Aug 8, 49.

Thompson, Dr. E. C. [Monaghan, N.]

Army Medical Department

Civil Surgeons;Salary, Aug. 12, 422.

Retired Officers;Titles, Aug. 12, 422.

Capital Punishment;"Drop" Regulations, Death not Instantaneous, Alleged, Aug. 16, 1153.

Local Government Board (Ireland) Administration;Training of Nurses for Workhouses, etc., Aug. 9, 322, 329.

Londonderry Railway Station;Erection of Suitable Buildings, Aug. 15, 950.

Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 833.

Lunatic Asylums, Ireland;Trade Warders going on Duty after Day's Work, etc., Aug. 15, 940.

Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 848.
Thornton, Mr. P. M. [Clapham]
Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 565.
Thurles
Brennan, J.; Death from Police Violence, alleged
Q. Mr. K. O'Brien; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1181.
Thurso and Bettyhill
Mail Car Service, Contract for
Q. Mr. Leveson-Gower; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 432.
Tickhill Light Railway
Order Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 18.
Tipperary
Mail Delays from Dublin
Qs. Mr. Cullinan, Mr. J. Redmond, Mr. Flavin; As. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 951.
Rent Appeals; Compulsory Land Purchase Bill proposed
Q. Mr. Landon; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 71.
Tobercurry
Boycotting at
Q. Col. M'Calmont; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 13, 607.
Tomlinson Mr. W. E. M. [Preston]
Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 507, 508, 542.
Tonbridge
Postmen's Petition for Increase of Pay
Q. Mr. Nolan; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 16, 1165.
Town Tenants
Ireland; Perpetuity of Tenure, etc., Legislation Proposed
Q. Mr. Sheehan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 929.
Trade, Board of
President; Rt. Hon. G. W. Balfour.
Parliamentary Secretary; Earl of Dudley.
Labour Department, see that title.
Railway Department Administration
Debate on Appropriation Bill, Aug. 15, 1075.
Trade Reports Presented
Annual Series, Aug. 8, 3; Aug. 9, 253, 268; Aug. 13, 590; Aug. 14, 731; Aug. 16, 1129, 1140.
Miscellaneous Series, Aug. 9, 253, 268.
Trade Unions
Report of Chief Labour Correspondent of Board of Trade, Presented, Aug. 14, 733; Aug. 15, 862.
Tralee Mails
Delay in Arrival from Limerick
Q. Mr. Flavin; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 17, 1305.
Tramway and Gas and Water Orders

Report of Proceedings, Presented, Aug. 9, 254, 267.

Tramways

Street and Road Tramways;Return, Presented, Aug. 8, 19.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 1) Bill

c. 3R.* Aug. 8, 15.

l. Commons Amendts., Aug. 9, 252.

Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 2) Bill

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 3) Bill

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.

Tramways Orders Confirmation (No. 4) Bill

l. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.

Transport Service

Gambling on Transports from South Africa

Q. Mr. Mansfield; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1146.

Transvaal

Administration of Transvaal and Orange River Colony;Form of Future Constitution

Os. Mr. Bryce, Aug. 15, 1027; Mr. Asquith, 1042.

Contracts to Purchase or Lease Land or Mining Rights, etc., entered into prior to the War;Proclamation by Lord Kitchener

Q. Mr. B. Jones; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 12, 418.

Copy Presented, Aug. 15, 863, 895.

Customs and Trade Regulations, Orange River Colony and Transvaal

Q. Sir J. Rolleston; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 15, 897.

Johannesburg Refugee Owners of House Property;Exemption from Rent, etc., during enforced Absence

Q. Mr. Mildmay; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 25.

Land Settlement Scheme for the Transvaal and Orange River Colony

Expenditure

Qs. Mr. Lambert; As. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 8, 25; Aug. 9, 271.

Liquor Law and the Native Question

Os. Sir C. Dilke, Aug. 15, 1044; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1049.

Native Labour;Pass Law, etc.

Os. Mr. Asquith, Aug. 15, 1044; Mr. A. J. Balfour, 1049.

Enforcement of Contracts, Employment of British Soldiers for

Q. Mr. Channing; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain Aug. 9, 269.

Situation in Transvaal and Orange River Colony after the War;Bringing back

Civilisation, Industrial Pursuits, etc.

O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 15, 1050.

Trawling

Ireland;Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, see that title.

Scotland;Incompetency of Masters of Steam Trawlers, etc.

Q. Mr. Crombie; A. Mr. G. Balfour, Aug 9, 280.

Treasury

First Lord;Rt. Hon. A. J. Balfour.

Financial Secretary;Mr. A. Chamberlain.
Tree Planting, Ireland
see Ireland;Afforestation.
Trevelyan, Mr. C. P. [York, W.R., Elland]
Cooper's Hill College, Report of Board of of Visitors;Presenting to Parliament,
Aug. 12, 423.
Trim Union
Finance;Debit and Credit Balances, Each Division Contributing due Proportion,
etc.
Q. Mr. Kennedy; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 298.
Trinidad
Government Schools, Closing of, etc.
Q. Mr. C. Rickett; A. Mr. J. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 279.
Truck Acts
Prosecutions in Ireland;Deane v. Boyle, Remission of Costs
Q. Mr. S. MacNeill; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 933.
Tuberculosis
Communicability of Bovine Tuberculosis to the Human Species;Royal Commission
Q. Mr. Carew; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 8, 52; Q. Mr. Field; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 15, 915.
Cancer, Communicability from Animals to Man;investigation proposed
Q. Mr. J. More; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 16, 1161.
Tully, Mr. J. [Leitrim, South]
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1092, 1093.
Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1111.
Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 13, 702,
703, 716.
Light Railways (No. 2) Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1124.
Local Government (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 835.
Pacific Cable Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 633, 640, 645, 646.
Public Works Loans Bill, 3R., Aug. 15, 1123.
Rogers, J.;Pension Claim, Aug. 16, 1143.
Royal Titles Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 623.
Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Con. Aug. 14, 837, 844, 845, 847,
848.
Sheridan, Sergeant, Charges against, etc., Aug. 15, 943, 1092.
Valuation (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1127.
Turkey
Money Orders to United Kingdom;Reduction of Charge, proposed
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 285.
Parcels Postage Rate to United Kingdom
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 286.
Postal Order System, Extending to Salonica, Smyrna, etc.
Q. Mr. H. Heaton; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 9, 284.
Turks and Caicos Islands
Report for 1900 Presented, Aug. 8, 4.
Tweedmouth, Lord

Naval Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 17, 1286, 1288.

Tyneside Tramways and Tram Roads Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.

Typhoid

Destroyer of Armies;Mr. L. Canney's Water Corps Suggestion

Q. Sir M. Foster; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1145.

Tyrone

Assistant Surveyors;Increase of Salary

Q. Mr. Murnaghan; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 9, 292.

County Councils' Complaint with reference to increase of Salaries of Surveyors, etc.

O. Mr. Murnaghan, Aug. 9, 320.

Hospital-Training of Nurses Question

Os. Dr. Thompson, Aug. 9, 323; Mr. Wyndham, 329.

U

Uganda

Railway;Report of Committee for 1900–1901 with Map, Presented, Aug. 9, 253, 268.

Union Jack

Hauling down on s.s. "Pilot"

Q. Mr. W. Johnston; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 12, 446.

United Irish League

see Ireland.

United States

Coaling Facilities for the Navy;New Policy

Os. Mr. Pretyman, Aug. 14, 750, Mr. Lough 763, Sir J. Colomb, 766.

Horse Industry;Report Presented, Aug. 9, 253.

Nicaragua Canal;Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, Reply to Lord Lansdowne's Despatch, etc.

Q. Mr. Perks; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 15, 909.

Philippines, see that title.

Prosperity, Phenomenal Bounds in;New York competing with London as one of the Financial Centres of the World;Excess of Exports over Imports Argument

O. Lord G. Hamilton, Aug. 16, 1212.

War of Independence and the Employment of Natives

O. Mr. J. Chamberlain; Aug. 15, 994

V

Vaccination

Conscientious Objectors;Case of W. Venables

Q. Mr. C. Grant; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 12, 426.

Leeds;Case of E. M. Child, Report of Inspector

Q. Mr. C. Grant; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 8, 52.

Metropolitan Small-pox Hospitals;Number of Cases 1898–1900, etc.

Q. Mr. Cremer; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 15, 917.

Valuation (Ireland) Bill

c. 2R. Aug. 14, 819.

Com., Aug. 15, 1126.

l. 1R., 2R., and 3R.* Aug. 16, 1137.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Veterinary College, Dublin
 Qualifications of Students
 Q. Mr. Flavin; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 16, 1180.
 "Victoria and Albert"; H.M. Yacht
 Return to Portsmouth; Defects, etc.
 Q. Mr. Mansfield; A. Mr. Arnold-Forster, Aug. 13, 596.
 Victoria and Albert Museum
 Amount spent under First Contract; Completing Foundations, etc.
 Q. Mr. Massey-Mainwaring; A. Mr. A. Douglas, Aug. 8, 54.
 Victualling of the Navy
 see Navy
 Vincent, Sir Edgar [Exeter]
 India; Financial and Economic Position, Lord G. Hamilton's Statement, Aug. 16, 1266; (for details, see India)
 Vincent, Sir Howard [Sheffield, Central]
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 3R. Aug. 17, 1326.
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, Con., Aug. 12, 551.
 Separating Consolidating from Amending Clauses, etc., Aug. 8, 47.
 Volunteers
 Camp Attendances; Giving Power to General Officers to dispense with, etc., Aug. 16, 1145.
 Increase and Efficiency; Period of Training, War Office Schemes which might have a tendency to reduce Number of Forces, etc., Aug. 17, 1326.
 Mounted Infantry Companies; Future Position, Aug. 8, 32.
 Musketry Regulations; Paucity of Target Accommodation, etc., Aug. 16, 1145.
 Volunteers
 Camp
 Allowances; Increasing Rate of Pay, etc., proposed
 Q. Sir A. Agnew; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 17, 1296; Q. Mr. Mansfield; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 12, 422.
 Attendances, Giving Power to General Officers to dispense with, proposed
 Q. Sir H. Vincent; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1145
 Period of Training; War Office Schemes which might have a tendency to reduce number of Forces, etc.
 Debate on Appropriation Bill, Aug. 17, 1326, 1332, 1333, 1334.
 Mounted Infantry Companies, Future Position
 Q. Sir H. Vincent; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 32.
 Musketry Regulations; Paucity of Target Accommodation, etc.
 Q. Sir H. Vincent; A. Lord Stanley. Aug 16, 1145.
 Rifle Ranges, see that title.
 W
 Waima Arbitration
 Delays; Payments to Sufferers pending Settlement
 Q. Mr. Mansfield; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 16, 1151.

Waiters, Waitresses and Bar Attendants Bill
c. 1R.* Aug. 13, 616.

Wales
Aberystwith;"Queen Bee" Fatality, Registration of Pleasure Boats
Q. Mr. G. Kenyon; A. Mr. Long, Aug. 9, 282.
Carmarthenshire and Carnarvonshire, see those titles.
Ordnance Maps, Revision of
Q. Mr. L. Morgan; A. Mr. Hanbury, Aug. 9, 282.
Penrhyn Quarry Dispute, see that title.
Pretstatyn Board School;Erection of New School, Reconsidering Decision, etc.
Qs. Mr. Yerburgh, Mr. G. Kenyon; As. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 15, 925.

Wales and Loughton Light Railway
Order Presented, Aug. 8, 5, 18.

Walker, Col. W. H. [Widnes]
Liverpool Water Mains;Compensation Claims, Aug. 8, 51.
Walker v. Lord Gosford
Re-hearing
Os. Visc. Templeton, Lord Ashbourne, Aug. 8, 12.

Wallasey Improvement Bill
c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 9, 265.
I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.

Walsall
School Board;Illegal Exemptions
Qs. Mr. Flynn; As. Sir J. Gorst, Aug. 9, 283; Aug. 13, 600.

Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin
Resignation of Seat on Board of Education, Ireland, see Education;Ireland.

War
Secretary of State;Rt. Hon. St. John Brodrick.
Under Secretary;Lord Raglan.
Financial Secretary;Lord Stanley.

Warfare
Belligerent Rights, see that title.
Hague Conference, see that title.
Natives, Employment of, see titles South African War, Mexican War, etc.

Warner, Mr. T. Courtenay [Stafford, Lichfield]
Army and Navy Expenditure;Application of Surpluses to meet Excesses, Com., Aug. 8, 193.
Military Works Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 798; Com., Aug. 15, 1100, 1105.
Rifle Ranges;New Ranges in 1901, etc., Aug. 9, 277; Aug. 14, 798.
Salisbury Plain;Wooden Huts, Aug. 14, 798.

Water Corps
Formation of;Mr. L. Canney's Suggestion
Q. Sir M. Foster; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1145.

Waterford
Ardmore Abbey Church, see that title.

Watford and District Tramways Bill

c. Con.* Aug. 12, 409.
 3R.* Aug. 15, 891.
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
 Ways and Means
 Appropriation Bill Resolution, Aug. 8, 231.
 Procedure;Discussing Preliminary Resolutions to the Introduction of the
 Appropriation Bill
 O. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 8, 233.
 Weaving Sheds
 Burnley;Operatives' Wages, Deductions for oiling Machinery
 Q. Mr. Nannetti; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 13, 598.
 Webb, Col. W. G. [Staffordshire, Kingswinford]
 Seisdon Rural District Council, Complaints against, etc., Aug. 9, 281.
 Weights and Measures
 Proceedings and Business under Act;Report Presented, Aug. 9, 254, 268.
 Weir, Mr. J. G. [Ross and Cromarty]
 Allotments
 Ross-shire;Taking Land Compulsorily on Lease, Refusal of Application, Aug. 9,
 291.
 Stornoway;Refusal of Applications, Aug. 9, 291.
 Wells Corporation Water Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 250.
 West Cumberland Electric Tramways Bill
 c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 8, 15.
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Westbourne National Schools
 Return of Correspondence, proposed
 Q. Mr. T. O'Donnell; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 17, 1302.
 Weston-super-Mare Gas Bill
 c. 3R.* Aug. 9, 265.
 I. Commons Amendts.* Aug. 12, 397.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1291.
 Westminster
 Roman Catholic Procession;Police Protection, etc.
 Q. Col. Sandys; A. Mr. Ritchie, Aug. 13, 597.
 Westminster Abbey
 Coronation Preparations;Removal of Screen
 Q. Lord Balcarres; A. Mr. Douglas, Aug. 15, 922.
 Wexford
 County Council;Number of Meetings and other Defects of Local Government Act
 Debate in Com. of Supply, Aug. 8, 83.
 Evangelistic Platform pulled down;Prosecution of Farmers
 O. Mr. T. M. Healy Aug. 15, 1093.
 Surveyors' Salaries;Dispute between the County Council and Local Government
 Board
 Os. Sir T. Esmonde, Aug. 8, 89; Mr. Field, 126.

White, Mr. P. [Meath, N.]
 Crown Officials on Irish Grand Juries; Mr. Knight at Monaghan, etc., Aug. 12, 446.
 Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, Con., Aug. 14, 841.
 Tara Hill; Prevention of Excavations, Aug 13, 608.
 White Estate, Bantry
 Sale of Land to Tenants, Delays
 Qs. Mr. Gilhooly; As. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 8, 62; Aug. 12, 437.
 Wigan Corporation Tramways, etc., Bill
 I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.
 Wild Animals
 African Big Game Preserves; Sir H. Johnstone's Representation, etc.
 Q. Mr. Dillon; A. Visc. Cranborne, Aug. 12, 426.
 Wild Birds
 Protection of, in Ireland
 Q. Earl of Mayo; A. Lord Ashbourne, Aug. 8, 12.
 Wilson, Mr. F. W. [Norfolk, Mid]
 Agricultural Returns; Accounting for Non-Agricultural Area, Aug. 15, 918.
 Light Railways (No. 2) Bill, 2R. Aug. 14, 858.
 Military Works Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1105.
 Wilson, Mr. H. J. [York, W.R., Holmfirth]
 Chatham Graveyards, Condition of, Aug. 15, 916.
 Guernsey Bookmakers transferring Business from Holland; Advertisements in English Newspapers, etc., Aug. 15, 910.
 Indian Army; New Scheme for Mounted Infantry, Cost of Accommodation, etc., Aug. 12, 424.
 Wilts, County of
 Inquiry into Charities; Return Ordered, Aug. 9, 268; Presented, Aug. 15, 896.
 Winchester Bishop of
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 877.
 Windsor, Lord
 Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and Consolidation Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 869, 874.
 Public Libraries Bill, Commons Amendts., Aug. 15, 890.
 Wolffe, S.
 Prosecution under Debtors Act, 1880; Abandonment of, etc.
 Q. Mr. Parkes; A. Mr. S. Dickson, Aug. 13, 602.
 Wolverhampton and Cannock Chase Railway Bill
 c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 8, 15.
 Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.
 Woods and Forests Department
 Vote for; Facilities for Discussion early next Session
 Qs. Mr. H. Lewis, Mr. W. Jones; As. Mr. A. J. Balfour, Aug. 16, 1187.
 Woolwich Arsenal
 Foremen; Proposed Pensions, Conditions, etc.
 Q. Mr. K. Hardie; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 16, 1144, 1145.

Worcester Tramways Bill

I. Royal Assent, Aug. 9, 249.

Workhouses, Ireland

Accommodation, Increase in Expenditure, etc.

O. Mr. Cullinan, Aug. 8, 100.

Amalgamation of Unions

Q. Mr. Daly; A. Mr. Wyndham, Aug. 15, 933.

Dietary, Improvement in; Cost of

Os. Mr. Daly, Aug. 9, 314; Mr. Macartney, 315.

Hospitals

Disgraceful Condition of

O. Dr. Thompson, Aug. 9, 324.

Return Presented, Aug. 13, 578.

Nurses; Employment of Trained Nurses, Local Government Board Order; Employment of Nuns, proposed, etc.

Debate in Com. of Supply, Aug. 8, 87, 101, 114; Aug. 9, 314, 322, 324, 326, 328.

Workmens' Co-operative Societies

Report, with Statistical Tables, Presented Aug. 16, 1129, 1138.

Wotton-under-Edge

Post Office; Making R.S.O., etc.

Q. Mr. C. Allen; A. Mr. A. Chamberlain, Aug. 13, 601.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. G.; Chief Secretary for Ireland [Dover]

Afforesting

Supplying Trees free of Cost to Owners of Land, proposed, Aug. 15, 941.

Treasury Grant, Aug. 8, 67.

Agrarian Offences Returns; Number of Incendiary Fires, Aug. 13, 605.

Agriculture and Technical Instruction Department; Return, Date of Issue, Aug. 15, 935.

Antrim, County; Discharging Firearms, Aug. 12, 442.

Ardmore Abbey Church; Preservation of Ruins, Aug. 12, 446.

Banagher Great Fair, Forestalling at, etc., Aug. 13, 603.

Banbridge Sanitation; Compelling Urban Council to carry out Improvements, Aug. 8, 71.

Belfast

Queen's Island; Preservation of Public Peace, Aug. 15, 926.

Roman Catholic Employees; Discharge by Anglo-American Oil Company, Aug. 15, 926; Aug. 16, 1181.

Camolin Disturbances; Trial of Farmers by Stipendiary Magistrate, etc., Aug. 17, 1304.

Carden's, Sir J., Game Coverts; Mr. Bruen and others shooting on Public Road, Aug. 12, 440.

Cavan, Local Government Inquiries; Selection of Major Fair, Aug. 15, 932.

Census; Employment of Boy Copyists, Appointment of Female Clerk, etc., Aug. 12, 436; Aug. 16, 1180.

Clerks of the Crown and Peace, Clerks to; Holding Office during pleasure of Lord Chancellor, Aug. 15, 938.

Congested Districts Board (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 12, 574.
 Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill, 2R., Aug. 15, 1069; 3R., Aug. 17, 1313, 1316.
 Constabulary, Royal Irish
 Ballyhaunis, Prosecution at; Police Interference with Witnesses, alleged, Aug. 16, 1169.
 Ballymote; Arrest of J. Gilmartin by Police, Aug. 8, 68.
 Charges of Organising and Manufacturing Crime, Aug. 15, 1068; Aug. 17, 1316.
 Compensation for Injuries; Return, Aug. 15, 927.
 Fund; Amount on Division into Benefit and Reward Branches, etc, Aug. 15, 927.
 Sheridan, Sergeant, Dismissal of
 Magoohan, D., Case of, Aug. 15, 943.
 Murphy and Bray, Case of; Compensation, Aug. 16, 1175.
 Tallaght Petty Sessions; Charge of damaging Kynoch's Property, Action of Police, etc., Aug. 17, 1302.
 Thurles; Death from Police violence, alleged, Aug 16, 1181.
 Court Houses, Control of, etc.
 Cavan Court House, Right of County Council to transact Business, etc.,; Action of High Sheriff, Aug. 9, 301; Aug. 13, 606.
 Dawra Court House; Right of District Council to use, etc., Aug. 9, 298.
 Criminals, Arrest of; County Liability for Expenses, Aug. 16, 1174.
 Dalkey; Revision Court, proposed, Aug. 8, 67.
 Donaghmore Churchyard, Desecration of, Aug. 15, 932.
 Dublin
 Dispensary District, North; Medical Officers' Salaries, Aug. 17, 1301.
 Lost Property in Cabs and Cars; Sale of unclaimed Property, Rewards for Finders, etc., Aug. 16, 1168.
 Mountjoy Convict Prison; Complaints against Principal Warder Murray, Aug. 9, 296.
 Pathological Laboratory, County Councils contributing towards, Aug. 8, 64.
 Veterinary College; Qualifications of Students, Aug. 16, 1180.
 Education
 Board of; Resignation of Archbishop Walsh, Second Memorandum, Aug. 8, 61; Aug. 15, 928.
 Books
 Blackie, Messrs., Supplying; Bookbinders' Society's Complaints, Aug. 8, 59.
 Charges against Book Department; Resolutions of Teachers, etc., Aug. 9, 294.
 Memorandum of Commissioners, Aug. 8, 60.
 Hand and Eye Training Classes for Teachers in remote districts, Aug. 16, 1178.
 Londonderry and Education Act; Appointment of School Attendance Committee, Aug. 8, 58.
 Spearstown National School struck off Roll; Teacher's Pension, Aug. 8, 64; Aug. 9, 300.
 Westbourne National Schools; Return of Correspondence, proposed, Aug. 17, 1302.
 Egg and Butter Trade; Irish Representative in England, proposed, Aug. 17, 1303.
 Eglinton, T., Ex-Soldier and Postman; Pension proposed, Aug. 13, 603.
 Emigration, Number of Emigrants in May, June, and July, 1900–1, Aug. 15,

933.

Enniskillen Boundaries;Protestant and Roman Catholic Representation on Local Bodies, Aug. 8, 74.

Evictions

Cappawhite;Case of T. Franklin, Failure to serve Notice, etc., Aug. 12, 443.

Condition of the Campaign Tenants, etc., Aug. 15, 1071.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill, Com., Aug. 15, 1114.

Fermanagh

Boundaries;Protestant and Roman Catholic Representation on Local Bodies, Aug. 8, 73.

Electoral Divisions, Proposed Change, etc., Aug. 12, 442.

Finigan and Muldowney, Prisoners;Proposed Release, Aug. 8, 72.

Fisheries

Inspectorship;Appointment to Vacancy, Aug. 16, 1170.

Mackerel Industry and Congested Districts Board;Contract, etc., Aug. 15, 930.

Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 825, 828.

Galway Licensing Prosecution;Resident Magistrate Leaving Bench etc., Aug. 8, 63.

Great Southern and Western Railway;Conveyance of Irish Produce, Fish Sates, Aug. 8, 65.

Irish Language Teaching in Irish Schools

Coakley, Mr., Ratifying Appointment of, Aug. 16, 1173.

Fees, Aug. 8, 57.

Jury System;Crown Officials on Irish Grand Juries, Mr. Knight at Monaghan, Aug. 12, 446.

Kerry, Returns, Date of Publication, Aug. 16, 1180.

Kilkenny Magistracy;Appointment of Nationalist Magistrate, Aug. 12, 435.

Kinvara Harbour, Improvement of;Accumulation of Sand, etc., Aug. 12, 445; Aug. 13, 608.

Labourers' Cottages

Cork

Kelly's, W., Application, Aug. 15, 939.

Millstreet Union;Rejection of Applications, Aug. 12, 439; Aug. 15, 929.

Donegal County;Erection of Cottages, Delays, etc., Aug. 17, 1301.

Fishermen, Housing of;Rejection of Applications for Labourers' Cottages, etc., Aug. 9, 297.

Limerick;Rejection of Applications, Aug. 8, 70.

Macroom Scheme;Application for Cottage on Mrs. Manning's Lands, etc., Aug. 9, 298.

Omagh;Income Tax Demands, Aug. 8, 66.

Land Commissioners

French's Colonel, Coonagh Estate;Sale of Land to Tenants, Aug. 8, 70.

Kerry Appeals;Delays, Aug. 15, 941.

Killclooney Estate, Galway, Aug. 8, 63; Aug. 15, 927.

Louth Land Court Appeals;Hearing in Drogheda or Dundalk, Aug. 12, 438.

O'Brien Estate, Aug. 15, 931.

Skibbereen;Major Cronsdales, Commissioner, etc., Aug. 12, 441.

Valuers;County Court Valuers, etc.,
 Martin, Mr., Valuing Farm for Landlord, alleged, Aug. 16, 1174.
 Test of Qualifications, Aug. 8, 72.
 Land Judge's Court;Sale of Land to Tenants, Delays, etc.
 Farrar's Estate, Ballyvarra, Aug. 8, 71.
 Headley Estate, Co. Kerry, Aug. 16, 1171.
 White Estate, Bantry, Aug. 8, 62; Aug. 12, 437.
 Land Purchase Guarantee Fund;Allocation of Money, Return, Aug. 13, 608.
 Limerick Poor Rate Collectors;Local Government Board Requiring Bond, etc., Aug. 15, 930.
 Liscannor Harbour, Improvement of;Grant proposed, Aug. 12, 435.
 Local Government Board
 Administration;Defects of Local Government Act, etc., Aug. 8, 108; Aug. 9, 327.
 Scientific Research Grant Proposed, Aug. 12, 445.
 Local Government Elections;Publishing Notices in Local Newspapers, Aug. 16, 1168.
 Local Government (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 14, 835, 836, 837.
 Londonderry Infirmary, Nurses trained in;Recognising as eligible for
 Appointments in Workhouse Infirmaries, Aug. 16, 1172.
 Lunacy (Ireland) Bill, Com., Aug. 13, 727; Con., Aug. 14, 832.
 Lunatic Asylums;Trade Warders going on Duty after Day's Work, etc., Aug. 15, 940.
 M'Elligott, Imprisonment for Contempt of Court, Aug. 16, 1173.
 Malicious Injury, Claims for;Increase in number in Omagh, etc., Aug. 9, 295.
 More Island;Transfer to Borrisokane Union, Application of Ratepayers, Aug. 9, 300.
 National School Teachers
 Classes for Teachers;Claims for Travelling Expenses, Aug. 16, 1179.
 Residual Grant, Balance of, Aug. 8, 57; Aug. 16, 1179.
 Retiring Gratuity, etc., Mr. Walters, Late Teacher, Diamond School, Aug. 13, 609.
 Salaries
 Cappamore Teacher;Salary, Aug. 15, 939.
 Roll No. 7138, District No. 52;Delay in Payment of Salary, Aug. 12, 439.
 Sallybank Teacher, Aug. 8, 61.
 School No. 7245, District 46;Dispute between Manager and Teacher, Aug. 12, 444.
 "Pilot";Hauling down Union Jack, Aug. 12, 447.
 Rabies;Number of Oases since Jan. 1901, etc., Aug. 12, 443.
 Railways
 Portumna;Re-equipment, Treasury Grant proposed, Aug. 12, 436.
 Rashenny Station;Erection of Goods Store, Aug. 16, 1171.
 Rating Grievances;Tenants of Houses at £;4, and under, Aug. 8, 69.
 Roads
 Armagh;County Surveyor controlling Repairs, Complaints, etc., Aug. 15, 936.
 Direct Labour;Provisional Order etc., Aug. 15, 940; Aug. 16, 1169.
 Sligo, County;Agrarian Disturbances Proceedings at Bally mote Petty Sessions,

Aug. 15, 942.

Sneem Pier;Erection of Goods Store, etc. Aug. 16, 1183.

Surveyors;County Surveyors, etc.

Monaghan Assistant County Surveyors, Appointment of Deputies etc., Aug. 9, 294;
Aug. 15, 936.

Tyrone Assistant Surveyors;Increase of Salary, Aug. 9, 293.

Tara Hill;Preventing Excavations, Aug. 13, 608.

Tarbert and Kilrush Steamer;Calling at Glin, proposed, Aug. 8, 68.

Town Tenants;Perpetuity of Tenure, etc., Legislation proposed, Aug. 15, 929.

Trim Union Finance, Aug. 9, 299.

Truck Act Prosecutions;Deane v. Boyle, Remission of Costs, Aug. 15, 934.

Unions, Amalgamation of, Aug. 15, 933.

United Irish League

Dromod Meeting prohibited by Police, etc., Aug. 13, 604.

Galway Proclaimed Meeting, Aug. 15, 942.

Killorglin Meeting;Protection of Mrs. Shea, etc., Aug. 16, 1170.

Leitrim, Intimidation in;Prosecutions at Kiltyclogher Petty Sessions, Aug. 16,
1176.

Meetings, Police Interference;Instructions to Police while Parliament was not
sitting, Aug. 17, 1301.

Rhode Meeting;Action of Police Sergeant, Aug. 12, 438.

Tobercurry, Boycotting at, Aug. 13, 607.

Valuation

Belfast Valuation Lists;City Burial Grounds, Aug. 12, 444.

Kerry;House Valuations, Increase of, Aug. 15, 937.

Valuation (Ireland) Bill, 2R., Aug. 14, 819; Con., Aug. 15, 1127.

Y

Yeomanry

Fife and Forfar Yeomanry;Pay Arrears and Furlough

Q. Capt. Sinclair; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 33.

Officers;Placing on Equality with Militia Officers as regards Precedence

Q. Mr. Peel; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 9, 275.

Returned Yeomanry from South Africa;Pay Arrears

Q. Mr. Bromley-Davenport; A. Lord Stanley, Aug. 8, 33.

Yerburgh, Mr. R. A. [Chester]

China Customs Duties, Increase of;Forward Contracts, Exemption, etc., Aug. 16,
1151.

Naval Manœuvres;Report, including Statement of Claims referred to
Umpires, etc., Aug. 16, 1148.

Prestatyn Board School;Erection of New School, Reconsidering Decision, etc.,
Aug. 15, 925.

Youthful Offenders Bill

c. Con.* Aug. 12, 574.

Con.* and 3R.* Aug. 13, 728.

l. 1R.* Aug. 14, 731.

2R. and 3R. Aug. 15, 884.

c. Lords Amendts.* Aug. 16, 1188.
l. Royal Assent, Aug. 17, 1290.