

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/mar/28>

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.
FOURTH VOLUME OF SESSION.
HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 28th March, 1901.

TOOK THE OATH.

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS (STANDING ORDERS NOT 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 Petition for the following Bill, the
Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:

Barry Railway.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT 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 Petition for the following Bill,
originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with,
viz.:

Rodgers' Patent [Lords].

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY BILL (BY ORDER).

Read a second time, and committed.

BARRY RAILWAY.

Petition for Bill; referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (HAM) PROVISIONAL ORDER

Bill to confirm a scheme relating to Ham Common, in the parish of Ham, in the
county of Surrey, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hanbury and Mr. Austen
Chamberlain.

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (HAM) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

"To confirm a Scheme relating to Ham Common, in the parish of Ham, in the county
of Surrey," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners
of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 126.]

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (ORPINGTON) PROVISIONAL ORDER.

Bill to confirm a Scheme relating to Broom Hill Common and other Commons in the
parish of Orpington, in the county of Kent, ordered to be brought in by Mr.
Hanbury and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (ORPINGTON) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

"To confirm a Scheme relating to Broom Hill Common and other Commons in the
parish of Orpington, in the county of Kent," presented, and
read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private
Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 127.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1).

Bill to confirm certain provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Carlisle, Erith, Hornsey, Oxford, and Whitley and Monkseaton, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Carlisle, Erith, Hornsey, Oxford, and Whitley and Monkseaton," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 128.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW).

Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the parish of Saint Giles, Camberwell, the Southampton Incorporation, and the Stepney Union, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) BILL.

"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the parish of Saint Giles, Camberwell, the Southampton Incorporation, and the Stepney Union," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 129.]

THAMES PIERS AND RIVER SERVICE BILL.

Reported [Preamble not proved]; Report to lie upon the Table.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP A.).

MR. Alexander Hargreaves Brown reported from the Committee on Group A of Private Bills, That, for the convenience of parties, they had adjourned till Tuesday, 23rd April, at Twelve of the clock; Report to lie upon the Table.

METROPOLITAN POLICE PRO VISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered to-morrow.

PAISLEY GAS PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Reported, without Amendment [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow.

THAMES AND SEVERN PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Reported, with Amendments [Provisional Order confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill, as amended, to be considered-to-morrow.

HONLEY URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (GAS) BILL.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL.

Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

NEATH HARBOUR BILL.

Reported, with Amendments; Report to lie upon the Table.

BURY CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY BILL.

TAPE VALE RAILWAY BILL.

Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

Petitions, in favour, from Knutsford; and Southern Division of Wilts; to lie upon the Table.

COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petitions, in favour, from Kidsgrove; Buttlane; Birchinwood; Pack Moor; Morley Main; Swinton; Holbrook; Wharncliffe (No. 3); Audley; Pittshill; Madely and Leycett; Brown Edge; Halmer End; Bucknall; Golden. Hill; Milton; Harriseahead; Whitfield; Lochgelly; Chesterton; Newcastle-under-Lyme; Clanway; Cheadle; West Hallam; and Shipley Woodside Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING (SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS).

Petition from Manchester for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions, in favour, from Swinton; Morley Main; Holbrook; Mow Cop Kidsgrove; Buttlane; Birchinwood; Pack Moor; Audley; West Hallam; Wharncliffe; Silkstone; Pittshill; Madely and Leycett; Brown Edge Halmer End; Bucknall; Golden Hill Milton; Harriseahead; Cheadle; Whit field; Lochgelly; Chesterton; New-castle-under-Lyme; Knntton; Clanway and Woodside Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY (MONMOUTHSHIRE).

Petition from Coedpoeth for alteration of Law; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN HILL.

Petitions, in favour, from Norwich (two); Headley Hill (two); Balachulish; Cornsay Colliery (six); Levenshulme (two); Heaton Moor; South Cheriton; Dalton in Furness; Kilmaurs; Aluwick; Eorfar (three); Clitheroe; Burnley; East Ardsley; Mirfield; Sheffield; Edinburgh; Denbigh; Llangollen: Pendle-ton; and Rossett; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions, in favour, from. Ardrossan; Stevenston: Stornoway: Fraserburgh; Montrose (three); Arbroath (two); Isch; Forfar; Ayr: Udney; Culsamond; Maxwelltown; and Rutherglen; to lie upon the Table.

TROUT FISHING ANNUAL CLOSE TIME (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

MONMOUTH BOROUGH ELECTION PETITION (THOMAS EMBREY AND ANOTHER v. FREDERICK RUTHER FORD HARRIS).

A Petition of Hollams, Sons, Coward, and Hawksley, solicitors, for leave to the proper officer of the House to attend a trial and produce documents and give evidence in the High Court of Justice.

Leave to the proper officer to attend accordingly.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (NAVY VOTES).

Paper [presented 27th March] to be printed [No. 106.]

ARMY (CLOTHING FACTORY).

Annual Account presented of the Royal Army Clothing Factory for the year 1899–1900, with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 107.]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (ARMY VOTES).

Copy presented, of Treasury Minute, dated 27th March, 1901, under the Appropriation Act, 1899, authorising the temporary application of Surpluses on certain Army Votes for the year 1899–1900 to meet excesses on certain other Army Votes for the same year [pursuant to Resolution of the House of 4th March, 1879]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 108.]

TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION ACT, 1889.

Copies presented, of Minutes sanctioning the Subjects to be taught under Clause 8 of the Act for the following County Borough and County::

County Borough of South Shields (Fourth Minute), dated 6th March, 1901; County of Glamorgan (Tenth Minute), dated 8th March, 1901

[by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2566 and 2567 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Durham).;Further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February, 1900; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to be printed. [No. 109.]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Return ordered, "of the Additional and Supplementary Estimates voted in each of the years since 1890, distinguishing those due to active military operations.";(Sir Edgar Vincent.)

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND).

Return ordered, "showing, in respect to the Registration of Parliamentary and Local Government Electors for each County and Borough during the year 1900, the salaries and travelling expenses of Revising Barristers; the inclusive salaries of the Assistants to Clerks of the Peace at Revision Sessions; the sums certified by the Treasury to be the Additional Cost recoverable from local bodies under Section 1 (4) of the Registration (Ireland) Act. 1898; the expenses of printing voters' lists, and all other expenses connected therewith. ";(Mr. M'Fadden.)

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (EXPENSES).

Address for "Return of Charges made to Candidates at the General Election of 1900 in Great Britain and Ireland by Returning Officers, specifying the total expenses of each Candidate (both exclusive and inclusive of Returning Officers' Charges) delivered to the Returning Officer pursuant to the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act, 1883, and the number of Votes polled for each Candidate (in continuation of and in the same form as Parliamentary Paper, No. 145, of Session 1896). The totals of each column to be shown separately for England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, with a Summary showing the gross totals.";(Mr. Armine Wodehouse.)

BREWERS' LICENCES.

Return ordered. "of Accounts of the number of persons in each of the several Collections of the United Kingdom licensed as Brewers for sale,

i.e., Common Brewers, Victuallers, Retailers of beer to be drunk on the premises, Retailers of beer not to be drunk on the premises, and Brewers of beer not for sale, particularising each class in each Collection; and stating also the quantities of malt, unmalted corn, rice, &c., and sugar, including its equivalent of syrups, &c., used by Brewers of beer for sale, and of malt and sugar used by Brewers not for sale, from the 1st day of October, 1899, to the 30th day of September, 1900.

"Of the amount of Licence Duty paid and Beer Duty charged from the 1st day of October, 1899, to the 30th day of September, 1900, distinguishing Brewers for sale from other Brewers.

"Of the number of Brewers for sale paying for Licences, from the 1st day of October, 1899, to the 30th day of September, 1900, separating them into classes, according to the number of barrels of beer brewed, namely, under 1,000 barrels, at 1½055 degrees gravity; 1,000 and under 10,000; 10,000 and under 20,000; 20,000 and under 30,000; 30,000 and under 50,000; 50,000 and under 100,000; 100,000 and under 150,000; 150,000 and under 200,000; 200,000 and under 250,000; 250,000 and under 300,000; 300,000 and under 350,000; 350,000 and under 400,000; 400,000 and under 450,000; 450,000 and under 500,000; 500,000 and under 600,000; 600,000 and under 700,000; 700,000 and under 800,000; 800,000 and under 900,000; 900,000 and under 1,000,000; 1,000,000 and under 1,500,000; 1,500,000 and under 2,000,000; 2,000,000 barrels and over; showing separately, in each class, the quantities of malt, unmalted corn, rice, etc., and sugar, including its equivalent of syrups, etc., used; and stating also the amount of Licence Duty paid and Beer Duty charged in each class.

"And of the number of barrels of beer exported from the United Kingdom, and the declared value thereof, and where exported to, from the 1st day of October, 1899, to the 30th day of September, 1900, distinguishing England, Scotland, and Ireland (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 69, of Session 1900).";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;AFRIKANDER DELEGATES' PETITION TO BE HEARD AT THE BAR.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if the Government will propose to the House that Mr. Merriman and Mr. Sauer be heard upon the policy of the settlement in South Africa, pursuant to their petition.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The Government do not think that the course which the hon. and learned Member suggests would be a proper one.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman consult the House on the question?

[No reply was given.]

LAWS OF WARFARE-HAGUE CONFERENCE.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government now accept the laws and usages of war settled at the Hague Conference as forming the usages which distinguish civilised from

barbarous warfare.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course this Government accepts the principle to which it gave its assent at the Hague Conference.

MR. FLYNN: But not the practice.

INQUIRY INTO THE CONDUCT OF THE WAR.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state what steps the Government have taken or propose to take to redeem their pledge of an inquiry into the causes of our failures during the South African War.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have more than once stated to the House that we do not propose that this Commission should begin its work until the war has finished, or very nearly reached its finish.

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WITH GENERAL BOTHA; SIR ALFRED MILNER.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, in view of Commandant Botha's objection to negotiate with Sir Alfred Milner, he will consider the expediency whenever negotiations may be renewed of requesting the Premiers of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand to act with Lord Kitchener as an advising council.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): No, Sir; His Majesty's Government have no intention of superseding Sir Alfred Milner as suggested by the hon. Member.

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can give any information as to the meaning of General Botha's statement, in his letter of 16th March, to the effect that Lord Kitchener would certainly not be surprised that he was unable to accept the terms offered, because they differed from those which had been discussed in the interview of 28th February, and if he can state in what respect they differed, and what were the points on which the negotiations consequently broke down.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no information beyond what is contained in the published Papers.

EXPULSION OF FOREIGNERS FROM SOUTH AFRICA; COMPENSATION CLAIMS.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the negotiations between the German Foreign Office and the British Government as to the claims made for indemnity by Germans expelled from the Transvaal at the outbreak of the war have been concluded; and, if so, whether he is in a position to state what the financial arrangement arrived at is.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): A Commission will shortly be appointed for the purpose of investigating the claims to compensation which have been made by the subjects of various friendly Powers in consequence of their expulsion from South Africa by the British military authorities.

CAMPS OF DETENTION.

MR. C. P. SCOTT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state approximately the number of women and children at present confined in each of the detention camps in South Africa, and whether there is any reason why such of

them as desire to return to their homes or to friends in Cape Colony who are willing to receive them should not be permitted to do so; whether he can state the number of children who have been born in these camps since they were established, and the number who have died; and whether he has received, or will procure, full information as to the sanitary conditions of the camps, and as to the supply of food and clothing.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Lord Kitchener has been requested to forward full information on these matters.

DESPATCH OF REINFORCEMENTS.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how many of the reinforcement of 30,000 men last asked for by the War Office have been secured, and what number have been actually despatched to South Africa; whether any application, has been received by the Government from Lord Kitchener for reinforcements over and above the 30,000 men, and to what extent; and have the Government in, contemplation any further reinforcements over and above the 30,000 men.

*MR. BRODRICK: The number of 30,000 mounted troops which the Government undertook on 7th February last to send to South Africa has been exceeded. Up to date 28,560 men have been despatched, and 6,000 more are ready to embark as transports are provided. Of these, Regular Cavalry drafts are, 3,860; Mounted Infantry, 4,400; Imperial Yeomanry, 16,600; South African Constabulary, 4,700; Colonials, 5,000; 34,560. Two battalions of Militia and thirty-eight Volunteer companies and some other drafts have been sent during the same period to relieve similar units at the front. Lord Kitchener has asked for drafts for certain battalions which are being prepared. No other application has been made to me by Lord Kitchener, and after the South African Constabulary is completed it is not at present proposed to raise any further force.

DEFENCES OF CAPE TOWN.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if four new forts are to be erected for the better defence of Cape Town; whether the Imperial Government will bear the cost; and, if so, what is the estimated amount.

*MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir. Nothing is known of the four new forts at Cape Town alluded to.

PRESENT STRENGTH OF BOER FORCES.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state approximately the number of Boer prisoners of war, how many Boers capable of bearing arms are in the British laagers, and the number of fighting Boers still in arms against us in South Africa.

*MR. BRODRICK: The number of Boer prisoners of war is approximately 16,000. I do not know how many Boers capable of bearing arms are in the British laagers, or how many Boers are still in arms.

MR. LAMBERT: Can you not give us the total approximately?

*MR. BRODRICK: I have no recent data.

WARM CLOTHING FOR THE TROOPS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if the military authorities are providing sufficient warm over and under clothing for all the troops, Regular, Militia, Volunteer, Yeomanry, Colonial, in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies during the coming winter, or if they are in any way dependent upon private supplies; and in respect of the latter, if there is a Government officer at Cape Town and Durban whose duty it is to be posted as far as possible as to the whereabouts of the several corps and companies in the field, or detached posts, or in garrison, and with power to forward parcels to them by any available means.

*MR. BRODRICK: The military authorities are providing warm underclothing, and the troops will receive the authorised issues; but special consignments of such things and other luxuries are much appreciated. An Army Service Corps officer at Cape Town is in, charge of the distribution of parcels, and either has the latest information of the locality of the troops at his disposal, or can readily obtain it. The telegraphic address of the information bureau is, "Casualty, Cape Town."
GOVERNMENT PENSION SCHEME.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to make any provision for the widows and orphans not on the establishment of the various classes of combatants who have fought and fallen, or who may fall, in the British ranks in South Africa.

*MR BRODRICK: His Majesty's Government can only deal with the claims or widows and orphans of men on the strength. Widows and families not on the strength will be assisted from the funds at the disposal of the Patriotic Fund Commissioners.

PROVISION FOR RESERVISTS' FAMILIES;PRIVATE HASLER, 2ND SOMERSET LIGHT INFANTRY

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the widow, married on the strength of the regiment, and two young children of Private Harry Hasler, Reservist, of the 2nd Somerset Light Infantry, who died of enteric fever at Kimberley on 9th November last, have been unable, in spite of repeated efforts, to obtain any pension or allowance from the War Office, and if it had not been for private assistance would have been compelled to enter the workhouse; and, seeing that unless some provision be made this soldier's widow and children will shortly have to apply for parish relief, will he instruct the proper authorities to make an immediate allowance, taking into consideration also the fact that nearly five months have passed without any grant being made.

MR. BRODRICK: I am afraid that my hon. friend has been misinformed. As soon as Private Hasler's death was reported from South Africa, the case was notified to the Patriotic Fund and the Daily Telegraph Fund. The former made an initial grant of £;7, and a weekly allowance of eight shillings, and the latter fund made an initial grant of £;26, and an annuity of £;10. The widow will come under the new Government pension scheme, though some of the assistance referred to will possibly then cease. I must point out to my hon. friend that, as I have already stated, the new scheme will only come into effect on the 1st July, and that therefore the War Office was not in a position to make any grant from

Government funds.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): And what is going to happen until the 1st July? Are these People to be left destitute?

MR. BRODRICK was understood to reply that no doubt assistance would be forthcoming from private funds.

GARRISON REGIMENTS.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing the probable difficulty of obtaining a sufficient supply of men for the garrison regiments, he will consider the advisability of altering the conditions contained in Section 1 (a) of the Royal Warrant of 23rd February, 1901, so as to enable men eligible in all respects and under 40 years of age to serve, although more than 20 years have elapsed from the date of first attestation.

MR. BRODRICK: The matter has been carefully considered, and it is not intended to make the alteration suggested. The Garrison regiments are not dependent on the enlistment from the Royal Reserve Regiments for their completion.

IMPERIAL FORCES IN AUSTRALIA; DISTURBANCES.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has made inquiries into the disturbances among the Imperial representative forces at Brisbane and Melbourne, and what answer he has received.

MR. BRODRICK: A Report has been called for, but has not yet been received.

OFFICERS' BARRACK FURNITURE.

MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, on an officer joining the Army and receiving quarters in barracks, the only furniture supplied by the Government is one small table, two wooden chairs, and a coal scuttle; whether he is aware, that the cost of buying other furniture is a burden upon many young officers; and whether, seeing that on an officer changing his quarters this furniture has to be moved at considerable cost or stored at the officer's expense, he can arrange that in future all necessary furniture will be supplied by the Government to officers' rooms in barracks.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The articles of furniture supplied to an officer's quarters are:

Two chairs, one table, one poker, one shovel, one pair of tongs, one scuttle.

The question of furnishing officers' quarters in future is under consideration.

MEDITERRANEAN FLEET AND CHANNEL SQUADRON CRUISERS.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what is the number of cruisers at present attached to the Mediterranean Fleet and the Channel Squadron respectively, and what is the normal number supposed to be required in each case.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The number of cruisers belonging to the Mediterranean Fleet is ten, of which one second and one third class are temporarily employed on the Cape Station. The third class cruiser is about to be replaced by another ship. Six cruisers are attached to the Channel Squadron. There is no fixed establishment of cruisers for the two fleets in question.

COST OF NEW ROYAL YACHT.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury what has been up to now the total cost of the new "Victoria and Albert" yacht, and what amount is estimated as still necessary to complete her.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The total net cost of the Royal Yacht, up to the present date is

£;433,637; the estimated amount required to complete the vessel is £;32,146; to those amounts must be added a sum of

£;46,251, the estimated proportion of incidental charges upon the entire work.

Making a total of

£;512,034.

MR. WOLFF (Belfast, E.): What was the amount of the original estimate?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I have not the figures with me.

MR. FLYNN: What has caused the great increase?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: There are many causes. I cannot detail them in answer to a question.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Has any estimate been formed of the cost of breaking her up?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir.

TRAINING SHIP CRUISES IN THE NORTH.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, if arrangements will be made for H.M.S. "Northampton" to visit Invergordon during her summer cruise in the North.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: It is not proposed to send H.M.S. "Northampton" to Invergordon during her summer cruise. H.M.S. "Cleopatra" visited Invergordon last year, but I am unable to state whether she will repeat her visit during the coming year, as the programme of cruises for the training ships has not yet been finally settled.

CAPE COAST COLONY AND ASHANTI ;LABOUR LAWS.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Return of all ordinances, laws, and regulations in force in the Cape Coast Colony and in the Ashanti Protectorate in respect to the labour of natives, including the forced labour ordinance in the former, and all laws, regulations, and ordinances in the colony and the Protectorate in respect to the terms and conditions affecting the ownership and working of mines and the taxes that are levied thereon.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, we have had numerous applications for copies of some of these documents, and it will be convenient to print them in the form of a Blue-book. The compulsory labour ordinance to which the hon. Member refers expired in 1898, and has not been renewed.

WEST INDIAN FRUIT INDUSTRY.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can give any particulars as to the condition, packing, vendibility, and price realised of the first consignment of fruit from the West Indies by the new subsidised line of steamers.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The only information which I have received on the subject

referred to by the hon. Member beyond what has appeared in the press is in a letter from the contractors for the Imperial Direct Jamaica Service, in which they state as follows;

"The fruit by the 'Port Morant' arrived in splendid order and the system of preserving fruit, so far as we can tell, will retain the temperature we require, irrespective of what the temperature may be in Jamaica or this country."

CHINA;ANGLO-RUSSIAN DISPUTE AT TIENTSIN.

SIR JOHN LENG: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Mr. Kinder, the chief engineer of the Tientsin Railway, a British subject in the employment of the Chinese railway administration, was entitled to call upon General Barrow to interfere in the recent siding dispute: whether General Barrow had any authority to send the telegram ordering him to proceed with the work by force if necessary; and whether Mr. Kinder, having provoked a misunderstanding with Russia by a display of force, will be permitted to take a similar course in the future on the supposition that he is countenanced by His Majesty's Government.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The hon. Member appears to be under a misapprehension as to the facts of the case. The railway is at present under the control and management of the British military authorities, who are working it for the common benefit of the allied forces. It was Colonel MacDonald, R. E., not Mr. Kinder, who referred for instructions to General Gaselee when the dispute arose as to the ownership of the land upon which the siding was to be built. General Barrow did not at any time order the work to be continued by force.

MURDER OF THE REV. JOSEPH STONEHOUSE.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information as to the murder of the Rev. Joseph Stonehouse, of the London Missionary Society, on Saturday last, on the Hun-ho river; whether at the time of the murder Mr. Stonehouse was distributing relief to starving villagers: whether any special reason is assigned for the murder; and whether the British authorities have taken prompt measures to discover the perpetrators of the crime.

VISCOUNT CRANBOKNE: His Majesty's Minister at Peking has reported that Mr. Stonehouse was shot by Chinese on the 23rd instant, and died the same evening, but we have no further particulars. Sir E. Satow is no doubt taking the necessary action in the matter.

RUSSIA AND MANCHURIA;ANGLO- GERMAN AGREEMENT.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information to the effect that the German Chancellor has expressed the view that the Anglo-German Agreement does not affect Manchuria; and whether he will inquire whether such statement was made.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I will ask the hon. Member to allow me to deal with this question in debate later on in the evening.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether his attention has been called to a statement by Count von Bismarck denying explicitly that the Anglo-German Agreement applies to

Manchuria; and whether His Majesty's Government agrees with the views of Count von Bismarck; low.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I would rather postpone my answer to this until I speak on the subject in the debate which I understand is to come on later in the evening.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can, give the House any information as to the acceptance or rejection by the Chinese Government of the Russo-Chinese Agreement regarding Manchuria which the Russian Government has been pressing upon China.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: No information has been received that an agreement between Russia and China has been either accepted or rejected.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Can the noble Lord state whether such an agreement has been or is being pressed upon the acceptance of His Majesty's Government?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I have no doubt that my hon. friend will have an opportunity of addressing himself to that question later on.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: That is not the point. May I ask;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member's second question does not arise out of his first. It is quite a separate question.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Will you kindly read the last sentence of my question, Sir? Will the noble Lord be

kind enough to promise to give us the information this evening? I will promise to address myself to the question if only he will answer.

[No answer was returned.]

KOREA; DIRECTOR-GENERALSHIP OF CUSTOMS.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): On behalf of my hon. and learned and gallant friend

[Laughter.] All the gallantry is not on the other side of the House. [More laughter.] Mr. Speaker, am I not entitled to designate my hon. friend as honourable, learned and gallant?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must ask his question, and must not continually obstruct the business of the House in this way.

MR. FLAVIN: Well, on behalf of my hon. and learned and gallant friend the Member for East Clare, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Mr. Brown, the Director of Customs, has been dismissed by the Korean Government; and, if so, whether His Majesty's Government are taking steps to secure his reinstatement.

The following question also appeared on the Paper.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Mr. McLeavy Brown has been dismissed from his position as Director General of Customs in Korea, and, if so, whether His Majesty's Government are taking steps to secure his reinstatement.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Mr. McLeavy Brown has not been dismissed. A difficulty arose with regard to Mr. McLeavy Brown's official residence, which is the property of the Korean Government, and which the latter desired that he should vacate. This led to a demand for his dismissal, but there are reasons for hoping that the matter will be satisfactorily arranged within a brief period.

UGANDA RAILWAY.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): I beg to ask the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs whether he can state how many miles of the Uganda Railway have been constructed; and whether he can say when the undertaking will be completed.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The rails have been laid on 481 miles. The line is open for traffic for 448 miles. As soon as Colonel Gracey, R.E., who has recently returned from an inspecting of the line, has reported we shall be in a better position than now to form an idea as to the date when the undertaking will be completed.

INDIAN POLITICAL AGENCIES.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state what was the number of troops stationed at the close of 1898 in the political agencies of Dir, Sivat, the Khyber, the Kurran, Tochi, and Wano, and what was their estimated cost; and whether he will say whether any reduction has been made in the number of these troops during the present Viceroy's period of office; if so, to what extent; and what is the estimated aggregate annual cost of these military and political outposts under the conditions of the new province.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The number of troops stationed on the 1st December. 1898, in the districts referred to was: Malakand Agency, including Dir and Swat. 5,447; the Khyber Brigade. 3,211; the Kurrum, including Samana, 2,489; Tochi, 2,344; Wana, 1,094. The Khyber Brigade has been withdrawn, and the Khyber is now held by Afridi Militia. Half a squadron of Native Cavalry and a half battalion of Native Infantry, numbering about 500, have been transferred from the Kurrum Valley to Kohat. The cost of these several outposts cannot be given without reference to India; nor have I as yet, received any estimate of the cost of the new arrangements which are now contemplated.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: Will the information be available before the discussion on the Indian Budget is taken?

LORD G. HAMILTON: I doubt if I shall have it by then.

COOPER'S HILL COLLEGE.

MR. WALTER PALMER (Salisbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the inquiry into the proposed dismissals at Cooper's Hill Engineering College which is being held, he will give an assurance that no professors or lecturers will be dismissed until Papers relating to the present inquiry have been laid before the House and an opportunity afforded for discussion.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I undertook that, before effect was given to the proposed educational reforms at Cooper's Hill College, all the teaching staff affected should have a full opportunity of giving their reasons before the Board of Visitors against the proposed reorganisation, and that the Council of India would suspend their decision until they had received the evidence and the Report of the Visitors upon it. Further than this I cannot go. Papers on the subject will be circulated, I understand, on Monday.

MR. WALTER PALMER: Will the noble Lord assure the House that no dismissal will take place until the new representatives of the Universities have taken their places on the Board of Visitors?

LORD G. HAMILTON: No, I cannot.

CANADIAN TARIFFS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he is aware that in the Budget proposals of the Government of the Dominion of Canada the Minister of Finance maintained the preference of 33½ per cent. granted upon British goods in Canadian markets directly the colonies were freed from the restraining foreign treaties of 1862 and 1865; and can he state for how long he proposes to accept this arrangement without making any efforts to reciprocate towards Canadian products in the markets of the United Kingdom.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I think my hon. friend is well aware that the Canadian tariff differs so completely from our own that, while the action of Canada was confined to a reduction of very high duties in our favour, what he calls reciprocity on our part would involve the imposition of duties by us on imports from other countries for the benefit of Canada. I am not prepared to propose this, and I feel certain that Canada does not expect it. We have shown our sense of the spirit in which the Dominion has acted by the help we give towards the steamship service between Canada and Japan, and the assistance we have promised towards the Pacific cable.

INCOME TAX ABATEMENTS.

SIR EDGAR VINCENT (Exeter): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state the estimated financial losses, at the present rate, of the abatements of the Income Tax voted in 1894 and in 1899.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It is estimated that at the present rate of Income Tax (1s. in the £;) the total financial loss involved by the changes in the scale of abatements introduced by the Finance Acts of 1894 and 1898 amounts to £1,470,000.

IMPORT DUTIES.

MR. WALTER PALMER: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, with a view to the provision of the increased revenue from taxation, which will be necessary, he will favourably consider the expediency of an ad valorem fiscal duty on certain imported manufactured articles amounting to more than one hundred millions of pounds in value, rather than any new duty on imported food products, whether used for actual food or manufacturing purposes.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: My hon. friend asks my opinion on a suggestion for a complete change in the fiscal policy which has been adopted by this country for many years. I feel that I cannot deal with such a matter in answer to a question.

MAINTENANCE OF ROYAL NAVY; PROPOSED TONNAGE TAX.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will consider the advisability of raising the £30,000,000 asked for the maintenance of the Navy by a tonnage tax levied on all ships, native and foreign, entering British or Irish ports from overseas ports.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The suggestion appears to be that the whole cost of the Navy should be paid by a tax which would mainly fall on the mercantile marine of this country in addition to other taxation to which it is now liable, and which would probably involve reprisals from foreign countries on our ships in foreign

ports. I do not think this would be a feasible proposal.

DISORDERLY HOUSES IN LONDON.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the statement made by the prosecuting counsel on Thursday last at Clerken well Sessions, in the case of persons indicted for keeping a disorderly house, to the effect that for the tenth time at least he had to bring to the notice of the Court that Bouillon Fleet, Limited, and Heinekens Lager Brewery Company were connected with the house, and to the statement made by Mr. M'Connell, K.C., in giving judgment, that he regretted that the directors were not present, and that they were the responsible persons who would probably pay the fines; and whether he will ascertain the names of the directors of the two companies, and whether he proposes to take any action in the matter.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): My attention has not previously been called to this matter, but I will look into it and see whether any action is called for on my part.

HORSE EXPORTS TO ROTTERDAM.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a case at the petty sessional court, Grays, Essex, in which Inspector Buckingham stated that a horse suffering badly from canker and with large sores had been sold and sent to Rotterdam for sausage meat, to be subsequently re-imported to England; and whether he can impose some limit on this description of traffic.

*MR. RITCHIE: From inquiry which I have caused to be made it appears to be true that a horse with canker in the foot and some sore places in the skin caused by harness was shipped to Rotterdam a few days ago. But I find no evidence that the carcase would afterwards be prepared for human food, or that, if it were, it would be re-imported to England. Nor have I any power to check the traffic indicated in the question.

PREVENTION OF MINING ACCIDENTS ;FRENCH METHODS.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has considered the report on the methods of preventing falls of roof adopted at the Courrieres collieries, in which it is shown that the death rate from falls of roof and sides per 1,000 persons employed below ground for the ten years 1890 to 1899 is only 0·15, and the death rate per million tons of coal raised is only 0·39, while for the United Kingdom the average death rates are 0·78 per 1,000 persons employed below ground and 2·05 per million tons of mineral raised for the five years ending 1899; and whether he has taken or will take steps to bring about in the collieries of this country the adoption of methods of preventing falls of roof and sides similar to those which have produced such results at the Courrieres collieries.

*MR. RITCHIE: As long ago as September last the Home Office communicated with all the coal-mine owners in this country with regard to the methods of preventing, falls of ground adopted at the Courrieres collieries and called their attention to the figures quoted in the hon. Member's question. On

receiving the further special report to which he refers, I sent a second circular letter to the owners, enclosing a copy and pressing upon them the importance of studying the methods adopted in France. The Home Office has long been in communication with the Mining Association with a view to steps being taken to reduce the number of accidents from falls of ground, and I have arranged for a conference next month between the inspectors of mines and the representatives of the association on the subject.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): Is this system applicable to mines generally?

*MR. RITCHIE: I think only to coal mines.

POLICE AND SANITARY REGULATIONS BILLS; SELECT COMMITTEE.

MR. M'KENNA: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can state when he proposes to move for the appointment of a Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulation Bills.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley): It is not certain whether the motion for the appointment of this Committee will be made this session. The matter is under consideration, and a decision will be arrived at shortly.

S.S. "ORONA"; ALLEGED INSUFFICIENT MANNING.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick) I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, whether his attention has been directed to a complaint from one of the crew of the s.s. "Orona," who alleges that this vessel signed on eight able seamen, which provides an effective crew of four men for each watch, but that the captain of this vessel has by the system he has adopted reduced the number of men in each watch to two, namely, one man on the look-out and one man at the wheel, which is in contravention of the Board of Trade manning scale, which provides that there shall be three effective hands in each watch; whether, seeing that this may endanger the lives of the crew of this vessel, he will call the attention of the owners to the captain's conduct and request that they will give instructions to stop this reduction of the effective number of hands in each watch; and whether he can state if this steamship has been engaged by the Admiralty for the conveyance of stores to His Majesty's troops in South Africa.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): Yes, Sir; my attention has been called to the complaint referred to in the question, and I have been in communication with the owners of the "Orona." I find that the vessel carried eight A.B.'s, besides a boatswain, a carpenter, and four deck officers. This was in excess of the requirements of the Board of Trade, and I am advised that the vessel was certainly not undermanned. The Department has no power to interfere, with the disposition of the hands by the master when at sea. I am informed that the

"Orona" was engaged by the Admiralty, as stated in the question.

HIGHLAND RAILWAY; MIXED TRAINS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that on the 14th October last a cattle wagon without brake was detached at Munloch from the passenger train leaving Muir of Ord at 8.38 a.m., and

that on the 15th October a cattle wagon without brake was detached at Munlochry from the passenger train leaving Avoch at 9–26 a.m.; and, will he ascertain why the Highland Railway Company failed to provide these mixed trains with the continuous brake through-out, as required by the Board of Trade regulations.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The railway company point out that the 14th October last was a Sunday, and that no trains are run on Sundays on the branch in question. They add that on the 15th October no cattle wagon was detached at Munlochry, but that one was attached there, and that it was fitted with a continuous vacuum brake pipe in conformity with the requirements of the Board of Trade.

MR. WEIR: I am sorry I made a mistake in the date, but as this question is based on my personal experiences, will the right hon. Gentleman inquire further?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR replied in the negative.

MR. WEIR: I will put another question.

LIGHT RAILWAYS.

MR. BILL (Staffordshire, Leek): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, considering the expiration at the end of the present year of the powers of the Light Railway Commissioners, he will grant a Return showing the number of applications for Orders and the number of Orders which have been passed by the Commissioners and confirmed by the Board of Trade in each year since the passing of the Light Railway Act, 1896; and also the number and amount of the loans which the Treasury has agreed to advance in each year under Section 4, and of the special advances under Section 5.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: This information is contained in Reports presented annually to Parliament in accordance with Section 13 (5) of the Act referred to.

BANKRUPTCY DELAYS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether it has been brought to his notice that creditors in bankruptcy cases suffer loss through delay in dealing with these cases, seeing that the interest goes to the Government and not to the creditors; whether he is aware of a case where from £;40,000 to £;50,000 was received by the Official Receiver in January, February, and March of 1900, and that no dividend has as yet been paid to the creditors, who thus, in addition to the loss of their money, are kept out of what remains, and also out of what these sums have earned as interest; and whether he can see his way to ameliorating this state of affairs.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not aware of any undue delay in the official administration of bankruptcy cases resulting in loss to creditors. The investment of funds which cannot immediately be distributed is made pursuant to Section 76 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, and the dividends thus derived are applied solely to meeting the expenses of bankruptcy administration, and are taken into account in fixing the fees payable in respect of the bankruptcy proceedings. I cannot identify the case referred to, which I should probably have been able to do had it been in the hands of an official receiver.

CAPTAIN NORTON: But will not the right hon. Gentleman take steps to ameliorate this state of things?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I will have any specific cases inquired into.

CAPTAIN NORTON: But I am raising the cases as a whole, of the long detention of these funds.

PATENT LAWS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that British patents are taken out at the risk of the applicants, it being left to every person to protect his own rights, and that Great Britain is the only country which issues patents without satisfactory proof that the inventions described have not been previously patented, and without examining specifications before they are filed; and whether, in view of the importance to British trade of encouraging invention, the Government will take the necessary steps to place the British inventor in a more satisfactory position in this respect.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not think the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question accurately states the position as regards the issue of patents, and certainly there are countries other than Great Britain which make no search for novelty. The subject of search among prior specifications has, however, engaged the attention of the Board of Trade, and I would refer the hon. Member to the Report of a Departmental Committee presented to Parliament this session. At present I am unable to make any statement as to legislative action on that Report.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE; PRECAUTIONS AGAINST IMPORTATION FROM SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether, in view of the prevalence of foot-and-mouth disease in South Africa, adequate precautions have been and are being taken to prevent the disease from being conveyed from that country to the British Isles.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): We have no confirmation of the statement that foot-and-mouth disease is prevalent in South Africa. Even if it were, there is the fact that no cattle, sheep, or swine have been imported from South Africa during the last three years, and we have no reason to believe that such importation is probable. The danger of infection by hides and skins is, as I explained the other day, very small, and is guarded against in the same way as in the case of similar imports from the Continent.

MR. STEVENSON: Is the right hon. Gentleman not aware that the disease is easily conveyed with clothing?

*MR. HANBURY: Yes. I know that.

CORN RETURNS.

MR. LOYD (Berkshire, Abingdon): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, beyond appointing officers of Inland Revenue, under Section 13 of the Corn Returns Act, 1882, to be inspectors of corn returns, the Commissioners of Inland Revenue exercise any supervision over such inspectors in the performance of their duties under that Act.

*SIR M. HICKS-BEACH: The Commissioners of Inland Revenue retain the sole control

over Excise officers appointed to act as inspectors of corn returns. The inspectors are responsible to the Commissioners for their due attendance at the markets, for seeing that all the requirements of the Corn Returns Act are strictly complied with, and for the accuracy and punctuality of the returns and summaries which they send to the Board of Agriculture.

MR. LOYD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether any and what steps are from time to time taken by the Board of Agriculture to ascertain whether the inspectors of corn returns receive, under the Corn Returns Act, 1882, complete and accurate returns of the prices at which British corn is sold in each of the towns specified by Order in Council.

*MR. HANBURY: The inspectors of corn returns are, of course, directly responsible to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue. But after the returns collected by them have been sent to the Board of Agriculture, they are examined at once, and if any point arises which seems to call for further explanation the inspector is at once consulted. Such points are the possible inclusion of foreign corn, or considerable variations in price from one week to another, or errors in calculation. Any complaints received from outside sources, as, for instance, complaints of the omission of particular sales, are referred to the Board of Inland Revenue for investigation.

MR. LOYD: Is any distinction made in the Return between purchases from growers and purchases from dealers?

*MR. HANBURY: I think not.

MR. LOYD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether any, and what, steps are from time to time taken by the Board of Trade to ascertain whether the inspectors of corn returns, under the Corn Returns Act, 1882, receive complete and accurate returns of the prices at which British corn is sold in each of the towns specified by Order in Council; can he state how many convictions have taken place since the commencement of the Act, 1st January, 1883, for failure to make return, and for making a false return; and in how many instances has the Board of Trade caused a return, or any particular in a return, to be omitted in the computation of the average prices on the ground that the Board had reason to believe such return or particular to be incorrect.

*MR. HANBURY: The whole of the functions of the Board of Trade under the Corn Returns Act have now been transferred to the Board of Agriculture. Twenty-three prosecutions and twenty-two convictions have taken place since the commencement of the Act for failure to make returns, but none for making a false return. Since 1892, when the Board of Agriculture took over the duty, there have been two or three cases in which returns or particulars in them have been omitted in the compilation of the averages.

LONDON WATER QUESTION; GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will place the text of his proposals respecting London water before the House before the close of the present session, so that they may be duly considered by the people of London and the extra municipal areas affected during the Parliamentary recess.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): No,

Sir; I am unable to assent to the suggestion.

CHRIST'S HOSPITAL SITE.

MR. KENYON (Denbigh): I beg to ask the hon. Member for Tunbridge, as representing the Charity Commission, whether the Bill now before the House of Lords for the sale of the site of Christ's Hospital has been sanctioned by the Commission: whether the Commissioners have suggested any restrictions on the sale of the site, and whether it is within the powers of the Governors to remove the ancient schoolrooms, including the dining-room and other historical buildings, pending the passage of their Bill through Parliament; whether the girls' day school and science school, contemplated in the Scheme of 1890, have been erected; and whether negotiations are still proceeding on the subject.

THE PARLIAMENTARY CHARITY COMMISSIONER (Mr. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN, Kent, Tunbridge):

The Commissioners received from the Council of Almoners a copy of the Christ's Hospital Bill on 11th December, 1900, and informed them in reply on the 14th of that month that the Commissioners had no objection to offer to the Bill as regards form or otherwise. They have not suggested that any part of the site should be excepted from sale. It is within the powers of the Governors, acting under the authority of the Commissioners, to remove at any time the buildings referred to or any part of them, but there could be no intention to remove them pending the passing of the Bill, as they are required for carrying on the school temporarily under Section 66 of the Scheme of 1890. No buildings for the girls' day school and day science school for boys have been erected. No negotiations on the subject of the Bill are proceeding.

THE NEW CODE; SIR J. GORST'S ADDRESS TO SCHOOL INSPECTORS.

MR. KENYON: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education if he has any objection to lay upon the Table of the House a precis of the address he recently delivered to His Majesty's Inspectors of Schools.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I am unable to do this. What I said was confidential, and no record of it has been kept.

TRAINING COLLEGES FOR FEMALE TEACHERS.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been called to the lack of trained female teachers for elementary schools; and whether the Board of Education propose to take steps to provide for such deficiency by increased training college accommodation or by other measures.

SIR J. GORST: I have repeatedly called the attention of the House to the matter, and the Board of Education are giving every encouragement in their power to the establishment of additional training colleges.

LONDON SCHOOL BOARD RETURNS.

MR. TALBOT (Oxford University): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, in estimating deficiencies in school accommodation in the district of the London School Board, the population of each parish as ascertained by the Census of 1891 is taken as the basis of calculation, or whether any attempt is

made to ascertain the actual population of the present day.

SIR J. GORST: The basis of calculation is the census of children of the elementary school class taken in the spring of each year by the London School Board.

BROMPTON CEMETERY.

MR. KEARLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Government some years ago purchased Brompton Cemetery with a view to its being closed; if so, why this has not been done, and whether the accounts and Papers connected with the matter will be granted if a Return is moved.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): Perhaps I may be allowed to reply to this question. It is not a fact that Brompton Cemetery was purchased by the Government with a view to its being closed, as the hon. Member will see by referring to 13 and 14 Vic. c. 52. The accounts and Papers covering nearly fifty years are very voluminous and of very little, if any, public interest, and I cannot agree to make such a Return as suggested.

*MR. KEARLEY: Will the right hon. Gentleman give us an account of the annual profit on this investment?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I must ask the hon. Member to give me notice of that question.

KEW GARDENS; LABOURERS' WAGES.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he has seen his way to meet the application of the labourers at Kew Gardens for a reduction of hours of labour, and an arrangement as to overtime pay.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: I am happy to say that arrangements have been made to give the labourers in Kew Gardens a half-holiday on Saturdays, so that their hours of labour will be practically the same as those employed in the neighbouring Royal parks at Richmond and Hampton Court; and when they are required to stay on some Saturday afternoons they will receive the usual overtime pay.

INLAND REVENUE-RETIREMENT IN OUTDOOR SERVICE.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Retirement Order of the Board of Inland Revenue, No. 10, of 1897 (18th June), is still partially suspended in the Taxes Branch (outdoor department); and, if so, whether the reasons stated by the Secretary to the Treasury on 24th March, 1899, for the retention in the service of officers who had then passed the age limit still exist and to the same extent; and how many officers are at present employed in the Taxes Branch who come within the limits of the Retirement Order, and of what rank in the service; and can he name an approximate date by which it will be possible for the Board to enforce the rule with the strictness and impartiality promised by the Secretary to the Treasury two years since.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The Retirement Order referred to is still partially suspended in the Tax Surveying Branch of the Inland Revenue for the reason given by my predecessor. The Board, however, hope that within a year from the present time it may be

practicable to bring the Order again into operation. It is to be observed that, notwithstanding the suspension of the Order, promotion in the Taxes Branch has been exceptionally rapid of recent years. Five officers are at present employed in the Taxes Branch who come within the limits of the Retirement Order.

CUSTOMS EXAMINING OFFICERSHIPS.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the Customs General Order 25 of the 20th instant announces that the number of examining officer-ships will gradually be reduced by ninety-six, and that as a consequence the general body of assistants who entered from 1891 to 1895 will not receive the salaries of examining officers until their twelfth year's service; and whether, in view of the fact that before the reorganisation assistants were promoted to examining officerships after nine years service, he will guarantee that this limit shall not be exceeded for the remainder of those at present in the class.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is true that the number of examining officers will be gradually reduced by ninety-six, but steps have been taken which will have the effect of safeguarding the interests of the assistants who are near their turn for promotion. The general body of assistants will proceed as now in the assistants' scale until they reach the maximum of £105, but after spending a year at the maximum they will, if fully qualified in all respects, be paid on the scale of second-class examining officers, and will be ranked as such as vacancies occur in the class. The assistants who during the last few months have been promoted to the rank of examining officer, second class, have each had, at the time of their promotion, a service (as outdoor officer and assistant) of between nine and ten years. No guaranteed rate of promotion existed prior to the reorganisation, neither can any such guarantee be given for the future; but it is not expected that the interests of assistants generally will be materially affected.

PARCELS POSTAGE;POSTMEN'S DELIVERY WEIGHTS.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the rule laid down by Mr. Lewin Hill at the Tweedmouth Inquiry, in reply to Question 11,983, to the effect that four or five of the lighter and less bulky parcels per man, of a total weight of not more than eleven pounds, is still in force; and, if so, will he cause it to be included in the postmen's rule book and is he aware that when a postman complained lately of having to carry twenty-two pounds it was ruled that he had no grounds for complaint.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Such a rule was laid down some years ago for observance in London, but it has not been applied to the provinces. The present rule is that a postman delivering letters may also be called upon to deliver some of the lighter and less bulky parcels, provided the total weight of letters and parcels combined does not exceed thirty-five pounds, and it is not considered necessary to make any change. Inquiry will be made with regard to the particular case mentioned by the hon. Member if he will send particulars to the Postmaster General which will enable it to be identified.

EASTBOURNE POSTMEN;CHRISTMAS OVERTIME PAY.

MR. HOGG (Sussex, Eastbourne): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can state why the Eastbourne postmen have been called upon to refund moneys duly earned by them respecting Christmas overtime; and whether he is aware that the times of attendance were altered by the acting postmaster, thus causing men to work considerably over their eight hours, and the suspension of one delivery subsequently causing a double delivery.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The claims for extra duty performed by the Eastbourne postmen to which the hon. Member refers appear to be those for 21st December. As the extra time claimed for was larger than the circumstances seemed to justify, the matter was reserved for special inquiry, and the postmen were called upon to refund provisionally the money paid. The inquiry is proceeding, and if the claims are substantiated they will be paid, including any extra duty owing to altered times of attendance.

FEMALE POST OFFICE CLERKS; HOURS OF LABOUR.

MR. YOXALL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state the custom of the Department regarding the hours of attendance for female sorting clerks and telegraphists, the earliest hour at which they are expected to attend, and up to what period of the evening they can be kept on duty.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: As a general rule female sorting clerks and telegraphists are not required to attend for duty before 6 a.m. or later than 10 p.m.; but where local conditions are favourable it is sometimes thought not necessary strictly to adhere to these hours.

POSTAL TELEGRAPH SERVICE; EFFICIENCY BARRIER.

MR. YOXALL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, in view of the fact that a telegraphist having been kept at the efficiency barrier for one year and then being permitted to proceed suffers a loss of salary each year until he arrives at the maximum, whether the Postmaster General can state the reasons which led the Department to treat the stoppage of an increment at the efficiency barrier in an exceptional manner; and whether the Postmaster General will consider the advisability of placing it upon the same footing as an ordinary arrestment of increment.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is a fact that a telegraphist who has been stopped at the efficiency bar, and who is subsequently allowed to proceed when efficient, has every year, until he reaches his maximum, a less salary than he otherwise would have had. The increment which takes an officer over the efficiency bar is treated in a different manner from ordinary increments, because it was intended to mark the attainment of a definite standard of efficiency at a certain point in the officer's career. The efficiency bar was instituted in order to ensure that no one should proceed to the maximum of the telegraphist's scale of pay without substantial guarantee of his efficiency and of the excellence of his conduct. To pass the efficiency bar is, therefore, equivalent to promotion to a higher class, and a man who fails through his own fault to pass the bar in the first instance has no claim to be relieved of the consequences. It

is not in contemplation to alter the system which now prevails.

FAWCETT ASSOCIATION;ELECTIONEERING MANIFESTOES IN RETIRING ROOMS AT MOUNT PLEASANT.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state for what reason the candidates seeking election to the executive of the Fawcett Association and to the Committee of the Refreshment Department at the General Post Office have been called upon to explain why manifestoes bearing their names have been distributed in and allowed to lie on the tables in the sorters' retiring rooms without permission having first been obtained, seeing that in the case of the election to the executive of the Fawcett Association permission had been sought and obtained for the ballot boxes to be placed in the said rooms, and that the election for the Refreshment Department Committee is being conducted by the department itself.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The fact that permission has been given for the election of the executive of the Fawcett Association and the election of the Refreshment Committee to be held in the General Post Office did not carry with it the permission to distribute bills in large numbers inside the building, and it is not desirable that such permission should be given.

ISLAND OF SKYE MAILS.

MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness-shire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he has received a copy of a resolution passed at a meeting of the inhabitants of the Island of Skye at Portree on the 20th February; and, in view of the anxiety therein expressed in regard to the mail steamer, can the Postmaster General say that he does not contemplate any alteration such as would render the mail service less convenient than at present; and is he in a position to say that, in the event of the mails being sent via Mallaig, efforts will be made to secure an improved postal and steamer service.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has received a copy of the resolution referred to by the hon. Member, passed by the inhabitants of Skye at Portree on the 20th February. He does not contemplate any alteration in the hours of the mail steamer running between Kyle and ports in Skye, or any change which would render the mail service less convenient than at present. Any steamer service to or from Mallaig must, in the first instance, be experimental in character, and the Postmaster General is not in a position to say what service, if any, may ultimately be provided from that port.

PROTECTION OF TARBAT NESS AND ORD OF CAITHNESS FISHERIES.

*MK. LEVESON-GOWER

(Sutherlandshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate upon how many days between 20th January and 23rd February a Fishery Board cruiser or vessel patrolled the waters between Tarbat Ness and the Ord of Caithness, and on what days.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am informed by the Fishery Board that between the dates named the Fishery Board cruiser "Norna" patrolled the waters in question on seven days, namely, 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 8th, 14th, and 18th February.

ROYAL TITLE IN SCOTTISH WRITS.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, in resolving to retain the words "the Seventh" as an addition to His Most Gracious Majesty's name in writs proceeding from the Crown in Scotland, he has consulted the precedents of the two Sovereigns bearing the name of James who have reigned since the Union of the Crowns, and the cases of William and Mary and William after Mary's death; and if he will inform the House of the practice in Scotland in these cases.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: It is the fact that in the cases referred to by the hon. Member the writs passing the Signet in Scotland ran in the name of James, William and Mary, and William. But the present practice follows the more exact precedent under William the Fourth, after the Union of the kingdoms, in whose reign the writs in Scotland ran in the name of William the Fourth; and for this and other reasons it is intended to adhere to it.

MR. BLACK: Did not the Union take place in the reign of James?

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Union of the Crown then took place.

MR. BLACK: And is it not because of the Treaty of Union that Scotland is still treated as a separate kingdom?

[No answer was returned.]

SCOTTISH FISHERY HARBOURS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will grant a Return (Fishery Harbours, Scotland) showing the name of each fishery harbour on the coast of Scotland, the name of the county in which it is situated, and the name of the proprietor or authority responsible for its upkeep.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I must refer the hon. Member to the answer I gave him to a somewhat similar question on the 11th instant, which also applies to this question.

MR. WEIR: Is the Scottish Office unwilling or unable to give the names?

[No answer was returned.]

MR. WEIR: I shall raise the question on the Estimates.

LADYSMTTH REJOICINGS AT LONDONDERRY.

*MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether reports were furnished by the Londonderry Constabulary authorities to Dublin Castle with reference to the discharge of explosives from the city of Derry Walls into the house or yard of a man named M'Gowan on the occasion of the rejoicing over the relief of Lady-smith; whether the report contained the names of the parties who discharged
† See Debates, Vol. xc, page 1116–7.

the explosives, and can he explain why the Castle authorities refused to allow the police in Londonderry to institute proceedings against these parties; and will he lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the correspondence between the Dublin Castle authorities and the Constabulary authorities, as well as a copy of the Order made thereon by the then Chief Secretary for Ireland.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYKDHAM,

Dover): The reports made by the police disclosed the names of two persons who

were believed to have discharged rockets of a dangerous character. One of these rockets was found in the yard of John. McGowan. I have already stated that the organiser of the demonstration, who was unaware that rockets of this character had been used, expressed his regret at the occurrence. It was decided under the circumstances not to institute proceedings against the parties, but to warn them that upon a repetition of the offence proceedings would be taken. It would be contrary to practice to lay departmental correspondence on the Table of the House.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: Why did the Castle authorities prevent the Londonderry police from prosecuting for the discharge of firearms in a proclaimed district?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have answered that question.

INCOME TAX COLLECTORS' PENSIONS ;CASE OF JOHN FEORE.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that John Feore, of Charleville, county Cork, who for forty-six years served as a collector of income tax, retired from his position some two years ago through old age and decrepitude; and, seeing that his petition to the Commissioners of Inland Revenue for a grant or allowance was refused, whether a grant or pension could be given to John Feore, who is now in his seventy-fifth year, and otherwise through no fault of his own devoid of means of subsistence.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed by the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue that the facts are as stated, except that Mr. Feore retired, not two years ago, but in June last. The Board has no funds at its disposal out of which to award any grant, or pension, to collectors of taxes on their retirement.

IRISH HERRING FISHERY.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Irish Government have considered the necessity of applying to Ireland the Acts at present in force in Scotland with reference to the marking or branding of herrings; whether he is aware that the absence of any official brand for Irish-cured herrings militates against this Irish industry in the English and Continental markets, and gives to Scotch curers an advantage over their Irish brethren; and whether legislation will be introduced this session for the purpose of remedying this grievance.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department of Agriculture has no evidence that the fact is as alleged in the second paragraph. If the system of herring branding were re-established in Ireland its cost would presumably, as in Scotland, be a tax on the industry; and it is not clear that the imposition of such a tax in Ireland would be attended by any compensating benefits. The whole question is receiving the consideration of the Department. I cannot undertake to give any pledge in the matter of legislation.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Congested Districts Board has been already asked by the herring curers of Donegal to have the law in Ireland assimilated with what it is in Scotland in this regard?

MR. WYNDHAM: That may be so, but I cannot form any opinion until I have looked into the question.

CRIME IN COUNTY DONEGAL.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to the charge delivered by Mr. Justice Madden to the Donegal grand jury at the spring assizes, whereby he testified to the crimeless state of the county Donegal; and, if so, will the Irish Government give practical effect to his Lordship's utterance by revoking the proclamation under the Peace Preservation (Ireland) Act, 1881, at present in force in that county.

MR. WYNDHAM: The learned judge in his address to the grand jury referred to the immunity from serious crime of the county Donegal. In reply to the second query, I have nothing to add to my reply to the similar question the hon. Member addressed to me on the 19th February.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: That being so, is the right hon. Gentleman still of opinion that the laws as administered in Ireland are the most just and liberal laws in any constitutionally governed country in the world?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

DONEGAL MAGISTRACY.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the name of Mr. Humphrey Sheils, of Ballyhiernan, in the county of Donegal, has been submitted to the Lord Lieutenant for the commission of the peace for the county of Donegal, and seeing that the district in which Mr. Sheils resides is practically exclusively Roman Catholic, and that all the magistrates in the district are Protestants, whether the Irish Government will act on the precedent set by Lord Chancellor Walker, in the event of the Lord Lieutenant of the county refusing to appoint Mr. Sheils to the commission, and will direct the Lord Chancellor to make the appointment.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is not the intention of the Irish Government to act in the manner suggested in the question.

IRISH MAGISTRACY; THE MEMBER FOR MID-TIPPERARY.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware

See Debates, Vol. lxxxix., page 487.

that there were no reporters present at the meetings at which the hon. Member for Mid-Tipperary was reported to have made the speeches for which the Lord Chancellor of Ireland removed him from the commission of the peace in the county of Tipperary; will he explain by what authority the Lord Chancellor acted in calling upon the hon. Member to convict himself of the alleged offence by acknowledging that he had made the speeches as reported; and on what grounds the Lord Chancellor came to the conclusion that there was a difference in the case of the hon. Member for Mid-Tipperary and those of the hon. Member for South Sligo and the hon. Member for North Mayo, so that he refused to appoint the hon. Member for Mid-Tipperary on his re-election as chairman of the Tipperary District Council, but appointed the other two hon. Members on their re-election to their respective offices. I wish to point out that very important parts of the original question have been eliminated, and without them the question is useless.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member could have appealed to me if necessary. If he cares to postpone it I will consider if anything more should be admitted. I cannot deal with it now.

MR. CULLINAN: No; I will put it as it is.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Lord Chancellor is unable to say whether the fact is as stated in the first paragraph. But the speeches, as reported, were of a character entirely inconsistent with the position of a magistrate, and the hon. Member in question, when furnished by the Lord Chancellor with a report of his speeches, did not repudiate the language attributed to him. The Lord Chancellor considered it his duty, in the exercise of his undoubted disciplinary control over the magistracy, to remove the hon. Member from the commission. This control is extended to ex officio magistrates by Section 95 (2) of the Act of 1898. I replied on Monday to the last paragraph.†

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): May I ask if the hon. Member for † See preceding volume, page 1114.

Mid-Tipperary is the Mr. Kendal O'Brien who, when he became an ex officio magistrate, three times refused to take the oath of allegiance to Her late Majesty, and did not do so until he was compelled?

MR. CULLINAN: Can the right hon. Gentleman give the House the phraseology of the speeches of which he complains?

MR. WYNDHAM was understood to decline to do that.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): Is it not a fact that the other Members mentioned in the question never apologised or withdrew their words?

MR. CULLINAN: Are we to understand that a Member who is entitled to sit in this House and legislate for the Empire at large is to be deprived of the privilege of sitting on a local bench of magistrates?

[No answer was returned.]

COMPENSATION FOR CRIMINAL INJURIES.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the merits of Sir Frederick Falkiner, Recorder of Dublin, on the working of the law relating to compensation for criminal injuries, especially in Dublin; and whether, seeing that Sir Frederick Falkiner has expressed the opinion that the law referred to ought to be altered, on the ground that it works injustice to the ratepayers, he will take into consideration the question of acting on Sir Frederick Falkiner's suggestions, and introduce a Bill to carry them out.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): Perhaps I may be permitted to answer this question. The reply to the first query is in the affirmative. The observations of the learned Recorder had, I understand, reference to the wanton breaking of plate-glass windows which had been insured by the owners, the application for compensation for which, though nominally made by the owners, was in reality made in the interest of the insurance companies. It is doubtful whether any change in the law is necessary to correct this abuse, and it is not the intention of the Government to introduce legislation dealing with

the whole subject of criminal injuries to property, which was discussed and considered at the passing of the Act of 1898 in both Houses of Parliament.
IMPORTATION OF DOGS FROM IRELAND.

MR. WOLFF: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the regulation prohibiting the introduction of dogs from Ireland into Great Britain is still in force; if so, whether there is any prospect of its being rescinded at an early date; and, if not, what is the reason.

MR. HANBURY: There is no prospect of the Order being rescinded so long as rabies unfortunately continues to exist in Ireland. A case of rabies was reported from county Westmeath less than a fortnight ago.

MR. WOLFF: Was this only a solitary instance?

MR. HANBURY: No, there have been several cases.

IRISH ORDNANCE SURVEY;ALLEGED MISDESCRIPTIONS.

MR. LONDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why or by whose orders the gentlemen having charge of the revision of the Ordnance Survey of Ireland have marked on their revised sheets a venerable Roman Catholic church in the village of Killeely by the term chapel instead of church; and whether, in view of the fact that the principal place of worship in every parish is by canon law titled church not chapel, he will take steps that all such places of worship are designated as churches on the Ordnance maps.

MR. HANBURY: There are as yet no published revision maps of the village of Killeely. The Ordnance Survey is not, I presume, bound by the canon law, and they have hitherto followed

the name given to buildings by the inhabitants of the district. If the practice of the inhabitants in naming their buildings is in accordance with the canon law as stated by the hon. Member we shall be glad to designate Killeely Church accordingly on the maps.

POST OFFICE EXAMINATIONS IN IRELAND.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state the number of candidates who presented themselves for examination at the last examinations held respectively in Belfast, Cork, and Dublin, for clerkships in the post offices in those cities, and the number of successful candidates respectively at said examinations; the number who were examined at the last examination held in the city of Londonderry for clerkships in the post office, the number who were successful, where was the examination held, and who conducted it; and whether steps will be taken to treat Deny similarly to every other Irish city in the way of throwing these examinations open to the general public.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The result of the competition for men learners held on the 26th ultimo is not yet known; but the numbers who competed at the July examination were as follows:;At Belfast, forty-six, of whom fifteen were successful; at Cork, forty-five, of whom ten were successful; and at Dublin, eighty-seven, of whom fifteen were successful. The numbers of female competitors were:;At Belfast, 122, of whom six were successful; at Cork, twenty-five, of whom one was successful; and at Dublin, eighty-six, of whom five were

successful. The last competition for female learners at Londonderry was held in May, 1900; Seven candidates were nominated by the Postmaster General, and two were successful. The last competition for a male learnership was held in July, 1899; three candidates were nominated by the Postmaster-General, but one did not present himself for examination, and neither of the others obtained a qualifying number of marks. The examinations at Londonderry were conducted by the Civil Service

Commissioners, who made all arrangements in connection with the examinations. The system of recruiting the class of sorting clerks and telegraphists varies with the size and importance of the office concerned, and it is not proposed to introduce at Londonderry the system which exists at offices of the size and importance of Belfast, Cork, and Dublin.

CASTLEISLAND (KERRY) MAIL SERVICE.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that owing to recent alterations in train service the mails which are due for delivery in Castleisland, county Kerry, at 8.10 a.m., are generally from an hour to an hour and a half late, and that, as the outgoing mail leaves at 10.5, the limited time allowed traders causes a loss of twenty-four hours often in replying to English letters, which delay means loss to persons engaged in the butter and egg trade; and whether he will make arrangements in future to suit the people of Castleisland in accordance with the representations made to the local postmaster on the subject.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General regrets that owing to loss of time by the mail train the morning mails have recently been somewhat unpunctual in arrival at Castle-island. Repeated representations on the subject have been made to the railway company, who have promised to effect an improvement in this respect, and it is hoped the service will be more regularly performed in the future.

GLENCOLUMBKILLE SUB-POSTMASTER.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the present sub-postmaster at Glencolumbkille was at the date of his application and of his appointment as sub-postmaster a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary, was not either a resident or householder in the town of Glencolumbkille, and that he has not exclusive possession of the premises in which he purposes conducting the business

of the office; will he state what are the total emoluments per annum attached to this position; whether the head postmaster of the district recommended another applicant to the Postmaster General for the appointment; and upon what grounds did the Postmaster General refuse to act on the recommendation of the head postmaster of the district.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The present sub-postmaster of Glencolumbkille was at the time of his application for the appointment a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary. At the time of his appointment he had already retired from the Constabulary and had made arrangements to become the tenant of the premises in

which the post office work is carried on and to provide sufficient accommodation. The total emoluments of the office are about £;20 15s. a year. The head postmaster of the district is not called upon to make recommendations to the Postmaster General.

*MK. O'DOHERTY: Is it not the practice in the Post Office for the head postmaster to make the recommendation, and for the person so recommended to[^] be appointed by the Postmaster General?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have said it is not.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: Are we to understand that this man was appointed not for his efficiency, but for his political views?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. FLAVIN: What special qualification have the members of the Royal Irish Constabulary for these sub-post-masterships?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

DERRY CENTRAL RAILWAY.

*MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury upon what terms the Treasury have disposed of their interest in the Derry Central Railway to the working company, the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway, Company; what was the total sum due to the Government for principal and interest at date of sale; what was the amount of capital subscribed by the shareholders; whether anything is to go to the shareholders out of the purchase money paid to the Treasury; and whether the Treasury have made any arrangements as part of the contract of sale for a more efficient train service upon this railway than that which has existed up to the present.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Treasury have disposed of the line of the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company for £;105,000, of which £;20,000 goes to the Derry Central Railway Company for division among their shareholders and secretary. The total sum due to the Government at the date of the sale was £;131,720 18s. 4d., of which

£;100,000 was principal and £;31,720 18s. 4d. arrears of interest. The subscribed capital was £;120,340. Of this

£;10,000 was subscribed by the purchasers, who are to receive nothing in respect of their shares. Besides stipulating that the public shall be afforded at least the same facilities as they at present enjoy, the Board of Works have arranged for a complete system of through rates and fares similar to that on the Belfast and Northern Counties line, and for a full and free flow of traffic of every description in connection with this railway.

BUNCRANA BARRACKS, COUNTY DONEGAL.

*MK. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if the War Department have determined to erect military barracks at Buncrana, county Donegal, in connection with the new forts erected on Lough Swilly, and if so, what are the obstacles, if any, in the way of the works being at once proceeded with.

LORD STANLEY: Yes, Sir. The question of selecting a site is under consideration. As soon as a convenient site at a suitable price is secured, the barracks will be proceeded with.

IRISH UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION.

MR. ALFRED HUTTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Morley): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state the terms of reference to the Royal Commission to inquire into University Education in Ireland; and whether the inquiry is to cover the grievances of Roman Catholics; and, if so, whether it has been finally determined to exclude Trinity College from the scope of the inquiry, and to preclude the possibility of considering any suggested remedy for present grievances that might affect Trinity College.

The following question also appeared on the Paper;

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON: To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in case the Government should advise His Majesty to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into and report upon questions connected with University Education in Ireland, they will extend the scope of the inquiry to the Royal College of Maynooth, in order to ascertain what facilities could be afforded at Maynooth for the education of Roman Catholic laymen.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have indicated, in answer to an appeal made by the hon. Member for East Mayo, that the final settlement of the terms of reference will not be made until after the debate on the motion that the Speaker leave the Chair on the Civil Service Estimates.

DEMISE OF THE CROWN BILL.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether he will, before the Second Reading of the Demise of the Crown Bill, circulate a memorandum explanatory of its provisions.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): No, Sir. I have already explained the provisions of the Bill.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: May I ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, considering the most important nature of this Bill, and the serious consequences which its rejection might have upon right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Bench, the motion for the Second Reading will be postponed until we have the official report of the explanation of the Attorney General.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the request of the hon. Gentleman is rather an unusual one. This is a short Bill, and hon. Members will be able to discuss it adequately.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Does the right hon. Gentleman understand that this Bill deals with the question whether he himself has not, by accepting re-appointment;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; A discussion on the Bill cannot be allowed.

QUESTIONS;PROPOSED LIMITATION OF NUMBERS.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will consider the advisability of amending the Standing Orders so that no Member shall be entitled to ask more than one question upon one day.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not deny that the number of questions put down by individual Members sometimes amounts to an abuse, but I do not know that we have yet reached the point when it is desirable to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend. There are other abuses which lead to a greater waste of time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): Can the First Lord of the Treasury say what the

business will be on Monday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose to take as the first Order on Monday the Second Reading of the Demise of the Crown Bill, and as the second the Army (Annual) Bill.

[CIVIL LIST.]

Power given to the Select Committee to report their observations.

Report brought up and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. (No. 110.)

Minutes of proceedings, with an appendix, to be printed. (No. 110.)

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR, in moving that the House meet to-morrow at eleven, explained that the meeting would be purely formal, and that the attendance of Members would not be necessary, a House would be made by Black Rod. The ordinary business would be taken as usual at three o'clock.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That this House do meet to-morrow at Eleven of the clock a.m."; (Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): For my part, I do not quite understand the necessity for meeting at eleven o'clock. Why cannot this House go up at three o'clock to hear the Royal assent given to the Bill? Is it for the convenience of the Lords, and to save them the trouble of meeting again at three o'clock?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It will be absolutely necessary that the Royal Assent should be given to the Appropriation Bill at an early hour to-morrow.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That is the point I do not understand. There may be some urgent necessity which I do not understand.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member need not be brought here. There will be no business done. The early hour of meeting is in order to enable the Treasury to carry out the business entrusted to them before the end of the financial year. I hope the hon. Gentleman will accept that explanation. The proposal imposes no inconvenience on this House in any way.

Question put, and agreed to.

NEW BILLS.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I beg leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Factory and Workshop Acts. This Bill is drawn mainly on the lines of that of last year, but the fact that there are some new provisions, while several of the former proposals are omitted, will, I think, secure approval and prevent a good deal of misapprehension on the part of hon. Members on both sides of the House. I consider that some of the former proposals are not of such a character as to make it desirable that I should reintroduce them. I will merely state for the convenience of the House what those provisions are. I propose to omit what was called the two-shift clause and the clause with reference to overtime in certain trades. There was also a clause repealing certain schedules as to overtime which were unsatisfactory in their working, and substituting the order of the Secretary of State for the schedules. I do not think it will at all damage the Bill if this proposal is left out. In regard to the important question of

dangerous trades, the House knows that the present law may entail many arbitrations as regards the special rules proposed by the Secretary of State. That was proposed to be remedied by the Bill of my predecessor last year, who proposed that the regulations should be referred to a referee, and that the referee should come to a decision which would be binding on the Secretary of State. I am bound to say that I think there are strong objections to this principle of arbitration altogether. The effect of arbitration is really to place in the hands of an outsider the absolute power of rejecting, or otherwise, a proposal made by the Secretary of State. It is taking the responsibility off the shoulders of the Minister and placing it on the shoulders of an irresponsible outsider. For my own part, I do not think that is a satisfactory position either for one side or the other. I think the responsibility on such an important matter should rest upon the shoulders of the Secretary of State. I propose, therefore, in the new Bill that the Secretary of State should be responsible for making the rules for dangerous trades, subject to two conditions; first, that he should be bound to make the fullest inquiries and receive evidence in public, and, secondly, that the rules should lie on the Table of both Houses of Parliament for six weeks before they take effect. There is another important modification. The present state of the law relating to laundries is unsatisfactory and confused. One of the proposals in last year's Bill was that the Secretary of State might by order apply the provisions of the Factory Acts to laundries. I propose now to deal with the matter by legislative action instead of by the action of the Secretary of State. I propose to apply the provisions of the Factory Acts to laundries, preserving, however, the existing latitude as to the daily distribution of hours of employment so long as the statutory weekly total is not exceeded. It was proposed in last year's Bill to continue the exception in favour of any institution conducted in good faith for religious and charitable purposes. That exception, in my view, is indefensible. The laundries conducted by these institutions ought not to be worked on conditions other than those imposed on ordinary laundries with which they may be competing. If they are not so worked they have nothing to fear from the application of the Acts to them, but I propose to insert special provisions to meet the objections which have been expressed against the inspection of religious institutions by ordinary factory inspectors. In conclusion I may say that important powers as to sanitary matters are given to the local authorities, and there are other small amendments of the law with which I will not now trouble the House. I hope I have said sufficient to show what tin-main alterations in the Bill are, and I trust they may prove satisfactory to the House.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I have no doubt the right hon. Gentleman could quote precedents in support of the course he has taken, but had it been otherwise I should have been disposed to protest against the introduction of so important a Bill under the provisions of what is called the ten minutes rule. I rise, in the first instance, for the purpose of expressing the satisfaction

which I feel in common, I am sure, with a very large number of Members on both sides of the House, at the resolution which the hon. Gentleman has come to omit some of the most objectionable provisions in the measure of last year. I am very glad that the right hon. Gentleman has deferred to the representations which

were made from all quarters, particularly with regard to the double shift clause, and I may express especial satisfaction that the Government are going to deal in a comprehensive and, as I think, thoroughly logical fashion with the difficulty which has hitherto arisen respecting the power of arbitration. I have over and over again expressed the opinion that those provisions were obsolete and unworkable, and that the only satisfactory

way of dealing with them was to throw the responsibility on the Secretary of State, subject to Parliamentary supervision and control. I am very glad that the right hon. Gentleman has incorporated that provision in his Bill. Of course, as regards laundries one must reserve final judgment until one sees the provisions of the Bill. But there again I may say that it is with great satisfaction I find the right hon. Gentleman has been converted to the proposal I made in 1895 to bring laundries under the general operation of the Factory Acts, and which I was unable at that time to carry through from causes I shall not at the moment specify. I think the right hon. Gentleman's proposal is a substantial modification in the right direction of the existing law. Upon other points it is not possible at this stage to express an opinion, but I would suggest that in the interval, which I presume will be a reasonably long one, between now and when we shall be called upon to discuss the Second Reading, as this is a matter which affects a great many interests in this country, the right hon. Gentleman should circulate with the Bill a memorandum or explanatory statement, comparing the measure not only with the provisions of last year's Bill, but also with the existing state of the law.

Bill to amend the Factory and Workshop Acts, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Secretary Ritchie and Mr. Jesse Collings.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Factory and Workshop Acts," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 130.]

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS CONSOLIDATION.

*MR. RITCHIE: I wish to ask the leave of the House to introduce a Bill to consolidate the Factory Acts. While it is quite clear that it is desirable to consolidate the law relating to various matters, it is more than ever desirable that laws relating to the working classes should be consolidated and made as simple as possible. It is sometimes said that the law ought to be consolidated before it is amended, or, on the other hand, that it ought to be amended and at some future time consolidated. Sometimes consolidation is promised after amendment, and a considerable period elapses before the consolidation takes place. I want both these processes to proceed *pari passu*. I hope that both Bills will be sent to a Committee upstairs, and that that Committee will do as it did with the Public Health (London) Bill and the Housing of the Working Classes Bill, namely, that it should take the amending Bill first in Committee, go

through all the Amendments proposed in the Bill or which any member of the Committee desires to propose, on the understanding that when the Bill is amended it should be then returned along with the Consolidation Bill to the draftsman with instructions to amend the Consolidation Bill by the Amendments in the Amending Bill. The Bills would then go before the Grand Committee, and the clauses be gone through pro forma; they would then be returned to the House as one Bill, which the House would consider on Report. Therefore we may hope that in one session we should get both the Amendments and the consolidation of the existing law that we desire.

Bill to consolidate the Factory and Workshop Act, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Secretary Ritchie and Mr. Jesse Collings.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS CONSOLIDATION BILL.

"To consolidate the Factory and Workshop Acts," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 131.]

CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 1) BILL.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;PEACE NEGOTIATIONS.

*MR. URE (Linlithgowshire) said that the House and the country were surprised to learn that the negotiations for peace between General Botha and Lord Kitchener had come to nothing, and that the much-looked-for cessation of hostilities had not been brought about. On the 22nd of February Lord Kitchener received a letter from General Botha intimating his desire to treat for peace, and that letter was written after consultation between General Botha and his fellow generals, on the distinct understanding that the question of the independence of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony lay outside the region of discussion. Later on a prolonged interview took place between General Botha and Lord Kitchener at Middelburg, and at that interview Lord Kitchener said that General Botha showed good feeling and seemed very anxious to bring about peace, ten different topics being discussed. On the 6th of March Lord Kitchener was in possession of the Government's proposals, and on the afternoon of the 7th of March the letter from the Government was sent by special messenger to General Botha. This was followed by nine days' silence. At the end of that time there came a most startling letter from the Boer general, in which he intimated to Lord Kitchener that, after what had passed between them he should refuse to recommend for consideration the terms offered by the British Government. General Botha did not say that these terms had been discussed and afterwards refused; he stated no objection of any kind to them, but simply refused to submit them for consideration. That seemed to indicate that something had passed between the two generals on the 28th of February which must have made it plain to Lord Kitchener that the proposals of the British Government could not possibly have been accepted. What that something was the Papers

did not disclose, and he thought it was the general feeling of the House that the time had come when the Government, without any detriment to the public service, might make a full and frank disclosure of all they knew on the subject.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.):

Surely the hon. Gentleman is aware that I have again and again said we have disclosed to the House all we know. There is nothing beyond what is in these Papers.

*MR. URE assumed that communications had taken place since the papers were laid.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No.

*MR. URE said if that was the case he thought the right hon. Gentleman would agree that it was right they should turn to the proposals themselves in order that they might discover, if possible, where the mystery was. In turning to the proposals of the Government, he wished to say that he assumed that General Botha's desire for peace was honest and sincere. If his assumption was wrong, then there, was no mystery to reveal. It appeared to him that of the ten topics discussed on the 28th of February the treatment by His Majesty's Government of seven afforded no sort of ground or reason for the curt refusal on the part of General Botha even to entertain the proposals. His Majesty's Government offered the assurance that at the end of the war there would be no special war tax put upon the Boer farmers, and that assistance would be readily granted to those who were willing to take the Oath of allegiance to the King. No difficulty was raised about the return of the Boer prisoners from St. Helena and Ceylon. With regard to the Kaffir question, often burning and troublesome, all that General Botha seemed to be anxious about was that the Kaffirs should not have the franchise until representative government was conceded to the two colonies, and the British Government readily agreed to that. His Majesty's Government was prepared to grant complete amnesty for all bona fide acts of war, and it was only in the case of colonials who desired to return to Natal or Cape Colony that the Government proposed that they should be relegated to the treason law of their own country. Lord Kitchener proposed that in the case of the colonials a recommendation should be made merely to disfranchise them; but he could not believe that an alteration of that kind was the rock on which these peace overtures were wrecked.

He turned now to the remaining three topics discussed, which he admitted stood in a wholly different position from those to which he had hitherto adverted.

There was, in the first place, the question of liability for the debts of the two republics. That was a topic on which Lord Kitchener told them that General Botha laid special stress. Botha's point was intelligible enough. He said that if they were taking over the assets of the two republics, why should they not also take over their legal debts? He referred to the notes, amounting to something less than £1,000,000 sterling, issued by the Boers during the campaign. He would not argue the legal point, because this seemed to him to be a question of policy, and of policy only. The proposal seemed to have commended itself to Lord Kitchener, but His Majesty's Government characterised the seemingly modest proposal suggested in his Lordship's draft letter as highly dangerous. His Majesty's Government seemed to suggest that there might be some feeling engendered on the part of the loyalists if money was paid to those who had assisted and supplied the enemy. All he wished to say was that concessions of this kind, if freely granted, would only expose them to the charge of undue

generosity, and would not afford a foothold for further agitation. When they came to examine this closely they would find that it was not a concession at all, but a thing which in the end would turn out to their own benefit. There was no element of peril in it, and that was the reason why Lord Kitchener and Sir Alfred Milner were ready to grant this concession as a ready means of settlement.

Then came, in the second place, the proposal to give assistance to the Boer farmers who had suffered loss during the course of the war. It was impossible to shut their eyes to the fact

that this was one of the most important topics discussed at the conference between Lord Kitchener and General Botha. But, though Lord Kitchener freely admitted that they should give some assistance, the Government said this proposal too was dangerous, and they made what, in his judgment, was a very vital and fatal change in the suggestions of the men on the spot, and one which, as he gathered, was deeply regretted by both Lord Kitchener and Sir Alfred Milner. They thought that the introduction of the words "by loan" would weaken the effect of the concession. The men on the spot entertained a strong objection to the introduction of those words. Lord Kitchener's reason for this was that in view of the suspicious nature of the Boers he thought this alteration would be regarded as an attempt to get the farmers into the clutches of the Government. Was there any hon. Member present who did not feel the force of that remark? The objection of the Government to this proposal seemed to be that they would be favouring enemies as against friends. He had every sympathy with the position of the loyalists, who, under very trying circumstances, had been true to the British connection, and they were entitled to every consideration and respect. He thought, however, that the House would be disposed to agree with the men on the spot, who were well able to judge of the circumstances under which they were negotiating. On the other hand, he should have thought that the interests of the loyalists were very safe in the hands of Sir Alfred Milner, because he did not think that the very worst enemy of that distinguished and capable public servant would suggest that he was at all likely to ride roughshod over the loyalists, or brush aside their feelings and sentiments.

He would now turn to the last topic discussed at the Middelburg Conference; he alluded to the question of the future government of the two colonies. The Conference took place on the express understanding that the question of independence was to remain outside the negotiations altogether, and the Conference took place after General Botha had communicated with his fellow generals. Let the House consider the contrast between the proposals of Lord Kitchener, on the one hand, and those of the Government, on the other, in order to see if they could discover the real cause of the failure of the negotiations. Lord Kitchener proposed that as soon as the surrender was complete military law should come to an end and that civil administration should take its place. The Government, on the other hand, proposed that as soon as practicable military administration; not military law; should cease that civil government in the form of Crown Colony government should take its place. He observed that in the draft letter reference

to Crown Colony government was studiously kept out. Crown Colony government had a somewhat evil reputation in South Africa, which was not confined exclusively to the men of the Dutch race, but it was largely shared by many of those who were loyal to the British connection. He quite appreciated the reason given by the Government that it might be necessary afterwards to maintain military law, but surely the Governor appointed would be entitled to claim that at his own discretion. He should have placed in the very front the proposal that military administration should cease, and not military law. But there is a still much more important proposal. Lord Kitchener proposed that the new Government should consist of a Governor and a nominated Executive, "with or without" an advisory elected Assembly. That phrase was a little vague, and wanted explanation, but he thought, at all events, it would open up a hope that; and he thought it would become a certainty; from the outset there would be an element of representative government, through which they would be able to ascertain the wishes and desires of those who were to be governed. That door was shut at once by the alteration proposed by His Majesty's Government; namely, that the new Government should consist of a Governor, assisted by a nominated Executive and by a nominated advisory council, consisting of officials and some non-officials, who should be nominated by the Crown. He thought that was a most unfortunate change, for it at once precluded all hope of the representative element being present. He saw no danger whatever in allowing this elected element to remain. As soon as circumstances permitted free representative government should be conceded to the two colonies, but what His Majesty's Government put forward was that as soon as circumstances permitted a representative element should be introduced, and ultimately free representative government probably would be conceded. Those changes were made by the Government in the interests of precision and exact phraseology. He was bound to say that he could not congratulate the Government upon the phraseology employed. Who knew what a

"representative element" meant? and where in the English language could they find a word more vague and shadowy than "ultimately"? In their recent debate upon the terms of settlement he found it was often said that the time had come to substitute the statesman for the soldier. When he read those proposals he was inclined to think that that statement ought to be reversed. He preferred very much the proposals of Lord Kitchener to those which had been framed by the Government. He could scarcely conceive that such changes would have been made in phraseology which had been carefully framed by Lord Kitchener unless the Government attached importance to the change.

He was sure that the House would welcome from the Government some further explanation in regard to the reasons for making such important changes in Lord Kitchener's despatch. It was said that General Botha entertained a strong objection to Sir Alfred Milner, but if that had been the cause; of the failure of the negotiations it was, inconceivable that it should not have found a place in the Papers laid before the House. He had failed to discover in the detailed statement of what had taken place at the Middelburg Conference the smallest hint or suggestion that there was anything in the personality of the High

Commissioner to prevent the two generals from coming to terms. On the contrary, he found in every important particular in which the Government differed from Lord Kitchener Sir A. Milner was on the side of Lord Kitchener and against the Government. What was the reason why the statement was made by the right hon. the Colonial

Secretary on Saturday last?* He was wholly at a loss to comprehend what it could be. Since the ill-starred day of the publication of the Spion Kop despatches no more mischievous thing had been done by the Government than that statement of the right hon. Gentleman. He was told that the same plea would be put forward for making that statement as for the publication of the Spion Kop despatches; it was to feed the public appetite. But he thought they would all be in a chronic state of indigestion if that were the fare on which the Government proposed to nourish them.

He was desirous that there should be no mistake whatever in regard to his views in this matter. He saw in the early part of the telegram of 1st March sent by Lord Kitchener to the right hon. gentleman the Secretary of State for War that at the outset of the discussions General Botha expressed a doubt as to whether he could bring about peace without independence. If there were any truth in that, if that doubt were realised, he, for his part, regretfully admitted that the campaign must be fought to the bitter end. Lord Kitchener added that at the beginning of the conference General Botha strove hard for some sort of independence, and General Kitchener at once refused to discuss the subject, and instantly dropped it. Here Lord Kitchener was unquestionably right. A claim for complete independence he thoroughly understood although he disagreed with it; a claim for all the rights and privileges of a self-governing British colony he also comprehended, and thoroughly agreed with it; but a claim for some sort of independence, or a modified form of independence, for some stunted thing, some debased image of the genuine article, he could not comprehend. He did not believe there was any man in that House who was honestly anxious for a lasting and enduring peace in South Africa who could for a moment think of suggesting it. Why, to give the Boers a modified form of independence would be to give them a stone wherewith to break their own heads, and to lay up a store of disaffection. Current criticism admitted that it was

* See Preceding volume, p. 991.

here where was to be found the true secret of the failure of the negotiations. He could scarcely think so, because when General Botha entered into these negotiations he agreed; and that after consultation with his fellow-generals; to leave the question of independence outside; and he (the hon. Member) could not see why General Botha should have taken the extreme course of refusing absolutely to consider the proposals of the British Government merely because some modified form of independence was not offered. As to the proposals of the Government as a whole, he made no hostile attack on them. He had offered his criticism on the points which he thought were open to challenge; but that criticism had gone no further than the criticism of the civilian and the soldier on the spot who understood the circumstances under which they were negotiating. He would not utter a single word suggesting that the proposals as a whole were

not fair and generous, or that would give His Majesty's Government any excuse for saying that Members on that side of the House were unreasonable persons; nor would he give the Government any excuse for receding from the position they had taken up, and falling back into the arms of the extremists, who would be only too ready to say to the Government, "You have already gone too far; your generosity has been unappreciated; never again." On the contrary, he would infinitely rather that the Government, if they did not adhere to their present position, should go to the length to which Lord Kitchener went. However, he did not suggest for a moment that they should reopen the negotiations. That was out of the question, after the curt refusal of General Botha even to consider the terms proposed. The overtures must come from the Boers; and if they did come he hoped that His Majesty's Government would stand firm in the position they had taken up, would go one short step further, and be prepared to agree to the terms which Lord Kitchener had suggested. He agreed with the statement in the papers, that never in the history of the world had such generous and fair terms been offered by the victors to the vanquished. [Cries of "Oh, oh" from the Irish Benches.] He defied any student of history to contradict that.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): They are the meanest terms ever offered.

*MR. URE said that, at all events, it was his opinion that the terms offered were fair and generous. They should, however, never forget that the case they had in hand was unique, and out of the common; for the belligerents in arms against us in the field were all men who might some day come to be subjects of His Majesty; the war-stricken country whose homesteads they were asked to restore was at present part of His Majesty's dominions; and the humble creditors whose claims we were asked to pay would, they hoped, soon pass under the benign sway of the British Crown. Under these circumstances they could afford to be generous. He thought the country might rest assured that the claims of the loyalists were perfectly safe when they had Sir A. Milnor to look after them; and the Government could afford, with Lord Kitchener at their back, to treat with the contempt they deserved the braggadocios who shouted that weakness and cowardice were the proper names for the lenity and magnanimity which the Government might display.

MR. STROYAN (Perthshire, W.) said that if he asked the indulgence of the House for a brief space it was based on the fact that he had had a connection for more than twenty years with South Africa, and that fifteen of these years were spent in that country. He was a South African colonist, in the proper sense of the term, before gold was discovered on the Rand, and before Britons were termed Uitlanders in the land which owed everything to their energy and enterprise. Although he had not been connected actively in business with South Africa for some years past, he had still investments in that country, and was determined to hold these investments. He went further, and said that it was his intention that his children should do something towards the development of that most important portion of His Majesty's dominions. He felt that he voiced the views of every loyal South African when he said that the terms offered by Lord Kitchener to General Botha were generous in the extreme. He felt

he spoke for every loyal South African when he said that he was heartily glad that those generous terms were offered; for it showed to the world, and to the Boers themselves, the good feelings entertained towards them by the people of this country. [Cries of "Oh, oh";] Boer and Briton must live together in the future and work side by side for the prosperity of their common country. He was convinced, however, that the Government had gone as far in the direction of generosity as it would be safe to go. To offer better terms would simply mean to risk being seriously misunderstood by friend and foe alike. The first essential of a permanent settlement was that the terms should, besides being generous to the vanquished, be just and fair to our own loyal colonists; and, above all, it was essential that the terms should be dignified and incapable of being misunderstood. He entirely agreed with His Majesty's Government in the substitution of the term "assistance by way of loan" for the more vague promise of assistance contained in Lord Kitchener's proposed letter. Statesmen, in matters like this, must come to the assistance of the great soldier. They must be precise, if they would avoid misunderstanding. The alteration was, in his opinion, absolutely necessary. No amount of generosity would have satisfied the Boers or would have been accepted by them as an adequate fulfilment of that undertaking. They would have misunderstood it. Besides, free gifts of money would have been misrepresented, and would have been looked upon as the purchase-price of peace. Peace under such conditions we could not have, and peace under such conditions would not have been lasting. He had, personally, implicit confidence in Sir A. Milner. He had watched his career since that distinguished Statesman first became connected with South Africa. For the first time, however, he could not see eye to eye with him. He could not agree with him in his preference of Lord Kitchener's proposals to those cabled by His Majesty's Government. They were told that General Botha objected to Sir A. Milner. He could quite believe that, and he thought the House would agree with him that that was quite natural. He fancied that the great majority of the enemies of this country in South Africa, whether they were open or secret enemies, objected to Sir A. Milner. He had no doubt that these men equally objected to Lord Kitchener, General French, and a number of others of the most successful of our generals, and, that being so, they fell back on the rebel cries of abuse. Sir Alfred Milner's ability and fitness for the difficult and trying position to which he had been appointed had been amply demonstrated and conclusively proved by the fact that every known rebel and disloyal subject throughout South Africa objected to him and desired his recall, whilst, on the other hand, he had the confidence of the loyalists and the British to an extent unprecedented in the case of any official in South Africa, and to stultify or diminish his influence there would be a blow to British prestige. The interests of British supremacy and the Empire itself made his presence in the country necessary for the time being at least. In any terms of peace we must be just to our friends as well as generous to our enemies. He implored the Government not to lay themselves open to the reproach, which at the conclusion of the last Boer war was made with a considerable amount of justice, that "loyalty in South Africa does not pay." The much-abused British in South Africa were, after all,

the same people as ourselves;willing, perhaps, to undergo more hardships and exercise more self-denial than, happily, we were called upon to in an old country like England;and many of them had been under arms for the Empire. It had been suggested that these men might be vindictive; brave men were never vindictive. They had given Great Britain troop after troop; they gave the Imperial Light Horse, that magnificent body of men who fought shoulder to shoulder with the Gordons and rode in the van to the relief of Mafeking. Those who systematically and indiscriminately endeavoured to belittle and besmirch such a community were no friends of that closer union which was binding the colonies to the mother country, of which we had heard so much in recent years;that closer union which had stood the British Empire in such good stead during the present crisis, and which we should have to preserve if Great Britain was to last.

MR. ROBSON (South Shields): The hon. Member who has just sat down has devoted his time to uttering observations with which everyone will agree. I should like to draw attention to one point, which is indeed a matter of more general interest than the matter under discussion, but which will not, I hope, be overlooked, because it has great bearing upon it;that is, the policy of publishing despatches in which the local advisers of a Minister set forth their own views and opinions by way of assisting the Minister to form his judgment. I have little doubt that there are many cases where such a course might be convenient, but this particular case is one where it must be objectionable, and, I think, highly dangerous. I am not speaking of the negotiations between this country and the Boers; that is totally different to the matter of which I am now speaking. I am referring to the confidential difference of opinion between a Minister and his advisers. That is quite different to the information which the House is so eager to get. Knowing all that passes, the responsibility of the Colonial Secretary in a matter like this is something more than the average responsibility which Ministers are so fond of referring to. He is the actual person and the only person responsible for these negotiations, and the only person who ought to receive praise or blame, according to the view taken of them. It is for him to answer, and I submit that he has no right;that a Minister has no right;to bring his confidential advisers within the range of parliamentary criticism at all. It is for him to deal with them and for Parliament to deal with him. But it is not only from the point of view of Ministerial responsibility that I invite attention to this matter; there are other points. It is impolitic to show to our enemies that there are differences of opinion between the Colonial Secretary and his advisers with regard to the terms of peace, especially when those terms had been rejected, and it is highly inexpedient that when this matter comes up again our enemies should be able to speculate on the disposition of this or that adviser in their favour with respect to the terms. Whatever terms we present to them should carry with them the weight of absolutely undivided counsel. Now, I do not think that the terms we shall hereafter present to them will carry the weight of undivided counsels, but there are other objections more grave than that. My hon. friend has pointed out the difference between the terms suggested by Lord Kitchener and

those suggested by Sir A. Milner. Lord Kitchener did not lay the same stress on political difficulties that Sir A. Milner felt. Sir Alfred Milner felt it his duty to point out that the Cape rebels in the Transvaal ought not to be treated better than the Cape rebels in the Cape; that was certainly a very reasonable suggestion, but was it right that Sir A. Milner's advice should be disclosed so that he has put upon him the opprobrium, such as it is; of attempting to exact worse terms than were suggested by the military authorities? That cannot fail to work against him in his ministerial authority. Was it wise to hold out to the Boers the fact that it is the military authority who is most eager to give them the best terms? Will not their suggestion be that it is not the Minister in England, or even his local adviser in South Africa, but the military authorities, who, recognising the difficulties of the campaign, are most anxious to offer the best terms? I am surprised that the Government should utter such things in the House.

Now I come to the terms themselves, and I frankly admit not only that the terms are generous, but that the alterations and additions made in the terms add to their clearness and precision and to their freedom from minute controversy afterwards, and on the whole they are sound and substantial improvements on the terms suggested. With regard to the alterations, I cannot understand them coming into controversy at all. The stipulation made by the Colonial Secretary that these terms should be made conditional on the cessation of hostilities was reasonable enough, because it would not do to bring back 18,000 or 20,000 men and still find yourself fighting a hostile community; that, in my opinion, was a most reasonable stipulation. My hon. friend, by way of emphasising his objection to these terms, laid great stress on the substitution of the word "loan" for the word "gift," and I should have been disposed to agree with him if I had thought that the alteration of those words had caused the rejection of peace. It was the terms as a whole that were rejected. If Botha, instead of rejecting the terms, had said that the terms were acceptable so far, but that he would rather have the word "gift" inserted instead of "loan," I do not think anybody would have stood in the way. That alteration was not of such a degree of importance as to induce us to suppose that it caused the rejection of the terms. The principal point connected with these proposals and their rejection is the introduction of the representative element. The introduction of representative government in the Transvaal seems to have produced a good deal of confusion of thought among many persons. Some have suggested that representative government in its fullest sense ought to be conferred upon the Boers immediately after the cessation of hostilities. I do not know whether that view is put forward by anyone now. [SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, it is.] Then it appears that there are still some persons who hold the extraordinary view that representative government should be conferred upon this half-depopulated country immediately on the cessation of the war, and there are certainly some other Members who go extremely near it. The substitute for it is that the country should have representative government on the restoration of order. Well, that is a more elastic formula, and I do not know whether I could not get my own suggestion under cover of it if stretched far enough. It is not by any means a safe

formula. Surely hon. Members, on reflection, will see that in the interest of peace there must be a resettlement of the country before you can have anything like a fair system of representative government. The thousands of legal inhabitants of the Transvaal, who have been expelled because they are of British race, must be resettled in the country before you can give representative government to the Boers. It is not enough to talk of the cessation of hostilities. It is not enough to talk of the restoration of order. The fact is that those who desire representative government without the resettlement of the country ignore the fact which, I think, has been at the root of their mistaken attitude throughout this controversy. They ignore the fact that, although the Boers conquered the Transvaal, their conquest was not complete. It was subject to the right of people of British race to settle, and live and labour in that country. The British Empire had a proprietary right in the Transvaal at all times under the Convention. The Briton was in the Transvaal by the same right as the Boer, and now the Boer has (spelled him, although his race represented a large proportion; some people say a majority; of the population. Are you going to confer representative government before he has returned? [An HON. MEMBER: "Nobody wants it."] I am very glad to hear that, because some people have wanted it. I cannot help observing from my own experience of this controversy that very often, because some little fault is found with England, it is always held to absolve the Boer. I think we should look at both sides of the question, and I hold it to be an unreasonable demand, the Boer having expelled so great a proportion of the population, that he should expect or desire anything like full representative government until there has been a reasonable settlement of the country. Personally I should prefer that the Government should make an estimate; by no means an impossible thing to do; of the time in which that resettlement may reasonably be expected, and having fixed that period, then by declaration in this House; although I would not make it part of the terms of peace; announce the intention of His Majesty's Government to give full representative government at that period, if in their discretion they may think it right, provided, of course, that hostilities shall have ceased, and that the country shall have resumed its normal industrial conditions. It should be open to them, if that condition is not fulfilled, to extend the period, and equally open to them to curtail the period if they thought it advisable to do so. The fixing of a certain period would be a guide to them, and an aid to any Government holding power in England at the time. I dare say it will be said that that is practically what the Government are doing now, and that it is the discretion they have under the existing terms of peace. That is quite true, but nobody can predict what the temper of the Government a few years hence may be, but I hope the people of this country will see to it that representative government is not delayed. I have dwelt thus long upon the question of full representative government because the same reasons apply to, and have a direct bearing upon, the agreement in regard to the Advisory Council. No doubt an advisory council looks very tempting, but again you have to remember that your elective Advisory Council

would represent only a small portion of the population. It would have this disadvantage. The Boers would, of course, first of all return to the country and be in a great majority, and this would be a source of possible danger and disturbance. We know perfectly well what would happen if their representative government were so full as to give them full legislative powers. We should undoubtedly have a repetition of the franchise and registration difficulties which we have already dealt with. Such a thing would be practically unconditional surrender to the Boers. An Advisory Council, while it would not have, so great an evil effect as that, would, nevertheless have an evil effect. If they sought to take advantage of their position by suggestions unfair to the still more or less absentee Uitlander population, they would be overruled by the executive authority. It is better to fix a provisional period, to let that provisional period be frankly stated, and not pretend it is anything else; and then, as soon as possible, to introduce the representative government which is shared by every white race under the British flag. We cannot; carry on our Imperial system as a great empire except upon the basis of local self-government. From their experience of the Cape Government the Boers know as well as we do that an essential part of our Imperial system is representative government in some form or other, and that, generally according to the distance from England, some extremely ample form is always granted, and the more they appreciate that fact the less difficulty we will have. I express satisfaction that His Majesty's Government are desirous of meeting the Boers on terms so fair.

There is, in my opinion, no reason to complain of the way in which they have treated the Boers or loyalists in regard to these negotiations.

MR. ELLIOT (Durham): I wish to say a few words on the general position in which we find ourselves; that is, on the precise terms proposed in the negotiations. We talk, and we have a right to talk, of being generous in this matter. After all, generosity is the best policy for ourselves. I don't know that we can spend too much time in praising ourselves. After a sanguinary tussle with a brave enemy we are still able to go into negotiations with moderate minds, with just intentions, with a desire, having regard to our own interests, to deal fairly and generously if we can with our enemy. There is talk about representative institutions and so forth, as to the when, the where, and the how, they shall be introduced: hut, after all, the main thing which lies at the bottom of all is this, that neither in one way nor another shall we be able to make peace and quiet in South Africa until there is some sort of drawing together between the two races. (Opposition cheers.) Hon. Gentlemen cheer, and will not go any further. If by advancing further we shall be repaid a hundredfold in the good temper with which we are met, then it is foolish to say, in a spirit of defiance, that nothing will induce us to advance beyond these terms. It is a consolation, I should imagine, to every one that, notwithstanding the figure which the warlike operations have cost the country, General Botha and Lord Kitchener can come together. They seem, as far as we can judge from the only account that has come before us, to have been able to talk together almost like good friends in regard to the common object they have in view. Surely if these

men, who have been doing their best to take each other's lives by their forces, are able to meet in that way, it is not for us at home to take another course? We will be generous, if you will, in order that we may pull together the two races in South Africa. I wish to say one word upon a rather delicate subject; the subject of Sir Alfred Milner. I am perfectly certain, from my personal acquaintance and friendship with him, that he has been actuated throughout by the highest principles and the desire to serve the truest and best interests of his country. It would be absurd to recall Sir Alfred Milner. We must look at both sides; the British on the one side and the Africander section on the other; and do our best to steer a medium course, because in that course alone all safety lies. Sir Alfred Milner has undergone great trials since he went out to South Africa. Does any man really suppose in his heart that as time goes on Sir Alfred Milner will be the best able to pull together the two jarring races? I doubt it. I think the time will come; and the Government must know it as well as other people; for everything to settle down, whatever may be the rights and wrongs of the question. When the time comes for everything to settle down it is inevitable that things will be laid to his charge, and he will be in a position, no matter how great his abilities or how good his intentions, where he will not be able to do full justice to a difficult situation. [Cries of "No."] I do not say one word against Sir Alfred Milner but I venture to say that these are words of common sense. People may remember, after all, that the man who has been responsible for conquest will not be the best man to elicit the loyal feelings and the fraternal sentiments. If I may say so, of those who are opposed to him. These are disagreeable words for an Englishman to have to use. We have not been accustomed, and I hope it will be a long time in future before the English House of Commons has to contemplate it, to the making of British subjects against their will. It is a disagreeable task we have undertaken. Since the war began I have felt this, and I have stated it again and again. Since the war began it became, in my judgment, our absolute duty to conquer these two Republics. I do not wish to go back on the old story on this occasion. We have before tried the system of independent Republics, and it broke down in disaster and disgrace. If we had set up the Republics again their functions would have been differently interpreted by the two sides. The Republics would have claimed all the rights of independence in the neighbourhood of a British colony where a large portion of the population are in close relationship to the people of the Republics. I think it would not have been a wise or politic thing. I think the war put an end to that state of things, and we have to find a solution in another way. I must say that, when we talk of the generous terms we are offering, we should try to look a little to the other side of the question. We are offering to pay debts, to pay sums to those who have been spending money against us. We have been offering to build the farms of those who have recently been engaged in the war. But what are we getting from General Botha? He is giving away what is of supreme importance; he is giving up the cause for which throughout a year and a half he has fought with great courage and vigour. I say, beyond all dispute, he is giving up that cause for which thousands of his friends and relations have sacrificed their lives. If he gives in he has to

sacrifice all that. I say he is bound to do it for his own well-being, and he will best consult, no doubt, the interests of his country if he does so give way, but do not let us say as Englishmen that he is not called upon to make a gigantic sacrifice. He is as brave a man as any in the world. Let us do what we can to make things easy for those against whom we fought. When we see the Government taking the line they are taking now; a moderate medium course between the two extremes; let us strengthen them in the task, which I am perfectly certain they will find one of extreme difficulty. My right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary, speaking last December, said he looked forward to an early conclusion of the war. I saw the comment two or three days afterwards, "What was the use of being generous to people who did not understand it; that sort of thing would be done again." We have to be fair to all parties. We have to remember our own loyalists who have fought so well. We have to remember the great objects before us, and look them fairly in the face. What can be the future of South Africa? Are we to succeed in pouring in a British population which will ultimately

by its numbers reduce to insignificance the minority of Dutchmen? That, so far as I can see, is impossible. What is it that causes distant countries to fill up with Englishmen? A country that abounds with cheap labour is not the country to which Englishmen will flock. They will go in twos and threes to the extent of a few hundreds to make fortunes by speculating at Johannesburg, but they will not go in the only way in which great masses of the population can ever be got into a new country. They will not go to take the place of labourers. I hope what can be done will be done to induce Englishmen to go out and take farms in South Africa, but I do not expect much of that kind of thing to occur. Look the thing fairly and squarely in the face. If we cannot change the character of the country districts of South Africa from Dutch districts into British districts, what have we to do? There is only one thing to be done, and only one possibility by which South Africa can be retained in the Empire, and that is by gradually enabling a good spirit to grow up between the Dutch and the English. They will come together, and I hope we shall have the Government of Cape Colony largely composed of Dutchmen. Personally, I find it difficult to improve the policy of the Government as sketched out by the Colonial Secretary last December. The differences between Downing Street and Sir Alfred Milner and Lord Kitchener are very small. The way in which the Government are now acting deserves the support of Members on both sides of the House.

MR. BEYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I entirely agree with my hon. friend who has just sat down in the view that this debate affords a proper opportunity for reviewing the general position in which we now stand, and I agree also with the desire that we should endeavour to recall to the House the brighter aspects of the question, and to induce it to look at the matter with that dispassionate temper which is so eminently absent from some quarters, especially in South Africa, and which is so extremely necessary at the present moment. We are all agreed that the Government took an onward step when they allowed the peace negotiations to be entered into' and I think it is important to observe that not only Lord Kitchener but Sir Alfred Milner was

persuaded that General Botha meant business. They thought General Botha was sincere in his wish for peace, and if you read Sir Alfred Milner's telegram you will see that Lord Kitchener was anxious to put the terms in the best way. He also thought there was a reasonable chance of peace being arranged. He thought the thing was within our grasp. Sir Alfred Milner was hopeful and Lord Kitchener was hopeful, and therefore, I trust the House will bear that in mind, because it is our justification in asking the House to look carefully at the difference between the terms Lord Kitchener stated in his interview and the terms which ultimately went to General Botha. There may have been many causes and forces at work which we do not know, which are not disclosed in these Papers, and which made the negotiations to be broken off; but we have to go on the basis of these Papers. General Botha and Lord Kitchener parted in the belief that peace was probable. A letter was received a few days afterwards in which General Botha says: "You will not be surprised to hear that my answer is in the negative."

What are the reasons for the use of the words

"You will not be surprised"? One of two things must have happened; either Lord Kitchener heard from General Botha a great deal that we have not heard of, or else General Botha was so much struck by the difference between the terms Lord Kitchener had discussed and the terms received in the letter that he conceived a distrust of us altogether, and believed that the Government at home would not implement what Lord Kitchener had offered.

I do not think we should look upon this as a question of generosity at all. I wish that the term generosity had been left out of the discussion. We shall never agree as to what is generous to the enemy, but what we may all agree upon is; What is business? I wish to look at the matter entirely from the point of view of what is best for us to offer in order to get peace. I am sure that that is the point of view in which Lord Kitchener approached it. No one accuses Lord Kitchener of being a soft or sentimental

man. He thought it was for the interest of this country that the war should come to an end now, and that it should come to an end on the terms he offered, and which I have no doubt he believed would receive the support of the Government.

I want to trouble the House to go through these ten items. I think the Government were entitled to ask that the oath of allegiance should be taken, that they were entitled to insist upon the provision that all hostilities must cease if the terms took effect, and that they could not be answerable for the precise time when they would bring back the exiles. But there are three points in which there are substantial differences between the terms Lord Kitchener offered and the terms in the final letter. Lord Kitchener and General Botha appear to have come to an agreement upon that subject. The words Lord Kitchener reports are;

"Amnesty to all at end of war. We spoke of colonials who joined Republics, and lie seemed not adverse to their being disfranchised."

There is no objection on Botha's part to the disfranchisement of the Cape rebels, and Lord Kitchener does not convey any suggestion whatever of anything except disfranchisement. Therefore General Botha goes back to his own people, having a right to believe, so far as Lord Kitchener's inclinations went, that

the Cape rebels would be entitled to go home, subject to the penalty of disfranchisement and nothing more. I cannot agree with the hon. Member for Linlithgow in looking upon that as an unimportant factor. With a military force such as that to which Botha submitted the proposals, there is nothing to which more importance would be attached than the treatment of their brothers in arms. It is a point of honour with a soldier that his fellow-soldiers are well treated. I can therefore conceive nothing more likely to turn back their pacific desires than the fact that instead of the Cape rebels having nothing but disfranchisement to fear they would be subjected to the penalties; of the Cape law of treason when they returned to the colony. [Ministerial cheers.] I am not arguing whether it is right or wrong. Hon. Members do not seem to appreciate the point of the argument at all. The question is what the Boers would think. It was a most natural thing that they should be struck by the contrast between the terms Lord Kitchener appeared to offer and the terms contained in the letter, and it was just a point with regard to which men feeling for their comrades would be inclined to stand out. Of course we shall be told that you would displease the loyalists at the Cape if you did not exact all the penalties for treason. I hope that we shall never in this House consider it any part of our business to satisfy the vindictive feelings of people at the Cape. All legitimate feelings on their part are entitled to consideration, but feelings of revenge are not. Such feelings are illegitimate, and are the very worst counsellors you can have. The so-called loyalists at the Cape; [Cries of "So-called" and "Oh, oh" and "Withdraw."]

[The right hon. Gentleman essayed to continue his remarks, but was prevented by renewed cries of "Withdraw."]

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; If the right hon. Gentleman had exceeded the limits of Parliamentary debate I should have called him to order.

MR. BRYCE: I am going to tell hon. Members why I use that expression. There are a great many people at the Cape; Dutchmen very largely as well as Englishmen; who are entirely, thoroughly, and heartily loyal to the British Crown, but who are not the faction that I describe as the "so-called loyalists." That name is given by the persons who telegraph and write home, purporting to represent them, to the extreme faction at the Cape who arrogate to themselves exclusively the name of "loyalists." but who are not

a bit more loyal than a large number who do not share these vindictive feelings, but have a far better sense of the real gravity of the position and of the remedies which ought to be applied. There is a faction; I hope it is only a small faction; which is not thinking of ending the war or of the welfare of the colonies, but which simply wishes, in the words of the Old Testament. "to see its desire upon its enemies," to see severely vindictive punishment inflicted upon Cape rebels of every kind. I again repeat that we ought not to be guided by those vindictive feelings: they are dangerous to the future of the Cape; they are the worst possible advisers at a crisis of this kind, and I earnestly hope that no appeal to the feelings of that faction will be made to dissuade us from what should appear to be the interests of Cape Colony in the way of terms. If you look at the experience of history you will

find that the policy of amnesty has generally been the best policy, that the violent men who have desired to indulge their own feelings of vengeance have been very bad counsellors, and that when they have been overruled peace and loyalty have been more quickly restored. In Canada, after the rebellion of 1840, some of the men who had been rebels were within two years not only loyal subjects, but Ministers of the Crown. Many of us remember the outcry which arose at first in the United States at the end of the Civil War for severe punishment upon the leading rebels. The people of the North had the good sense to resist those vindictive passions. There never was a war after which so few punishments were inflicted, or a case in which the policy of leniency was so conspicuously successful; and if the South is now, and has been for many years, as loyal a member of the American Republic as any part of the North, it is very largely because the passion of vengeance was repressed and a practical amnesty given. I come now to the second point upon which there was a difference between Lord Kitchener's proposals and those which were conveyed by letter, namely, the question of aid to the farmers. That change was, as Sir Alfred Milner thought, a very important one, because it was not only a change calculated to arouse the suspicions of the Boers, but one which seemed to imply that help would be given in a very different spirit from that of a free gift. Whatever other question may arise with regard to the settlement of peace, surely the question of a small amount of money ought not to be allowed to destroy the good effect of the offer of terms. This war is costing us from £1,250,000 to £1,500,000 a week, and if we were able to shorten the war by a month it would be good policy to give not one but two millions to help the farmers to resume their position in the land. Even beyond that, when we are endeavouring to govern these countries after peace has been restored it will surely be to your advantage to have a population with some hope, with some measure of prosperity, with something to lose, with what we call a stake in the country, rather than have an impoverished, half-starving, and miserable population, driven by its misery into discontent. Therefore any money which is given so as to be well applied to re-establish the people on the land, and to give them a chance of restoring prosperity to these devastated countries, will be money well invested for the future of the country and for our own security as governing that country. Then, lastly, there is the discrepancy between the terms offered at the interview and the terms offered in the letter with regard to the future government of the country. At the interview Lord Kitchener suggested; "that when hostilities ceased there should be Crown Colony administration, consisting of nominated executive, with elected Assembly to advise administration, to be followed after a period by representative government. He would have liked representative government at once, but seemed satisfied with above."

I think it is not going too far to say that that is the most hopeful statement we have had. I should like myself, though we know that Lord Kitchener was forbidden to discuss the question, to know what proposal General Botha made with regard to modified independence. I have often said, and I say still, that it is quite possible it may turn out in the long run that some kind of modified

independence, protection, will be a great deal easier for this country to work than a system of Crown Colony government. ["Oh, oh!"]. I may have some opportunity in years to come to ask hon. Members who say, "Oh, oh! "when they see what are the difficulties of other kinds of colonial government, whether they might not have preferred the modified independence. Lord Kitchener's proposal of an elected Assembly was a very important one. An elected Assembly to the Boers would mean what they call a Volksraad, a continuation to some extent of their old free constitution, an opportunity of meeting, of electing people, of expressing their views, and of bringing their collective opinion to bear upon the Executive Government. The hon. Member for South Shields seemed to suppose that an Assembly of that kind would have no value. My hon. friend must have read history to little purpose if he thinks that such an Assembly, which furnishes a most valuable safety-valve for the expression of opinion, may not be a most valuable element in the government of a country. I rejoice to-day that Lord Kitchener should have found General Botha willing to see the value of such an institution, and to express himself satisfied with the proposal. When the final letter came that proposal was entirely changed. Instead of it we have only the suggestion that there should be Crown Colony government, consisting of a certain number of official Members, to whom a nominated unofficial element would be added. Strangely enough, Lord Kitchener does not appear to have adopted the suggestion from home of a nominated Legislative Council. I do not know that that made any difference, because clearly a nominated Legislative Council would be no satisfaction to the Boers, and I do not suppose that it had anything to do with their disappointment with the proposals they received. But I think the contrast between the elected Assembly which Lord Kitchener offered and the purely arbitrary and despotic system which the final letter conveyed must at once have struck the Boers as indicating the difference between the views the military man on the spot entertained and the proposals they had to expect from the Government at home. As we are obliged to seek in these discrepancies an explanation of the change in General Botha's attitude, I think we must attach great weight to the particular variation between these two proposals. Of course there are objections to the immediate granting of self-government. There are objections to every course you can suggest. In the position to which South Africa, has been reduced there is no course for the government of these Colonies to which grievous objection cannot be urged. What you have to do is to select the course open to the fewest objections and promising the fewest evils. I believe that the course of Crown Colony government, likely to be continued for a length of time, is of all the courses which have been suggested the very worst. It is said that what we are asking is the immediate and full granting of representative and responsible government. We have never suggested that. We have admitted that, when the war comes to an end, you must necessarily have an intermediate period of provisional administration, whether military or civil. But there is all the difference between maintaining for a short time a provisional administration, and creating the whole apparatus of Crown Colony government, associated in the minds of the Boers with the days of Sir Owen

Lanyon, and with the arbitrary government which prevails in our Crown colonies. "Oh, oh" Of course, it is arbitrary government. Perhaps hon. Gentlemen do not know what Crown Colony government is. It can be nothing else but arbitrary government. It cannot be said that the existence of nominated councils prevents the government being arbitrary, because the nominated members are bound to vote as they are directed by the Governor.

I have only one word more to say about the causes of refusal. Those causes are very obscure. I cannot help thinking that Lord Kitchener might be able if he was asked to throw some light upon that remarkable expression in General Botha's letter;

"But, after the mutual exchange of views at our interview at Middelburg on 28th February last, it will certainly not surprise your Excellency to know that I do not feel disposed to recommend that the terms of the said letter should have the earnest consideration of my Government."

It has been said that the fact that the Boers make no counter proposals shows that they are in a perfectly obstinate frame of mind. That may or may not be so, but at any rate it is clear that it would be extremely difficult for the men assembled at Middelburg under General Botha to have formulated any terms, and therefore I do not take so hopeless a view of their refusal to formulate counter proposals as might otherwise have been the case. If there had been a regular Government expressing itself through its Foreign Office you might have expected counter proposals, but where you have this large mixed group of people it is quite clear that it would be difficult or impossible to formulate such counter proposals. Therefore, I do not think we ought to despair of the future acceptance of terms

merely because no counter proposals were made on this occasion. As to the causes of refusal, I think possibly Lord Kitchener could throw some light, but I do not think we here can. The Colonial Secretary told us, to my great surprise, on Saturday that, according to Lord Kitchener's private telegram, General Botha objected to Sir Alfred Milner. That was a most extraordinary statement, and it was made, in the first place, without producing the telegram. It gave us a very partial view of General Botha's mind. There may be others to whom General Botha objects just as much, but in this obscurity and complete uncertainty as to the causes which are acting on General Botha's mind I do not feel inclined to discuss his objection to Sir Alfred Milner. I do not think we have any occasion to bring Sir Alfred Milner into this discussion at all, and I should not be led into doing so either by personal statements of the Colonial Secretary or by the indiscreet phrase which is attributed to him in certain quarters. We have to deal with the Government; they are responsible for the conduct of these negotiations and the future of the country under some government or another.

While I regret the failure of the recent negotiations, I earnestly hope the Government will resume communications when there is a chance of doing so, and whenever a fresh proposal comes from the Boers for negotiation. ["Hear, hear" Yes, but not only then, but when this country has gained another clear military advantage I think it will be to our own interests to propose that negotiations should be resumed. "Oh, oh" Hon. Members seem to be under

a strange delusion as to what our interests are. This is not a case in which whatever is given to the enemy is taken from ourselves. People seem to argue as if it was our interest to impose and exact a severe charge, as if every concession we made was so much taken from ourselves. ["No."] Well, a great deal of language has been used which seemed to imply that, and to suppose that the more severe the terms, the more they are to our advantage. That is not the case at all. On the contrary, I believe it is to our interest to offer liberal terms and to get rid of this war. Do hon. Members realise what the state of these countries is? Do they realise

the total devastation which prevails and which has reduced the two republics and parts of Cape Colony to a wilderness? Do they realise the total destruction of stock and farm buildings, the impoverishment of the people, the stoppage of all cultivation, the very serious risk of famine, and the possibility that before long we should have to feed a large starving population? In this state of things it is to our utmost possible interest that we should abridge the war if we can in any way do so, and do it upon terms which will make the fusion of the races easier. It is said that these are liberal terms to offer to the conquered. Who are the conquered? They are the people we desire to make good British subjects, whom we desire to be loyal, against whom we do not wish to be obliged to keep an enormous garrison at an enormous expense, and to whom even the Government express themselves as desirous of restoring free government at the earliest possible moment. If you want to make them loyal and contented subjects, the more liberal the terms the better it will be and the sooner that consummation will be realised. I therefore repeat once more that it ought to be our object, as it is our interest, to give the widest terms we can, and to settle this unhappy business on the basis, not of surrender, but of terms acceptable to the other side. I believe there are many on the Boer side who are animated by just the same vindictive feelings as those which prevail among a small section in Cape Colony; they do not desire that there should be a settlement, because, they want to be crushed, and they are afraid a section of their own fellow-countrymen will accept terms and endeavour to work them fairly and to become good British subjects. It should be our object to defeat that extreme section, to offer terms which will be acceptable, and bring about a settlement on the basis that a valiant enemy has been respected and an appeal made to the good feelings of these people to work out the terms upon which they have consented to come in and surrender, and to endeavour to let bygones be bygones, and to effect that fusion of the races upon which alone the prosperity and welfare of South Africa depend.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: We have listened to a very interesting debate, interesting not merely because of the light thrown on the subject with which we are principally concerned, but also because of the light indirectly thrown upon the so-called unity of the Liberal party. We have had three speeches from hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House. In the first place, we had a speech from the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Linlithgow, a speech upon the moderation of which I cannot say too much, a speech of which I have certainly no right to complain since, although he indulged in some general criticisms, the

hon. and learned Gentleman approved, on the whole, of the Government policy. His idea seemed to be that we had done well, and he encouraged us to continue in our well-doing. It is true that the hon. and learned Member did discover out of the ten points discussed by Lord Kitchener and General Botha three upon which we had not been so liberal as he thought we might have been, and upon that difference he ranged himself on the side of the local administrators. Then he was followed by the hon. and learned Member for South Shields, and if I am grateful to the hon. and learned Member for Linlithgow for his recognition of the services of the Government, their moderation and magnanimity, still more am I gratified, and I may say flattered, by the compliments of the hon. and learned Member for South Shields. He could find nothing to criticise in the ten proposals, and found that in the differences between ourselves and Lord Kitchener we were strongly justified in the attitude we adopted. But then came the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Aberdeen. [Cries of "No, Durham."] No; I am referring to the agreement to be found in speeches coming from the other side. I have nothing to say at present of the speech of my hon. friend the Member for Durham.

The third speech from the other side came from the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, and he approached the question from a totally different point of view from that of the two hon. Gentlemen on his own side in his united party who preceded him. The right hon. Gentleman is still in favour of what he has called a modified independence, though I have never known exactly what he meant, but I suppose he means that debased form of independence to which the hon. and learned Member for Linlithgow referred as a stone for the Boers to break their own heads with. Then the right hon. Gentleman went on to say that Crown Colony government is the worst of all possible solutions. I do not know whether he attaches importance to the word "solution." If the hon. Gentleman means that Crown Colony government is not a permanent solution, it is only what we have said scores of times. I understand him to say that it is the worst possible device

that could be adopted at the present time. If he takes that view, his two hon. friends take an exactly contrary view, because they support the proposals of the Government, which constitute one form of Crown Colony government. Then the right hon. Gentleman is of opinion that the negotiations which have been twice initiated, and have twice failed, should be resumed by the Government at the first possible opportunity. But that is not our intention. I only notice for the moment those differences between the hon. Member and his hon. friends, and I shall proceed to deal with the other details afterwards.

In the first place let me say something about the form in which these Papers have been produced. The right hon. Gentleman said that on Saturday last I made a surprising statement, and the hon. Gentleman behind him said we were introducing a precedent, to which he took exception, of allowing the expression of the views of our agents abroad to be introduced into parliamentary controversy. That rests upon two facts; in the first instance upon an answer I gave to a question on Saturday, and in the second place upon the terms of the despatches which are printed in the Paper presented. Now, take the last first. Does any hon.

Gentleman on the other side suggest that we should have left out everything

which expressed an opinion on the part either of Lord Kitchener or Sir Alfred Milner? If so there would be nothing to produce but the fact that Mrs. Botha had, at her husband's request, gone to see him, that Lord Kitchener allowed her to go, and the next thing would have been the letter that Lord Kitchener was instructed

to present to General Botha and the General's reply. Lord Kitchener's account of the interview with General Botha could not have been produced at all if we kept out all opinions on the part of Lord Kitchener. I do not agree with that doctrine at all. I do not think anyone would honestly believe that I am the man to shrink from any responsibility properly my due, and I make myself answerable for everything that is under my control, and for everyone as long as they remain in office. But, although that is the case, I had no idea whatever of throwing upon them responsibility even for their own actions when I have subsequently approved of them. I think the House and the country have a perfect light, when we are dealing with such authorities as Lord Kitchener and Sir Alfred Milner, to know anything that can be produced, without injury to the public interest, about their opinions. That is my answer.

With regard to the Papers as they stand, I say we have not produced this information in order to shift our responsibility in the slightest, but we have produced it in order to give the fullest information in our power to the House. Suppose we had kept this information back. Suppose we had taken this belated advice and left this information out. What would have been the language of hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite? We should have been accused of attempting to mislead the people and keep them in the dark. When the other day I simply refused to present a Report which I had not seen myself, and in regard to which further inquiries were being made from Sir Alfred Milner, because its production would have been contrary to the public interest and would have damaged the policy it recommended, for three hours or more we were kept debating the scandalous conduct of the Colonial Secretary, who was accused of having some ulterior, wicked, and un-avowable motive for keeping back that Report. So much for the form of Papers.

Now I come to the statement I made on Saturday in answer to a question. I was asked by the hon. Member for Rushcliffe whether the Government had any other information besides what was contained in the Papers as to the attitude of General Botha. I was obliged to answer in the affirmative and say, "Yes." Suppose I had had other information bearing on the attitude of General Botha and had refused to produce it, a week's discussion would not have been enough to exhaust the indignation of gentlemen opposite. Of course they would have suspected that the particular thing I kept back I kept back because it would have been dangerous to myself or the interests of the Government to produce it. The answer to the hon. Member for Rushcliffe was that General Botha had taken strong objection to Sir Alfred Milner's appointment as Governor of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. I do not suppose he has any personal objection to Sir Alfred Milner. He also objects to him in the capacity to which he has been appointed.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): When was the objection taken?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: At the interview which we published telegrams from Lord Kitchener describing. But I was obliged to confess, in answer to the hon. Member for Rushcliffe, that there was a private telegram which accompanied it, in which this additional information was given. I attach no importance to the statement at all, because I have no reason to believe that Sir Alfred Milner's appointment had any effect on the mind of General Botha in regard to these terms. For my own part I do not think he would allow a personal question of that kind to interfere with his acceptance of the terms.

Let me deal with the differences which it is said exist between the terms which Lord Kitchener appears to have discussed and the terms originally offered to the Boers. The right hon. Member for South Aberdeen, at the beginning of his speech, said this was a matter of business, and what he wanted the House to consider was how to get peace. I do not want to press this too far. But that is not the business of the House, and it is not the business upon which we are engaged. The business of the House is to get a peace which will be both honourable and lasting. This distinction is important. If you attach supreme importance to peace by itself, of course you may be prepared to make concessions which would be quite wrong if you want the peace to be lasting and honourable. The right hon. Member for South Aberdeen referred to what he called the refusal to grant amnesty to rebels. What is the position? In the first place, who are these rebels? Who are these gentlemen for whom the right hon. Gentleman is willing to make such exceptional terms? They are, in the first place, those who had absolutely no grievance themselves; who have never pretended that they had any. They were subjects of Queen Victoria in a colony in which they and their compatriots ruled the roost, and had political predominance on the condition of extending equal civil rights to their British and other fellow-subjects. They had absolutely nothing to complain of themselves. It is said that they had a natural sentiment in favour of men of their own blood across the border. That may be, but that does not justify them in going into rebellion. If you like to find a sort of moral excuse for their action, that is all right, and well and good; but you cannot find a legal or a just and proper answer to the position of those who say that men who commit that offence must be punished in the interests of the rest of the community. You cannot afford to say once more that it pays better to be a rebel than a loyalist. The conduct of rebels in Cape Colony was, as a rule, worse than the conduct of the Boers; their treatment of their neighbours, their property, and persons was worse, speaking generally, than the treatment of the same people and things by the Boers themselves. And yet, Sir, according to the right hon. Gentleman, we ought to send them back, we ought to force them upon the colonies; because it is the colonies who have to deal with this matter; we ought to use our influence to impress upon the colonies the desirability and importance of sending these men back to the very places where there still remain the farms which they have burnt, the property which they have destroyed, and the people whom they have injured; we are to send them back there, without even putting them on their trial.

MR. BRYCE: Perhaps I may be permitted to observe that all I said was that I was content with what was suggested by Lord Kitchener. Those were Lord Kitchener's

terms.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot tell what Lord Kitchener had in his mind when he spoke of this

"amnesty" in discussing the matter with General Botha. But Sir Alfred Milner, who knows a great deal more about the local political conditions, necessarily, by virtue of his position and his long residence in the country, was from the first opposed to it, and we were opposed to it. I cannot conceive anything more mischievous than this proposal, by whomsoever it was made; by Lord Kitchener, by Sir Alfred Milner, or by the right hon. Gentleman opposite; I say I cannot conceive anything more mischievous, more likely to lead to trouble in the future, than to lay down here, or in South Africa, that rebellion of the particular kind which we have under our consideration should go absolutely unscathed. The right hon. Gentleman said again and again, "Lord Kitchener's terms," "the terms that Lord Kitchener recommended." Where does he get that? He does not get it from these Papers. It is not in these Papers. It is not true to say, as the right hon. Gentleman has mistakenly said, that Lord Kitchener recommended an amnesty. He did not do anything of the kind. What he says in this Paper is this. General Botha asked him about an amnesty to all at the end of the war;

"We spoke of colonials who joined the Republics, and he seemed not adverse to their being disfranchised."

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): That is in his letter.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes. In accordance with that conversation which he had with General Botha he, in a private letter which he sent us, says;

"His Majesty's Government is prepared at once to grant an amnesty in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony for all bona fide acts of war committed during the recent hostilities; as well as to move the Governments of Cape Colony and Natal to take similar action, but qualified by the disfranchisement of any British subjects implicated in the recent war."

I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman will perceive the distinction, but that is not a recommendation; it is a suggestion, if you like, but it is not a recommendation. [Opposition laughter] It is a suggestion, but it is not a recommendation; and if hon. Gentlemen cannot see the difference between these two words I must recommend them to look at one of the dictionaries which I have seen advertised. But if the right hon. Gentleman will look at the account of the interview he will find what Lord Kitchener was doing. He was not, of course, prepared beforehand, but what he was doing in that conversation was stating on his own personal authority what he fancied the Government at home were willing to do. It was not what he recommended; it was what he understood. For instance, take the first one. He says;

"The nature of future government of the colonies asked about. He wanted more details than were given by Colonial Secretary, and I said that, subject to correction from home, I understood that when hostilities ceased military guard would be replaced by Crown Colony administration;"

and so on. And, therefore, I want to point out to hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite that I think they are altogether exaggerating any difference that

exists between either Lord Kitchener or Sir Alfred Milner and ourselves. It is one thing for Lord Kitchener to say, "I understood so and so as being your views"; it is another thing to say that he differed from our views when he understood them in their fulness.

Let us see what these differences are. I have spoken about the question of amnesty to rebels; now I come to aid to farmers. What is the situation there? All that General Botha asked for was "assistance to farmers." All that we did was to define that "assistance." There was nothing to show in the question of General Botha that he meant that assistance to be by gift. But it was quite possible that he did mean that, and it became of importance, therefore, that we; unless we intended it should be by gift; should make it clear that it was to be by loan. In making it clear that it was to be by loan we did not, of course, preclude the possibility of there being certain cases of hardship in which a free gift

might be made. Those cases would have to be dealt with at the time upon their merits, and no doubt could with perfect safety

be left in the hands of Sir Alfred Milner. But we did mean to say, as a principle, that we were not going to aid these men by free gift. What an extraordinary proposal to make! We are, by actual gifts of money, to put back these men, whom we have been fighting, in their old position so that they should not suffer in any way by the fact that they have declared war upon us and have invaded His Majesty's possessions. I do not call that magnanimity; I call that folly. It is all non-sense to make a proposal of that kind, and I should like to know how far the right hon. Gentleman proposes to go. I observed, as we have always observed in his speeches on this subject, that it is the Boers and the friends of the Boers in Cape Colony that he cares for. When he has to speak of the men who, to the extent now, I think, of something like 20,000, have risked their lives in His Majesty's service, when he has to speak of the men whose property has been seriously injured and, in some cases, destroyed, when he has to speak of the men who during the invasion of the Boers suffered every kind of insult and injury; then he calls them "these vindictive people, these so-called loyalists."

MR. BRYCE: After I had expressly explained that I applied that term to a small faction of extremists, and said that I believed the large majority of the British and an enormous number of the Dutch were perfectly loyal, I did not expect that the right hon. Gentleman would again try to misrepresent me.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I leave that to the House, who heard the right hon. Gentleman; and I say again that in no speech that the right hon. Gentleman has ever delivered upon this subject, in this House or out of it, has he ever done anything like justice, has he ever behaved fairly, towards the "so-called loyalists." Now, Sir, in dealing with this question of aid to farmers, he spoke of only the Boers who have been in arms against us had been injured in this war. What of the loyalists.

MR. BRYCE: Certainly.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: What of the loyalists whose farms have been destroyed by the Boers? I am almost in doubt whether there are not quite as many

farms that have been burnt by the Boers or more than there have been burnt by our troops. And what of the loyal British and the loyal Dutch who have been commandeered by the Boers, who have suffered in property or person? I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say that to them also he would make this gift.

MR. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman does not seem to understand that I was discussing the terms of peace. The question as to what is to be done for the loyal Dutch does not arise on the terms of peace. Of course, I am entirely in favour of doing all we can for them; and my argument comes to that.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman says the case of the loyalists does not arise on the terms of peace. I say it does. That is where we differ. If he would think of the loyalists when he is talking of peace we should not be found so far apart. I say that that is the whole cause of the difference between us.

MR. BRYCE: The right hon. Gentleman does not seem to understand that the whole of my argument was directed to criticising the difference between Lord Kitchener's proposals at the interview and the letter that was sent to General Botha. It is

apropos of that that all these questions arose.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I quite understand that; and the right hon. Gentleman would perhaps do better if he were to wait until I have concluded my argument. The difference was between "loan" and "gift." In objecting to "gift," I say you have not only to deal with the Boers whose property has been destroyed in the course of military operations by our soldiers or in other ways, but you have got to deal with loyalists whose property has been destroyed, and the right hon. Gentleman agrees to that. As I have pointed out; and I am perfectly justified in doing so; he never mentioned them in his speech. Now I go a step further. You have agreed to compensation by the Government to the loyalists who have suffered in regard to the burning of farms. What about the mines? Are you going to compensate the capitalists?

[Opposition cries of "No."]

MR. DILLON: They made the war.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No. I think the hon. Member opposite has always said that I made the war.

MR. DILLON: So I did, when the right hon. Gentleman agreed to obey Mr. Rhodes and the capitalists.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That is an observation which is clearly impertinent, and which is absolutely without the shadow of a shade of foundation. Now, the House will see, and perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will see, what is the difference between a loan and a gift. The mines do not come to us for a loan; they are not likely to require that sort of assistance. But if once you lay it down as a principle that all the injury done by a war to your enemies is to be compensated by gift after the war, you cannot refuse to compensate by gift your friends, and I should like to see the bill that the House would have to pay in that case. Now I hope the right hon. Gentleman understands my argument. I say, then, that we believe, after carefully thinking over the matter, that, while, of course, there is perfect room left to deal with exceptional cases that may arise, it would be most dangerous to lay down as a principle that in every case gift, and not loan,

should be the method by which the farmers should be assisted. I have a grievance, not against the right hon. Gentleman, but against those who take quite a different view, and who think that in the offer to put aside £1,000,000 in order to pay the debts incurred by the Transvaal Government we went a great deal too far. I admit that we went to the very extreme; but we have, I think, a justification for what we are doing. Not that there is any obligation upon us to compensate those who forced this war on us. Certainly we have no obligation whatever to them. What we do, if we do it at all, may be an act of grace to them, but ought to be an act of policy for us. It is solely as an act of policy that I recommend

that even by loan these men should be assisted. What I have felt for months past has been that when the hostilities came to an end our first object should be to restore the industries of the country; the great mining industry, of course, as it is from that industry that the greater part of the wealth of the country will always have to be derived, but the agricultural industry also, which must be developed by those who are in possession of the land; that is to say, by the Boer farmers who have been fighting against us. If they were to go back absolutely impecunious and unable to rebuild their homes and restock their farms, it might be years before the farming industry was restored; and I think it was in the interest of the Transvaal to make it part of our future policy that some assistance should be given to prevent such a contingency. I may say that long before this meeting with General Botha I had been in communication with Sir Alfred Milner on the subject. We entirely agreed on the matter, and that provision should be made, whenever the war is at an end, to deal with cases that may arise and to give such assistance as may be found desirable or necessary.

The offer, which has not been contested at all to-night, actually to give £1,000,000 in order to pay the debts of the Transvaal is an offer which I feel to be an extremely dangerous one, or, at all events, one which requires to be carefully guarded. It is true that General Botha himself proposed that, in any case, such a grant should be limited to £1,000,000; but we have to take care, if we are to put money aside in that way, that it goes into the right pockets.

We know that, in any country where it is stated publicly that there is £1,000,000 to be distributed, the claims have to be most carefully examined, and we should be perfectly justified in giving preference to the claims of loyalists. [Cries of "Oh!" from the Irish Benches.] Does somebody say "No"? I repeat that we should be justified in giving preference to the claims of loyalists. We should also have to take care that the debts are bona fide, and that we are not being asked to pay for goods which were not forcibly taken from their possessor, but willingly handed over as his contribution towards the progress of the war. Without being vindictive, it can hardly be expected that we should actually reward our enemies.

The only other point to which exception has been taken in the terms is as to the future government of the Transvaal. There has never been any change in our policy in regard to that matter. What we offered, and stated from the first that we offered and what we state now, and we are not to be moved one jot from our conclusion in that matter; what we propose is a gradual progress towards self-

government. We propose that as soon as possible the military administration shall be done away with. We propose that there be substituted for that administration an Executive Council, together with a nominated, or partly nominated, Legislative Council. That is the second step in the progress. Probably the next step would be to give an elective element in the Legislative Assembly, and the last step would be absolute self-government. In the first place, what is the alternative? Lord Kitchener in his letter proposed that the Executive Council should be "with or without an elective Assembly." I am sure the House will be unanimous that we could not have done a worse thing than to accept those terms, because what does "with or without" mean? If they mean "with" we ought to say so, and if they mean "without," we certainly would be accused of breach of faith afterwards for not giving some representative element; and, as we never intended to give this representative element at the very beginning, we were quite right to point this out and make it perfectly clear that in our view it would not be an elective Assembly. Now any man who knows anything of the situation can make such a preposterous proposal as that, and that we should commence with an elective Assembly, I cannot for the life of me understand. What are the facts? Before you can elect an Assembly you have to decide what the franchise is to be, who the electors are to be, what the electoral districts are to be, what the members returned for these are to be, and a whole heap of questions, all of which are of the greatest importance, and which it would necessarily take some time to consider and decide. But that is not all. The proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen

actually is that we should elect this Assembly at a time when all the British element has been expelled and will be absent from their homes; and he recommends it to our acceptance because he says it would give them an elective Assembly something in the nature of the old Volksraad. Well, Sir, we have had some experience of the old Volksraad, in which the British were not represented. The idea that after all this war, after all this loss of life and treasure, we should begin with installing the old Volksraad without practically any British representation in it, seems to me one beyond which the force of unreason could not possibly further go.

MR. BRYCE: I only want to know whether the right hon. Gentleman intended to represent me as having said that; I said nothing of the kind. I said that, presumably, if there were an Assembly, it would be an Assembly in which everyone would have a vote.?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman seems to have a singular incapacity for understanding what has been said. I have already pointed out to him that one section of the population would not be there. What is the good of everybody having a vote when half the population is away?

MR. BRYCE: They will come back.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Oh, yes; but we are to do it before they come back.

MR. BRYCE: I never said anything of the kind.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am sorry to differ from the right hon. Gentleman, but if he will say now that when he says "immediately" he does not mean "immediately."

and if he will go further and say what time he thinks it would be right to give before the Crown Colony government is abolished in favour of one in which there is to be an elective Assembly, then we can understand what it is we are arguing. He did use the words, "an elective Assembly," to be like the old Volksraad, and he did say that to set up a Crown Colony government would be the worst possible solution. Therefore he could only have meant that immediately after military administration we were to set up an elective Assembly. I cannot twist his language into any other meaning. To any proposal of that kind I take the most absolute exception. As to the terms of difference between us, let us see what Sir Alfred Milner says. Sir Alfred Milner says that the suggestions we have made are many of them improvements. He still would prefer the omission of the words "by loan." but the context shows that he is evidently of opinion that by inserting the words we may not absolutely preclude the possibility of a gift, which, as I have said, was not our intention. I do not believe that when Sir A. Milner knows what we propose he will differ from us on that point. As regards Lord Kitchener, I do not think it would be proper for us to ask him for his opinion on these proposals of His Majesty's Government; but I would point out that in the interview with Botha, what Lord Kitchener said, with every qualification as to its being only a personal impression, was what he believed to be the opinion of His Majesty's Government. It does not follow that when he knew what the opinion of His Majesty's Government was he would not be equally agreeable to those terms. I think there is only one other matter to which I need call attention, and that is a remark which fell from my hon. friend the Member for Durham. Practically, with the whole of his speech I absolutely agree. It was a very moderate statement of the case. We ourselves have disclaimed over and over again anything in the nature of a vindictive feeling with regard to our foes. That does not enter into our policy, and never has done. We want to make it absolutely certain that the issue for which

the war was undertaken shall be favourable to us; we want to make it absolutely certain that there shall be no recurrence of the war; but when we have taken the steps that we think necessary for that purpose, there certainly will remain no feeling whatever of a desire to punish or to be revenged upon those against whom we have been in arms.

MR. ELLIOT: I hope it will be understood that I have brought no charge against the Government. My point was that pressure might at some time be exercised by persons with more vindictive feelings than the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: So long as the present Government are in office I do not think it matters much what these imaginary or unknown vindictive persons may say or do. All I can say is that I do not know them. They do not appeal to me. Although I entirely agree with my hon. friend that he made no charge against the Government, unless he has some cause for uneasiness, or cause to believe that we shall be vindictive, unreasonable, and arbitrary, I do not understand why he gets up so often to impress those virtues upon us. A point in his speech to which I do take serious objection was that with regard to Sir Alfred Milner. He

said his personal friendship for Sir Alfred Milner, which I know exists, would prevent him from under estimating the full importance of his services, or the great qualities of his character. But, in spite of Sir Alfred Milner's virtues, ability, and experience, my hon. friend went on to suggest that when the burden of the day is passed, a burden which has been entirely on Sir Alfred Milner's shoulders, then the credit of the settlement should devolve upon somebody else. This tribute to his friend, I must say, lacks something in the shape of generosity. I think I have dealt with all the points raised. I will only say in conclusion that I agree entirely with those who seek to impress upon us again and again the fact that after this war is over the two races must live together. That is a matter which is continuously present to us. But, as I have said before, the most important element in securing that good feeling between the two races is that we should be animated by mutual respect, and if we take any steps which would lead the Boers to suspect our firmness, resolution, and courage, and to believe that they are less than their own, the two races will never settle down in harmony, and I am convinced that the Boers would again attempt the policy which, I am happy to say, has failed on the present occasion.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): The right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary has been revelling to-night in his favourite element. There are many topics in regard to social legislation on which he might have dilated, but all these yielded when he had the chance of discoursing on the divisions in the Liberal party. That topic owes a great deal to the right hon. Gentleman. If there is, as I believe there is, a division on this subject of the present situation in South Africa, the person who has most advertised it and brought it before the mind of the country is the right hon. Gentleman. To-night the right hon. Gentleman had his opportunity, and he has reviewed the speeches which have been made in the course of the present discussion; but so keen was he to dwell on the differences amongst Liberals that he forgot altogether the differences on the Unionist side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman omitted to the last, and then only briefly, to take notice of the admirable speech made by the hon. Member for the city of Durham. That hon. Gentleman, in a tone which was full of a desire to be fair, made a proposition which many of us think to be well deserving of consideration. The hon. Gentleman then passed to another topic, and spoke of the answer which had been given by the right hon. the Secretary for the Colonies on Saturday morning to the question put by the hon. Member for Rushcliffe. In that answer the right hon. Gentleman invited the House to believe that they were in possession of all the facts of the case, and that he had no information as to what Lord Kitchener had said to General Botha. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that what we were reproaching him with was for not having suppressed the facts within his knowledge. Is it necessary for anyone on this side of the House to say that our purpose was not to convey anything of the kind? But we have a good cause for complaint that on Saturday morning we learned for the first time that it was the personality of Sir A. Milner which had led to the failure of the negotiations. For my part, I do not believe that the right hon. Gentleman should have given that answer without publishing the words of the telegram which contained such a

grave suggestion, and which has caused so much confusion.

On the question of amnesty I think the right hon. Gentleman was well founded in his proposition that there were no serious differences between Lord Kitchener and General Botha. In the account of the interview between Lord Kitchener and General Botha, Sir A. Milner agreed with what Lord Kitchener had proposed, with the exception that, instead of the words "as well as to move the Governments of Cape Colony," etc., there should be read, "British subjects of Cape Colony or Natal, though they will not be compelled to return to those colonies, will if they do so be liable to be dealt with under the laws of those colonies specifically passed to meet the circumstances arising out of the present war, and which greatly mitigate the ordinary penalties of rebellion." I do not think that Sir A. Milner meant anything very different from what the right hon. Gentlemen meant. But the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary would have been well advised if he had acceded to the strong view expressed by Sir A. Milner in his despatch of 9th March, that the advances to the Boers should not be confined, in all cases, to advances by way of loan. I feel that there are strong grounds for what was urged by the hon. Member for Durham on this matter. I believe that the cheapest thing we can do will, in the end, be the most generous. I cannot believe that we can differentiate between the loyalists and those who have risen in rebellion. I do not believe that the advances should be in all cases by way of gift, but we should not be tied down in a hard and fast fashion to make the advances by way of loan.

My right hon. friend the Member for South Aberdeen said there had been a good deal of indiscreet praise of Sir A. Milner. I think there has been a good deal of indiscreet blame of Sir A. Milner. I believe that, whether rightly or wrongly, Sir A. Milner is actuated by the highest motives, and is the very last person to allow himself to be made the tool of any faction at the Cape, or to support any ascendancy of Briton over Boer, any more than Boer over Briton. We have got to realise and bear in mind the peculiar difficulties of the position.

I believe that not only in

Cape Colony and Natal, but in the two late Republics, the majority of the white inhabitants are not of British blood. If that be so, we have got to consider the point of view of the Afrikanders, and how we can conciliate the Boers as well as the people of British blood who take up a strong attitude on this matter. The business of His Majesty's Government is to hold the balance evenly between the two contending factions in South Africa, and to make it perfectly clear that there is to be no racial ascendancy of Boer over Briton or Briton over Boer. The scale should be held at a perfect level, and it would be a mistake for the Government to lend themselves to any treatment which would differentiate the case of the loyalists from the case of the colonists who have thrown in their lot with the Boers. Therefore, on the question of amnesty, and on other matters, I feel myself in agreement with the course taken by Lord Kitchener and Sir A. Milner rather than with that adopted by His Majesty's Government.

I wish to say a word upon the question of what is called Crown Colony administration. I think that is a most unfortunate term to have introduced into the matter, for it covers two or three sorts of administration. Crown Colony

administration has peculiar associations in South Africa. It is identified with the rule of Sir Owen Lanyon, which was a great failure. It is also associated with the government of some of the small islands under British dominion, where it means the management of things from Downing Street. From the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary and the despatches I understand that the Crown Colony administration proposed to be set up in South Africa is something of a very different character from government from Downing Street. What the Government proposes, as I understand it, is to govern these colonies from South Africa, the Government here, being responsible, but delegating authority to somebody on the spot, who should form his own judgment, and base and frame the policy of the Government upon the knowledge he has acquired on the spot, telling them what course they ought to adopt. That is a very different thing

from Crown Colony government in the ordinary sense, and if it is put into the hands of a fit and proper man I can conceive nothing better as forming the initiatory stage from which by subsequent stages we may proceed to popular representative government. In this connection the extensive experience and knowledge of Sir A. Milner cannot fail to count for much, and I should regret very much if we were deprived of the services of the one man strong enough to hold down the British faction as he has held down the Dutch; who would keep them in their places and allow neither to get the upper hand. The House should give the Government every chance, believing that the Government knew better than they the circumstances and facts which ought to determine what the transition stages between this so-called Crown Colony government and popular representation should be. I do not believe that Botha rejected these terms on any small matter or any difference between the despatches sent from here and the proposals made by Lord Kitchener. I do not believe he declined to entertain peace on a question connected with the personality of Sir A. Milner. Botha is a man who has fought a brave fight, and a man for whom I have a profound respect. He is placed in a difficult position, and I believe it will be discovered when all the facts are known that he could not control those with whom he was associated.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies made his speech an attack upon my right hon. friend the Member for South Aberdeen. I can assure the Secretary for the Colonies that my admiration for the Member for South Aberdeen; and I think it is the feeling of many Members in this House; rises each time the right hon. Gentleman seizes upon his opportunity to attack him and sneer at him. The Secretary for the Colonies described his own speech pretty clearly when he said, speaking of the speech of the Member for South Aberdeen, "I cannot twist his language into any other meaning." The fact is, he spent half an hour trying to evolve meanings which did not exist in my right hon. friend's speech.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present; House counted, and forty Members being found present;

MR. LABOUCHERE: The right, hon. Gentleman then fell back on his old device. He deplored the differences on this side of the House. I trust there always will be differences on the Liberal side of the House. They are an independent party

acting together for specific objects, but they preserve their independence on various matters. If I recollect rightly the right hon. Gentleman himself was accustomed to act in a very independent manner. I remember something about the "Unauthorised Programme," and he would have found then that a great many persons did not agree with him. We have had as yet three gentlemen on this side of the House addressing it. These three gentlemen are, I take it, "Liberal Imperialists." We are not all Liberal Imperialists on this side; in fact, the Liberal Imperialists are very few in number, and we who are not Liberal Imperialists represent the majority of the Liberal party. I may say that those gentlemen are always looking over the hedge and supporting the Conservative party. These three gentlemen are all members of the legal profession, and they tried the matter in a *nisi prius* sort of way. They took small, nagging objections, and as I was listening to them I could not help thinking of what Burke once said; that a lawyer knows as little about great political subjects as a mouse understands about the parturition of an elephant.

I think it was the hon. Member for Linlithgow who went out of his way to say that the terms which were being offered to the Boers were the most lenient and the most generous a victor has ever offered to his foe, and he challenged us to show the contrary. You cannot prove a negative. I would challenge the hon. Member, or any hon. Member of his way of thinking, perhaps, on the other side of the House, to tell me a case in which terms less lenient were ever offered by a victor to the conquered. We burn their farms, depopulate the country, and deport a large number of them, and we then tell them that we are exceedingly lenient if we give them a small trifle as a loan, in order to help them to take back a few farms and build a few houses where their former homes were. We tell them that we are going to deprive them of their independence and their flag. If the French were to vanquish us, and if we were to be told, after being harried and having our houses all burned down, that we were to receive a little sum of money out of the French Treasury, and that we must thank God that we were going to have occasion to cease to be Englishmen to become Frenchmen, we would not consider the terms liberal. The terms we offer to the Boers are not liberal, and they are not lenient. I am one of those who have never concealed their opinions in regard to this war. I have always regarded it as a crime. But we have to look at the facts as they are. The milk has been spilt, and the question for us is really what we should now best do in the interest of the Empire, and particularly of South Africa. Shall we continue this war? We know the death list published every week. We know what we are doing in South Africa, the misery and desolation we are producing there, and we know that it costs a somewhat large sum, £1,500,000 per week, or rather more, perhaps, to carry out this policy. For my part, I am not in favour of that. I do not regard that as a policy. I am not one of those who blame the Boers for resisting. I regard the Boers as brave men, and I would honour any man who resists no matter what force, when it is a question of the independence of his native land. I may regret that they do resist and do not submit to the inevitable. To say that we should regard them as base men whom we ought to despise because they are doing what we should do ourselves under similar circumstances is a preposterous

doctrine.

Up to just recently the only "terms" we had offered to the Boers were to surrender at discretion. If they gave up their arms and put them selves entirely into our hands we were ready to receive them.

That was altered on the occasion of the recent negotiations. I respect Lord Kitchener for having taken the line he did in those negotiations. Lord Kitchener is a soldier, and I believe a somewhat rough soldier. He does not hesitate in doing his utmost in order to achieve victory. But I do think that of all the three gentlemen who seem to have the destinies of South Africa in their hands; the Secretary for the Colonies. Sir Alfred Milner, and Lord Kitchener; Lord Kitchener has shown himself far more of a statesman than either of the other two. If anybody looks into the Blue-book given to us he will see that Lord Kitchener himself invited General Botha to meet him. He sent the request through Mrs. Botha. What does the right hon. Gentleman say in answer to Lord Kitchener's letter that this had taken place? He says. "I am glad to hear that General Botha desires to treat." It was Lord Kitchener who desired to treat, and General Botha was willing to hear the terms we were willing to submit to him, and if he thought them desirable terms, then to accept them. General Botha seemed to me to be anxious to bring about peace, and so far as minor details, if I may so call them, are concerned, I do not think there would have been any insuperable difficulty if the matter had been left to General Botha and Lord Kitchener. But at once Sir Alfred Milner interfered. Sir Alfred Milner would not go so far as Lord Kitchener in the matter of the amnesty. I was rather amused when the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies was speaking at the absolute mess he got into in regard to the recommendation of Lord Kitchener. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to imply that Lord Kitchener did not advise an amnesty, but it was shown to him that Lord Kitchener, in the letter he proposed to write to General Botha, had literally stated that one of the proposals that he, subject to the approval of this Government, would submit to General Botha was that there should be a full amnesty not only to the Transvaalers and the Orange Free Staters but also to the rebels from Cape Colony. All the limitation he made was that he was ready to accept their disfranchisement, and certainly that was not a matter of

serious importance. It was a matter that concerned the Cape Government itself. What did the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies say? He said it was a suggestion and not a recommendation. I really do not know what he meant. I hardly like to make a suggestion or recommendation to a gentleman who is so very able a debater as the Secretary of State for the Colonies, but if I might venture to do so, it is to stick to his own views and arguments which he intends to use, and not be led astray from them by something the Secretary of State for War says to him. He got into a mess through the Secretary for War, who was sitting near him.

I shall not enter at any length into the question of the difference between "loan" and "gift." I do not think it is a matter of very great importance. But what is important is that Lord Kitchener did propose that there should be a gift. Sir Alfred Milner took his side, and the right hon. Gentleman the

Secretary for the Colonies interfered and said it must be a loan. Sir Alfred Milner said this would weaken the effect on the Boers, and Lord Kitchener was even stronger in his view than Sir Alfred Milner. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies to-day showed how very right General Botha was to distrust the alteration made by the Secretary for the Colonies when he told us that the gift is to be limited to a certain sum, and that the loyalists would be considered first. If the loyalists are to be considered first, I should like to know what will remain for those in the Transvaal or Orange Free State who have taken the side of their respective countries.

The real difference, so far as I can see, that separates Sir Alfred Milner or the Secretary of State for the Colonies from General Botha and his friends is the position that these men will occupy after the war. When the Secretary of State for the Colonies gave his consent to the meeting with General Botha he wrote, "I have already made clear the policy we intend to pursue as to government." The right hon. Gentleman did make it perfectly clear. He told us in the House that the Boers would not be allowed one single shred of independence. What did he mean by that? I do not gather that the Boers are claiming to be outside

the area of the British Empire. I remember that Sir Wilfrid Laurier lately said Canada was an independent nation, and the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies echoed that sentiment. I would like to know what would be said in any one of the self-governing colonies if the Secretary for the Colonies were to declare that they did not possess one shred of independence. They would insist at once that they had independence. The question is not whether the Boers are to enter the area of the Empire, but what is to be the position they will occupy when they enter. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies even disputed the small amount of independence Lord Kitchener was prepared to grant to the Boers. Lord Kitchener says there will be a Crown Colony with an elective Assembly, followed by representative government. The Secretary for the Colonies says there will be a Crown Council, but the members will be nominated; he will then introduce the representative element, not representative government, and ultimately concede the privilege of self-government. We know perfectly well what "ultimately" means. We have heard of it from Lord Salisbury himself. I do not know whether the Secretary for the Colonies reads his speeches. Lord Salisbury said it might be generations before this self-government was granted to them. When talking about "ultimately" we must accept the view that it may be generations before we grant it. What does the right hon. Gentleman mean by the "privilege" of self-government? Self-government is not a privilege. It is a right, and I assert that every man so soon as he becomes a citizen of this Empire has that absolute right. It is not granted as a generous gift. He has a right to it precisely in the same way as we have a right to it in this country. It must be remembered when we talk of these generous terms what we are asking the Boers to do. We are calling on the Boers to surrender their national existence and flag, and yet when they were ready to accept this position and when they asked what their position would be in the Empire, practically the reply was that their position in the Empire, so far as political rights were

concerned, would be little better than that of Kaffirs. So far as ultimate self-government was concerned they were to put their faith in the Colonial Secretary. I do not put my faith in the Colonial Secretary, and I do not know why the Boers should do so. If they would take my advice it would be, "Put no faith in the Colonial Secretary." I would say also, "Put it all in black and white."

I regret that these negotiations have ended so unfortunately, but I am in no way surprised that they have done so. We have lost a great opportunity to end the war and settle South Africa in the only way it is possible to settle it. It is very probable, and I think it is certain, considering the disparity of the forces, that peace won with the sword will be of no advantage to us. A dependency will be created in which racial feuds will go on, the minority will be placed over the majority, and the rule of the minority maintained by a huge British garrison. Our aim ought to be to make South Africa a strength, not a weakness, to the Empire; to obtain the assent of the people of South Africa to their country becoming a portion of the Empire; and to make South Africa not a dependency ruled by a garrison, but a Free State like Canada or Australia, which, together with us, should form the British Empire. Hon. Members should look a little at the facts. In South Africa there is a Dutch majority which will be perfectly certain to increase every decade, for the reason that the Dutch people in South Africa are exceedingly prolific. In order to meet that, what does the Colonial Secretary propose to do? He sent out a Commission to discover whether South Africa was a fitting place for English colonists. Probably anybody on this side of the House could have told him that a more God-forsaken place for English colonists did not exist. He even carried his idea so far that we were to endeavour to increase the population by a sort of competition between the Dutch and the mythical colonists and the mythical women in the procreation of their species. It must also be remembered that the Dutch are agriculturists, and agriculturists are always the backbone of a country. What are the English in Cape Colony? They are middlemen and speculators; they are men who go out there not with the intention of remaining, but simply to make if possible a certain amount of money and then come back to England. South Africa never will be a place for English working men, owing to their inability to compete with the abundant mass of cheap labour in that part of the world. The Afrikaner in Cape Colony has certain racial sympathies with the Afrikaner in the Orange State and the Transvaal. That is not the least surprising. These Afrikaners were formerly loyal to the Crown; they objected to the war, and some even went so far as to join the Boers. We may regret that, but let us reverse the position. Suppose Cape Colony had been in the hands of Holland, that these two small States had been English, and that Holland had attacked them. Do you mean to say that Englishmen living in Cape Colony would not have taken sides with the English? We know perfectly well that they would. When we complain of these men we are acting contrary to every principle we have ever professed. Surely you must make allowances for the Dutchmen who, carried away by their racial sympathies, joined their countrymen in defending themselves

against our attacks. They were aggravated into this course before the war. We all remember the famous speech of Sir Alfred Milner in which he attacked them; SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): Which speech?

MR. LABOUCHERE: I beg your pardon, it was not a speech; it was a despatch, in which he spoke of the Uitlanders being "helots," and expressed views as to the Dutch in Cape Colony in a way which was exceedingly uncomplimentary to their loyalty. The Afrikanders really believe that the war is to a certain extent only an excuse to enable the minority to obtain a majority in the Cape Assembly by a jerrymandering of the constitution, and by the disfranchisement of a large number of Afrikanders. During the war they have seen martial law prevailing in their country, administered not by English generals and officers, but in many cases by their political opponents, who never lose an opportunity of taking advantage of them. The Transvaal is an exceedingly poor country with the exception of the gold. The Transvaal farmers live in a poor, rude manner which Englishmen will not accept. There came the rush for gold, and then happened that which happens everywhere. A great cosmopolitan crew of adventurers arrived there. About 1850 I was in California and saw what happened there. You can rule these camps only by a species of lynch law. You have a vigilance committee, and I, the respectable Englishman standing before the House to-day, have sat on a jury and condemned a man to be hung by lynch law. ["Oh, oh!"] What would those gentlemen who say, "Oh, oh!" have done? The man had shot somebody, he was a ruffian; the vigilance committee was the only authority existing; a jury was called, and I had to act as a jurymen. My duty as a jurymen was to say whether or not the man was guilty. If he was innocent I should have said he was innocent, but if the case was made out I said "Guilty," and the sentence was undoubtedly unpleasant to the gentleman himself. I only cite that to show the difficulty these farmers must have had to get any sort of law recognised among these cosmopolitan adventurers. I do not particularly admire the Boers; there is a great deal too much of the conservative element in them. They have their virtues, and their faults; but if you judge between the Afrikanders of South Africa and the Englishmen who go there, recognising fully that amongst the English there are many highly respectable men, I think the Boers are the better men. Certainly so far as we are concerned, if we want to maintain our rule in South Africa the Boers are the safest men to be on good terms with. We must also take into account the increase every year in the black races, and also the advance of civilisation. Mr. Merriman, in his petition to be heard at the bar of the House, has pointed out how necessary it is that we should do everything to abate this racial feud between Afrikanders and Englishmen, and that otherwise we should be faced with this great increase of the black races. But the English and Dutch together would probably be able to hold their own against them. What are the Boers ready to do? As I read the correspondence they are ready to enter the area of the British Empire, but only upon terms. Surely our problem is to find terms that are honourable to us, and to those brave men themselves, which will produce a state of things that will be of no danger to ourselves, but eventually lead to South Africa becoming one of the great commonwealths connected with the Empire, such as now exist in

Canada and Australia. What are the terms I would suggest? First, a full and absolute amnesty. I cannot understand these arguments of vengeance or political supremacy. I am talking not of the question of justice, but of policy and expediency. Any country that has gone through a species of civil war; for that is what it comes to; if it is wise does not treat the conquered as conquered, but endeavours to make no distinction between the one side and the other. In Canada, in 1836, what happened in the Papineau Rebellion was that, although the six men who were already transported were for some reason excepted, the fullest amnesty was given to men who were unquestionably technically, and as matter of fact, rebels. Why we cannot follow in South Africa the policy which has been so successful in Canada I cannot understand. In regard to the Transvaal and the Orange State, I would make them, not in generations, but as soon as possible, self-governing colonies. What objection can you have to the Orange State becoming a self-governing colony? It has been regarded by all Englishmen who have written upon it as a model State, and was said to have the very best Government existing in South Africa. In the Transvaal I admit there is a difficulty. As soon as the Uitlanders came back the Dutch would be outvoted, and probably the Dutch would lose more than they gained. But that fact could be met in a very simple way. For the benefit of the Dutch themselves, and with their consent, separate the mining area, the Rand, from the Transvaal Colony, give the large area remaining, in which they would have a majority, to the Dutch, and you would be able to administer under a military Governor, if you like, the Rand. The absolute necessity of giving some sort of pecuniary aid to the Transvaalers would be easily met by giving them a reasonable rental for the district of which you deprive them. The

Colonial Secretary and others have always played upon the word "immediately." "Immediately" means not tomorrow, but as soon as possible. All we contend is that it would be undesirable to establish there a Crown Colony government, because it would mean a question of years before self-government could be instituted. Of course, it requires time. We, and I believe the Boers also, would be perfectly ready to agree that there should be a provisional government, let it be either military or civil. Personally I should prefer Lord Kitchener to Sir Alfred Milner. Let the provisional government be there simply to carry on affairs during the time we are arranging for the colony to be self-governing. As to Sir Alfred Milner, he really seems to me to be regarded as a sort of divine pro-consul, and if anybody ventures to say a word, not against his personal character or his intelligence in many walks of life, but against his being a fit man for South Africa at the present moment, hon. Members immediately say, "Oh, oh!" Sir Alfred Milner began as an Oxford don, and he became a valuable official in the Treasury. Both those circumstances are against him as a practical man in South African politics.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: He is a Liberal.

MR. LABOTTCHERE: I am not questioning his Liberalism, although I do not see much of it in South Africa. What I do object to is the claim of infallibility. He is the very worst man you could find for putting an end to racial feuds. The hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick at a Liberal Imperialist dinner, speaking of Sir

Alfred Milner, said;

"It is impossible to send any other man in his place who would not have the position made untenable by the British section."

Those words prove my case. This gentleman is considered by the English section to be such a partisan that they literally would confederate, or possibly rebel, in order to make untenable the position of any other man who might replace him. Surely we are not to be tied down in that way. The very fact that he is looked upon as a partisan of the one side is a sufficient reason why, if

we want to bring the war to an end, and to get the people to be friendly together, we should substitute for him some other man. There are a dozen men on the other side of the House who would do the thing more efficiently if they were sent than Sir Alfred Milner. ["No."] Hon. Gentlemen are really too modest.

["Name."] I will not name anybody here, as it might be personal to others; but a man like Lord Dufferin in the other House would do more towards bringing peace than any of the military operations of our soldiers. We are told again and again that the Boers must be conquered, because there is something peculiar in the Boer in that he will not accept any argument that is not knocked into his head by physical force. But the very gentlemen who tell us that are those who have been wrong right throughout the entire war. It is perfect non-sense for for us on this point to believe either Ministers or the miserable press that supports them. What are the Boers after all? They are farmers, and a farmer, as a rule, does not look far beyond his own nose or his own fields. The Boers lived far distant from one another, and they hardly recognised the Government at Pretoria. You may say that the Transvaal was a confederation of divers districts paying a certain allegiance to Pretoria, but each separate district was practically independent of the other, and I believe they carried their independence so far as to refuse on several occasions to pay any taxes that went to Pretoria. These simple-minded men met once a week or month in a little town and passed most of their time in singing hymns. These men are as honourable as we are, and, unless they are very different from farmers and agriculturists in every other part of the world, I cannot suppose that they would say: "We are not going to cultivate our fields or look after our own interests; we are going to rebel against the Government." They would be perfectly satisfied if you gave them that local autonomy which really they did possess under the Boer Government itself.

We are accused of being pro-Boers. I do not know what the term means, but, as far as I can understand, it applies to anyone who does not agree with the policy of the Government

in South Africa. Even admitting that the Government have a great deal of political wisdom, they have not a monopoly. We are so foolish as to think that a certain amount of political wisdom exists among the Liberal party. Let us agree that neither party has a monopoly of that element, and that one is not a wretch, a traitor, or a felon because he happens to disagree with the policy of the Government. We have the interests of the Empire as much at heart as hon. Gentlemen opposite, and it certainly required more courage while the war fever was raging for a Member of this House to risk his seat, his popularity, and his

position in the country by going against the passion of the hour than to glide with the stream. Hon. Gentlemen opposite should not attack us and imply that we have acted dishonourably, because, believing honestly that this war was a mistake, we boldly stood up before our countrymen and said so. I am not influenced by the Rhodesian press, nor am I influenced at all by mere party considerations. If I were it would be in the interests of the Liberal party that I should allow the Government to continue to cook in their own juice.

[An HON. MEMBER: "Stew."] Well, either "cook" or "stew," I will give you the choice. I think hon. Gentlemen opposite will admit that the war is not quite so popular now as it was in February last, and it will become more and more unpopular every day, and will end by ruining the Unionist party. It is an old dictum that the party which embarks upon a war in the end suffers by it, and if you go on with this war policy we shall have a majority of 150 at the next election. But I am not influenced by party considerations; I prefer my country to my party, and that is why I give to hon. Gentlemen opposite advice which is clearly not in the interests of the party of which I am a member. I want the war to cease, and I want it to cease in such a way that we shall not have a great disaffected dependency in South Africa. I want us to have a colony which will be a strength, and not a weakness, to the Empire. This great and noble Empire was not built up in the fashion that hon. Gentlemen are trying to build it up now, and it will not be maintained in the way they are seeking to maintain it. I do urge Ministers to act as statesmen instead of mere partisans. I urge them to emancipate themselves from the thralldom of the very worst elements in any party, of these Cape Town filibusters, of these cosmopolitan millionaires, of this Rhodesian press howling for blood and swaggering and boasting all over the world in a manner which renders them the laughing stock of all Europe.

Have hon. Gentlemen opposite read yesterday a telegram that was received from the South African correspondent of The Times? I think that was a very remarkable telegram. Explaining the situation, The Times correspondent said that we did not want another 30,000 men, but we wanted 50,000 men, and he seemed to think the war would last two years, and he thought we should make it clear to the Boers that, although it would last two years, we were prepared to go on for ten years. We are spending £1,500,000 per week upon this war, and I will leave it to hon. Members opposite to calculate how much we shall have spent at that rate at the end of ten years. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said this was the most unfortunate war we have ever been engaged in. I do not think anyone can look with approval or admiration at the mode in which we are carrying on this war. This system of depopulating the country, destroying the farms, and reducing the whole place to a desert, is un-English. When we remember that we ourselves hope to conquer these colonies and get them into our hands, it seems to me to be sheer madness to pursue such a policy if by any other means we can come to a practical arrangement with the Boers. I protest against the policy now being carried on, for I believe it is against our own interest, contrary to humanity, contrary to every principle which ought to actuate an enlightened Government, and contrary to that principle of independence of nations that we have hitherto professed.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln): At this hour of the evening I will not detain the House at any length, more particularly as I understand there is another important subject which the House wishes to discuss before parting with the Appropriation Bill. I should like to say

just a word or two upon the question before the House. I should like to add my word to the general approval which I think has come from all sides of the House as to the liberal and generous terms which His Majesty's Government offered to the Boers a fortnight or three weeks ago. I agree with the hon. Member for Haddington when he says that he does not believe that the small differences between the terms suggested by Lord Kitchener and the letter which was ultimately sent out by the Government had much effect upon the ultimate result and refusal of those terms by the Boers. I cannot help thinking myself that the subject we are to discuss in a short period from now may have had more to do with this refusal than any small differences as to the terms of peace. I hope that when the Boers see, as they must see by now, that the troubles in the East which occurred on the 12th and 14th March, before they sent their reply, have now come to an end, they will somewhat regret the attitude they took up in the middle of this month.

I should like to press upon the Government two points in regard to these terms in case they should come up again. One is the question of the assistance to be given for the rebuilding of farms, as to whether it should be given by loan or in some other way. I quite understand the object of the Colonial Secretary in inserting the words "by loan," and I think all those who listened to his speech must agree that it was necessary to take some precaution of the nature he has pointed out. But I do hope the Government will interpret very liberally indeed those words, and let it be widely known that there are a considerable number of special and exceptional cases where the assistance could take the form of gifts. Undoubtedly many farms have been burned by mistake. I know of one case myself where the farm of a woman who had nursed our wounded was destroyed. [Cheers from the Irish benches.] Hon. Members opposite need not cheer me, for they are more responsible for this war and for the continuance of our troubles in South Africa than anybody else. [Nationalist interruptions.]

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Lecture your own friends.

*MK. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has not used any unparliamentary expression, and he has a right to say that in his opinion a particular party is responsible for the war. Hon. Members must not interrupt in this way.

MR. SEELY: I thought that hon. Members opposite seemed to imply by their cheers that I was in sympathy with some of the speeches they had made on this subject.

[An IRISH MEMBER: "Keep your sympathy."] I know of a case where a woman who had nursed our wounded, and had nursed them with great kindness and great devotion, and who had won the respect of every member of that company, had her farm afterwards burned, not by those men, but by another company of soldiers who knew nothing about this, and who destroyed the farm through some mistake. If that occurred in one case, similar things may have occurred in many other cases, and there must be many other instances where farms have been burned where, if there had been full time to consider the circumstances, they would have been spared.

Therefore, I hope the Colonial Secretary will interpret these exceptions very liberally, and let it be known widely that he is willing to do so.

There is one other matter, although it is with very great diffidence that one speaks about it, because it is a very difficult question; I refer to the question of amnesty for the colonial rebels. I see the difficulty in giving an amnesty to men who are undoubtedly rebels and who have fought against us with no grievance of their own, but I do think that those Boers who are fighting in the regular forces under such commanders as General Botha should be treated differently, because it is difficult for them to lay down their arms without some very clear understanding as to what they will be liable to. I do hope that when His Majesty's Government reopen negotiations they will consider that point very carefully. I have merely mentioned these two topics, not with the intention of disapproving of what His Majesty's Government have done or of criticising their action, but simply as suggesting two points on which I think it is desirable that they should act with even greater generosity and liberality than they have acted in the terms offered. I hope that the liberality and generosity which they have shown towards the Boers will have its reward in influencing them to soon put an end to this most disastrous, and, to them, this most ruinous war.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I approach this question not as an Englishman, whose mind for the time being is filled with thoughts of satisfaction, but with feelings of regret for the blood of my countrymen which has been spilt, and regret for the loss of money and prestige which my country has suffered. The right hon. Gentleman on the Front Opposition Bench who so courageously expressed his honest views upon this question, was taken very severely to task for his words by the Colonial Secretary, who misinterpreted and twisted the meaning of those words. I listened with great interest to the hon. Member for Northampton, who spoke of the courage which it required to come to this House and express honest convictions about the war and afterwards share the fate which those convictions had so often brought. I admire the man who has the courage to speak out plainly and fearlessly at what I consider is a very critical moment in our history. I approach this question with absolutely no bias or partiality. Ireland owes nothing to the Boers. We are not connected with them by ties of kindred or of religion. We are of a different creed, and an entirely different race. We have no memories of past services rendered by them towards our country or its people to urge us on to immoderate zeal or unreasonable demands on their behalf, and therefore are we qualified to speak on the subject now before the House with impartial minds, with minds unclouded by prejudice, by self interest, or by any of the other baser feelings that naturally arise within the breasts of those intimately concerned or directly engaged in the quarrel.

We Irishmen rise solely in the interests of justice and fair play. We have watched with horror and indignation the combat; if such it may be styled; which has now dragged on for over seventeen months. We expressed our disapproval of the causes which led to the

war at the beginning as unworthy of a great Empire, degrading to a Christian people, characteristic only of the looting ages, which we supposed had passed.

From their position in this House Irishmen have time after time criticised severely, but with only too much truth and justice, the inhuman and barbarous manner in which you conducted this war, by which, ten against one, you still resort to the cruellest treatment of women and children; to the burning of homesteads, to exposure, hunger and forced exile to your camps; some of them dens of vice; in order that you might induce these people to piteously appeal to their fellow-countrymen to give up the struggle and volunteer a surrender which your might was unable to enforce. The Boers are of a different race and creed from the Irish, and as the latter owe nothing to them and are outside the quarrel, they are most competent to give an unprejudiced opinion upon it. You have a vast army, backed up by the richest treasury in the world and unlimited supplies, matched against 30,000 untrained farmers. Yet, in spite of such enormous odds on our side, you have to resort to methods which are not honourable, like the burning of farms and the throwing of women out on the veldt to starve and die.

[A UNIONIST MEMBER: It is a falsehood.]

MR. BURKE (King's County, Tullamore) asked whether it was in order for an hon. Member opposite to apply the word "falsehood" to what was said by a Member on the Opposition benches.

*MR. SPEAKER: If any hon. Member used that expression regarding anything said by the hon. Member who is addressing the House, he should withdraw it. [Nationalist cheers and cries of "Brook-field."]

MR. FLAVIN: I heard the hon. Member sitting on the front bench below the gangway use that expression. He said, "It is an impudent falsehood."

COLONEL BROOKFIELD (Sussex, Rye): In deference to your ruling, Sir, I beg to withdraw the expression.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I repeat that women and children were thrown out on the veldt to die. All

these inhuman sights are ever present to the mind of the Boer, and surely they are not such as will tempt him to come in and willingly lay down his arms and trust himself to the care of the Government which caused all this trouble; We wish these inhuman and brutalising acts to cease. We Irishmen are for peace and for justice, and I think Englishmen on both sides of this House will admit that we ought to be ready and willing to sacrifice a great deal in order to bring about peace.

I will turn to the correspondence which has recently been issued. In that correspondence hon. Gentlemen will note that the one point insisted upon by General Botha was some sort of independence. One point insisted upon by hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House is that we should refuse any form of independence. [Ministerial cheers.] I am sorry to hear hon. Gentlemen cheer that statement, but perhaps the time will come when charity and justice will demand this concession, and possibly they will then repent that they did not consider this question more carefully. It is useful to notice two very important changes in the attitude of the British Government, directly and solely attributable to Boer perseverance and success. The first is that it is the English who now first moved for peace, and the second is that they have come down considerably from the

"unconditional surrender" attitude adopted on a previous occasion. These changes are important, and to thinking Englishmen ought to be instructive. Turning to the first telegram from Kitchener, he states that Botha agreed to discuss terms of peace on the express understanding that the independence of the Transvaal and the Orange Free Colony were not to be discussed. In a second telegram to Mr. Brodrick, Lord Kitchener, says "Botha showed very good feeling, and was anxious for peace; he tried very hard for some kind of independence." which of course was refused. It is certainly instructive, in reading the final revised telegram sent to Botha, to note the beautifully characteristic vagueness of its terms, all, of course with the object of being;

"quite precise, in order to avoid any charge of breach of faith afterwards."

"Amnesty will be given for bona fide acts of war."

The devil trying his case in his own court!;

"At the earliest practicable date military administration will give place to Crown Colony government."

Then;

"As soon as circumstances permit a representative element will be introduced," and, as if dealing with men who have neither spirit nor manhood in them the telegram proceeds;

"Ultimately the privilege of self-government will be conceded."

Is this the way to treat a brave people? Are these the prospects that will induce men who love liberty dearer than life, posterity dearer than self,** to come in and end this horrible and inhuman war? Is it any wonder, in the face of that telegram, that Botha, who was fighting for his home, his family, for freedom, for posterity, for his country, should have replied;

"It will certainly not surprise your Excellency to know that I do not feel disposed to recommend that the terms of your letter should have the earnest consideration of my Government?"

And now, when these bitter, inhuman sights are about to be ended, and prospects of peace appear on the horizon, we again appeal, for justice sake, on behalf of humanity, on behalf of the age which proclaims itself Christian, that you will listen to the voice of reason, and field to these brave men such terms as they can honourably accept; such terms as their unexampled bravery deserves. "Not unacquainted with sorrow, the sad we learn to befriend." We who have lived for years in slavery, whose country and people have been denied the blessings of free

self-government for hundreds of years, can speak with authority, can speak from experience of the aimless existence, the living death endured by the human soul when its aspirations, its ideals, are checked by the cage of foreign government, by the loss of liberty; and therefore can we understand the apparent madness of the Boers in still continuing a hopeless contest, or rather what is termed a hopeless contest: for I deem it impossible that such heroic bravery, such dauntless perseverance in the cause of justice, in the fight for home and kindred,

should not, by God's aid, finally succeed. Have Englishmen no justice, no charity, no mercy in their breasts? Can they not look with unprejudiced eyes on

the spectacle presented to the world in South Africa to-day? On one side you have, or rather you had seventeen months ago, 30,000 peasant farmers, with limited resources, with no means of supplying the places of those who fall in battle, giving their lives, dying to the last man, fighting against unheard-of odds, fighting with madness, with desperation, for the liberty and homes they love. You see the mother willingly send forth, never to be seen more, the husband and the sons she loves, with the old Roman words at parting. "Come back with your shield, or on it." On the other side; and I do not wish to say this in any offensive spirit; you have a trained and disciplined army of 300,000 men, with unlimited supplies of men, stores, arms, and ammunition to draw from, fighting, not for home, not for liberty, not for any great human cause, but rather for the basest of human motives; the acquisition of land whose gold made it too valuable to remain in the possession of a weak nation, the destruction of a race whose valour and patriotism will resound through future ages as the one bright spot in the closing years of this commercial nineteenth century. Is this the way you intend to bring about peace? Have you brought peace to Ireland, where for hundreds of years the only treatment we have got has been government by coercion? You may exterminate us, you may crush us, but still we live and are prepared to fight for freedom and our homes. It was an English poet who wrote; "Slaves cannot breathe in England: if their lungs Receive our air, that moment they are free; They touch our country, and their shackles fall."

I would like hon. Gentlemen opposite to take these words to heart, and try to understand that they are not upholding that tradition. Has the God of justice, of charity, but of retribution, been superseded in your mighty Empire, flushed as it is with the pride of success, by the god of iniquity and unrighteousness? Beware lest you are now disregarding an opportunity of retrieving your lost fame. Beware lest in your endeavour to crush out disaffection in South Africa by cold-blooded murder you are sowing the seeds of another Ireland 7,000 miles away from your shores. I would also ask Englishmen to remember that they have not yet conquered, and that perhaps in the exigencies of the situation they may soon find sufficient employment for their bellicose tendencies in other lands. Ah, even at this late hour, when your thirst for blood has been satisfied, will you not refrain from crushing, by pure weight of numbers, the brave remnant who are prepared to die to the last man before they surrender; will you continue to murder; for such I call it; the men who, despite your opportunities, were infinitely superior to you in the arts of war, and who undoubtedly have been the means of bringing radical changes in your Army, and thus perhaps saving you from that destruction which would have followed had you in your arrogance engaged in a European war before this. Is the spirit of justice, of fair-play, of charity, dead within the breasts of Englishmen? Do they seriously glory in the murder; for such it must be called; going on in their name in South Africa to-day? Are all appeals, except those of the leaden bullet, to be disregarded? Now, even now, we appeal for magnanimity, for justice. We ask you to send the angel of peace to those brave men dying for honour, for liberty, and for home. Shall the words of the poet

still continue to apply to you;

"Truth for ever on the scaffold, Wrong for ever on the throne,
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above His own."

CHINA;PRESENT POSITION AND POLICY.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I do not apologise for venturing to bring before the House a subject different from that which has interested hon. Members to-night hitherto. I mean the question of China and our relations with that country and the other Great Powers. I had the opportunity of listening to an important discussion which took place this afternoon in another place, and I found that the general view of the leaders of the party opposite was, that a debate on China was not only necessary but imperative. It was admitted that Parliament and the country had the right to the fullest information on this vital question, and the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs thanked his political opponents for their forbearance in postponing, to so late a date discussion upon it. Another reason I have for asking the attention of the House to the affairs of China at the present stage is that in the critical position which prevails in the far East at the present moment His Majesty's Government have an opportunity of acting with, I trust, permanent effect. There can be little doubt that the Russian Government is now pressing upon China a Convention which, if signed, would give our great rival in the Far East very important advantages over this country in regard to political power and commerce in the north-eastern portion of China. I hold that it is equally clear from all the facts that have come under our notice that His Majesty's Government at this moment hold the key of the position, and if they are prepared to assure China, of their support in resisting the most unreasonable demands of Russia, that Convention will not be signed, and a serious check will be offered to Russian aggression in the Far East. I venture to say that our position in China, and the encroachment of other Powers in that country, constitute at this moment a far graver crisis and are of infinitely more importance to this country than the South African question has ever presented. However great the mistakes that have been made in South Africa by the Government;and they have been truly colossal;there was always this satisfaction to those who desired the ultimate triumph of the Briton in South Africa;the position in that country was never out of our control. The war in South Africa has cost us five times as much money as was necessary, and ten times as many human lives as were necessary, but we have never lost control of the position; we have never been in the presence of force majeure. The same cannot be said in regard to the Far East. We are there in the presence of the greatest possible danger, and when hon. Gentlemen on the other side of the House, and perhaps some on my own side, are disposed to accuse those who feel with me of exciting: a warlike feeling, and rousing irritation in other States, I would beg their attention to this fact, that if what we said ten or fifteen years ago had been listened to in regard to South Africa, the troubles there would have been settled at a tenth of the cost now being expended.

The present phase of the Chinese crisis is perhaps the last opportunity that will ever be offered to this country of dealing with this tremendous question victoriously for England. When Russia once obtains political and military control in Manchuria, and when the Trans-Siberian railway is completed, by which Russia can throw immense stores of munitions and hundreds of thousands of troops into Manchuria, we shall find ourselves in presence of that force majeure which it will be impossible to deal with. Therefore it is the bounden duty of those who wish to see the territorial integrity of China preserved, and British commerce there maintained and increased, to do what they can to bring pressure on the Government, and to rouse the country to the dangers that exist. Our trade in China amounts to 64 per cent. of the foreign trade of the country, and British shipping amounts to 84 per cent. of the foreign shipping which carries foreign commerce to China. That country, with its 400 millions of population and great natural wealth, offers boundless openings for British commerce in the future. It is not only the question of China that is at stake; it is the question of the future of Asia; and with Asia goes our Indian Empire. I would try to rivet the attention of the House on the danger of Russia obtaining control of even one province of China. If Russia gets possession of Manchuria, with its twelve millions of people, she would be able to form there a large, well-equipped, and well-drilled Chinese army, armed and disciplined, and led by Russian officers, which would enable her, step by step, to overrun absolutely the whole of China and threaten our possessions in India. Against such an army we would be perfectly powerless, and even the whole of Europe would be powerless.

The history of the last seven years has, I regret to say, been one series of the most inconceivable blunders in regard to our policy in the Far East. First of all, we allowed the Japanese to be driven out of Port Arthur. That was a stupid and cowardly blunder. I believe that Lord Rosebery was opposed to it, but was overborne by his colleagues in the Cabinet. The Japanese were our natural allies in the Far East, and so long as they were in the Lao Tung peninsula we had no reason to fear. Then we come to the year 1898, which brought disasters in every part of the globe to this country. Fortunately that policy has been reversed and we are now in a better position. The second great blunder in our Far Eastern policy was the withdrawal of our ships from Port Arthur by the Ministry now in power. That was not quite as bad as the first blunder, but it was pitiable beyond description. It will be seen that I am impartial in my criticism. I regret that the First Lord of the Treasury is not present, because I would have called his attention to that unfortunate speech of his at Manchester in which he invited Russia to occupy Port Arthur. That was one of the most mischievous observations ever made in this country. It is no secret that the Leader of the House has adopted a very Gallio-like attitude in regard to foreign affairs, though I am glad to know that he is getting rid of it. Then came the Boxer movement, which was undoubtedly stirred up by Russian agents. It was exceedingly like the agitations carried on in Bulgaria and Armenia. There was the working of a corrupt coterie in China in the supposed interests of the people. There were wholesale terrorising and brutal

outrages of every kind. Then we come to the most extraordinary blunder of the Government, the Concert of Europe, which to me is the most preposterous fiction ever palmed off on an ignorant public. The idea that there can be a genuine Concert of Europe is to place far too great a strain on the imagination, of intelligent persons. To some, the Concert of Europe is a delightful sound, and I am prepared to admit that it has misled considerable numbers of the Members of this House. But the Concert of Europe as practised in China has been the most wicked, cruel, and disastrous failure that any Government has put before the country. It has resulted in losing our prestige in China, in weakening our power very seriously, and has led to squabbles and disputes of the most dangerous kind between the Great Powers. So serious were these, that the whole time of the Governments of Europe, the Ambassadors, and the Commanders on the spot, has been exhausted in trying to prevent the Concert from coming to blows within itself. In regard to China, this Concert of Europe has been practically a besom of destruction. The looting and massacring carried on by the troops of the so-called Concert is a disgrace to humanity and a scandal to civilisation. Nothing like it has been seen since the days of Attila and Genghis Khan; 50,000, some say 100,000, Chinese were deliberately massacred by the Russian authorities in Manchuria. I have accounts of the most horrible character by persons who were eye-witnesses of these scenes. The great majority of the victims were not fighting men at all, but perfectly harmless men, women, and children. They were driven into the river or bayoneted on the bank and then cast into the river. The river was so choked that the steamers coming up the Amur had difficulty in forcing a passage through the great mass of human corpses. The scenes that occurred between Tientsin and Peking were in many cases not much more creditable to the European troops. I am glad to say that our own troops as well as the Americans and Germans are free from any serious complicity in the atrocities committed there. The Government for a long time tried to defend this fiction of theirs; it was not a fiction of theirs but of Mr. Gladstone's; the fiction of the Concert of Europe, but I fancy we shall not hear much more about it, because the Government have shown by their own action that the Concert of Europe is a farce. Having allowed or invited the Great Powers to go into China, they found the position so hopeless that they have now been obliged to do that which they ought to have done at first, make an alliance with a Power on which they could rely. The agreement with Germany is a conclusive condemnation of the Concert of Europe. By that agreement they bound themselves to preserve the integrity of China; others have joined them, notably Japan, in that policy. It was sensible and practical to ally ourselves with those Powers whose interests are identical with ours, and those Powers whose word we can trust. It was the policy of Lord Beaconsfield in 1878, when he saved Constantinople and gratified Europe. It was followed in 1885, on the collapse of Mr. Gladstone's Government; it has been resuscitated in 1898, and has given us our South African Possessions; and if we use it properly we shall be able to settle the Chinese question. The Concert of Europe has for us been, disastrous in every respect. Our prestige has been lowered before the Chinese and our Indian troops, and I am afraid that one of the results will be

that the Chinese will have an undying hatred of Europe and of this country, which has been allied with the forces which have inflicted such great cruelties upon them. Russia has been aggrandised and our prestige lowered. The Russians have marched at the head of the allied troops through Peking. We have had repeated insults levelled at our troops, our officers, and our flag; the seizure of railways in the most flagrant and unjustifiable way; the occupation of Niu-chwang in spite of the protests of every foreign consul; agreements with regard to Manchuria made behind our backs; the sudden evacuation of Peking proposed by Russia, and carried out by Russian troops in face of the so-called Concert of Europe; the refusal of the Russian Minister to demand the death punishment of local Chinese officials who had been guilty of such gross cruelty, and of the murder of our missionaries; and all this has been done with a motive, because the Russian Minister promised the Chinese Government that if they supported Russia with regard to Manchuria, he would abstain from demanding the death punishment of these Chinese criminals, and would even demand their release by the Great Powers. Those are the points on which we have had loss during the continuation of the recent policy in China.

Now I come to the questions which are at this moment agitating China, and upon which our future position in China depends. I mean the agreement or agreements which are now being negotiated with regard to Manchuria and the adjoining provinces. Although I listened with great interest to the speech in another place of the noble Lord the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, I am bound to say I could not get any indication from his words as to what was the policy of the Government. In one sentence he made a reassuring statement, and in the next statements of a most alarming character. I do not wish to pass any criticism upon Lord Lansdowne in this matter. He combines the quality of courtesy with that of backbone, which is most necessary for dealing with this question, and it would be unfair to blame him for the present position of affairs. I do not wish to derive any dark conclusion from what he said. I desire to look at the facts as they are. One phrase of the noble Lord struck me very much. He said we must look to principles and not to details, and that we should be satisfied if we secured the principle even if the details went against us. That is exactly what we should not be satisfied with. It is the details which count in this matter. It is the practical, material position that is a force in China which counts for prestige in the future. We heard a good deal about principles in general two years ago. We were told of free trade in China. We see little of it now; but in its place we see Russia holding forts at Port Arthur, and controlling the whole of the province of Manchuria, throwing out railways in all directions; those are details. We heard a great deal about principles and the promise of China never to alienate the Yang-tsze Valley. Of course she will not do so if she can help it. If such a promise had been given by Russia or some other Great Power it might have been worth something, but given by China it is worth nothing, and we see ourselves losing our power and all our advantages in northern China, and having no compensating advantages in the Yangtsze Valley. Those are illustrations of the importance of detail. It is, I know, a favourite view upon the part of men who are indisposed to take action, that the question of

Manchuria is hopeless; that Manchuria is lost. Manchuria is lost; Pechili is lost; Northern China is lost: the Yang-tsze Valley is lost: and Asia is lost, if the policy of the last seven years is followed by the Government. But the position is not hopeless; the position is full of encouragement if the Government will only recognise a policy of firm and consistent action. The right hon. Gentleman might rise in his place and say, "Do I want to put upon this country a Russian war on the top of the war in South Africa?" But there is no necessity for any war in this case. We need not send a single soldier to the Far East. We have the game entirely in our own hands if we will only use the materials which lie before us. We have a natural and most valuable ally in the Far East, we have the great and rising nation of Japan, whose people bear the same relation to Asia as we do to Europe. A rising, brave, intelligent, and patriotic people, who are most anxious to be used, and we have only to use them, and we need fear nothing from the extremest exertion of Russian power.

The time has come for plain speaking in this matter. Russia respects nothing but force. That has been proved by all the nations in the last four years, and if any hon. Member doubts it I invite him to read the Blue-book containing most interesting statements in regard to not only China, but the Russian policy upon the whole question of China; No. 1, 1888. C. 1114. Let anybody read about Port Arthur, how it was to be a port for winter occupation only, how within three months it was annexed, and he will find that Russia respects nothing but force. The time has come to show what this country can do. We have only to use Japan to be, master of the situation. We have only to promise Japan that we will hold the ring, and the whole matter is settled. There would be no war even between Russia and Japan, because Russia knows how to respect superior force, and she will recognise that she is in the power of a superior force, and there will be no disturbance of the equilibrium. I express that view to the Government. I do not expect them to tell us they are going to adopt any such policy. I do not expect them to tell us what the truth is with regard to the Convention which Russia is now trying to force from China. We know what that convention is from the disclosures made by the Peking correspondent of The Times, and discussion upon this subject would be incomplete without a tribute being paid to that intelligent and most capable gentleman for the inestimable services he has been able to render to us and to our Imperial interests abroad. We understand that the terms originally demanded have now, to a certain extent, been modified. Russia has ceased to claim control over provinces like Mongolia and Turkestan, and some alterations have been accepted by the Government at St. Petersburg, but the basis of the objectionable proposals still remains intact. Russia is still to have control of all railways, customs, and concessions in Manchuria, and if that is once accepted by this country the fall of China and British commerce and British politics in the Far East is settled for all time.

There is, in addition to the points I have mentioned one point worthy of the consideration and attention of the Government, and that is that this encroachment on the part of the Russian Government has raised a strong feeling of resentment among the intelligent masses, so far as there are intelligent

masses, in China, Remarkable information has come to this country of late, to the effect that all the intelligent classes in Central and Southern China are uniting to impress on the Imperial Government resistance to and refusal of Russian demands. The Secretary of State to-night, in another place, paid a great tribute to the services which had been rendered to China, to British interests, and the cause of civilisation by those two eminent men, the Yang-tsze viceroys. It is impossible to speak too highly of them when we consider that through what they have urged they have earned the enmity not only of the Manchu officials, but of the Russian Government, because it must not be forgotten that Russia is perfectly well aware that her only hope of success in China is to maintain the Chinese Government in as corrupt a condition as possible, and to keep China in the same rotten condition for which Russia is responsible, as for the last thirty years the Ottoman Empire has been kept. That is a point worthy of notice. The Government will, it is to be hoped, maintain these viceroys in the position they have taken up, but they will find their work cut out for them unless they put a stop to this Agreement at Peking. The Secretary for Foreign Affairs made a statement to the effect that it is not the business of His Majesty's Government to support the cause of internal reform in China.

Every statement of that kind, that we are not deeply interested in the cause of reform in China, is a mistake. We, may not wish to support it, but we should not tell the world so; we should rather try and make the people believe we are willing and anxious to uphold their cause. But perhaps I may have taken the noble Lord's words too seriously. I trust the Government will not take a despairing view of their opportunities, and if in the future of Northern China or Manchuria there may be some difficulties with regard to the Anglo-German Agreement, they will not be more than can be easily overcome. Although Germany may not have included Manchuria in the scope of the Agreement, she is bound, as much as we are, to uphold the integrity of China, The situation is not hopeless, and if the Government grapple with it with a firm hand for a few months the position will be restored. Russia is engaged in a great game of bluff against this country, but right hon. Gentlemen on the Government Bench hold all the cards in their hands if they will only play them. There is no necessity for war, but there is great necessity for action being taken; and if it is known all over the world that we are prepared to take action, if we take the lead firmly and clearly, as we have a right to do, and as we are bound to do the great majority of the Powers will follow us. We shall have not only civilisation and humanity on our side, but, what is of more importance, force. Therefore I beg the Government not to temporise, but to act at once, and firmly press these tremendous British interests now at stake. The future of China, over 400,000,000 of people, will be assured if only the Government will act in a way worthy of the party and the great traditions it represents.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W. R., Barnsley): did not think that there was any difference of opinion as to the policy which the Government ought to pursue in the present crisis in the Far East. That policy had been declared again and again to be the preservation of the integrity of the Chinese Empire and the equal opportunity for all nations to trade there. There was reason, he

thought, to complain of undue reticence on the part of the Government; they had not answered questions put in the House in as full and complete a manner as they ought to have done. It was to be regretted that the Government had not, having regard to the great public interest in this matter, done as was done by Count von Bismarck and the President of the United States, both of whom had taken the opportunity of stating in the most definite manner the policy they intended to pursue in the Far East; but he hoped that what had taken place and the statement the House would have that night from the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs would constitute an adequate departure from that policy of reticence. It was only reasonable, having regard to the state of affairs in China, that this opportunity should be taken to have a reasonable discussion, and the Government should state to the House the progress they were making in the settlement of the crisis and the success attending it. The various agreements entered into behind the back of the Chinese Government interfered with the settlement of the present crisis. In the Agreement with Russia, under which the railway rights north of the Great Wall were conceded to her whilst she conceded similar rights to us in the Yang-tsze Valley, we did not stipulate for British goods to be carried over those railways at equal rates of carriage. The Anglo-German Agreement stated distinctly that its object was the maintenance of the territorial integrity of China and of the open door for trade throughout the whole Chinese Empire. It stated that;

"It is a matter of joint and permanent international interest that the ports on the rivers and littoral of China should remain free and open to trade, and to every other legitimate form of economic activity for the nations of all countries without distinction; and the two Governments agree on their part to uphold the same for all Chinese territory as far as they can exercise influence."

But was Japan informed, when her consent was sought, that Germany declined to recognise the Agreement as applying to Manchuria, or were the other Powers of the Concert informed? A most emphatic statement had been made by Japan that she understood it to mean

what it said, and that it applied to the whole of the Chinese Empire. If the Agreement had any utility, the time had arrived when we, who initiated the Agreement, ought to ascertain what action the other Powers who were parties to the Agreement were prepared to take in view of the serious infringement which was threatened by the new Manchurian Convention.

What was the policy of Russia? In August she made a declaration of her policy, which was the maintenance of the former State organisation in China, the removal of all that could lead to a partition of the Chinese Empire, and the re-establishment of a Government able to preserve order and tranquillity in the country. And she further said that the measures taken by her were in no sense to be regarded as indicating an independent plan, which she affirmed was completely foreign to the policy of the Imperial Government. She also stated when giving a qualified assent to the Anglo-German Agreement that she had been the first to lay down the integrity of the Chinese Empire as a fundamental part of her

policy. Therefore all the world had apparently agreed to preserve the international integrity of China. On the 28th February the Under Secretary stated

"that His Majesty's Government had the assurance of the Russian Government that the guarantee that they would require from China in respect of Manchuria would not take the form of an acquisition of territory, or a virtual or actual protectorate in Manchuria." The right hon. Gentleman had further stated a few days previously in reply to a question that the Russian Government had repeatedly declared their intentions to respect the integrity of China, and that His Majesty's Government were not aware that they had infringed it; and that His Majesty's Government had been informed by the Russian Government that they had no intention of withdrawing their co-operation with the other Powers in the affairs of China. All those declarations were satisfactory on the face of them, and it would appear to be difficult to discover where danger underlay them, but when they turned to the terms of the new Russian Convention; which included the disbanding of the Chinese Army, the razing of fortifications, the creation of an army without the consent of Russia forbidden; importation of arms and ammunition into Manchuria prohibited: refusal of advantages as to mines, railways, or other matters in the Russo-Chinese frontier provinces; Manchuria. Mongolia. Chinese Turkestan; including Kashgar, Yarkand and Khotan, right down to the borders of Thibet to other Powers; the Chinese debarred from constructing their own railways without the consent of Russia, and the right of Russia to construct a railway from the Manchurian railway towards Peking and the Great Wall; His Majesty's Government admitted that if the reported version of that Convention was correct, it was derogatory to treaty rights, and extended far beyond Manchuria. It was incumbent on the Government, therefore, in view of the destruction of treaty rights in the great regions of Central Asia and in the interests of the commercial future of this country, to take care that no Agreement was sanctioned to our detriment and in violation of our treaty rights with China. We could not afford to have a great neutral market like China invaded by great protectionist Powers like Russia, Germany, and France, which would inevitably be followed by protective tariff's excluding to a large extent British goods. At this moment Russia, France, Germany, and Belgium were all engaged in laying down railways and occupying the Chinese Empire, and stipulating in all their contracts that the materials and rolling stock should be drawn exclusively from the country of the concessionaires to the exclusion of the British trader and manufacturer.

The country was face to face probably with a cycle of trade depression, and therefore he wished to point out how very little attention the country had paid to the danger incurred in not upholding our commercial interests in the Far East. A great deal more attention would have to be given to them in the near future if British trade and commerce were to be maintained. Many hon. Members would have expected that the Government would have been able to give some information as to the terms of the new Chinese-Russian Convention, but apparently the Government had no positive information with regard to it. What course did the Government propose to take? The only possible course to pursue

was to put themselves, not individually, but collectively with the other Powers, into communication with the Chinese Government and bring about a practical agreement to preserve their mutual interests. Surely if the Great Powers of Europe stood together with the United States and Japan it would solve the question affecting China—There were other questions, some of which it was unnecessary to dwell upon, having regard to the lateness of the hour. There should be increased facilities for trade and the complete opening up of the immense waterways of China. There should be also a rearrangement of commercial treaties, and included in that arrangement should be the abolition of likin dues. But in addition to those there were other questions which ought to be the subject of friendly negotiation and settlement between this country and Russia. If a different policy had been adopted at an earlier stage the Tientsin incident might in all probability have been averted. The duty of the British forces, next to relieving the Legations in Peking, was that they should protect British property. He recognised the difficulties caused by having 200,000 men locked up in South Africa, but our naval forces in Chinese waters were for a long time only third in point of strength. If the railway from Tientsin to Neu-chwang, which was seized by Russia, had been occupied at various points by our blue-jackets it never need have passed under the control of Russia. What was the Tientsin incident? The allied troops had been victorious over the Chinese, and Russia yet said that she retained this ground by right of conquest. There was no right of conquest in the matter, and when that claim failed she said she had a concession signed by Li Hung Chang, but if that were so it was very doubtful if it had the sanction of the Chinese Government. That was a subject for negotiation, and he hoped in the settlement British interests would be fully upheld; but in the settlement of that question, why should not other questions be settled with Russia in a friendly way? Russia still retained possession of that part of the Northern Chinese railway from Shan-hai-Kwan to Neu-chwang. The earnings

of this railway had been allocated by the Chinese Government as security for British bondholders. He would like to know whether the assurances that the Russian occupation was temporary were written or verbal, and whether Russia might not be asked whether the time had not arrived when the military necessity that she should control the line had ceased to exist, and whether it ought not now to be given up to its rightful owners. There was the question of the administration of Niu-chwang. We had been told that there was no wish on the part of His Majesty's Government to exaggerate the importance of our interests in Manchuria or at Niu-chwang. We did, however, a trade of three millions sterling a year through Niu-chwang, and at the back of Niu-chwang there was the magnificent country of Manchuria; 400,000 square miles. Manchuria had enormous possibilities of expansion and development. The maintenance of the just treaty rights of this country was a matter of importance. Referring to the objection raised by Russia to the expedition to the Elliott Islands, he urged that a claim put forth through such an extent of water would give Russia control over the entrance to the Gulf of Pechili, and he desired to have an assurance that the Government intended to resist the pretension of Russia to own those waters.

There was also the dismissal of Mr. McLeavy Brown from his post in Korea. A similar thing happened in 1897, and he hoped the Government would do as they did in 1897; resist the demand which had been put forward.

There was another matter to which he wished to refer, namely, the remodelling of our consular system. He had received from British consuls in the Far East great hospitality and great kindness, and he was very much disinclined to say one word which would be derogatory to them. But he was bound to say that the general impression he obtained after having come into contact with the consuls of the United States, Germany and Japan was that, while they made it their main work to push the trade of their respective countries, British consuls seemed to make their judicial and diplomatic functions their main work, and to consider the question of pushing British trade as somewhat

beneath them. If we were to hold our own in competition with other nations, who were competing with us more effectually than ever, it was absolutely necessary we should employ the same agencies in the shape of consuls, who would devote their energies to obtaining information and pushing trade as other consuls did.

There was no doubt that the Chinese crisis, and especially the present phase of it, involved a problem of great importance to our country. They knew that the people of China were a most industrious commercial people. Commercially he believed they were the most honest people on the face of the earth. If China were developed in the next thirty years to the same extent as Japan had been developed during the last thirty years, there would be an increase in foreign trade of more than two hundred millions sterling a year, and if England only held anything approaching 60 per cent. of that increased trade, it would mean all the difference between commercial prosperity and commercial adversity. He hoped the House would have from the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs a full and definite statement regarding the present situation in China and the policy the Government intended to pursue, such as the House and the country had a right to expect, and which, he believed, it would be the noble Lord's pleasure to give.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): When I understood the arrangement of the business for this evening I was inclined to congratulate myself that before I should have the honour of addressing the House a far abler tongue than mine would have given to the country the views of His Majesty's Government on all the departments of the Chinese question. I am not so sure that I congratulate myself now, because it appears from the speeches of my hon. friend and of the hon. Gentleman opposite that to some extent this debate is to be looked upon as a continuance of a debate in another place, and that, without the presence of my noble friend who made the speech, and without having the report of his remarks before us, comments are to be made on his utterances. I do not know that that is a particularly convenient

arrangement, because it leads to considerable inaccuracy. My hon. friend, for instance, told the House just now that my noble friend in another place had declared against reform in China. I am confident he did no such thing.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I did not say that. I said the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had declared that the Government would not make it one of their principal policies in China.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON: I may be allowed to say that I carefully refrained from referring to various points raised in another place, on the very ground that I thought it would be unfair to anticipate the statement of the noble Lord.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I am much obliged to the hon. Gentleman. I am sure his intentions were admirable, but I am not quite sure that he did not refer indirectly to some of the statements made in another place. But my hon. friend told the House that the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs had discouraged, as it were, reform in China.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Hear, hear;

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I do not think so, and if the right hon. Baronet will look to-morrow at the report he will see that my noble friend was speaking of reform in China in connection with the question of fiscal reform, to which that particular portion of his speech was devoted. He had pointed out that fiscal reform was one of the things which the Powers had to place in the Identic Note which had been presented to China, that is to say, that it formed part of the programme which the Powers were intent upon compelling China to adopt. Then he went on to distinguish our attitude and that of other Powers on fiscal reform, and reform generally, and it will be abundantly clear to the House that nothing would be more rash than to have announced that part of the policy of the Government was that they intended to coerce China in the general reform of her administration, as distinguished from fiscal reform, the latter being evidently of international importance, instead of national importance, as is the former.

The speech of my hon. friend went back a long way into ancient history, into which he will not expect me to follow him. He discussed things which occurred many years ago, and he gradually worked his way down to the origin of the present crisis. To my hon. friend Russia is the author of all evil; nothing goes wrong in Europe or in the world but Russia is at the bottom of it. In my opinion, as far as my limited opportunity of acquainting myself with the subject extends, the Boxer movement cannot be said to have been due to Russia. The Boxer movement was a very remarkable one, because it took by surprise all those who knew China best. In its nature it consisted partly of a religious movement and partly of a national movement; and it suddenly grew, with quite unexpected force and vigour, and swept over the country. As far as the external action of the other Powers was concerned, I do not pretend that a certain aggressive spirit which had shown itself among European nations had not something to do with it, but I do not think it would be fair to assign that to Russia, or to any other one Power, but rather to a great many. When my hon. friend speaks of Russia I wonder he does not think of the danger of using generalities. Russia may mean anything, from the Russian Emperor, the Russian Government, the Russian representative in China, down to some obscure colonel in command of a small body of Russian troops in a remote province; and there can be no greater mistake in estimating the action of Russia than to confuse these very dissimilar units.

Recent experience has gone a long way to bear out the truth of this. The hon. Gentleman opposite reminds us of the question of the Northern Railway, and that furnishes an example of how pacific but firm representation and an appeal to the justice of the Russian Government meet with their reward. It is known now that, with regard to a large part of that railway, not the whole, but a large part; that part that is inside the Great Wall; the Russian Government have consented to surrender it, and have surrendered it to the Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief, who in turn handed it over to the British military authority. That is part of the railway, but I do not forget we have rights in the whole of the railway; rights founded on the fact that the railway was made by British enterprise and capital, under British management, and was solemnly secured in an international instrument as an addendum of the Anglo-Russian Convention. The rights we possess in that railway will not be forgotten by His Majesty's Government. The hon. Member opposite has asked me about the incident in reference to the Elliott Islands, and I do not know that I have anything to add to the answer I have given to this question. The incident occurred, as the hon. Member himself mentioned, owing to the fact that a British naval officer, detached to hunt down pirates in that part of the world, in the course of his duty put into one of the islands, and remonstrances were addressed to him, or rather I think to the Admiral Commanding-in-Chief, not by the Russian Government, but by the admiral on the spot. We have instructed our admiral that we know no reason why our treaty rights to enter any port in China should be disputed, and that, so far as we are concerned, no attention need be paid to the protest. The hon. Gentleman then addressed himself to the various conventions which exist between this country and other Powers in respect of China. I did not gather he objected to them. His objections consisted, as it seemed to me, in his opinion that they hardly went far enough. He spoke of the Anglo-Russian Railway Convention, to which I have referred, and he said it was a pity that it did not extend south of the Great Wall as well as north; or so I understood him. But I am not quite sure that I share that view. I recognise that in so far as it went it made for tranquillity and the avoidance of friction as between one Power and another, and anything that makes for tranquillity in China is for the benefit of British interests. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the Agreement is bi-lateral.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: A most discreditable surrender.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: My hon. friend holds very strong opinions on this subject, I know, but I think I should get on with my speech better without his interjected observations. My hon. friend is aware the Agreement is bi-lateral in character. We recognise the geographical gravitation; that is the phrase used; which led to our abstention from interference with Russian railway enterprise south of the Wall, just as the same geographical gravitation led to Russian non-interference with our enterprise in the Yang-tsze basin. The Anglo-German Agreement has been referred to by the hon. Gentleman opposite. That Agreement consists of three clauses. The first embodies the principle of the open door, but is limited in the terms of the article to the rivers and littoral of China, and to that part of the Chinese Empire in which the particular Powers signing the Agreement have

interests.

*MR. JOSEPH WALTON: The words are "to uphold the same for all Chinese territory."

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: That is not the interpretation put on the document by either of the contracting parties. The rivers and ports of China are the parts of China to which it extends, and the whole Empire of China so far as the influence of the Powers signing the document goes. I am asked how I explain the German Chancellor's speech in reference to that article. He said in the first place; I do not pretend for a moment to embrace all he said; that, as far as Germany is concerned, that article does not include Manchuria. I presume that the German Chancellor thinks that Manchuria is not a place where Germany has influence. But it is fair to say that, at the time that instrument was being negotiated, so far as Article 1 was concerned the German Government gave us to understand that they did not consider that, for the purposes of Germany, their influence extended to Manchuria. As to Clause 2, which binds the Powers to direct their policy towards maintaining the integrity of the Chinese Empire, that, as I said the other day in answer to a question, is, in our opinion, without qualification. Whatever the interpretation the German Government may have put on that article, at any rate this can be said, that as a matter of fact they are pledged, and admit themselves pledged, and are glad they are pledged, to maintain the integrity of China by a hundred other documents besides the Anglo-German Agreement. The fact is, as the German Chancellor pointed out, the whole of China is a security for the money which the Chinese Government owes to the Powers of Europe, and in the opinion of His Majesty's Government and the German Government China has no right to part with a single acre of that which constitutes the security for so large a sum. With regard to Manchuria, as I have pointed out we fully recognise the obligations upon us which the great interests of this country impose. I have mentioned the railways; but there are other interests, trade interests, in different parts, to which we are bound to have regard. I am asked by the hon. Gentleman whether we are in a position to communicate the text of the alleged Agreement between Russia and China to the House. We are not in a position to do so. No one regrets more than His Majesty's Government the atmosphere of mystery which has been thrown round that Agreement. We think it a pity. It has the disadvantage that many versions, more or less accurate, reach us from many different quarters, and it is exceedingly difficult to say what may be the accurate or final form which it has assumed. One thing I can say, and that is that to the best of our information neither the account of it given by my hon. friend, nor the account given by the hon. Gentleman opposite is accurate, though that does not carry us very much further.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: Will you support China in refusing to sign it?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The line we have adopted is to inform the Chinese Government that, in our opinion, any surrender of territory on her part under an agreement of the kind suggested between herself and anyone Power during the continuance of the present state of things in China would be a mistake dangerous to ourselves which we could not approve of. We have suggested that the proper course is to submit any such instrument to the representatives

of the Powers at Peking. That is the policy of His Majesty's Government. That is the policy not only of His Majesty's Government, but also, as we understand, of the German Government and of several other Governments; and I think it is quite as good a policy, indeed a far better one than that indicated in the reckless observation which has just been addressed to the House by my hon. friend. I know my hon. friend takes a very gloomy view of the future position of this country in Asia.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: No, no.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: He conceives that Russia is gradually absorbing everything, and I think he said that within three years she will have absorbed the whole of Mongolia and will have threatened India.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: No; I said nothing of the sort.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Well, I think if Russia's capacity and desire to pursue such a policy was anything like that which is described by my hon. friend we might indeed despair; but I confess I form no such opinion of Russia's intentions, and no such opinion of our want of strength, supposing any such thing were possible, to resist a danger of that kind. He attributes all our misfortunes to the Concert of Europe. Sir, the Concert is not perfect as an international instrument. I do not think that any of us on this side of the House have ever pretended that it was. I do not say that it was the most perfect method of addressing ourselves to the solution of the Chinese crisis, but I say that it was essential, that there was no other means of solving the crisis. The injury which had been inflicted by China was an international injury; an injury to all the Powers alike by assailing them in the persons of their representatives; and, of course, it was a matter of common interest and common obligation to vindicate our honour there and to take the necessary steps to prevent any such catastrophe ever happening again. But I quite admit that the Concert is very slow, and that its success depends upon; the cordial working of it by all its members, and that it is in the power of

any of the members of the Concert to make its future progress very difficult, or, indeed, impossible. For my part, as I have already said, we are not prepared in any way to abandon it. Indeed, the very policy I have described, of suggesting to the Chinese Government the propriety of referring any agreement of the kind which is alleged to have been made to the representatives of the Powers, is another example of the working of the Powers in concert.

I am not able to touch upon every point which has been raised by the two hon. Gentlemen who have addressed the House, but I hope it will not be thought that where I have not corrected them I have admitted the accuracy of all that has been said. I do not admit, for instance, that the

"open door" has been in any way injured by Russia. I do not admit that insults have been hurled at our officers and soldiers, except, of course, in a few cases between private soldiers in China. Nor do I admit that in the action we have taken in regard to the port of Neu-chwang we have anything whatever to be ashamed of. It is quite true that Russia continues to occupy Neu-chwang and the railway that leads to Neu-chwang. But in the course of the pacification of China undoubtedly the Russian troops advanced from that direction and used that

railway. That was her field of operation; Neu-chwang came within it, and it is not surprising that she occupied it. So long as that is a temporary occupation we have nothing to say against it and the attitude of our representative at Neu-chwang seems to have been a thoroughly proper one, which deserved and has received our full support. The fact is that I do not share the view of my hon. friend that the prestige of Great Britain in the East is a thing of the past, or that it has been seriously impaired. Depend upon it, prestige is not a matter of display and ostentation. Prestige really depends upon what is real and what is essential. What makes our power in the East is not that we are ostentatious, but the consciousness of those with whom we have to deal that there is a great power behind us. And there are also great moral qualities which make us powerful in the East; our tolerance, our fair dealing, our sense of justice, and our business capacity. All these things have told in the past in China, and they remain as powerful as ever. For my part, having taken some trouble to inform myself on the matter, I do not believe in the least in this great degradation of British influence in China. So long as our countrymen retain those great qualities which have served them so well in so many different Oriental countries, so long shall I believe and continue to believe in the continuance of British power and British influence. I have done my best to answer the questions put to me, and I believe that in China, as elsewhere, the Government deserve and enjoy the confidence of the country and of the House of Commons.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): I join in the debate at this hour, not at all with any desire to inflict a long speech on the House, but rather, if I may be allowed, to point out certain reasons which occur to me for thinking that a long debate on the details of the Chinese question to-night may not perhaps be considered altogether to be in place or to be very desirable. It is within our knowledge that a very important statement has been made in another place on the whole Chinese question, and I feel quite certain that I am expressing the view, not only of hon. Members who sit immediately near me, but of the House in general, when I say that whatever complaint there may have been the other day in regard to the action, or rather the silence, of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, we are all agreed that he has to-night made a full statement, and that he has fully respected the rights of the House of Commons to be fully informed about foreign affairs. I think we must also feel that the noble Lord has been at some disadvantage to-night, because this discussion began at a very late hour, and he himself had to rise after others had addressed the House.

Take first of all the speech of the hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division. I am bound to say that it seems to me that I have heard it as far back as 1884. The hon. Member as usual told us that the great error of all foreign policy has been that his advice has not been adopted, and that his advice to successive Governments has been that there should be an Anglo-German Alliance. He seems to

think that alliances are to be got simply and solely by saying that a particular alliance would be convenient to the country, and that, therefore, it could be at

once entered upon. Has not the hon. Member ever heard of the able and interesting speech of the German Minister in the Prussian Parliament, in which he warned those whom he addressed that Germany was not going to enter into alliances for the goodwill, pleasure, and advantage of other countries, but only exactly as far as they suited German interests? The hon. Member is aware that an alliance with Germany cannot be made simply because we say it would be convenient to us. The hon. Member has now added to his own recommendation with regard to a German alliance by saying that we have simply to proclaim that we want a Japanese alliance and that the Japanese will say: "Of course; let us frame it." The hon. Member appears to be the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs. Perhaps he would like to address the House from the bar as representing the Japanese Government. Then the hon. Member said: "Send the Fleet into Japanese and Chinese waters." He said that by sending the Fleet to the Gulf of Pechili;

SIR F. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I said nothing of the kind.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: I must congratulate the hon. Member that he did not repeat his former declaration about sending the Fleet to the coast of Poland.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I never said that either. I may as well kill, I hope once for all, one of the most monstrous fables ever spread about an unfortunate Member of this House, by stating that the story which was circulated by the noble Lord and Members like him was inaccurately attributed to me by the late Mr. Gladstone. I never said anything of the sort.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE: My recollection is that the hon. Member in former days did want to send the British fleet to the coast of Poland, and that when it was pointed out to him that Poland did not possess a coast he rushed into the columns of the press with the statement that Poland formerly had a sea coast, and that what he meant

was that the fleet should be sent into the Baltic. I congratulate the hon.

Member that he has on this occasion made a recommendation which at any rate is within the range of physical possibility.

It is pleasant to pass from the rather exaggerated views of the hon. Member on foreign policy, which he is never weary of inflicting on the House, to the clear and able statement, made from intimate knowledge of China, of my hon. friend the Member for Barnsley. My hon. friend pointed out to the House that the policy which this country ought to aim at in China was to maintain all our commercial rights. We have had in the statement of the noble Lord a very clear allusion to that part of the negotiations which have been going on. I think I may certainly say on behalf of hon. Members on this side that we shall approach everything that has fallen from the noble Lord and from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in another place in the spirit which at a grave moment like this they fully deserve. We desire that no single word shall fall from any of us which might complicate the position of the Government, which we all feel is one of very great difficulty in this matter. I would, however, venture to urge on the Government that there are two points on which we desire to be fully enlightened, namely, what the position is in regard to Manchuria, in respect, in the first place, to the maintenance of our general rights under

existing treaties, and secondly, in respect to what I might call our particular rights in regard to the railway which has been more than once mentioned in the debate. Subject to that observation, I will only say that I believe the feeling on this side of the House is that the Government ought carefully to abstain from pursuing any policy which would appear to assume that it was a matter of grave danger to this country if certain rights were acquired by Russia in Manchuria. We have interests there; commercial interests, not military or political interests. We desire to maintain the policy of what is called the "open door," and if that can be maintained we will be the very first to acknowledge that the foreign policy of the Government has been successful, because, after all, on these matters, we desire to

support the Government of the country as far as we possibly can. We ought never to look upon these great questions of foreign affairs from the point of view of party, because these are essentially questions regarding which party considerations should as far as possible be put into the background. There is, however, another point which has been mentioned, and which I must distinguish from the question of Manchuria. I mean the question whether Russia has or has not obtained large rights in what is called Mongolia and Chinese Turkestan, which is a far larger area than Manchuria, although it may look small on maps of a certain scale.

These are the points which I venture to place before the House, but I recur to the point from which I started, namely, that we are yet hardly in a position to enter on a detailed discussion of what has been said by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in another place, or to embark on those large views of foreign policy in which the hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division always rejoices. He says alliances are so simple, but I would remind him of what was said to Owen Glendower, according to Shakespeare, when he said he would call spirits from the vasty deep. Percy replied; I am struck by the fact that I now see a Percy sitting behind the hon. Member; "But will they come?" I would recommend the hon. Member to consult the noble Lord behind him, who has travelled experience, and ask him whether he thinks the hon. Member's views of foreign policy are possible, or whether the views of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in another place and of the Under Secretary in this House are not saner views to follow.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): May I venture to appeal to the House now to bring this debate to a close? We have had two interesting debates on the Second and Third Readings of the Appropriation Bill, and I must also remind hon. Members that the Speaker and the officials of the House have to be here at an early hour to-morrow in order to get through the financial business within the legal period.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): In view of the fact that for some time past I have put a number of questions to the noble Lord on the matter of Manchuria and the action of Russia without obtaining any direct answer, I think I am entitled to take this, the only opportunity I shall have, of repeating my questions and of emphasising, the indecision of the speech of the noble Lord upon the matter, It is another illustration of the disadvantage under which this House labours in

not having the Foreign Secretary here, that we should be all aware that a speech has been delivered by that Minister in another place this afternoon upon this subject, of the substance of which we must remain in more or less ignorance until to-morrow. The noble Lord did not give us clearly to understand whether or not the German Government are in accord with the action of His Majesty's Government in Manchuria. He told us that the first article of the Anglo-German Agreement was understood to extend to Manchuria, but that the second article, which had reference to the Chinese Empire generally, would naturally include Manchuria. The House of Commons and the country have a right to know which it is. Is it a fact that the German Chancellor has strongly declared that no Agreement with this country binds Germany to object to the outrages of Russia in China? The noble Lord has put off replying to the question again and again, as though he is desirous of biding the fact that the German Chancellor has made that statement. There is something mysterious about the whole matter. The fact of the matter is that the Anglo-German Agreement does not include Manchuria, and the German Government are not prepared to take action with this country in opposition to Russia. That means that Russia is practically doing what she likes in China. The people of this country and of Europe generally want to know what is to be the attitude of the Government upon this question. With or without the support of Germany, are you or are you not going to take up an attitude of opposition to Russia's operations? The indecision displayed by the Government goes to show that you are friendless in the matter, and that you have been unable to prevail upon Germany to make common cause with you against Russia. The speech of the noble Lord to-night was the weakest and lamest pronouncement the House of Commons has ever heard from an Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and it will be read to-morrow with amazement from one end of the country to the other. But the matter will not rest there. Sooner or later the Government and the people will have to face the question of whether Russia is to be allowed a free hand in Manchuria or not, and, if she is not, whether this country is prepared to take a strong stand in support of the integrity of the Chinese Empire. With regard to the general question, there is a growing feeling that the Governments of Europe are mainly responsible for the unfortunate development which has recently taken place. The Chinese people had been irritated and interfered with to an extent that no other people would have stood, and no grounds would have been given for the intervention of the allied Powers if the conduct of certain Europeans in China had not been of a thoroughly provocative character, which nobody could put up with. All this muddle is another illustration of the fact that it is dangerous and unjustifiable for Europeans to deal with

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Chapman, Edward

Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury)

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Charrington, Spencer

Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)

Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Grenfell, William Henry
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Groves, James Grimble
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Asher, Alexander
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x.
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Cranborne, Viscount
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Austin, Sir John
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Bain, Col. James Robert
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Doughty, George
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Banbury, Frederick George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Heaton, John Henniker
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Helme, Norval Watson
Beaumont, Wentworth, C. B.
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Bell, Richard
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brights'de
Bignold, Arthur
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Bill, Charles

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Blundell, Col. Henry
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Bond, Edward
Fisher, William Hayes
Kenyon-Slaney Col. W. (Salop.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Keswick, William
Brassey, Albert
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Knowles, Lees
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Bull, William James
Fuller, J. M. F.
Lawrence, William F.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Lawson, John Grant
Cautley, Henry Strother
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Graham, Henry Robert
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.

the populations of Eastern countries upon the assumption that they are dealing with people who have European instincts, customs, and habits. There will never be a settlement in China until a different system is pursued, and Chinese customs and habits are respected.

MR. BELL (Derby): The matter I wish to bring forward is one affecting a large number of railway men in the country, but in deference to the wishes of the First Lord of the Treasury, if the matter may be raised upon the Adjournment on Tuesday, I am prepared to defer my remarks until then.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member would be quite in order on that occasion.

MR. BELL: Then I will reserve what I intended to say.

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, 65. (Division List No. 109.)

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Pemberton, John S. G.

Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth

Penn, John

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Percy, Earl

Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.

Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G Ellison

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Macdona, John Cumming

Plummer, Walter R.

Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward

M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)

Pretymann, Ernest George

Valentia, Viscount

Majendie, James A. H.

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E.

Malcolm, Ian

Purvis, Robert

Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)

Manners, Lord Cecil

Handles, John S.

Webb, Col. William George

Martin, Richard Biddulph

Rankin, Sir James

Whiteley, George (York, W. R.

Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.

Ratcliffe, R. F.

Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne

Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.

Rea, Russell

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Middlemore, J, Throgmorton

Rentoul, James Alexander
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Renwick, George
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Richards, Henry Charles
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Moro, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Morrell, George Herbert
Rutherford, John
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Sackville, Col. S. C. Stopford-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Morton, Arthur H. A. Deptford
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Mount, William Arthur
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Younger, William
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Smith, H C. (North'mb. Tyneside)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Spear, John Ward
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E)
Harwood, George
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda.
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Malley, William
Ambrose, Robert

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Mara, James
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Black, Alexander William
Holland, William Henry
Power, Patrick Joseph
Poland, John
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Priestley, Arthur
Boyle, James
Joyce, Michael
Reddy, M.
Caldwell, James
Leamy, Edmund
Redmond J. E. (Waterford)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Redmond, William (Clare)
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Rigg, Richard
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Crean, Eugene
M'Fadden, Edward
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Cullinan, J.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Sullivan, Donal
Delany, William
Mooney, John J.
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r
Doogan, P. C.
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)
Dully, William J.
Murphy, J.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Duncan, James H.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Weir, James Galloway
Ffrench, Peter
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Gilhooly, James
O'Doherty, William
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Goddard, Daniel Lord
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Dowd, John
Question put accordingly, "That the Bill be now read the third time."
AYES.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Acland-Hood, Capt Sir Alex. F.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Bignold, Arthur
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Bill, Charles
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Black, Alexander William
Chamberlain J. Austen (Worc'r)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Chapman, Edward
Asher, Alexander
Bond, Edward
Charrington, Spencer
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Austin, Sir John
Brassey, Albert
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r)

Ball, William James
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Caldwell, James
Cranborne, Viscount
Banbury, Frederick George
Carson, lit. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
The House divided:;Ayes, 182; Noes, 47. (Division List No. 110.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Keswick, William
Randles, John S.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Knowles, Lees
Rankin, Sir James
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Law, Andrew Bonar
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Doughty, George
Lawrence, William F.
Rea, Russell
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Lawson, John Grant
Rentoul, James Alexander
Duncan, James H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Renwick, George
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Richards, Henry Charles
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Rigg, Richard
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Leveson-Crower, Frederick N. S
Ritchie, Rt. H n. Chas. Thomson
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Long, Col Charles W. (Evesham
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Fisher, William Hayes

Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Rutherford, John
FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose-
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. (J. F.
Sadler, Col Samuel Alex.
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Macdona, John Gumming
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Fuller, J. M. F.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Smith, H. C (N'rth'mb, Tynes'de
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Cordon, Hn. J E. (Elgin & Nairn
Malcolm, Ian
Spear, John Ward
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Manners, Lord Cecil
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. M.
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W. F.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Graham, Henry Robert
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh)
Thomas, J. A. (Glam'rg'n, Gow'r
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Tomlinson, William Edw. M.
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Grenfell, William Henry
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Valentia, Viscount
Griffith, Ellis J.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy

Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Groves, James Grimble
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x
Morrell, George Herbert
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Webb, Col. William George
Harris, F Leverton (Tynemouth
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Weir, James Galloway
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Morton, Edw. J. G. (Devonport)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Mount, William Arthur
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Hayne, Rt. Hon Charles Seale-
Murray, Rt. Hn A. Graham (Bute
Williams, Col. it. (Dorset)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Heaton, John Henniker
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Helme, Norval Watson
Pemberton, John S. G.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Penn, John
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Percy, Earl
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Holland, William Henry
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Hope, J. E (Sheffield, Brightside
Plummer, Walter R.
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Younger, William
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Jones, William (Carnarvon.)
Priestley, Arthur
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Pryce Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Purvis, Robert
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Malley, William
Ambrose, Robert
Joyce, Michael
O'Mara, James
Harry, F. (Cork, S.)
Leamy, Edmund
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Boland, John
Lundon
Power, Patrick Joseph
Boyle, James
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Reddy, M.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
M'Fadden, Edward
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Mooney, John J.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Crean, Eugene
Murphy, J.
Sullivan, Donal
Cullinan, J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Delany, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, George (Norfolk)
Doogan, P. C.
O'Brien, Kendal (T'pper'ry Mid
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Duffy, William J.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Ffrench, Peter
O'Doherty, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Dowd, John
Gilhooly, James

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Bill read the third time, and passed.
Adjourned at ten minutes before One of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 29th March, 1901.

The House met at Eleven of the clock.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Consolidated Fund (No. 1) Bill, without amendment.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners.

The House went; and, having returned;

MR. SPEAKER reported the Royal Assent to Consolidated Fund (No. 1) Act, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 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 Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.::

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Dearne Valley Junction Railways) Bill.

Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway (Various Powers) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT 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 Petition for additional Provision in the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.::
North British Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

HORLEY DISTRICT GAS BILL AND CRAWLEY GAS BILL.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Horley District Gas

Bill and the Crawley Gas Bill that they have power, if they think fit, to consolidate the said two Bills, or any part or parts thereof respectively, into one Bill.;(Mr. Caldwell.)

GREAT CENTRAL RAILWAY BILL.

Petition for additional Provision; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PAISLEY GAS PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

METROPOLITAN POLICE PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

THAMES AND SEVERN PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

As amended, considered; to be read the third time upon Monday next.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5).

Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Macclesfield, Ripon, Todmorden, Trowbridge, Ware, Wellingborough (Public Purposes), Wellington (Salop), Widnes. Wisbech, and Workington, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gerald Balfour and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

"To confirm certain Provisional Orders, made by the Board of Trade under the Electric' Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Macclesfield, Ripon, Todmorden, Trowbridge. Ware. Wellingborough (Public Purposes), Wellington (Salop), Widnes. Wisbech, and Workington," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 132.]

LONDON BRIDGE WIDENING BILL.

DERWENT VALLEY WATER BOARD BILL.

TEES VALLEY WATER BOARD BILL.

Reported, with Amendments; Reports to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act for supplying with gas the parish of Arlesey and other places in the county of Bedford." Arlesey Gas Bill [Lords].

Also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to convert the capital of the Newcastle upon-Tyne and Gateshead Gas Company; to empower the Company to raise additional capital; and for other purposes." Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Gateshead Gas Bill [Lords].

And, also, a Bill, intituled, "An Act to increase the number of the Council of the Borough of Folkestone, in the county of Kent; and for other purposes."

Folkestone Corporation Bill [Lords].

ARLESEY GAS BILL [Lords].

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE AND GATES-HEAD GAS BILL [Lords].

FOLKESTONE CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Rotherham; and Peterborough; to lie upon the Table.

COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Fenton (three); Longton (No. 1); Gark Hall; Longton (No. 2); Polton; Outfield; Loanhead; Rosewell; Newbattle; Wallyford; Carberry; Staveley; Brownhills; Hanley (No. 3); Hanley (No. 5); Hanley (No. 1); Hanley Deep Pit; Nostell; Haigh; St. Helens; Flimby; Ellenborough; Bullgill; Gillhead; Buckhill; Seaton Moor; Robin Hood; Lepton; Clayton West; Old Silkstone; Birley (No. 1); Wortley and Farnley; and Kirkintilloch Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

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

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

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

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Fenton (three); Longton (No. 1); Gark Hall; Wallyford; Carberry; Edinburgh; Loanhead; Brownhills; Hanley (No. 5); Hanley (No. 3); Hanley (No. 1); Deep Pit, Hanley; North Staveley; Haigh; Nostell; Robin Hood; Seaton Moor; Buckhill; Gillhead; Bullgill; Flimby; Ellenborough; Saint Helens; Outfield; Clayton West; Lepton; Lye; Two Gates; Old Silkstone; Birley (No. 1); Wortley and Farnley; and Cakemore Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Pickering; Dearham; Workington (three); Maryport; Netherton; Hermiston; West Croydon; Leicester; Mexborough; Oulton; Rothwell; Stanley-cum-Wrenthorpe; Ham; Hedgman; Pentre Estyll; Pickering; Sunday School Union; Islington; Cockermouth; Llanllyfni; New Maiden; Hatherleigh; Okehampton; Hackney; and Shore-ditch; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Cawdor; Naidu Landward; Lossiemouth; Drainie; Glenluce; Thurso; Edinburgh (two); Tain (two); New Spynie; and Kings' kettle; 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 Light Railways in the parishes of Hemsworth, Ackworth, and Badsworth, in the West Riding of the county of York (Brackenhill 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 Morley and the urban districts of Drighlington, Gildersome, and East and West Ardsley, in the West Riding of the county of York (Morley and District 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 deviation of a Light Railway authorised by the West Hartlepool Light Railways Order, 1897, and for other purposes (West Hartlepool Light Railways [Deviation, etc.] 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 county of Salop from Cleobury Mortimer to Ditton Priors (Cleobury Mortimer and Ditton Priors 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 county of Essex between Kelvedon and River Blackwater (Kelvedon, Tiptree, and Tollesbury 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 county of Lancaster from Ormskirk to Southport (Ormskirk and Southport 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 county of Kent from Hollingbourne to Faversham (Maidstone and Faversham Junction Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

BREWERS' LICENCES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 28th March; Mr. Austen Chamberlain]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 111.]

FLEETS (GREAT BRITAIN AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES).

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 12th December, 1900; Sir Charles Dilke]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 112.]

EAST INDIA (ROYAL INDIAN ENGINEERING COLLEGE).

Copy presented, of Papers relating to Remodelling of Course of Instruction and Retirement of certain of the Professors and Lecturers; and Report of the Board of Visitors, dated 25th March, 1901, and Minutes of Evidence taken before them [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;INQUIRY INTO CONDUCT AND OPERATIONS.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will state if in the promised inquiry into the conduct of the war will be included the hiring of transports; the price paid for them; the length of many of the passages; the food supplied to the troops; the alleged unfitness of some; and especially why, at a critical time, when speed was of such importance, the fast mail steamers were not requisitioned, as per the subsidy contracts, many of which could have carried a large number of troops without any alterations.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I do not think that anything will be excluded by the reference from the consideration of the Commission to inquire into the conduct of the war, but I confess that I do not think their task will be a very light one. This is a short sprig of a very small branch of that very large investigation.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Will the right hon. Gentleman inform us when the inquiry will take place, will it be a genuine inquiry, and will it take place at a time when the public interest has not decreased?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot imagine anything which would so rapidly decrease public interest as these very minute points being brought forward.

SEDITIONOUS LIBELS AT THE CAPE.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state when the trial of Mr. Albert Cartwright, editor of the South African Daily News, on a charge of seditious libel will take place; and whether he is to be tried by the Special Treason Court constituted by the recent Act of the Cape Colony Parliament, or under the ordinary law.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The only information I possess on this subject is that the preparatory examination took place in the Cape Town Police Court, but I have telegraphed to inquire.

HEILBRON AFFAIR.

MR. ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has official information to the effect that a convoy of sixty wagons, with food, mails, and 200 boxes of small arm ammunition, and 900 rounds of 15-pounder ammunition was despatched from the railway to Heilbron on 2nd June with an escort of only

140 infantry, and was captured by the Boers; that General Colvile expressed his opinion that the escort was inadequate; and that he did not receive the telegram informing him of the convoy's departure till 20th June.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): A convoy was despatched with an escort of 163 infantry on the 2nd June and was captured by the Boers. General Colvile did express an opinion as to the inadequacy of the escort, but the convoy had already started and could not be stopped, he was aware of the intended despatch of the convoy on the 2nd June. He reports that he received no telegram informing him that it had started till the 20th June; telegraphic communication was much interrupted at the time.

PLAGUE AT CAPE TOWN.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the increase of plague at Cape Town and the danger of importing the disease into this country, he will direct that all military invalids and soldiers arriving at English ports in ships on which any case of plague, has occurred should be isolated and kept under observation for a sufficient period before being allowed to go to their homes or to military camps.

*MR. BRODRICK: Instructions to this effect were issued on the 22nd instant to all concerned.

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WITH GENERAL BOTHA.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has received from Lord Kitchener, since his last answer on this question, any further report of the interview between him and General Botha.

*MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir.

MAFEKING SIEGE; THEFTS OF GOVERNMENT FOODSTUFFS.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that Staff Sergeant-Major J. S. Loney, who, during the siege of Mafeking, was tried by court-martial, pleaded guilty to the theft of Government foodstuffs, was sentenced to reduction, discharge with ignominy, and five years penal servitude; that, during the final attack on Mafeking, Loney was released and took a gallant part in its defence; and that he is at present serving his time at Portland; and whether, having regard to these facts and also to the fact that before joining Baden-Powell Loney was a warrant officer with an excellent character and fifteen years service, during ten of which he had no entry against him, a mitigation of the sentence may be granted.

*MR. BRODRICK: This warrant officer stole and sold Government food at a time when the whole of the inhabitants of Mafeking were on rations and undergoing a siege. I cannot undertake to reconsider the case.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is now able to state the proportion of members of the Yeomanry cavalry, of the Volunteer force, and of ex-members of the Regular or Militia forces in the second levy of the Imperial Yeomanry.

MR. BRODRICK: I am afraid that I cannot give my hon. and gallant friend the information at present, as the Returns have not yet been received.

ARMY REORGANISATION.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, before the special discussion on the proposed Army reforms takes place, he will furnish a Return or Memorandum giving the House information respecting the 120,000 men constituting the organised force to be held available for field service over sea, as set forth in the Return on to-day's Paper entitled Army Reforms.

MR. BRODRICK: The numbers which make up the 120,000 men are as follows:;
All ranks.

3 Army Corps

108,777

3 Cavalry Brigades

7,491

Line of Communication Troops

4,000

Total

120,268

I cannot assent to my hon. friend's Return, as the details are numerous, and our staff is already heavily worked.

MARK IV. BULLETS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the 50,000,000 Mark IV. bullets, of which 4,500,000 were recently broken up, were manufactured in conformity with the rules adopted by the Hague Conference; and on what date were the bullets contracted for.

MR. BRODRICK: Mark IV. bullets were adopted into the Service before the declaration of the Hague Conference. The order for this ammunition was given in June, 1898.

DEFECTIVE NAVAL GUNS.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state the result of the recent inquiry into the bursting of guns on board one of His Majesty's ships of war.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): There have been no cases of guns bursting on board His Majesty's ships in recent years. The only instance resembling a burst occurred on board the "Royal Sovereign," when a portion of the muzzle of a six-pounder gun was blown off. The Ordnance Committee is at the present time investigating the cause of this accident.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The case I referred to was that of the guns of the "Thunderer," which were at first stated to have burst, an inquiry being ordered. I suppose they did not burst. Still, there was an inquiry.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Had I known that the right hon. Baronet alluded to that case I would have obtained the information.

MALTA;LANGUAGE QUESTION.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will grant a Return of the Memoranda and Correspondence relating to the language question in Malta subsequent to June, 1899, and in continuation of the Return previously granted and ordered to be printed on 21st July, 1899.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I propose shortly to lay before Parliament further Papers in continuation of the Return referred to by the hon. Member.

INDIAN RAILWAYS;BENGAL COAL INDUSTRY.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether complaints have reached him that the coal industry in Bengal is cramped by the inability of the East India Railway to supply sufficient wagons to carry the coal from the mines to consumers, and for shipment; and whether, to secure a better service, of wagons on that railway as well as a general extension of profitable lines, the Government of India can arrange to make the expenditure on them independent of the general administrative finances under borrowing powers such as were granted some years ago and then withdrawn.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): Some representations as to the insufficiency of the rolling-stock of the East India Railway for the conveyance of coal reached me about a year ago. A short time previously large additions to the rolling-stock had been sanctioned by the Government of India; further additions were sanctioned later in the year; and, so far as I am aware, all the requirements of the Company have now been met. Though all capital outlay for railway purposes raised upon the security of the

revenues of India must be under the control of Government, I agree with the hon. Gentleman that the adequate equipment of lines in working order should be a primary consideration in Indian railway administration.

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will be able within a short time to present to the House further Papers relating to slavery and the slave trade in the Sultanate of Zanzibar, in continuance of those issued in April, 1900, and whether such Papers will include a statement of the reasons which have led His Majesty's officials to estimate that there are only half as many slaves in the two islands as were believed to exist in 1897, and to conclude that further abolitionist measures are not necessary; and whether His Majesty's Agent and Consul General will shortly issue a Report on the condition of the British East Africa Protectorate.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): Papers will be laid after the recess; they will include all the information which has reached His Majesty's Government on the subject. His Majesty's Agent and Consul General has been so short a time in the Protectorate that he has not yet had time to prepare a report, but he will be asked to do so.

DEMISE OF THE CROWN; POSITION OF OFFICE-HOLDERS.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can inform the House what is the total of the penalties that have been incurred by Ministers who were reappointed to their offices by the present King should the view of the existing law suggested by Mr. Attorney General be correct.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): When I first saw the question I hoped the hon. Member had discovered for me a new source of revenue. I may tell him, however, that the answer is nil.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether he is aware that, under the provisions of 54 George 3, cap. 16, the seats in Parliament of persons continuing in office under successive Lords Lieutenant of Ireland are not to be vacated; and whether there is any analogous provision in the existing law relating to the reappointment of Ministers by a new Sovereign.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The answer to the question in the first paragraph is in the affirmative; to that in the second paragraph, that I am not aware of any; but I may remind the hon. Member that by the Statute of Anne no re-appointment can be necessary until six months after the demise of the Crown.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman if he has seen the London Gazette of 24th January, in which I find this statement:—"The Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour was, by His Majesty's command, sworn as First Lord of the Treasury," and whether that does not constitute a new appointment.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I should say not, Sir.

POLICE PENSIONS.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, having regard to the late decision of Justices Channell and Bucknill in the case of ex-Police Constable Upperton against the Metropolitan authorities, under which it will become obligatory on all corporations and other police authorities to pay the retiring pensions of their police constables at the rate of 365 days per year instead of 364 days, or fifty-two weeks per year, whether steps will be taken to enable all police pensioners who have been retired under the same Act to recover back payment at the same higher rate from the various bodies under which they served.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): So far as the Metropolitan Police are concerned, all pensions granted previous to the decision referred to have been revised in accordance therewith, and the arrears have been paid. As regards other police forces, it is a matter for the various police authorities, who, I have no doubt, will take care that the law as now declared is carried out.

CENSUS RETURNS.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the difficulty managers of hotels and similar large establishments will be under in procuring the return for the Census, the enumerators will be authorised to accept particulars as inscribed in hotel registers of persons who, though known to have occupied rooms on the night of the 31st instant, have not presented any returns for the enumerators.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): It will be the duty of the resident manager or proprietor of a hotel or similar establishment to fill up the columns in the Census schedule for all the persons staying in the establishment on the night of Sunday next. I am afraid that the particulars in the hotel registers would generally not give the information desired.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES ACT; LOAN REPAYMENTS.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the replies he has received from local authorities throughout the country in response to his circular asking for information respecting the precise difficulties which stand in the way of carrying out the Housing of the Working Classes Acts, he can see his way to recommend the Government to extend the period of repayment of loans for housing schemes.

MR. WALTER LONG: I have nothing to add to what I have already said on this subject. Very few replies have as yet been received from the local authorities with whom I have communicated.

DR. MACNAMARA: Will the right hon. Gentleman give an assurance that the replies will be laid before the House?

MR. WALTER LONG: No; certainly not. The inquiry is one of a departmental character, and therefore I could not undertake to lay the Papers on the Table.

GOVERNMENT VETERINARY INSPECTORS.

MR. W. M'KILLOP (Sligo, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he can state how the situations of travelling inspectors in the

Veterinary Department of the Board of Agriculture are obtained, and what qualifications are necessary; and can he explain why the Secretary to the Board of Agriculture was allowed to leave his post and to go to South Africa as Secretary to the Hospital Commission, more especially when swine fever had not yet been stamped out, and foot-and-mouth disease had again broken out in England.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): We employ in connection with our work under the Diseases of Animals Act (a) veterinary inspectors and (b) inspectors. Both are nominated by the President of the Board for the time being. The former require veterinary qualifications for the performance of their duties, and they have hitherto been selected by the chief veterinary officer and their names submitted to the President. The inspectors require to possess good business habits and address, and to be capable of securing the proper observance of our orders with firmness and tact. The officer apparently referred to in the second paragraph of the question is an assistant secretary. He was selected, I understand, by the Government in July last, because it was thought that his combined military and civil experience rendered him specially qualified for the service required. Owing to the extra exertions of the remaining members of the staff, which were freely given, the business of the Department was not prejudiced by his absence for three months, which period included his ordinary holiday.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS; APPEALS AGAINST DISMISSAL

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham. W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education if he can now approximately indicate a date for the introduction of the Bill to afford to teachers of public elementary schools a method of appeal against wrongful dismissal from employ.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire. W.R. Thirsk): My right hon. friend the Vice-President of the Board of Education wishes me to say that he is detained at the Board of Education, but the answer to the question is in the negative.

RIFLE RANGES AT POLITICAL CLUBS; YOKER (DUMBARTONSHIRE) CONSERVATIVE CLUB.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that a rifle range is provided at a Conservative Club recently opened at Yoker, Dumbartonshire; and whether similar facilities for rifle practice will be afforded to the various branches of the United Irish League in Scotland and other political organisations.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I have no knowledge of the fact stated in the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question. As neither the provision of rifle ranges nor the fostering of political organisations is within the province of my Department I fear I am unable to answer the second paragraph.

FORT GEORGE WATER SUPPLY.

MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness-shire): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Report of the Medical Officer of Health for Inverness-shire published last year shows that water taken from a well at Fort

George Station was found to be so impure as to be quite unfit for use; can it be ascertained whether the Highland Railway Company have taken any action in the matter; and is the station at Fort George now provided with wholesome water. THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds,. Central): The Board of Trade are always glad to use their good offices with respect to any subject falling within their powers, but I feel sure that the hon. Member will see on reflection that this is a matter lying entirely outside the province of this Department.

EDINBURGH POST OFFICE REVISION.

SIR LEWIS M'IVER (Edinburgh, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the answer given on 10th May, 1900, to the effect that the scheme of revision for the sorting branch of the Edinburgh Post Office would very shortly be decided; and, seeing that on

12th December, 1900, it was stated that a portion of the scheme had been sanctioned by the Treasury and carried into effect, but that certain questions of principle, with regard to higher appointments, which affected the service generally, had been held over, but which it was hoped would be disposed of before long, whether he can now say what progress has been made in arriving at a settlement of these questions.

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

master General is not yet in a position to come to a final decision upon the questions referred to, as he is still in communication with the Treasury upon the subject; but he hopes that a settlement will be shortly arrived at.

INVERNESS-SHIRE POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. JOHN DEWAR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that in some districts of Inverness-shire the delivery of letters is effected only once a fortnight, whilst there are others in which the delivery is effected only once a week; and, in view of the fact that most of these townships contain from 50 to upwards of 100 inhabitants, will he have some inquiry made with a view to a more frequent postal service.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Member will inform the Postmaster General what are the districts or townships in Inverness-shire to which he refers, the Postmaster General will have special inquiry made with the view of ascertaining whether it is possible to afford a more frequent delivery of letters to the places in question.

HARRIS MAIL SERVICE.

MR. JOHN DEWAR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the Postmaster General has received a communication from a public meeting, recently held at Stockinish, Harris, the necessity for a mail steamer service between Loch Stockinish and the mainland; and will the Postmaster General consider the expediency of establishing the proposed service, especially in view of the fact that it would not only expedite the delivery of letters for Stockinish, but would also materially assist the conduct of the

postal service for the fourteen townships between Scadabay and Flodibay, Harris. MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has received the extract forwarded by the hon. Member from a letter relative to a public meeting recently held in Stockinish, Harris, at which a resolution was adopted as to the desirability of arranging for a mail steamer to call at Loch Stockinish. He is not sanguine that such a service could be established, as when the question was last considered, in 1897, it was found that if the Portree and Dunvegan steamer called at Loch Stockinish the arrival of mails at places beyond would be delayed, and also that the contractor objected to make the call on the ground that the entrance to Loch Stockinish was dangerous. The Postmaster General will, however, make further inquiry in the matter, and communicate the result to the hon. Member.

PORTARONAN BOAT SLIP.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the attention of the Congested Districts Board has been called to the necessity for the erection of a boat slip at Portaronan, Malin Head; whether he is aware that this port is frequented and used by deep sea men; that there is no accommodation for the landing of fishing boats and for the removal of the fish from the boats at present; and that in consequence quantities of

fish are lost in being taken from the boats to the shore; and can he say whether this port has been visited lately by a member of the Congested Districts Board, or by any of their officials, for the purpose of reporting to the Board as to the cost and the necessity of a boat slip; and, if so, what was the report.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Representations have been made to the Board to the effect mentioned in the first and second paragraphs. The answer to the third paragraph is in the affirmative. A committee of members of the Board will visit the place when a suitable opportunity presents itself.

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT; ASSISTANT SURVEYORS.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the professional qualifications necessary for candidates for the position of assistant surveyors, in order to obviate the necessity for an examination; and can he explain on whose authority and why were the

subjects of this examination altered on the passing of the Local Government Act.

MR. WYNDHAM: The qualifications have been described in detail by an Order of the Local Government Board, published in February last. I have forwarded a copy of this Order to the hon. Member. In answer to the second paragraph, I would refer to the provisions of Section 83, Sub-sections 4 and 9, of the Act of 1898. The Civil Service Commissioners demurred to conducting these examinations, and the Local Government Board was requested to discharge that duty by the Lord Lieutenant. If the hon. Member has any representations to make on the syllabus I shall be prepared to consider them.

ROXBOROUGH ROAD SCHOOL.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of

Ireland whether he can state how much money is now in the hands of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland on account of the Roxborough Road School endowment; from what source it is derived; to what purpose, or purposes, it is legally applicable; what became of the rents paid by the tenant for the ten years from 1880 to 1890; whether, during that period, the tenant hold under an agreement which bound him to keep the premises in repair; and whether there is any way now to recover that money for the endowment; and can he say when these premises were last inspected on behalf of the Commissioners of Education; and, as they are public property in which the city of Limerick has an interest, will he see that the present tenant is kept to the terms of his agreement, and does not allow the building to go into disrepair.

MR. WYNDHAM: The moneys referred to in the first query consist of a sum of £;163 10s.

1d. cash, and £;63 1s. 6d. stock, all derived from the rent payable by the present tenant of the school. The Commissioners are not in a position to state to what purposes these moneys are applicable. A sum of £;210 was received by way of rent between 1880 and 1890. Of this, a sum of £;188 17s. 6d. was expended by the Commissioners on repairs. The tenant is bound to keep the premises in good repair, reasonable wear and damage excepted. He appears to have expended on the premises, out of his money, a sum of £;160 in the same period. The buildings have not been inspected on behalf of the Commissioners since 1892. The present tenant is bound by his agreement to give up the premises in as good condition and repair as he received them.

IRISH LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the amount paid by the Treasury in discharge of its liability to the Irish Local Taxation Account for the grant-in-aid wrongfully paid in 1898 out of that account, by passing a Supplemental Vote last July for the amount so paid, is now standing to the credit of the Irish Local Taxation Account in Dublin Castle; and will the Treasury make an Order for its payment to the different asylums for the maintenance of patients for the three months intervening between the change from the old calendar year to the new financial year, during which period the entire cost of maintenance fell on the local rates.

MR. WYNDHAM: The amount of the Supplementary Vote taken in July last has been paid into the Local Taxation Account in the Bank of Ireland, and is available for the various purposes mentioned in Section 58 of the Local Government Act, 1898. The answer to the second paragraph is in the negative.

MR. FLYNN: Will the Treasury issue a statement for the information of Irish Members?

MR. WYNDHAM: I shall be very glad to attempt to explain the matter again if the hon. Members care to have my views on the subject when the Vote comes on.

APJOHN'S ESTATE.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, under the 40th section of the Land Act of 1896, steps have been taken to sell to the tenants of the late Michael Marshall Lloyd Apjohn

their several

tenancies on the townlands of Garrison, Nicker, Drominboy, and Ballyvoneen; can he say how far negotiations have been carried; and will he use his best endeavours to see that said sale will be carried out.

MR. WYNDHAM: The case of this estate was before the Land Judge on the 7th February. An adjournment was granted until June, in order that a rental might finally be settled with a view to the issue of a request for an inspection by the Land Commissioners under the 40th section of the Act of 1896.

LADY DE BURGH'S ESTATE.

MR. LUNDON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Land Commissioners, Messrs. Lynch and Wrench, made an order in respect of the values of the various tenancies on the townlands of Drumsally, Dromalta, and Dromcloher, in the parish of Cappamore, county Limerick, on the estate of Lady De Burgh, with a view to have those lands sold to the tenants under the 40th section of the Land Act of 1896; and, having regard to the fact that the tenants and the mortgagees and others interested in the sale have all agreed to the proposed terms, can he say what is now preventing the sale from coming to an issue, and will he take steps that on the earliest opportunity the matter may be brought to a completion.

MR. WYNDHAM: An Order was issued in January last by the Land Judge for the sale of the lands in question to the tenants under section 40. I understand that the procedure of making the offers is now being carried out.

IRISH HEAD CONSTABLES.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many "P" head constables have been examined for the rank of district inspector since the rule came into force of working with "P," as above those who passed the educational examination; how many of those men were clerks, and how many of those were clerks at the Castle; and how many of the men who were clerks have been successful at those examinations; whether he is aware that dissatisfaction exists in connection with Mr. Singleton; and can he state how many times this gentleman has presided at the Board of Examiners.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of head constables possessing the "P" qualification who have been examined for the rank of district inspector is 59. Only one of these men held the position of clerk, though not at the Castle, and he was unsuccessful. The answer to the second paragraph is in the negative. Mr. Singleton has presided at three examinations.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): What is meant by the mysterious "P."?

MR. WYNDHAM: I believe it means an examination for the rank of District Inspector.

CASE OF MRS. MURRIHY, OF TARMON, CLARE.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of Mrs. Murrihy, of Tarmon, county Clare, a widow, who was evicted; and, seeing that she was sentenced to one month's imprisonment and to find bail for twelve months, or to remain another month in gaol, and was convicted under a practically obsolete

Act, will he take steps to have her at once released.

MR. WYNDHAM: Mrs. Murrihy, on the 9th February last, persistently followed a man and molested him by opprobrious exclamations. She was prosecuted under Section 7, sub-section 2, of the 38th and 39th Vict. cap. 86. But that is the very Act for the protection of Trades Unions, the application of which to agrarian disputes in Ireland was so warmly advocated by some hon. Members from Ireland in an Amendment to the Address. Any representations in favour of the woman's release from custody should be addressed in the usual way to the Lord Lieutenant. I may add, however, that further proceedings are pending against her for similar conduct on the 25th February.

PEMBROKE (IRELAND) URBAN COUNCIL.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been drawn to the Report on the accounts of Pembroke Urban Council by the Local Government Board auditor, who refused to grant a certificate on the ground that the abstracts did not represent the position of affairs; whether he is aware that the Report revealed that loans were put to credit of current revenue; that moneys lodged by contractors as security were similarly treated; that false debit balances were shown in the accounts, and that other sums on deposit were ignored; that the sum collected as poor rate had not been all paid over to the county council at the end of the financial year; and that the debit balance had been wrongly stated, while the indebtedness of the council had increased during the year by £16,151 11s. 11d.; whether the Government will take steps to further investigate and set right the financial affairs of this council; and whether they will oppose the Bill promoted by this council for extension of its borrowing powers.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The general effect of the Report was as stated in the second paragraph. The auditor will duly complete the audit as soon as the irregularities in the accounts to which he called attention are set right. I think it only right to mention, however, that a resolution has been passed by the finance committee of the council as to the appointment of a skilled and independent accountant, in order to meet the requirements of the Local Government Board, and that this resolution will be dealt with by the council at its meeting on Monday next.

ROSCOMMON CONSTABULARY.

MR. HAYDEN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the county inspector of the Royal Irish Constabulary resides outside the county of Roscommon, and that his office, headquarters, and staff are in a neighbouring county; and, seeing that representations on the subject have been made by a number of the local boards of Roscommon, whether it is intended by the authorities to give effect to these representations by requiring the county inspector of Roscommon and his staff to reside within that county.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are as stated by the hon. Member, it is the intention to give effect to the representations of the local bodies in question as soon as the proposed new arrangements can be carried out.

DISTRICT COUNCILLOR JOYCE.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of District Councillor Joyce, who has been imprisoned without hard labour for a political offence; and whether such a penalty renders him unable to sit and vote as a district councillor.

MR. WYNDHAM: The person referred to was not convicted of a political offence, but of conspiracy to intimidate. As his sentence of imprisonment did not carry with it hard labour, he would not appear to be disqualified for being a district councillor.

WEXFORD DISTRICT COUNCIL.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Messrs. Felix Adams and Patrick Walsh, both members of the Wexford District Council, were disqualified as such by the Local Government Board because they were tenants of labourers' cottages; and, seeing that the Local Government Board have recently addressed a communication to the district councils stating that no legal disqualification attaches to a person by reason of his being a tenant of a labourer's cottage, and that the aforesaid gentlemen have sought to be reinstated on the Wexford District Council, whether he will advise the Local Government Board to relieve the Wexford District Council of the difficulty in which it is placed.

MR. WYNDHAM: A bench of magistrates in Petty Sessions having decided that tenants of labourers' cottages were disqualified for the office of rural district councillor, the Wexford Council declared the offices held by the persons named to be vacant, and subsequently co-opted two other persons in their stead. Having regard to the recent decision of the King's Bench Division, it is open to the council, if they wish, to choose Messrs. Adams and Walsh to fill the next vacancies on the council, provided, of course, they possess the necessary qualifications.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, Mid): In view of the injustice done these gentlemen, will the right hon. Gentleman see that they are reinstated in their membership?

MR. WYNDHAM: There is no power vested in the Local Government Board to do that.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Is not this another illustration of the improper interference of the Local Government Board?

MR. WYNDHAM: It is a case of non-interference.

LAND ACT, 1896, SECTION 40.

MR. FFRENCH: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that when an estate is put in the Land Judges' List for application of the 40th section of the Land Act of 1896, no direct notice is sent to the tenants, and that the only notice they receive is the notice which appears in the law lists of the daily papers; and whether steps will be taken to have direct notice served on the tenants.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): Where any question is raised or doubt is found to exist as to whether the 40th section applies to the particular estate, special notice is sent to some of the principal tenants on the estate informing them of the objection which has been raised, and naming the date when it will be considered. The course suggested in the question would

largely increase the costs of sale which must be borne by the estate, and, in the opinion of the land judge, is unnecessary.

POYNTZPASS PETTY SESSIONAL BENCH.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that though the Roman Catholics constitute nearly half of the population in the petty sessions district of Poyntzpass, county Armagh, there is not a single Roman Catholic on the bench, and that the resident magistrate, the petty sessions chairman, the dispensary doctor, the postmaster, and four postmen out of five are all Protestants; can he state how long it is since a Roman Catholic sat on the bench in Poyntzpass; and can he hold out any hope that the alleged grievances of Roman Catholics in respect of the above matters will soon be remedied.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no official cognisance of post-office appointments. The dispensary medical officer was appointed by the Board of Guardians. With regard to the religious composition of the petty sessions bench, the lieutenant of the county will consider any recommendations that may be made to him.

HAMILTON SYNGE ESTATE, ARMAGH.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that twenty-two tenants on the Hamilton Syngé Estate, Tullinaval, county Armagh, served originating notices in April, 1899; that their cases were listed, and came before Mr. Edge, at Newtownhamilton, on 19th July, 1900, when they were adjourned at the instance of the receiver, Mr. Meares, who guaranteed to have all requests under Section 40 of The Land Act, 1896, issued at once; that these cases were again adjourned by Judge Ross in November, 1900; and seeing that, though the requests under Section 40 have been issued, the Land Court has not yet sent down two valuers to inspect the holdings, whether he can state when these valuers will be sent; when the cases will be heard; and

whether, if not heard before the proposed sale, a reduction in valuation will be made by the Court valuer in proportion to the reduction the tenants would probably have received had their cases come before the Sub-Commission in due course.

MR. WYNDHAM: In these cases the Land Commissioners, by Order made in November last, adjourned the fair-rent applications pending the result of proceedings under the 40th section of the Act of 1896. The estate is at present being inspected with a view to enable two of the Commissioners to report to the land judge in accordance with the requirements of this section. It would not, in the opinion of the Commissioners, be expedient to carry on the proceedings for fixing judicial rents concurrently with proceedings under Section 40.

IRISH HISTORICAL MANUSCRIPTS; FRANCISCANS' COLLECTION.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if the Historical MSS. Commission propose to publish all the valuable historical MSS. in the collection of the Irish Franciscans, or only that portion of them referred to in the late Sir John Gilbert's Report (Appendix to Report 4, Historical MSS. Commission), and whether the documents recited by Sir John Gilbert are being published in extenso; if he is aware that MSS., some of them

in Irish, are included in the MSS. of the Irish Franciscans which have never been examined by any representative of the Commission, including, among other papers, Father Wadding's Correspondence during the Confederation of Kilkenny, and if these MSS. will be published in a subsequent volume to the one now about to be published; and if the Commission will make use of the copies and translations of these documents made by the Franciscan Fathers or on their behalf.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Commissioners on Historical Manuscripts intend to publish abstracts or copies of all the historical manuscripts belonging to the Irish Franciscans in Dublin, whether previously noticed by Sir John Gilbert or not; but only such

of them as are of special importance will be printed at full length. The Commissioners are only aware of one letter in Irish in Father Wadding's correspondence and of one other letter in that language in the rest of the Franciscan collection. These two letters will, of course, be published in their Report on the manuscripts. Use has been made in the preparation of the Report of any copies and translations which the Franciscan Fathers have kindly placed at the disposal of the inspector under the Commission engaged on the work.

GREAT NORTHERN OF IRELAND RAILWAY;POYNTZPASS LEVEL CROSSING.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the Great Northern Railway Company, Ireland, allow their trains to remain on the level crossing in Poyntzpass for fifteen or twenty minutes at a time to the obstruction of the traffic; and, seeing that this practice is one of many years duration, whether he will take steps to ensure the construction of a footbridge at least, so that persons may pass through the town without danger or delay.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have no recent information on the subject of the hon. Member's question, but will cause inquiry to be made. The Board of Trade have not in any case power to order the construction of a footbridge at this crossing.

POYNTZPASS POSTAL STAFF.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the postmaster in Poyntzpass, county Armagh, Ireland, is a Protestant, and that four out of the five postmen are also Protestants; whether he can state the salaries of each of these postmen; and whether, seeing that the Roman Catholics constitute about one-half of the population of the district, he will see that their claims are not overlooked when future vacancies occur in the above posts.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is not aware what is the religion of this sub-postmaster or of the postmen under his control, as that is a matter with which the Department is in no way concerned. There are only two established postmen attached to the office, and their wages are 16s. a week each.

ARMY REORGANISATION.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will now place upon the Paper the terms of the resolution relating to

the new Army programme of the Government.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope the Secretary of State for War will be able to lay the terms of the resolution on the Table before the House separates for the Easter recess.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether there is to be any business on Tuesday besides the motion for the adjournment of the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the most convenient plan for Tuesday will be to have a morning sitting at 2 o'clock in order to take the motion for the adjournment over the Easter holidays. Of course there will be a 9 o'clock sitting, if the House desires it, to carry on private business; but there will be no Government business on Tuesday except the motion for the adjournment, unless, as I do not anticipate, we are unsuccessful in obtaining the Second Reading of the Army Bill on Monday.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I wish to put a question to the right hon. Gentleman. He has stated that the Demise of the Crown Bill is to be taken on Monday. I would respectfully urge that this Bill raises a very serious constitutional question; namely, whether in certain cases an appointment by the Crown should carry with it vacation of seat in the House of Commons. According to one view of the law, therefore, this Bill will be for present Ministers an indemnity Bill; and I would ask whether it is desirable to push forward such a serious and controversial question on the day before the holidays; and whether it would not be better to postpone the Bill until after Easter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that the Bill involves the grave constitutional question which the hon. Member describes; and I think that the House ought to be able very well to decide such a matter on Monday.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The right hon. Gentleman will not entertain the idea of postponement?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There is, as far as I can see, no adequate reason for postponing it.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

That they have appointed a Committee consisting of seven Lords to join with a Committee of the Commons, pursuant to Message of this House, to consider the various charitable agencies now in operation, and the funds available for relieving widows and orphans of soldiers and sailors, with a view to ensuring that the funds supplied by local and private benevolence are applied to the best advantage in supplementing a scheme of Government pensions for widows and orphans of soldiers and sailors who have lost their lives in war.

PRESENCE OF THE SOVEREIGN IN PARLIAMENT.

That they have appointed a Committee consisting of five Lords to join with a Committee of the Commons, pursuant to Message of this House, to consider the accommodation available in the House of Lords when the Sovereign is personally present in Parliament, and the advisability of substituting Westminster Hall on such an occasion for the House of Lords.

NEW BILLS.

HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES (REPAYMENT OF LOANS).

Bill to extend the period for the repayment of Loans raised for the provision of Workmen's Dwellings, and to confer further borrowing powers on local authorities, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hay, Mr. Bull, Mr. Duke, Mr. Evelyn Cecil, Mr. Flower, Mr. Goulding, Mr. Remnant, and Mr. H. S. Samuel.

HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES (REPAYMENT OF LOANS) BILL.

"To extend the period for the repayment of Loans raised for the provision of Workmen's Dwellings, and to confer further borrowing powers on local authorities," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 18th April, and to be printed. [Bill 133.]

TRAMWAYS (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Law relating to Light Railways and Tramways in Ireland, and to assimilate the Law relating thereto in Ireland to that in England, ordered to be brought in by Mr. O'Doherty. Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Archdale. Mr. Condon, Mr. Lonsdale, and Mr. Carvill.

TRAMWAYS (IRELAND) ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to Light Railways and Tramways in Ireland, and to assimilate the Law relating thereto in Ireland to that in England." presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st May, and to be printed. [Bill 134.]

NATIONAL GALLERY (PURCHASE OF ADJACENT LAND).

Bill for the acquisition of certain Land near the National Gallery in London, and for purposes connected therewith, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Akers Douglas and Mr. Austen Chamberlain.

NATIONAL GALLERY (PURCHASE OF ADJACENT LAND) BILL.

"For the acquisition of certain Land near the National Gallery in London, and for purposes connected therewith," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 18th April, and to be printed. [Bill 135.]

WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS JOINT COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That two Members be added to the Select Committee on Widows and Orphans of Soldiers and Sailors; Mr. Archdale and Colonel Nolan.; (Sir William Walrond.)

SUPPLY [3RD ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

1. £1,023,100, Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and Abroad.

SIR U. KAY-SHUTTLEWORTH (Lancashire, Clitheroe) said that the sum asked for was the largest which had ever been presented under this Vote. To this must be added another amount of much more than two millions for works under the Naval Works Act. The hon. Gentleman was called upon to administer on behalf of the Government an enormous sum, and he heartily congratulated him, and sympathised with him as well, on the great responsibility which rested upon him. The works under the Act were of very great importance, and the House was naturally anxious for the fullest information about them. He should like to know when the Naval

Works Bill would be introduced, and whether the fullest opportunities for discussion would be given. If he received an assurance that ample opportunity would be afforded for full debate, then he would not on the present occasion detain the Committee with any observations on naval works, for he would very much prefer to discuss that after the Civil Lord had made the customary statement in introducing the Naval Works Bill.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) asked for some explanation of the proposed expenditure on the boom defences of Southampton. Were not the Southampton Waters already adequately protected by the torpedo establishments at Spithead and the Needles? He would like also some information as to what was being done with the coaling arrangements at Simons Bay. He was told that there were only six lighters there, the biggest of which held but seventy tons, while the tug for moving them alongside was condemned as far back as 1894. In fact, she could not do her work in anything like a breeze. Were the Government and the Admiralty sufficiently alive to the deficiencies in this matter? Further, he wished to inquire if the dredging had been completed at Wei-hai-wei, and were the Admiralty satisfied that sufficient had been done in this matter. Finally, he had to ask what progress had been made for improved coaling facilities at the Falkland Islands.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said he found on reference to the Votes that whereas at English dockyards they were spending hundreds of thousands of pounds, at Haulbowline they only proposed to spend some £;4,000 odd. The disparity was very great, and it was rendered all the more remarkable by the fact that the money spent at Haulbowline was distributed over a number of years, and expended very slowly, whereas the money voted for the English dockyards was got rid of with much greater rapidity. He was not complaining of the action of the present Board of Admiralty with regard to Haulbowline, because it had shown a more generous spirit than its predecessor. Seeing that at Chatham, Sheerness, Portsmouth, Devonport, and Pembroke the Vote for works, buildings, etc., amounted to over half a million sterling, the very fact that only £;4,200 was to be given to Haulbowline illustrated the niggardly spirit in which the spending authorities of their great Departments dealt with Ireland. Passing on to the Vote for hospitals, he found that at Plymouth it was proposed to expend some £;65,000 and at Portland £;03,000, but at Haulbowline only £;13,000 was to be laid out, and that in spite of the fact that large numbers of His Majesty's ships entered Queenstown harbour and quite recently there had been outbreaks of smallpox, which had rendered it necessary to send some of the men into the hospitals there. He did hope that the £;17,000 which it was proposed now to spend at Haulbowline would be spent with dispatch, and that there would be no unnecessary delay in the matter. Then he came to the question of armaments, and here again there was another striking contrast. At Portsmouth £;47,000 was to be spent, but the Vote for Bantry Bay was only £;2,700, and of that only £;700 had yet been laid out. That again illustrated the manner in which the Admiralty treated this question when stations in Ireland were concerned. They had in the Cork post office a still further illustration of this, for the rebuilding of that establishment had been spread over three years, whereas an

ordinary contractor would have done the work in six months. He hoped that the Admiralty would make up their mind to push the work forward more rapidly, and treat Irish stations on an equal footing with English stations.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge) said that the Naval Works Bill would be brought in later in the session, but the exact date must be left to the decision of the Leader of the House. He hoped, however, that it would be introduced without much delay after the House assembled. Of course, it was not for him to give pledges with regard to the conduct of business, but he was perfectly certain there would be ample opportunity afforded for a full debate. The occasion of the introduction of the Naval Works Bill might be the most convenient time for discussing the great and important works which were included in the Bill. With reference to the position of Southampton, he might point out that it was almost a part of the great naval port of Portsmouth. Circumstances might arise when the Fleet would have to make temporary use of Southampton Waters; and it was for naval purposes and not for commercial purposes that this new defence was provided. Simons Bay and Falkland Islands were portions of great questions which were now receiving the most careful consideration with reference to the coaling of the Fleet. The work at Simons Bay was in progress, but it did not come under this Vote, and a fuller statement on that subject would be made later. The Falkland Islands were under consideration. Some of the work was being put out to contract, progress was being made. The object of spending money at the Falkland Islands was to secure that the position should be made available for coaling the Fleet. Replying to the hon. Member for North Cork, he admitted that the figures quoted by the hon. Member with reference to the expenditure at Haulbowline and Bantry Bay were less than those relating to the great dockyards in England. He assumed, however, that the hon. Member intended to take them in a proportionate sense, and would not expect to have so much money spent at a small dockyard as at a large one.

MR. FLYNN: I pointed out that the disproportion was so enormous.

*MR. PRETYMAN said he quite took it that the hon. Member's argument was based on the question of proportion, but he might also inform him that in addition to the sums he had quoted, £12,000 was being expended at Haulbowline, and no less than £63,000 was included in the Naval Works Act for other work in Ireland. He thought that would remove practically any cause of complaint. Altogether a sum of £75,000 was now actually being spent by the Admiralty in Ireland. It should be remembered that in devoting money to Haulbowline as they were now doing they were doing it with the prospect of making still greater use of that dockyard in future years, and of spending a still greater sum on ship repairing and building there. The money they were now voting might be taken as an earnest of what was to be spent in Ireland in the future. With regard to works at Bantry Bay, the hon. Member had complained of the slowness with which the money was being expended, but he would like to point out that it would be impossible to push forward the work with greater rapidity without importing a large quantity of labour from other districts. He did not imagine the hon. Member would desire that, and the Admiralty were acting under the belief that the ordinary

population of Bantry would really derive more advantage from a slow and continuous expenditure than

if thousands of pounds were laid out in one year.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) referred to the question of the rifle range for the Marines at Plymouth. The present accommodation was quite inadequate, and a long way from the town. Last year it was stated that the War Office had acquired a range on Dartmoor, and that the Admiralty had asked that Department to negotiate for a site which should be available for the rifle practice of the Marines. It was understood that there were great difficulties, presumably connected with the landlord element, in the way, and the hon. Member then in charge of the Vote suggested that the time had arrived when the War Office should proceed by Provisional Order. Had the arrangement for this most urgently needed rifle range site been concluded? The hon. Member expressed his approval of the expenditure at various dockyards in the erection of new workshops, and hoped the machinery would be of the most modern description. In some yards the machinery was much behind the times, and it was impossible for work to progress as rapidly as the country desired unless the machinery was up to date. At Devonport two docks had been widened to accommodate second class battleships, but unfortunately the width was not sufficient to accommodate battleships of the size now being built. The era of so-called second class battleships had passed away, and the hon. Member, therefore, suggested that by certain alterations the docks at Devonport could and should be made available for the class of ships now being built.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB, in reference to the item for booms to close the port at Southampton, thought it was the first time such a charge had appeared on the Navy Estimates. The business of the Navy was to keep the ports open, and the access to them clear. Southampton was an inner port in a completely and almost over-defended area, and in that respect differed from other ports. He should be glad if the matter could be explained.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): said this was no new departure; the boom arrangement had existed for some time at Southampton. The money was taken to repair a portion which had been destroyed by fire. It was impossible to regard Southampton as a port not involved in military matters. In connection with the present war, nearly the whole of the troops had gone from Southampton, while if any attack were made which involved Portsmouth harbour, Southampton harbour would be equally exposed; and certainly the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Great Yarmouth would be the last willingly to divorce military from naval operations. It was almost inconceivable, if this country was engaged in any military operations, that the embarkation or debarkation of troops would not be going on at Southampton Water, which it would be the duty of the Navy to safeguard. Therefore, although there might be objections to the principle of applying boom defence to the defence of harbours, if the principle was adopted at all, Southampton was eminently a place at which it should be applied.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield) thought the charge for booms was rather an Army than a Navy charge. There were two Votes affecting Hong Kong. It was an acknowledged fact that the defences of Hong Kong were in a hopelessly bad

state, and it would be interesting to have details of this expenditure. Something certainly ought to be done towards making Hong Kong more defensible now that it had become one of our most important strategic positions in regard to China. A considerable sum appeared to have been spent on dredging in Portsmouth harbour. But a very serious question arose. The entrance to the harbour was very narrow, and the more dredging operations took place the larger became the basin inside, with the result that the dredging had already increased the current in the mouth of the harbour to a dangerous extent. The Admiralty would not be acting wisely if they carried on these operations too largely without widening the aperture for letting the water in and out with the rise and fall of the tide.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe) asked whether Stanley harbour was being fortified, and urged the advisability of connecting it by cable with the Cape.

*MR. PRETYMAN said that the matter of the rifle range for the Marines was entirely in the hands of the War Office, and he believed the negotiations were not yet completed. He understood that a great number of small owners were concerned, but he had no absolute information on the matter generally. In regard to the Devonport docks, they had there at present one dock capable of taking the largest battleship, and new docks which were being constructed would take such ships. It was not felt necessary, therefore, to widen the present docks. In reference to the question of dredging at Portsmouth, that matter was being very carefully watched. There had been dredging above low water, but the volume had not been so largely increased, and this would accelerate the current at Portsmouth Harbour. This dredging had not been done to any dangerous extent. The question of providing guns at Hong Kong was a matter in which the War Office solely was concerned.

Resolution agreed to.

2. Motion made, and Question proposed. "That a sum, not exceeding £359,500, be granted to His Majesty to defray the expense of various Miscellaneous Effective Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March. 1902.

MR. FLYNN asked for some information in regard to the travelling allowance per diem to seamen and Marines. He presumed that the travelling expenses of naval marine officers should be something respectable. What was the amount allowed? Was it so much per day, or so much per hundred miles while travelling from one station to another? Not long ago he saw a steamer travelling to Ireland from Portsmouth with a number of Marines on board bound for Cork. They got in a train on the Great Western Railway, and he was assured that they were only allowed sixpence per day for supper for all the night, and the miserable breakfast they got in the morning. The result was that they were turned out on the quay at Cork more dead than alive. He did not think soldiers travelling all night and having to provide breakfast next morning should be paid the miserable sum of sixpence per day travelling allowance. With regard to Roman Catholic chaplains for the Navy, they were anxious to know if the hon. Member for West Belfast had anything to add in reference to Roman Catholic chaplains being attached to squadrons or services on shore being provided for. A large number of

Roman Catholic sailors who joined the Navy were anxious to receive the ministrations of their own faith. So great was the need in this matter that those connected with the Navy at Cork Harbour had established some kind of a guild to provide for these services for the sailors by private subscription. He hoped the Secretary to the Admiralty would have some additional information to give to the Committee in addition to what he gave last week. There was one other matter, to which he referred with some reluctance, and that was the trip of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to Australia. There was not a proper opportunity afforded a few nights ago when the hon. Member for Merthyr Tydvil asked how it was that the sum required for this trip was taken without the previous sanction of the House of Commons. He objected to this upon principle, and when the question was asked as to who was responsible for this expenditure being undertaken, the Chancellor of the Exchequer replied. "I am responsible." There was a question of principle involved in that, and the Admiralty should have got the sanction of the House of Commons to such a large expenditure before incurring it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had no right to violate this principle. He was quite aware that this trip was contemplated during the reign of the late Queen, and was suggested more or less by her. But neither the Admiralty nor the Chancellor of the Exchequer had asked for the money, and he objected to the idea that because the expedition had been commenced the money was to be voted sub silentio. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had no right to undertake such a responsibility without the previous sanction of the House.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said the hon. Member was under a misapprehension. The expedition had not been undertaken without the sanction of Parliament. A sum of £35,000 for this expedition was voted by the House on the Supplementary Estimates. If the item was struck out of the present Vote the expedition would have to be recalled, but the constitutional point which had been raised had been fully met. With regard to Roman Catholic chaplains, this Vote did not deal with the payment to chaplains on board ship or those attached to naval institutions. The other matter mentioned by the hon. Member was that the subsistence allowance of sixpence a day was only given to seamen and Marines travelling, from port to port. If the hon. Member could give him the particulars of a specific case he would investigate it. Within the last few days he had had occasion to examine the question of subsistence allowance both for men and boys on journeys from port to port, but he did not find that the facts corresponded with what the hon. Gentleman had suggested had come under his notice.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest-of-Dean) said there was one matter on this Vote which had not been mentioned; he meant the Vote for naval attaches. The increase was very large indeed, and he was entirely favourable to it. But no statement had been made as to the character of the new arrangements. What chiefly interested him was the necessity which undoubtedly existed for appointing really able men as military and naval attaches. If the hon. Gentleman would mention to the First Lord of the Admiralty the interest felt in the House in regard to the personality of the attaches, he would do a good service. It would be practically admitted that in the past the appointments had been of various degrees of merit. These appointments were of

the highest possible importance, but that importance depended entirely upon the character of the men selected.

MR. KEARLEY said he wanted to refer to the question which had been mentioned the previous week, namely, the grant to warrant officers of the Distinguished Service Order. Would the hon. Gentleman tell the Committee whether the warrant officers would receive any medal at all, and whether this Vote comprised the medals that were going to be issued in connection with the South African and Chinese campaigns. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman might say whether, since the previous week, the Admiralty had come to any conclusion as to the distribution of the Distinguished Service Order to warrant officers, or, if they were not to receive the distinguished Service Order, what decoration they might expect.

MR. FLYNN asked if the same rate of pay applied to seamen, the Marines travelling from one ship or station to another, partly by sea and partly by land, as was given to soldiers. He had seen seamen and Marines travelling between Bristol and Cardiff. The boat did not leave Milford till the morning, and could not get to Cork till eight o'clock at night. All that the men were allowed was 6d. for supper and 6d. next day for breakfast. He had asked the officer in charge, who told him that 6d. a day was all that the men got for subsistence. That was a most disgraceful and utterly inadequate allowance.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that unless the men were borne on the ship's books he was not responsible. In regard to what had been said as to naval attachés, it was of the highest importance that the officers appointed to represent the Navy should be selected with the greatest care. It would tend to make the selection of first-rate officers easier if the emoluments were increased. These emoluments were being increased, and the remainder of the increase in the Vote was due to the fact that a fourth naval attaché had been appointed. The hon. Member for Devonport had asked if he could make a statement now in regard to decorations for warrant officers in the South African War and the Chinese campaign. He regretted he could not do so. He should be loth to make any statement until the announcement could be made in a complete form, not only as to the honorary distinctions to be granted, but also as to the question of emoluments. These two questions

would have to be dealt with in a different way, and when a decision had been arrived at by the Admiralty, he would be happy to inform the hon. Member.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER asked whether the large increase in the Vote for naval attachés was for salaries and expenses in addition to their pay, for he supposed that they got their pay under another Vote. The hon. Gentleman had spoken about some of the salaries being increased and of the appointment of a fourth attaché. Did that mean that there were only four naval attachés altogether?

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) said he noticed under head A an increase of £6,000, with reference to passage money and the conveyance of officers, seamen, and Marines. He wanted to know how that increase arose, and what proportion was paid to officers, seamen, and Marines respectively.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he could not give the hon. Member the actual details, but the increase in the Vote was due to the fact that more officers and men had

been sent out this year for reliefs to South Africa and others had been brought back and had received passages by mail steamers. With regard to the naval attachés, the present arrangement was that these officers received a consolidated rate of pay, and they were also granted, of course, certain travelling allowances, and special allowances for special work. As to their distribution, there were at present two attachés in Europe, with headquarters at Paris and Berlin. There were also two naval attachés whose duty it was to obtain information with regard to naval progress in the United States and Japan.

CAPTAIN NORTON said that they ought to have had a schedule showing the different rates of passage money for the different classes, and whether the rates varied with different steamship companies.

MR. FLYNN said there was an item of £2,500, loss by exchange and discount on bills drawn by the accountants on the China and East India stations. Considering the number of rupees given for an English sovereign, there ought to have been a gain instead of a loss.

CAPTAIN NORTON asked the right hon. Gentleman if he could state the various rates for pilotage and towing of His Majesty's ships. Was this system by tonnage or otherwise?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he was afraid he could not answer the latter question off-hand. He referred hon. Gentlemen to the statute which governed the question of the reduced charges for men, and to the very elaborate details with reference to the particulars and allowances. Pilots were to a large extent dispensed with in His Majesty's ships, but there were some small items for pilotage. The bulk of the sum, however, was for towing.

MR. FLYNN complained that no answer had been given to the important
AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)

Gilhooly, James

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Allen, Charles P (Glouc, Stroud

Goddard, Daniel Ford

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Grant, Corrie

O'Dowd, John

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Harwood, George

O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)

Black, Alexander William

Hayden, John Patrick

Oldroyd, Mark

Blake, Edward

Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)

O'Malley, William

Boland, John

Horniman, Frederick John
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Boyle, James
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Philipps, John Wynford
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jacoby, James Alfred
Reckitt, Harold James
Caine, William Sproston
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Reddy, M.
Caldwell, James
Joyce, Michael
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Cameron, Robert
Kearley, Hudson E.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lambert, George
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Cogan, Denis J.
Leamy, Edmund
Stevenson, Francis S.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leng, Sir John
Sullivan, Donal
Craig, Robert Hunter
Lewis, John Herbert
Tennant, Harold John
Crean, Eugene.
Lundon, W.
Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan Gower
Cremer, William Randal
M'Fadden, Edward
Ure, Alexander
Crombie, John William
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Cullinan, J.
Markham, Arthur Basil
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Delany, William
Mooney, John J.

Weir, James Galloway
Donelan, Captain A.
Murphy, J.
White, Luke (York. E. R.)
Doogan, P. C.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Dunn, Sir William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Yoxall, James Henry
Ffrench, Peter
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Mr. Flynn and Captain Norton.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
O'Doherty, William
NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

question he put. The hon. Gentleman could without referring to any schedule merely give an approximate idea of how much of this sum was for railway and steamboat fares and how much was for the maintenance of the men when travelling on service. As the explanation of the hon. Gentleman had been so unsatisfactory, he moved to reduce the Vote by £;100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A be reduced by £;100.";(Mr. Flynn).

MR. WARNER said that when the hon. Gentleman referred to the "statute" he no doubt referred to the Army Annual Bill, which put the allowance at 6d. a day. He contended that that sum was far too small.

Question put.

The Committee divided::Ayes, 87; Noes, 195. (Division List No. 111).

Austin, Sir John
Hain, Edward
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Baird, John George Alexander
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Parker, Gilbert
Banbury, Frederick George
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Partington, Oswald
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale
Plummer, Walter R.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Helme, Norval Watson
Pretymann, Ernest George
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Henderson, Alexander
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Higginbottom, S. W.
Purvis, Robert
Boulnois, Edmund
Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)
Randles, John S.
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Rankin, Sir James
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Horner, Frederick William
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Rea, Russell
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil
Renwick, George
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Causton, Richard Knight
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Rigg, Richard
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt. Hn Sir U
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Kimber, Henry
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Charrington, Spencer
Kitson, Sir James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Law, Andrew Bonar
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lawson, John Grant
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Colomb, Sir J. Chas. Ready
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Leigh, Sir Joseph

Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Leighton, Stanley
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Levy, Maurice
Spear, John Ward
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Spencer, Rt. Hn C R (Northants
Cust, Henry John C.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Strachey, Edward
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Stroyan, John
Dewar, John A. (Invernesshire
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets S Geo.
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Macdona, John dimming
Thornton, Percy M.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Maconochie, A. W.
Valentia, Viscount
Duke, Henry Edward
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H (Shef'ld
Duncan, James H.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Wallace, Robert

Edwards, Frank
Majendie, James A. H.
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Malcolm, Ian
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Emmott, Alfred
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Faber, George Denison
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigton
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset).
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Milton, Viscount
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
Montagu, G (Huntingdon)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Garfit, William
Morrell, George Herbert
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
Morrison, James Archibald
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'mlets
Mount, William Arthur
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Gorst, Rt Hon. Sir John Eldon
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Goulding, Edward Alfred

Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Mr. Anstruther and Mr. Hayes Fisher.
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry. S Edm'ds
Nicholson, William Graham

Original Question again proposed.

MR. KEARLEY drew attention to the item of wages of the Metropolitan police employed in the dockyards, and asked if it were intended to make the same concession to the police of Devonport as had been made to the Metropolitan police. That concession had been made in consequence of the high rents the men had to pay in London. It was a matter of common notoriety that the rental conditions prevailing at Devonport were even higher than those prevailing in London. The last Census Returns had called attention to the enormous overcrowding in the town, and showed that a very large percentage of the people were housed in a single room. If the police of Devonport did not get this concession granted to them it would be most unfair. Of course they knew that Devonport was a landlord's monopoly pure and simple. He agreed that the population had no means of extricating themselves, but that was no reason, when a concession was made on a definite basis, that it should not be extended to another place suffering under precisely the same conditions. He begged to move the reduction of this item by £;100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item S be reduced by £;100, in respect of the Salaries of the Water Police";(Mr. Kearley.)

CAPTAIN NORTON asked whether any portion of the amount for contingent expenses could be used for lodging allowance, or whether anything had been given to these men in the shape of lodging allowance. It would be in the recollection of the Committee that an increase was given to the Metropolitan police force as a special allowance for lodging-house accommodation. It was manifestly unjust that a similar allowance should not be made to the men at Devonport. With regard to the water police, he wished to know whether it was the case that when they succeeded in rescuing a person from drowning they received no compensation whatever, whereas if the individual was allowed to drown and they succeeded in getting out the corpse they were allowed something.

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Burns, John
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Delany, William
Asher, Alexander
Caine, William Sproston
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Caldwell, James
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles

Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry
Cameron, Robert
Donelan, Captain A.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Doogan, P. C.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Duffy, William J.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Causton, Richard Knight
Duke, Henry Edward
Bell, Richard
Cogan, Denis J.
Duncan, James H.
Black, Alexander William
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Dunn, Sir William
Blake, Edward
Craig, Robert Hunter
Edwards, Frank
Boland, John
Crean, Eugene
Emmott, Alfred
Boyle, James
Cremer, William Randal
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Crombie, John William
Ffrench, Peter
Burke, E. Haviland
Cullinan, J.
Flavin, Michael Joseph

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER asked whether the hon. Member was speaking of the police on the Thames within the Metropolitan area, or the police under the control of the Admiralty.

CAPTAIN NORTON said he was alluding to the water police. He presumed they were under the Admiralty if they were in the Admiralty Vote.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said the Admiralty had nothing to do with the pay and allowances of the water' police. They were sent down by the authorities of the Metropolitan police for service under the Admiralty in the dockyards, and the Admiralty paid the sum demanded by the authorities of the Metropolitan police with the sanction of the Treasury.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said the Amendment before the Committee raised a question of principle, namely, that an allowance ought to be extended to the men at Devonport. When the question was last before the House the First Lord of the

Admiralty promised to inquire into it. The hon. Gentleman representing the Admiralty had not attempted to discuss the question or to give any official answer to the case that had been made out. The hon. Gentleman said this was a question for the Metropolitan police authorities. The authority immediately responsible for this was the Admiralty, If his hon. friend divided the Committee on the question he should feel bound to support the Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 128: Noes, 173. (Division List No. 112.)

Flynn, James Christopher

Lough, Thomas

Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

Lundon, W.

Redmond, William (Clare)

Gilhooly, James

M'Dermott, Patrick

Rigg, Richard

Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John

M'Fadden, Edward

Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)

Goddard, Daniel Ford

M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)

Grant, Corrie

Markham, Arthur Basil

Schwann, Charles E.

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Mooney, John J.

Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)

Haldane, Richard Burdon

Murphy, J.

Shipman, Dr. John G.

Harmsworth, R. Leicester

Nannetti, Joseph P.

Smith, Samuel (Flint)

Harwood, George

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants

Hay, Hon. Claude George

Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Stevenson, Francis S.

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)

Strachey, Edward

Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale

O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)

Sullivan, Donal
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Tennant, Harold John
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Doherty, William
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r
Jacoby, James Alfred
O'Donnell, J. (Mayo, S.)
Ure, Alexander
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Wallace, Robert
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Dowd, John
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William
Weir, James Galloway
Kitson, Sir James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Lambert, George
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Partington, Oswald
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Leamy, Edmund
Philipps, John Wynford
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Pickard, Benjamin
Yoxall, James Henry
Leng, Sir John
Price, Robert John
Levy, Maurice
Rea, Russell
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Lewis, John Herbert
Reckitt, Harold James
Mr. Kearley and Mr. Warner.
Lloyd-George, Herbert

Reddy, M.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex F.

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden

Cripps, Charles Alfred

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)

Kimber, Henry

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Cust, Henry John C.

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Laurie, Lieut.-General

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Dewar, T. R (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo.

Law, Andrew Bonar

Atkinson, Right Hon. John

Dickson, Charles Scott

Lawson, John Grant

Austin, Sir John

Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon

Lee, Arthur H. (Hants. Fareh'm

Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitz Roy

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Long, Col Charles W. (Evesham

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart

Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas

Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Baird, John George Alexander

Faber, George Denison

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

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

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)

Fielden, Edw. Brocklehurst

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Banbury, Frederick George
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Macdona, John Cumming
Bhownaggre, Sir M. M.
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Bignold, Arthur
Fletcher, Sir Henry
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Garfit, William
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Majendie, James A. H.
Boulnois, Edmund
Gordon, Maj. Evans- (Tr.Hmlts)
Malcolm, Ian
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlex)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Bullard, Sir Harry
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds)
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n)
Butcher, John George
Hain, Edward
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Milton, Viscount
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire-
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Henderson, Alexander
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst.)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Morrell, George Herbert
Charrington, Spencer
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Morrison, James Archibald
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brights'de
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Horner, Frederick William
Mount, William Arthur
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Houldsworth, Sir William Hy.
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Nicholson, William Graham
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Nicol, Donald Ninian
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Sackville, Col. S G. Stopford-
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Parker, Gilbert
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Welby, Sir Charles G. E (Notts.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Sharpe, William Edward T.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Plummer, Walter R.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Smith, H C (Northumb. Tyneside)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Pryce Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Spear, John Ward
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Purvis, Robert
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)
Randles, John S.
Stroyan, John
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Rankin, Sir James
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Rasch, Major Frederic Came
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Renwick, George
Thornton, Percy M.
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Tomlinson, Wm. Ed. Murray
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. Thomson
Valentia, Viscount
Mr. Anstruther and Mr. Hayes Fisher.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield)
Original Question again proposed.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) asked whether the amount for telegraphic communications covered wireless telegraphy, as it had been stated that very important experiments had been made.

*THE CHAIRMAN ruled that, as the item dealing with this matter had been passed, the subject could not now be discussed.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS then alluded to the contributions in aid of charitable and

religious institutions, and asked what institutions were referred to. There were also contributions in aid of sailors' homes. These were excellent institutions, saving sailors from the temptations which beset them on shore, and tending to preserve their reputation and character, and that only £1,000 should be given to such institutions was parsimony in a direction in which it was not desirable. MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) directed attention to the large amount required in connection with the special journey of the "Ophir" to Australia. There were £126,000 for hire, and

£56,000 for the fitting up, and the fittings were actually to be sold on the return of the ship for £3,300. It was very desirable that some explanation of that great difference should be given.

MR. KEARLEY, referring to an item for the hire of foreign interpreters, and commenting on the fact that the bulk of the young fellows entering the Navy had no knowledge of any language other than their own, suggested that the Admiralty would be taking an admirable step in connection with the training of their officers if, instead of troubling about the classics, they insisted that no cadet should be taken into the Navy who had not a good colloquial knowledge of, at all events, German and French. In regard to the training of carrier pigeons, he asked for information as to where the operations were being carried on, and the place to and from which the pigeons were being trained to fly. At Dover he had seen a consignment of pigeons landed from Germany, in the custody of German officials connected with the Army or Navy, and those birds were released at Dover to fly back to Kiel or wherever else they had come from. The Committee were entitled to know whether the Admiralty had similar facilities granted to them with regard to flying pigeons from Germany to England.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER, who was very indistinctly heard, was understood to state that contributions were made from naval funds only to institutions directly connected with the interests of the Navy, and were usually limited to £50 for each institution. It would no doubt be satisfactory to many if the Admiralty were to give largely to deserving institutions, but the need must be proved before further funds could be asked for. With regard to the "Ophir," the hon. Member for West Islington was wrong in supposing that the £3,300 was for the whole of the fittings. About three-fourths of the fittings would not be required after the conclusion of the voyage, and the contractors were willing to take them back at a fixed price. As to the increase for telegraphic communication, it was due to telephonic connection at the principal dockyard ports.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) wished to know the principle on which the £340 now asked for was distributed for religious institutions. If it was between all the religious institutions in the land the amount was very inadequate. It was very important that there should be an equable distribution between the different denominations, and that no invidious distinction should be made between Nonconformists and Church bodies. Precisely the same remark applied to allowances to ministers of religion. With regard to the hire of foreign interpreters, it was admitted on all sides that it was better to have a

knowledge of modern languages than of Latin and Greek; and it would certainly be a great advantage for naval officers themselves to be able to speak languages instead of employing interpreters. It was impossible to carry on a really satisfactory conversation through an interpreter, as he was always likely to put his own gloss on the matter.

CAPTAIN NORTON asked whether the Committee were to understand that these contributions in aid of religious institutions were for the purpose of encouraging or developing religion. If that was the object the amount was totally inadequate. If, however, the contributions were merely doles to certain religious institutions, the Committee were entitled to know whether any undue preference was given to any one sect over another. In regard to the contributions to sailors' homes, he asked how many of those homes there were, and how much was given to each. Surely the home at Portsmouth received more than £;50, as it would be manifestly unfair to give only that sum to such a home, doing so much work, and to give an exactly similar amount to some small institution which did comparatively little. As to the hire of interpreters, were those interpreters in out-of-the-way places and for languages not usually studied? It would

also be interesting to know whether any incentive was given to naval cadets and officers to perfect themselves in modern languages. In most other navies the officers before they entered the service were encouraged to learn at least English as one language, and special facilities were given to enable them to visit other countries for the purpose of passing as interpreters. A somewhat similar system prevailed with regard to our own officers in the Army, especially those attached to the Indian Army with reference to the learning of Russian. Was there any such system in connection with the Navy? In view of the vast development of the Russian navy, the fact that Russia had now an outlet in the Pacific, and seeing that our Fleet in Chinese waters had been increased, some incentive ought to be given to our naval officers to study Russian. Twenty years ago positively not a single officer in the Army knew Russian, and at the present moment he believed only one officer in the Navy had a knowledge of the language. If any misfortune happened to that particular officer we should have to depend upon an interpreter, who, in all probability, would be a Polish Jew, to negotiate between ourselves and the Russians upon any matter connected with the Navy. The training of carrier pigeons also was a matter of considerable importance. It was known that quite recently a pigeon-loft had been erected at Aldershot, and a distinguished officer placed in charge thereof. In Continental centres pigeons had been used for some time and found of the greatest value, and certainly they could be used with much advantage in the event of naval warfare between ourselves and any Continental Power. He therefore asked whether there was a proper loft for the training of these pigeons; if so, where; and also whether there was any intention of extending the practice, so as to provide a complete system of pigeon carriers throughout the British Isles.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said the Committee might rest assured that the small sum of £;350 for contributions to religious denominations was not spent in propping up any particular denomination. Small contributions were given in large dockyard

towns in assisting

institutions connected with the places of worship attended by the sailors, and one denomination was not favoured more than another. With regard to the hire of interpreters, he believed that a considerable portion of the amount was with reference to interpreters in Chinese, and he could hardly suppose, the hon. Member would suggest that naval officers should qualify in that language. It might be possible to encourage the study of French and German among boys before they entered the "Britannia"; but it was one of the misfortunes of the naval service that it was not possible to give enough leave to junior officers to enable them to study foreign languages abroad. Facilities were afforded for the study of Russian, and a gratuity of £;150 was paid to any officer who would qualify as an interpreter in Russian. This year steps had been taken to improve young officers in regard to their knowledge of foreign languages.

CAPTAIN NORTON said the Secretary to the Admiralty did not state whether opportunities were afforded these officers to study Russian in Russia, as well as granting them £;150. No man could acquire a good knowledge of Russian without six months residence at Moscow. ["Oh, oh."] He was speaking from experience, and he knew that no man could get anything like a knowledge of the Russian language without spending six months in some portion of the Russian Empire. It was absurd to offer £;150, because living was so dear abroad. If the only incentive to learn Russian was the granting of a bonus of £;150 after a man had succeeded in passing a most difficult examination, this inducement was practically a dead letter.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) said he understood that the answer given by the hon. Gentleman applied to places of worship largely frequented by Marines and seamen. There was an item of £;7,300 in the Vote given to ministers of religion. He wished to know whether the sum given to ministers of religion was distributed in the same way as the sum given to religious and charitable institutions. Was it given in a proportionate manner, and without regard to any particular denomination?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that at the ports frequently or occasionally visited by men-of-war money was granted to ministers of various denominations, some of the ministers belonging to the Church of England, others to the Roman Catholics, and some to the Nonconformists. Altogether some 200 or 300 grants were made, varying in amount from £;25 to

£;200. He had no reason to believe that the sums granted were inadequate. With regard to interpreters, while facilities were given to officers on half-pay to study foreign languages abroad, the duties of the naval service were such that it was very rare indeed that naval officers, especially junior naval officers, could go to foreign countries.

CAPTAIN NORTON asked if it was at all likely that any naval officer occupying the position of a naval commander could go to Russia to study Russian under such circumstances.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER replied that it was not at all unlikely. They did it in the Army, and he hoped advantage would be taken of this offer in the Navy.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) desired to know on what principle the money

granted to ministers was allocated. Was it distributed according to the number of men who attended the services?

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that in some cases the money was allocated in accordance with the number of men who attended a particular place of worship, and in some cases according to the services of the minister. If the hon. Member desired to see the list of these ministers he should be very pleased to allow him the opportunity of doing so, and he would give him any further information which he desired. They were spread not only throughout the United Kingdom, but all over the world, and the money was distributed without regard to any particular denominations.

CAPTAIN NORTON asked if the Secretary to the Admiralty could state whether it was true or not that at the present moment there was not a single commander in the Navy qualified to act as an interpreter in Russian. Some further incentive should be given to officers of all ranks, and they should be placed in the same position as the officers in the Indian Army, who were allowed to draw their full pay, their bonus, and their travelling expenses during the whole time they were away in Russia studying that language. Seeing the importance of officers possessing a knowledge of Russian at the present time, he wished to know whether the Admiralty were prepared to offer the officers in the Navy similar advantages in regard to the study in Russian to those at present offered to the officers in the Indian Army.

MR. LAMBERT said the hon. Gentleman had not told them directly that no denomination was favoured under his scheme. If the sailors went to the Established Church, surely they did not want to give an other salary to the minister. If the sailors went to a Nonconformist place of worship, then there would be an excuse for adding something to the very small salaries which Nonconformist ministers received. They did not want any favouritism displayed, and if the Admiralty were going to endow any particular denomination they would object to it in the strongest possible way. He wished to know by whom the grants were made, He felt that unless he was able to get a satisfactory assurance from the hon. Member on these points he should have to take the sense of the House about giving a new endowment to a particular religious denomination.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS pointed out that the Secretary to the Admiralty had not given any information with reference to the training of carrier pigeons. The hon. Member for Devonport raised that question, and he showed that the German

AYES.

Abraham, Win. (Cork, N. E.)

Black, Alexander William

Cameron, Robert

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)

Blake, Edward

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Ambrose, Robert

Boland, John

Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton

Asher, Alexander

Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Causton, Richard Knight
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Boyle, James
Cogan, Denis J.
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry
Burke, E. Haviland
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Burns, John
Craig, Robert Hunter
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Crean, Eugene
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Caine, William Sproston
Crombie, John William
Bell, Richard
Caldwell, James
Cullinan, J.

Government gave every possible facility to this system, He wished to know whether the Government were going to afford similar facilities in this country. It was a question of the most important nature, because our international relations were now of a kaleidoscopic character and we ought to be fully prepared. With regard to languages, he knew that a great many Russian officers spoke English, and he thought this language ought to be encouraged more amongst English naval officers.

MR. LAMBERT said that as a protest against the vague manner in which the questions he raised had been answered, he would move to reduce the Vote by £;40. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item I be reduced by £;40, in respect of Contributions in Aid of Religious Institutions.";(Mr. Lambert.)

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) said there was only one Church represented on His Majesty's vessels, and that was the Established Church. Therefore the amount voted under this Vote to chaplains was a new form of endowment of the Established Church, and should be so treated.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: This Vote has nothing to do with chaplains on hoard ship.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member has mistaken the item, which relates to contributions made to religious and charitable institutions.

Question put.

The Committee divided;;Aves, 130; Noes, 183. (Division List No. 113.)

Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Price, Robert John
Delany, William
Leamy, Edmund
Rea, Russell

Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Reckitt, Harold James
Donelan, Capt. A.
Leng, Sir John
Reddy, M.
Doogan, P. C.
Levy, Maurice
Redmond, John E (Waterford)
Duffy, William.).
Lewis, John Herbert
Redmond, William (Clare)
Dunn, Sir William
Lough, Thomas
Rigg, Richard
Edwards, Frank
Lundon, W.
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Emmott, Alfred
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Robson, William Snowdon
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
M'Dermott, Patrick
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
M'Fadden, Edward
Schwarm, Charles E.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Ffrench, Peter
Markham, Arthur Basil
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Mooney, John J.
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Flynn, James Christopher
Murphy, J.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Strachey, Edward
Gilhooly, James
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Sullivan, Donal
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John

Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Tennant, Harold John
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Grant, Corrie
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Wallace, Robert
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Connor, James (Wicklow)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Harwood, George
O'Doherty, William
Weir, James Galloway
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
White, Luke (York, E. K.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Dowd, John
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon. N.)
Wilson, Fred. W (Norfolk, Mid.
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Malley, William
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Yoxall, James Henry
Jacoby, James Alfred
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Partington, Oswald
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Phillips, John Wynford
Mr. Lambert and Mr. Kearley.

Joyce, Michael
Pickard, Benjamin
Kitson, Sir James
Power, Patrick Joseph
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Garfit, William
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. F.
Gordon, Rt Hn J E (Elgin & N'irn
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'wer H'mlts.
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athol'e
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (M'dx)
Austin, Sir John
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitz Roy
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Cranborne, Viscount
Haslam, Sir Alfred S
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Baird, John George Alexander
Cross, Herb, Shepherd (Bolton)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Cust, Henry John C.

Henderson, Alexander
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Higginbottom, S. W.
Ban bury, Frederick George
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Dewar, T. R (T'rH'mlets, S Geo.
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Horner, Frederick William
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Dilke, Rt. Hon Sir Charles
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Bignold, Arthur
Dimsdale, Sir J. Cockfield
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Bigwood, James
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Boulnois, Edmund
Duke, Henry Edward
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Kenyon-Slaney, Col W. (Salop.)
Bull, William James
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Kimber, Henry
Bullard, Sir Harry
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W'm.
Butcher, John George
Faber, George Denison
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn F M ward
Law, Andrew Bonar
Cautley, Henry Strother
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lawson, John Grant

Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Finch, George H.
Lee, Arthur H(Hants., Fareh'm
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Charrington, Spencer
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Smith, H C (Northumb Tyns'ide
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Spear, John Ward
Macartney, Rt Hon W G Ellison
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Macdona, John Cumming
Parker, Gilbert
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Peel, Hn. William Robert W.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Penn, John
Thornton, Percy M.
Majendie, James A. H.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Tomlinson, William Edw. M.
Malcolm, Ian
Plammer, Walter R.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Manners, Lord Cecil

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Valentia, Viscount
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Pretymann, Ernest George
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Maxwell, Rt. Hon. Sir H. E. (Wigtown)
Purvis, Robert
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire)
Randles, John S.
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Nottingham)
Meysey Thompson, Sir H. M.
Rankin, Sir James
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Rasch, Major Frederick C.
Wilson, Arthur S. (York, E. R.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Rentoul, James Alexander
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Renwick, George
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow)
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestershire, N.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Richie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Morrison, James Archibald
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Mount, William Arthur
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Mr. Anstruther and Mr. Hayes Fisher.

Nicholson, Wm. Graham

Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)

Original Question again proposed.

CAPTAIN NORTON said he understood that the Government would be not unwilling to meet them in reference to certain Estimates if they granted facilities for the passage of Votes 10, 11, 13, and 15. Vote; 5 was a labour Vote, in which, as a South London Member, he took very special interest, for it contained a very hard case of some 300 men who were employed by the Government at a wage of only 20s. per week, out of which they were obliged to pay some 9s. per week for rooms.

This was a scandal to any Government, and he took it that this Vote would not be placed after Votes 8, 9, and 12, but that Vote 2 would be taken first.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER'S reply was inaudible.

CAPTAIN NORTON said he did not wish to prolong the discussion in regard to naval interpreters, but the answer he had received had been most unsatisfactory. He expressed the hope that increased facilities would be given to naval officers to acquire Continental languages.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked if the question of the Catholic chaplains in the Navy could be raised

on Vote 11, or whether it would be more properly taken on Vote 12.

*THE CHAIRMAN did not think the question of Catholic chaplains in the Navy could be raised on the Vote under discussion, as what was proposed was to give a sum of money to ministers of religion on shore.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said he wished to put it to the Secretary to the Admiralty that if it were good policy to have religious services for sailors of all denominations, it was part of that policy that the Estimates should contain an allowance for chaplains on shore. He had been told by men connected with the Navy that the service ashore was not altogether of the kind which met the spiritual needs and habits of the sailors. For that reason, it was very difficult to get the sailors to leave their ships and go to service on shore.

Therefore, if the Secretary to the Admiralty had to choose between having a chaplain on shore and a chaplain with a place on board ship, and chose the former, he would be making an unwise decision, and one not in consonance with the feelings and habits of sailors. This was a question on which his countrymen felt very strongly. It had been raised for a quarter of the century, and no solution of it had yet been found.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that the Vote was not for any services held on His Majesty's ships. It was simply for allowances, either by grant or contribution, in respect to attendance on the services of ministers who were not connected in any way with the Royal Navy.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND accepted the statement of the hon. Gentleman, but said he would take an early opportunity of calling attention to the fact that not a single penny was given to any minister except ministers of the Church of

England. He had not the slightest objection to ministers of the Church of England receiving allowances; but it was unfair that the Roman, Catholic and the Nonconformist ministers received no allowances. He would also raise the question, of the rank of Catholic chaplains on board ship and on, shore. The Catholic priest on, shore did not get the same rank as the Protestant clergyman. CAPTAIN NORTON said he had no desire to go to a division, for the hon. Gentleman had met them very fairly; but they must have some explanation in regard to the question of interpreters. The hon. Member for the Stroud Division of Gloucestershire had told him that he had spent six months in Russia, and that the result was practically nil; and, therefore, unless some special incentive was given to officers to study languages, the result would be that in Chinese matters they would have no officer capable of interpreting in Russian, He hoped the hon. Gentleman would do everything possible to give an incentive to either half pay or full pay officers to study languages.

*MR. ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud) said that the hon. Member for West Newington had exaggerated a little but was in the main correct. He had worked very hard at Russian at home, and then went out to Russia, where he studied for six months, working eight hours a day, and living with a Russian family the whole time. At the end of that period he found that, while he could get along well enough with reading novels and the newspapers, he could not read documents or anything of that kind. His experience was that nobody could go to Russia and learn Russian to an extent that would be really useful under twelve months solid hard work.

Question put and agreed to.

3. £;790,900, Half-Pay, Reserved, and Retired Pay.

4. £;340,600, Civil Pensions and Gratuities.

5. £;219,000, Medical Establishments and Services.

6. £;10,200, Martial Law, etc.

MR. KEARLEY said he wished under this Vote to refer to the ineligibility of Marine officers to sit on courts-martial when afloat. They had the privilege when ashore not only to sit on courts-martial but even to act as president; but, notwithstanding the fact that the Marine officers constituted one-fifth of the personnel of the Navy, they had not that right when serving afloat. This matter was brought before the House many years ago by Sir John Pope Hennessy, who was assured by the First Lord of the Admiralty of the day that the matter would be remedied, He, in fact, went out of his way to emphasise his definite promise by saying that the Naval Lords of the Admiralty recognised the justice of the claims of the Marine officers. He was aware that it was said that if this claim were to be conceded the doctors and the paymasters would demand the same privileges, He had nothing to do with that. All he asserted was that the Marines were a large and effective force in the Navy, and thought by some to be the best body of men in the service of the country; and it was monstrous that they should be excluded from this privilege, and it bred a great amount of discontent. The seaman part of the Navy entertained a pre judice against Marine officers sitting on courts-martial; they would exclude everybody from enjoying any privilege which they enjoyed. They had also the greatest possible objection to giving the

engineer officers the position they ought to take; but he did not raise that point specifically at this moment, although engineer officers were precluded from sitting on courts-martial. He appealed to the hon. Gentleman, and to any fair-minded man in the House, as to whether this privilege should any longer be denied to the Marine officers, and he hoped that the hon. Gentleman would be able to give a pledge that this injustice would be remedied.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB said he entirely supported the view that Marine officers who were combatant officers, and who were equal in every respect, except that of handling the ships, to the naval officers should be eligible to sit on courts-martial on board ship. It did not follow that any admiral at sea would be compelled to appoint a Marine officer on any particular court-martial, but Marine officers should be eligible to sit according to their rank. He well remembered the distinct pledge given by a former First Lord of the Admiralty that this would be remedied. He wished to take exception, to the use of the word "prejudice," on the part of naval officers, by the hon. Member for Devonport. Whatever prejudice there might have been in the past there was none now. Looked at from every point of view, to concede this function to the Marine officers would be to the advantage of the public service. He would remind the Committee, more over, that the Marine officers, whether infantry or artillery, were the only officers instructed in the principles of law. He knew how keenly this matter was felt in the service, and, in the interests of the efficiency of the service and the well-being of the Fleet, he hoped it would be remedied. MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport) said that Marine officers not being eligible to sit on courts-martial at sea, involved not only an, injustice to the Marine officers, but to the men. The Marines would have much greater confidence in the equity of the courts-martial if their own officers were allowed to sit upon them.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that the hon. Members who had spoken had put very forcibly their arguments in favour of the concession. It happened that at present officers of the Royal Marines were qualified to sit on courts-martial ashore, but not afloat. In his opinion, if ever the Admiralty were to change their views with regard to this subject, it appeared to him that it would be preferable that the Marines should take their places on courts-martial as officers of the Navy, and not merely as assessors representing the Marines, there being, as far as he was aware no such want of confidence in the existing courts as had been suggested by the junior Member for Devonport.

Resolution agreed to.

7. £100,600, Educational Services.

8. £65,800, Scientific Services.

ARMY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

9. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £119,200, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge for Establishments for Military Education, which will come in course, of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902."

MR. COURTENAY WARNER pointed out that no one representing the War Office was present, and asked whether, under the circumstances this Vote might he

postponed.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) asked whether, seeing the difficulty in which the Committee was placed, it would not be better to postpone the Vote until the questions which it was desired to raise could be, answered by some representative of the War Office.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY ((Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The hon. Gentleman appreciates what has happened. The arrangement between the two sides of the House has produced, as it sometimes does, an amazing drying up of the fountains of eloquence, with the result that Votes have been obtained with regard to subjects which to all appearances would have kept the Committee many hours in discussing. This is very satisfactory and gratifying, but my right hon. friend

the Secretary of State for War, not expecting this happy consummation, has gone to the War Office to carry on his exceptionally laborious duties. I have, however, telephoned for my right hon. friend, and expect him to arrive in a few minutes; so if hon. Gentlemen do not mind putting their questions, I will take them down and my right hon. friend will be able to answer them when he comes.

CAPTAIN NORTON disclaimed any desire to take an unfair advantage of the absence of the Secretary for War. He desired to point out that a stereotyped sum of £550 was put down for promoting efficiency in languages. This was exactly the same sum as had been voted last year, and he regretted that the War Office had not seen fit to offer an increased incentive to our officers to study modern languages. At the present time we were suffering severely in South Africa from the lack of knowledge on the part of our officers of the Dutch language. He contrasted the difference between the expenditure of this country in this May with that of continental countries, and urged that facilities should be given to officers to learn the language of every country with which we were likely to beat war.

MR. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.) suggested that the War Office ought to go a little further, and in Army schools facilities should be given to learn foreign languages. It was, he said, absurd to suppose that the ridiculous sum of £550 was sufficient for a nation like this to spend on such a subject. The War Office had not grasped the importance of the question. Every year more men of superior education entered the ranks in the hopes of obtaining a commission, and every facility should be given in the Army schools for men to acquire, at all events, a knowledge of French and German. Possibly it would be a little difficult to learn Chinese in London, although, no doubt that could be accomplished with great trouble. Something might be done also for the non-commissioned officers, with great deal of advantage to the Army and themselves, by a more modern system of what in civil life was called secondary education for the young men

who were training for Army school-masters. He hoped there would be less of the hide-bound idea of the War Office in putting down this stereotyped sum. The hon. and gallant Member had referred to the absolute lack of knowledge of Dutch among our officers in South Africa, but he had always noticed that if a man learnt a language there was no recognition of the fact. He hoped when the Army Estimates

were gone into next year special attention would be given to these subjects.

CAPTAIN NORTON suggested that some system analogous to that in force in India should be adopted. Certain bonuses were given when a certain standard of efficiency was reached in the various languages of India. That system had, so far as India was concerned, given very beneficial results, and should be adopted here with regard to European languages.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman pleads the same cause as he did when the Navy Estimates were before the House, and I have considerable sympathy with the views expressed, and I have no doubt that it would be of advantage to both the naval and military Services if there were more knowledge of foreign languages among the officers. But the English are not a nation much given to learning foreign languages. I think my hon. friend goes rather too far in suggesting that Chinese is one of the languages which our soldiers ought to learn, for the reason, as I have been informed by gentlemen familiar with Chinese trade that the common means of communication even among the Chinese themselves is by what is known as pidgin English. When we come to French and German it is a different matter, but I notice my right hon. friend has now returned to the House, and he will deal with the subject as affecting his Department.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that when he raised this question last year considerable sympathy was expressed from the Treasury Bench. He noticed, however, that the amount in the Estimates remained as before, and no move whatever had been made in the matter, so

far as he could see. It was a very important matter, and he hoped something would be attempted before the Estimates came up for discussion next year.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) said He would consider well the subject before presenting the Estimates

AYES.

Acland Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Faber, George Denison

Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Fellowes, H on. Ailwyn Edward

Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Goddard, Daniel Ford

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

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

Parker, Gilbert

Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John

Gordon, Maj Evans- (TrH'mlets
Partington, Oswald
Austin, Sir John
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Peel, Hn. Wm. Rbt. Wellesley
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Philipps, John Wynford
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Grant, Corrie
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Baird, John George Alexander
Greene, Sir E. W. (B'ry S Edm'ds
Plummer, Walter R.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Pretymann, Ernest (George
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds
Hamilton, Rt Hn. Ld. G (Midd'x
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Bathurst, Hon. A. Benjamin
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Randles, John S.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Rankin, Sir James
Bell, Richard
Harris, F Leverton (Tynemouth
Rasch, Major Frederick C.
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Harwood, George
Rea, Russell
Bignold, Arthur
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Bigwood, James
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Renwick, George
Bill, Charles
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Richards, Henry Charles
Black, Alexander William
Helme, Norval Watson
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Higginbottom, S. W.

Rigg, Richard
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Horniman, Frederick John
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Kearley, Hudson E.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Caldwell, James
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Kimber, Henry
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cavendish, V. G. W (Derbyshire
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Lawrence, William F.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.
Lawson, John Grant
Spear, John Ward
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Spencer, Rt Hn C R. (Northants
Charrington, Spencer
Lee, A. H. (Hants, Fare'm
Stevenson, Francis S.
Clare, Oetavius Leigh
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Leng, Sir John
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Levy, Maurice
Thomas, J. A. (Glaming., Gower
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Lewis, John Herbert
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Valentia, Viscount
Craig, Robert Hunter
Loyd, Archie Kirk man
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Cranborne, Viscount
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E.
Cremer, William Randal
Lyttelton, Hon. Allied
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Macdona, John Gumming
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton
Maconochie, A. W.
Weir, James Galloway
Cust, Henry John C
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Welby, Sir Chas. G E. (Notts
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Malcolm, Ian
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Dewar, T. R. (T'rHmlets, S. Geo.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Dickson, Charles Scott

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Duke, Henry Edward
Morrell, George Herbert
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Dunn, Sir William
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Morton, Edw. J. G. (Devonport)
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Mount, William Arthur
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)

next year. In the press of many matters since he came into office this particular Vote had not engaged his attention.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 179; Noes, 47. (Division List No. 114).

Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

Young, Commander (Berks, E.

TELLERS FOR THE AYES;

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Yoxall, James Henry

Mr. Anstruther and Mr. Hayes Fisher.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)

Ambrose, Robert

Joyce, Michael

O'Dowd, John

Boland, John

Leamy, Edmund

O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)

Boyle, James

Lundon, W.

O'Malley, William

Burke, E. Haviland

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
 M'Dermott, Patrick
 Pickard, Benjamin
 Cogan, Denis J.
 M'Fadden, Edward
 Power, Patrick Joseph
 Condon, Thomas Joseph
 M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
 Reddy, M.
 Crean, Eugene
 Murphy, J.
 Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
 Cullinan, J.
 Nannetti, Joseph P.
 Redmond, William (Clare)
 Delany, William
 Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
 Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
 Doogan, P. C.
 O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
 Sullivan, Donal
 Duffy, William J.
 O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid)
 White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
 Ffrench, Peter
 O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
 Flavin, Michael Joseph
 O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
 Flynn, James Christopher
 O'Doherty, William
 Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
 Gilhooly, James
 O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

10. £;218,200, Miscellaneous Effective Services.

11. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not, exceeding £;1,485,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the charge for Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals, and the In-Pensioners thereof; of Out-Pensions; of the maintenance of Lunatics for whom Pensions are not drawn; and of Gratuities awarded in Commutation and in lieu of Pensions, of Rewards for Meritorious Services; of Victoria Cross Pensions; and of Pensions, &c., to the Widows and Children of Warrant officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, and Men, &c., which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902."

MR. KEARLEY wished to raise the question of the pensions granted to the widows and orphans of those who had fallen in active service in South Africa. This was an important new departure on the part of the Government. It had for the first

time recognised its responsibility towards the dependents of those who had sacrificed their lives in the service of the State. He was sure the country viewed with great pleasure this new departure, and they would vote the money with the greatest satisfaction, because the country had become aware of the fact that in recent years much suffering had happened to the widows and dependents of those who had fought courageously for us in various parts of the world, and for whom no provision had been made by the State in the past. With regard to the amount the Government had detailed to the various ranks he had nothing whatever to say. Seeing that it was taxpayers' money, he thought a provision of 5s. per week, and 1s. 6d. per child, for the widow of an ordinary soldier or sailor was as much as could reasonably be expected. The pensions rose according to the rank or rating of the man who lost his life. He could not understand why the pensions were being withheld so long. A Committee had recommended that the pensions should be paid as from 1st April, but they were being withheld until 1st July. Even then the pensions were only to be given to the widows and orphans of those who were on the married establishment; the widows and orphans of men who married off the strength, that was (he supposed) without permission, were to be ignored so far as the Government was concerned. This was inexplicable. What was to become of these widows and orphans? The husband and father fought for his country, and the country would not recognise the distinction which the War Office was trying to make. If these widows were to be handed over to the tender mercies of the Patriotic Commission, God help them! The past history of the Commission had been exposed and condemned by every newspaper throughout the land. When money got into the Commissioners' hands it stopped in that stagnant pool and its circulation ceased. The Soldiers' Effects Fund should be applicable to the pensions which the War Office proposed under this Vote. He asked the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War whether in future the money belonging to that fund should not be handed over to the Patriotic Commission for administration.

*THE CHAIRMAN: You cannot discuss that on this Vote.

MR. KEARLEY, said he was sorry he could not proceed with that subject, because this was the only opportunity for raising it. During the debate, on the Address in reply to His Majesty's Speech, when an Amendment was moved, they were debarred from raising the question. The hon. Member asked the Secretary for War to give the reasons which had influenced the War Department to come to the decision that the widows of men who married off the strength of the regiment were not to get the benefit of this Vote. They were probably the most numerous of the whole lot. He was sure the country would be painfully shocked when it realised that these widows were to be left to look for assistance to outside funds. He hoped it was not too late now to come to some other decision.

CAPTAIN NORTON said that as a soldier he agreed that some distinction should be made between the widows and orphans of men borne on the establishment of regiments and those who had married off the strength. But surely the latter should have some allowance, if not the same allowance as the widows and orphans of men who had been on the strength. He did not mean that they should be placed

exactly on a par with the widows and orphans of men whose conduct had been exemplary, but he thought some consideration should be shown to them. The whole history of the Patriotic Fund was that the Commissioners of the fund had made no effort to help those who properly came on the fund. So he hoped something would be done for the widows and orphans of those who, although they married off the strength of their regiments, had also died in their country's service.

MR. DUKE (Plymouth) expressed the hope that the Government would do more for the survivors of the men who had married off the strength. The men had sacrificed their lives for the country, and a generous view ought to be taken of the cases of those whom they had left in a state of destitution. The number of men who married off the strength was very great. If a man gave his life for the country the question of discipline should be sunk and something should be done in a spirit of generosity. He suggested also that the pay of a man who had been killed should be continued to his widow until she became entitled to the pension she was to receive.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough) stated that in the House of Lords on Monday last Lord Monkswell asked;

"whether any alterations had been made since the commencement of the South African War in the dates and system of awarding pensions to soldiers disabled by wounds and sickness due to active service; and whether His Majesty's Paymaster General, as Chairman of the Board of Chelsea Commissioners, could give any information on the subject."

In reply to that question the Duke of Marlborough said;

"that it would be very unfortunate if there were any wounded soldiers going about the country who were not adequately provided for. Previous to the South African War; for example, the campaign in Egypt; soldiers who were wounded, and consequently discharged from the Service, received an award from the Commissioners of Chelsea Hospital at a rate which they considered to represent the permanent loss in the earning power of the individual as a result of his wound. In the case of private soldiers who were partially able to earn, the rates varied from

6d. to 1s. 6d. In the case of soldiers who were quite unable to earn, the rates were from 1s. 6d. to 2s. 6d. These pensions, when granted, became permanent. Since the commencement of the South African War no alteration had been made in the rate of the pensions to wounded soldiers in the Royal Warrant. That was to say, no wounded man, partially disabled, could get more than 1s. 6d., and no man who was totally disabled could get more than 2s. 6d. But the Commissioners had unanimously decided to make a somewhat new departure, and, in nearly every case, to grant the maximum amount of pension at once."

The hon. Member said he had had many instances brought to his notice in which men had been in receipt of one shilling a day. That seemed to be in direct contradiction to the statement by the Duke of Marlborough. He thought a statement should be made to the House showing exactly what these men were entitled to. Referring to the non-effective Vote for officers and men, he said he thought that, unless some greater provision was made for the men, the scheme to increase the number of men in the Army would be a serious disappointment to

the House.

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member who introduced this subject put one or two questions with regard to the widows of men who have died in the war. I know full well how great is the sympathy of the House for the men who have lost their lives in the war, and for those whom they have left behind them. The Government has for the first time in our history recognised the claims of these widows by giving pensions to the widows of non-commissioned officers and men. In taking that step they have been fully justified by the feeling of the country. But hon. Gentlemen have trenched on rather a difficult question by proposing that this advantage should be given, not merely to those who are married on the strength, but also to those who are married not on the strength of a regiment. That point has been very carefully and sympathetically considered by the Government. The Government are the guardians of the public purse in this matter, and the charge which is likely to accrue will be a very heavy one. But there is also something besides that. It is not the desire of the Government that the great majority of soldier's who join at the age of eighteen should marry at an early age and have families dependent upon them. In the first place, a soldier's pay does not properly allow of it, and, secondly, he has to move at any moment from his station and go abroad, and a large number of families would mean a serious impediment. On the other hand, if these families are left behind it will entail the greatest possible misery and privation to those who become dependent on soldiers who can only spare a very small amount out of their pay. If we were to go back on our decision with regard to pensions, to give them only to those married on the strength, we should be encouraging to a very great extent this kind of improvidence, and when we sent the men abroad we should have to give separation allowances to their wives and families. That would be an enormous charge to contemplate. Then there is another difficulty. There are three classes, I believe, who at this moment are entitled to separation allowances. The first are the men of the Reserve who are married, the second those who are married on the strength, and the third those who have married in anticipation of going into the Reserve and have been kept on by the terms of service until the end of the war. My constituency abuts on Aldershot, and I can say this, that when the Reserves were called up in November of 1899, it being found that separation allowance was being granted and also that money was being granted from charitable funds to the wives of those who went on active service, a very large number of marriages took place, in the cases of Reservists who were not already married, within a day or so of embarkation. There were a considerable number of cases in which men who sailed on 7th November had married on 25th November or 26th November, and whose wives claimed at once to have the allowance. I think the step proposed would be very unwise, more especially as there are charitable funds which are available for the limited number of widows, as they are at present, who married men off the strength. With regard to the administration of the Patriotic Fund, I had the pleasure of sitting on a Committee with the hon. Member respecting that fund, and. I was in favour, as the hon. Gentleman was, of more generous distribution of the fund. It was found that the administration of the fund was economical in

the first degree, and that the money went straight to those for whom it was intended. But we thought that a larger class might be included, and the inquiry about to take, place will deal with that point. There is no doubt whatever that those widows who cannot be provided for by the Government, owing to the regulations giving the allowance only to those on the strength, can and will be provided for by the Patriotic Fund. I think the House would be unwise to insist on provision being made out of public funds on their behalf. The rules and regulations have not yet actually been got out, and will not be got out by the 1st April. Therefore 1st July has been adopted as the most convenient date. I really do not think that the provision which Parliament is asked to make for the widows of those who have fallen in the war is an illiberal one. Certainly my own desire has been to get this subject settled on an efficient and proper basis, remembering, as I do, that there is the strongest disposition on the part of Parliament, after these Votes have been given and when abuse has been found to have occurred, to find fault with the Government for not having foreseen the point at which they should have stopped. I hope in this particular case, having in view the extreme undesirability of putting in the way of our soldiers the temptation of making improvident marriages in the hope of getting separation allowances, the Committee will rest satisfied with the arrangement the Government propose.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present. House counted, and, forty Members being found present;

MR. LEVY asked whether the Secretary of State for War could not see his way clear to make adequate arrangements whereby those men who were returned from South Africa partially or totally disabled should not have to eke out an existence on the mere pittance of one shilling a day. Many of these men had wives to keep, and it was a scandal that those men who had fought our battles in South Africa, and who had been incapacitated, should be compelled to live on charity. He noticed that the amount put in the Estimates for non-effective officers was something like £;800 more than it used to be. It was the first duty of the Government to make ample provision in their Estimates for those soldiers who were incapacitated in the war, and who were thus prevented from earning their own living. He had seen in his own district many men who had been totally incapacitated, and they told him that all they got was one shilling a day. He should be very glad if the

Secretary of State for War would state whether it was not possible to make some reasonable provision for these men.

MR. KEARLEY said he could not allow the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to pass without some comment. The decision of the War Office in respect to the case of soldiers who married off the strength had been arrived at, they were told, as a question of policy. The question of justice and common humanity was left out of consideration altogether. The widows of men who had lost their lives in the service of the country were not to receive pensions, because, as a matter of policy, it would be inexpedient to encourage men to marry.

MR. BRODRICK: Does the hon. Member suggest that the whole Army should be allowed

to marry off the strength?

MR. KEARLEY replied that the right hon. Gentleman was simply begging the question. At the present time we were recognising the claims of some widows who were no more entitled to recognition than in the instances he had raised. At present the War Office recognised the claims of the widows of Reservists who married a day or two before they sailed for South Africa. The right hon.

Gentleman said that if they recognised the claims of the widows of those soldiers who had married without consent, that would be encouraging others to do the same. The real question was whether these widows were to have uniformity of treatment, and that question had been evaded by the speculative theories put forward by the Secretary for War as to what might happen if these widows were recognised. Did the Government propose to throw these women and children on the world to pick up promiscuous charity? If that was so, he had no hesitation in saying that such a decision would not receive the approval of the country. A great number of Reservists, when they discovered that funds were being raised, married a day or two before going out to the war. Did the right hon. Gentleman suggest that those men married in order to get the paltry sum which was offered them? It was a feature of this

war that many of their officers married just before they went away. Did the right hon. Gentleman allege that they married with some ulterior motive? The Secretary for War had told them that the number of the class of widows for whom he was pleading was very few, and sooner than bring them into this Vote the right hon. Gentleman preferred to make them an exception in order not to encourage young soldiers to marry. If the House of Commons were left to decide the question there would not be a vote against including in the pension list the whole of these widows. The right hon. Gentleman went out of his way to endeavour to whitewash the Patriotic Commissioners. He was free to admit that the Committee which sat on the administration of the fund found no abuses in regard to expense of management, and so on; but they did find that the Commissioners had hoarded instead of administering the funds at their disposal, and he hoped the day was not very remote when those funds would be taken out of their hands altogether. He wished to know what was to be the medium through which this payment to the widows was to be made. Were the payments to go through the Army and Navy officials, or through some other outside body? They had perfect confidence in the War Office and the Admiralty administering the pensions, but if it was to be delegated to the Patriotic Commissioners, there would be a good deal of objection. When these men went away a year ago amid the cheering crowds, everybody declared that their widows would not suffer, and that the country would look after them. Now that the war fever had died out they were asked to accept the decision that the unfortunate widows and orphans of those who married off the strength were to be cast upon the world to pick up such sustenance as they could in the day of their trouble.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince), speaking as an old soldier, said he had no doubt whatever that it would be a most dangerous thing for the Secretary of State for War to class the widows of those who had married without leave with the widows of those who were married with leave. It would be a most serious

thing to induce a lot of young fellows, just before going out to the war, to marry their sweethearts. At the same time, he felt most strongly that cases might arise which the commanding officer of a regiment should have the power of bringing before the Patriotic Fund or some fund of that kind with a view to the unfortunate widow of a man who had married without leave receiving proper treatment.

CAPTAIN NORTON said it had been suggested that some distinction should be drawn between those who had married on the strength and those who had married without leave. The issue was now narrowed down to this; that the widows of the men who had married without the permission of their commanding officers and had then gone out to South Africa and had died were to be left to die in the workhouse.

MR. BRODRICK dissented.

CAPTAIN NORTON said the right hon. Gentleman shook his head, and perhaps he thought that outside charitable organisations would make some provision for them. The Member for Devonport had been for years contending that the Patriotic Commissioners had not done their work satisfactorily. What they asked in the name of the country was for some assurance from the right hon. Gentleman that the funds subscribed by the public for the support of those whose relatives died in South Africa should be handed over to some body distinctly under the control of this House, so that there should be money available for pensions for the widows and orphans of those who, though they had transgressed the rules by marrying without leave, were entitled to consideration at the hands of the country. The sum of

£160,000, representing the unclaimed balances due to the relatives of deceased soldiers who had died in the service, was handed over to the Patriotic Commissioners, who hoarded it up for future use instead of distributing it. The country was enthusiastic with the men who went out to South Africa, and they were distinctly led to believe that those they left behind would be provided for. If those outside funds were properly administered they would then have the distinction which was asked for, and that would be quite sufficient to deal with the case of the widows of those soldiers who were not on the strength.

MR. BRODRICK: There appears to be some misunderstanding on the part of the hon. Gentleman opposite. I told the Committee an hour ago that the Government could not undertake to recognise the claims of those who had married off the strength on the same basis as those who had married with leave. The hon. Member for Devonport has made a most impassioned speech, but he does not appear to have grasped the nature of the answer which I gave. I added frankly that I think their claims are claims to be recognised by the Patriotic Fund, and that I know the Patriotic Fund will recognise them.

MR. KEARLEY: Under what compulsion? Will the Government undertake to see that they do administer the funds?

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Gentleman's mistrust of this body carries him too far. It is a body composed of trustees of undoubted position, many of them members of this and the other House of Parliament, and all of whom have shown that their only desire is to administer the fund so that they shall have security that all those who are upon it shall receive the pensions given to them to the end of

their lives. The hon. Member thinks the Commissioners have been a little too conservative, and so do I, but the pressure that the House of Commons can exercise has been put upon them to induce them to take up a less conservative attitude. As far as the Government are concerned, our position is this; we have undertaken the charge of all those who married on the strength and those who married with a reasonable expectation that they would shortly come into the Reserve, and have gone into the Reserve since they went out to South Africa. I have brought all these men under the rule. But I cannot admit that we can consider the widows

of those who married off the strength in one category for one purpose and in another category for another purpose. What I do say is that those who married on the strength will receive pensions from the Government, and that those who married off the strength will be provided for by the Patriotic Fund, and I will take care that any influence I can bring to bear will be exercised in the direction of their being treated with the generosity and sympathy which we all desire to see exercised.

MR. KEARLEY asked if the right hon. Gentleman would consult the Government as to the desirability of making a small contribution to the Patriotic Fund, to enable the House to discuss the doings of the managers of that fund.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.) said he wished to make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman on behalf of two women who were not widows. On the previous day, in his capacity as a medical man, he had visited these women, whose husbands were at the front. One of these women had five children a sixth being dead. He could assure the Committee that if they could only realise the situation of dire distress in which these two women and their children were, they would hurl the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War from the Treasury Bench if he refused to give assistance. Someone had asked if the doctors would attend gratuitously women and children in such cases. He had done so, although entirely opposed to the war, for the past twelve months, and was, therefore, in a better position than other hon. Members to tell the Committee of the dire necessity in which many of these poor people were. They were living from hand to mouth, though they got a little assistance now and then from ladies from the West End. They talked about the Patriotic Fund, but why did not the Government step in and help? What had been done with all the money collected by the Telegraph and other journals? The way that money had been dispensed was a disgrace to London.

*THE CHAIRMAN said that the hon. Gentleman was discussing a War Office matter, which did not come under the Vote before the Committee.

DR. AMBROSE said he would not proceed to discuss the distribution of the money collected, but he protested against the cold-blooded treatment meted out by the War Office to the wives and children of men who had given their lives to their country, ever since Crimean days.

MR. BRODRICK said the Government could not guarantee to give a separation allowance to women who had married off the strength, and who were not entitled to it.

MR. PHILIPPS (Pembrokeshire) said he did not care twopence whether a woman

married on the strength or off the strength. If a soldier married without leave, let the right hon. Gentleman deal with him in his own way and punish him, but if that soldier went to the front and was killed his widow and children ought to get a pension from the State. They had heard a good deal about getting recruits and about reforms at the War Office, but here was the right hon. Gentleman making speeches saying that if a soldier married without leave his widow, if he were killed, might, with luck, and if there were funds in the hands of the Patriotic Commissioners, get a small allowance. That was all very fine, but he maintained the widows ought to be provided for by the country. However great the taxation was going to be he believed the representative of the taxpayers of the country would be perfectly prepared to vote

the money to all the sufferers from the war. A good deal of money had been voted that was not popular, including the large amount to buy Salisbury Plain. He did not think anything the Government had done was so unpopular as to vote that money and not to provide for the relief of widows from the war. He knew he would be reproached in his constituency unless he protested against money not being voted for these widows. And he believed that

every Member of the House, including the Irish Members, would be ready to vote money for the widows of the men who had died for their country. It was by such actions as this of refusing pensions to widows that the right hon. Gentleman, in spite of all his eloquence, was making the war unpopular in the country and bringing down a reproach on the nation.

MR. FLYNN said that the Irish Members had always voted against the war, but when it came to punishing, not the soldier who had married off the strength, but the innocent wife who was left alone when her soldier husband died, their feelings of indignation were roused. Surely it was stretching red tape too far to refuse gratuities to innocent sufferers. This cast-iron discipline was being carried too far in allowing the widows of the gallant men who had died of wounds in battle or from disease in South Africa, and their poor fathers and mothers, to be left to the cold charity of the workhouse. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider the matter; and grant justice to the widow's and orphan children.

CAPTAIN NORTON said that surely the right hon. Gentleman would consider the suggestions that had been thrown out. The question of exercising discipline over a man who had married without leave was quite different from that of making a certain allowance to the widow of a man who had died for his country.

*THE CHAIRMAN rose to put the question; whereupon;

CAPTAIN NORTON: As the right hon. Gentleman does not appear willing to meet this question. I beg to move to reduce this Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question put, "That a reduced sum of £1,484,900 be granted for the said Service.";(Captain Norton.)

The Committee divided::Ayes, 76; Noes, 127. (Division List No. 115.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)

Goddard, Daniel Ford

O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Grant, Corrie
O'Malley, William
Ambrose, Robert
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Mara, James
Austin, Sir John
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Bell, Richard
Hayden, John Patrick
Philipps, John Wynford
Black, Alexander William
Helme, Norval Watson
Pickard, Benjamin
Blake, Edward
Horniman, Frederick John
Power, Patrick Joseph
Boland, John
Joyce, Michael
Rea, Russell
Burke, E. Haviland-
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Reddy, M.
Caldwell, James
Leamy, Edmund
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Levy, Maurice
Redmond, William (Clare)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Lundon, W.
Rigg, Richard
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Dermott, Patrick
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (N'rth'nts
Crean, Eugene
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Cremer, William Randal
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Sullivan, Donal
Cullinan, J.

Murphy, J.
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Delany, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Donelan, Captain A.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Doogan, P. C.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Duffy, William J.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Dunn, Sir William
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Ffrench, Peter
O'Connor, T, P. (Liverpool)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Doherty, William
Captain Norton and Mr. Kearley.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Gilhooly, James
O'Dowd, John
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Morton, A. K. A. (Deptford)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Mount, William Arthur
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Bailey, James (Walworth)

Gordon, Maj. E. (T'rHamlets)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Bain, Col. James Robert
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Eldon Goulding, Edward Alfred
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry
Plummer, Walter R.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Pretymann, Ernest George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (M'dd'x
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Harris, F Leverton (Tynemouth
Bignold, Arthur
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Randles, John S.
Bigwood, James
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Rankin, Sir James
Bill, Charles
Higginbottom, S. W.
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Rentoul, James Alexander
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Renwick, George
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Kimber, Henry
Richards, Henry Charles
Bullard, Sir Harry
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Win.
Ritchie, Rt Hon. Chas. Thomson
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cautley Henry Strother
Lawrence, William F.
Samuel, Harry S. (Limebouse)

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Lawson, John Grant
Seton-Karr, Henry
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Lee, Capt A H (Hants. Fareh
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Chamberlain. J. Austen (Worc.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Charrington, Spencer
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)
Spear, John Ward
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J G (Oxf'd Univ.
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Macdona, John dimming
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Maconochie, A. W.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Valentia, Viscount
Cranborne, Viscount
Majendie, James A. H.
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo
Meysey-Thompson, Sir M. M.
Wason, John Catheart (Orkney
Dickson, Charles Scott
Molesworth, Sir Lewis

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

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

More, Robert J. (Shropshire)

Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)

Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart

Morgan, Dav. J. (Walthamst'w

Wilson, John (Falkirk)

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.

Morrell, George Herbert

Wilson, John (Glasgow)

Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.

Wolff, (Gustav Wilhelm

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

Mr. Anstruther and Mr. Hayes

Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath

Young, Commander (Berks, E.)

Original Question put, and agreed to.

12. £;188,500, Superannuation, Compensation, Compassionate Allowances and Gratuities,

MR. FLYNN said that the Vote was a very important one, and there were various questions his hon. friends desired to raise on it; but, in view of the fact that there was an important Irish Bill (the Roman Catholic Disabilities Removal Bill), which was supported by the Irish Members, on the Order Taper, they did not desire to discuss the Vote in Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is only fair to remind hon. Members that the invariable practice on a Friday evening devoted to Supply is for the Government to move the adjournment of the House after the Votes have been disposed of.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he was really serious in proposing to move the adjournment of the House at ten o'clock, and thereby preventing a large number of Members from discussing a Bill which was on the Order Taper and in which they were interested. They had been keeping very late hours recently in the House, the closure had been frequently applied, and there had been no end of statements from the Government as to the necessity of rushing Supply through the House of Commons. The Irish Members were now prepared to allow the Vote before the Committee to pass, in order that they might have an hour, or even half an hour, to take the sense of the House on the Bill on the Order Paper. The right hon. Gentleman, however, coolly told them that he intended to move the adjournment of the House at ten o'clock, and cut the Irish Members out from getting the Second Reading of a Bill which had been before the House year after year for many years, and which the right hon. Gentleman would admit engaged the interest, not only of the Irish Members but of millions of His

Majesty's subjects.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. Member that the question to which he is addressing himself is not the one before the Committee. He must put himself in order.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he was quite aware that, technically, he was not in order. He would not discuss the matter further, but he would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman not to allow it to go forth to the millions of people interested in the Bill that at ten o'clock at night the Irish Members would not be permitted to take the sense of the House on it.

MR. FLYNN said he did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman rightly understood him. The Irish Members were willing to allow the Vote which they had a perfect right to discuss to pass in order that they might get on to the next Order of the day.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope hon. Gentlemen will understand that the course I have stated as the course which the Government feel bound to adopt has nothing whatever to do with the merits of the Bill. That is my view, and I know hon. Members will believe me. Whether they think it is desirable or not, that course is in adherence to general principle, and to general principle alone. Hon. Members will remember that under the Supply Rule Fridays are allocated to Supply, and although Bills may be put down Members interested in them go away knowing they will not come on for discussion. Further hon. Members should remember that on Friday, being a Government day, we should put down Bills ourselves Bills of great general importance; it we did not feel that no Bills ought to be taken on Fridays. I am sure, therefore, that hon. Members will feel with me that if the Government allowed private Members' Bills to be taken on a day which did not belong to them, it would be asking the House to accept a principle unjust in itself and most inconvenient. As far as I know anything about this Bill, there is nothing to object to in it. Its general principle, at all events. I would not have any objection to, but if the Bill were the one of all others I desired should be passed, I should still think it my duty as Leader of the House to observe the general rule which, on the whole, is a rule of expediency and for the proper order of debate, and to support the Government in declaring that on Fridays no business but Supply should be taken.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I hope it will be consistent with the rules of order to pursue this matter. The Government say that Fridays are allocated to Supply alone, and that they abstain themselves from putting down Government Bills because they intend the entire sitting to be devoted to Supply. On this occasion all the Supply put down has been practically granted. [AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.] Technically I am correct. The right hon. Gentleman will admit that he has received facilities, and that a considerable amount of Supply has been voted. With regard to the particular Bill on the Order Paper, the right hon. Gentleman says, as far as he can observe, he sees no objection to it in principle. We now find ourselves in the position of having practically finished Supply, and still having two hours before the time for the adjournment. The next Order is a Bill to which the right hon. Gentleman takes no objection, and is it not a great hardship, to put it no higher, that we cannot have the few minutes

necessary for the passing of the Second Reading of this Bill? I am most anxious not to outstep the limits of order, but I may be allowed to point out in one sentence what this Bill is. As the law stands at present, absurd restrictions exist against the existence in Ireland and England of religious orders. These religious orders, such as the Franciscans and the Jesuits, cannot by law live in the country or own property, and I do not think that there are half-a-dozen Members of the House, whatever their political opinions may be, who will not admit that that is an absurd state of law and ought to be abolished. I suggested to my hon. friend who has charge of the Bill that if the Bill were reached he should not trouble the House with a long speech, but should simply move the Second Reading. If there are objections in detail to this Bill, they can be dealt with in Committee, and all we ask is that, having let Supply go through, we should be given an opportunity of taking the Second Reading of this Bill. The right hon. Gentleman says he cannot do that because it is against precedent. I would ask him, if he takes that view so strongly, can he afford us some hope or give us some undertaking that the small modicum of time necessary to discuss the principle of this Bill will be afforded to us at another period of the session? If he will undertake to close Government business some night in time to enable us to take the Second Reading of the Bill, then we will not pursue the matter further now. If the right hon. Gentleman cannot do that. I am afraid it will be necessary for us to discuss this Vote, and also the question of the adjournment, which no doubt the right hon. Gentleman will move after the Vote is carried. I would make a conciliatory appeal to the right hon. Gentleman, and would ask him, in view of the character of the Bill, and that opposition to it is confined probably to two out of the 670 Members of the House, whether he would not make some small concession to us and give us an assurance that on a future occasion we should have half an hour, or less, in which to discuss the Bill. If he will do that, we will at once withdraw the claim we now make. I would earnestly appeal to him in the interests of that wide tolerance which I believe exists in the minds of the great majority of the Members of the House, to afford some small opportunity of dealing with this question, which, although it may not press very hardly on these religious orders, because the evasion of the law is winked at, is still regarded by the people of Ireland as a badge of inferiority and a relic of the bad old days when their religion was prescribed by law.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must point out that this discussion is irregular. The Committee now seems to be discussing the merits of the next Order on the Paper. The Vote before the Committee must be disposed of one way or the other.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I think the right hon. Gentleman might be allowed to reply.

MR. WOLFF (Belfast, E.) said he did not wish to say anything about the Bill itself, but at all events it was understood by a great many hon. Members that on Friday nights no business except Supply would be taken. He knew one hon. Member, his hon. friend the Member for South Belfast, who would have been present if he had had any idea that the Bill would be brought forward. His hon. friend and other hon. Members went away under the impression that only Supply would be taken.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said that before the right hon. Gentleman replied perhaps he might, without discussing the merits of the Bill or infringing the rules of order, be permitted to point out a precedent for the course the right hon. Gentleman was asked to take. Last session on a Government day business was disposed of at an earlier hour than was expected. The next Order was the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill. The Government moved the adjournment, but they were appealed to to allow the Bill to be dealt with, as it excited considerable interest in the House, and in answer to that appeal the Government withdrew the motion for the adjournment and allowed the Bill to be discussed. He thought that was an exact precedent, and he would ask whether the right hon. Gentleman would now follow the action of the Government on the occasion he mentioned.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have nothing whatever to complain of in the speeches of the hon. Gentlemen who have just spoken. The precedent mentioned by the hon. Gentleman is really no precedent. I was not in the House at the actual moment when the business of Supply was concluded, and, unfortunately, contrary to my directions another Order of the day was called on.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I was in the House all the time. Mr. Goschen, who was then First Lord of the Admiralty, actually moved the adjournment of the House, and it was in answer to an appeal made to him that he withdrew it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is perfectly true that the Government moved the adjournment, but not until after the order of the day had been called and the House had entered upon the discussion of the Bill. That was through a misapprehension of the very clear directions I had given to the Gentleman then in charge of the business of this bench. If the hon. Gentleman will consult the archives of the House he will see that I have over and over again moved the adjournment immediately after the conclusion of the business on Fridays, against Bills brought in by Gentlemen on my own side of the House and supported by the great majority of the party to which I belong, and I think as impartiality should be exercised by the Leader of the House it would be absurd to make an exception in favour of a minority as against a majority. I have nothing to do with the merits of the Bill. It is in the power of hon. Gentlemen to keep on the discussion of Supply until twelve o'clock, and I suppose they will do so if I do not give way, as I feel I cannot in honesty and honour give way. I wish I could. Then the hon. Gentleman says to me. "Give us an opportunity." Is it to be the rule of the House that whenever Supply finishes before twelve o'clock the Bill which is next Order of the Day is to have a slice of Government time for its Second Reading discussion? I think the hon. Gentleman will see that if this House is to be managed on general principles irrespective of the merits of Bills, the general principle which I have laid down is the only one which can be laid down. If I gave way now to the eloquent appeal of the hon. Gentleman, the force of which I admit, I should be perfectly helpless in dealing with any Bill in future which had any backing at all in this House, and as a matter of fact Friday would cease to be a day given to Supply, and would become a day on which those who have the power of obstructing or

discussing Supply at length would always be making bargains with the Government, that if they refrained from discussing Supply they should have the Second Reading of some Bill in which they were interested. That would be very inconvenient. Frankly I say that if the House now indicates that their view is that Friday should not be exclusively given to Supply, I shall be bound to put down Government Bills as the next orders, which would, of course, exclude private Members' Bills. I am not able to accede to the request of the hon. Gentleman. I have not dealt with it in any contentious spirit, and I am sure he will feel that no other course was open to me in the interests of equality and justice.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: The precedent quoted by the hon. Member for East Clare is scarcely a precedent in this case. I have looked the case up in Hansard. We were dealing with the Army Supplementary Estimates on Report of Supply, not with the ordinary business of Supply. I myself feel great sympathy with my hon. friends, but I quite understand the position the Leader of the House has taken up, and, in the general interests of our procedure, I am bound to say that his decision to keep Fridays intact for Supply is in the general interests of legislation in the House. I am sorry we could not have some pledge with reference to this Bill, because I should like to see it brought before the House and divided upon. It is a Bill which ought to have an opportunity of eliciting a vote from the House; but while I should be glad to press that view I am bound to support the decision the right hon. Gentleman has taken in the interests of public business, and because it conduces to general fair play.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said he thought the precedent mentioned by his hon. friend the Member for East Clare was very much stronger than was acknowledged by the right hon. Gentleman. The action proposed by the right hon. Gentleman would be a direct premium on loquacity. The right hon. Gentleman said he could not break a rule, but if there was a rule there should also be an exception to prove it. That

was logic. The Roman Catholic Disabilities Bill was the exceptional case and deserved the consideration of the right hon. Gentleman. His hon. friend the Member for Waterford had made a moderate proposition, and if the right hon. Gentleman could not assent to the Bill being discussed now, he ought to assent to it.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must respectfully ask the Committee to come back to the matter before it. This discussion is irregular.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said he would suggest that the Vote be allowed to pass, and when the Bill was taken the discussion could continue on the motion for adjournment.

Resolution agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed. "That this House do now adjourn."; (Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to oppose the motion. My reason for doing so can be

stated very clearly and briefly. We have now reached half-past 10 o'clock, and an hour and a half remains for the transaction of business. In the early part of to-day's sitting a very large amount of Government business has been transacted. No obstruction has been thrown in the way of the Government, and, having obtained all they desired, they now propose that the House should adjourn, although there remains on the Order Paper one Order of very great importance which has the support of the overwhelming majority of the House. It is a Bill entitled "Roman Catholic Disabilities Removal Bill." It would be improper for me to attempt to go in detail into the provisions of this Bill, but I may be permitted to point out that the Bill deals with a very important question, and that it has practically the unanimous support of the House. It was introduced by a private Member, and of course the opportunities of private Members in promoting legislation are very few. It has been the fate of this Bill year after year to be defeated by the opposition of one or two Members. The opportunity has arisen for dealing with the Roman Catholic Disabilities Removal Bill now. We have an hour and a half before us, and I respectfully submit to the House that it would be a monstrous thing if, after we have helped the Government business to be transacted quickly at the earlier part of the sitting, the Government should intervene with a motion for the adjournment of the House. This matter which we desire to bring before the House is one which excites the keenest possible interest, not only in Ireland, but among large classes of the people of this country and in other parts of the Empire. Perhaps you will allow me to mention in one sentence what the object of the Bill is.

*MR. SPEAKER: I think the House understands the object of it. I do not think you can discuss the details of the Bill now. The object is plain from the title.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: It is quite true that the object is clear on the title, but I am afraid that in these days of toleration in this country hon. Members in this House are apt to forget that there remain on the Statute Book some relics of the old Penal days.

*MR. SPEAKER said if he allowed the hon. Member to argue the question he must allow other Members to reply.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I never had any intention of arguing the matter at all, and I will not go further than to say that the Bill proposes to remove certain religious disabilities attaching to a large class of the citizens of the Empire; disabilities which, I believe, not one per cent. of the Members of this House desire to see continued. In fact, I think I am right when I mention that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury has already stated that so far as he understands the Bill, he does not see any objection to it. I do not know anybody who has any objection, with the exception of two Members of the House, and I do put it in all seriousness, if it is not monstrously hard, after sitting up night after night since the commencement of the session helping the Government in the passage of its business; bringing to bear on the business of the Government keen interest and intelligence; that we, are to be prevented now from spending ten minutes or a quarter of an hour in passing the Second Reading of a Bill of this nature. [Laughter.] Hon. Gentlemen laugh. Of course they think that if the House has been sitting late it has been the fault of the Irish

Members. I will not argue the question. Possibly they think that it would have been better for the interests of the Empire if hundreds of millions of money had been voted without any discussion at all. Possibly they think that the function of the House of Commons is discussing;

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Member was travelling beyond the question of the adjournment.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I quite understand that, Mr. Speaker, but what I desire to point out is that we, having been necessarily engaged night after night for prolonged hours in discussing the business of the Government, would feel it very hard to be prevented from taking advantage of this happy opportunity to-night to push forward a Bill about which there is practically no difference of opinion at all. The right hon. Gentleman pleads that there is some understanding that on Friday nights nothing but Supply should be taken. I respectfully submit to him and to the House that I think that would be an unfortunate understanding to have translated into an unwritten rule of the House. If that were so, it would be placing a, direct premium, as one of my honourable friends said, upon loquacity, and upon prolonging discussion, and where you have an occasion like tonight, where large sums of money have been voted with meagre discussion, it would be hard indeed to deprive us, who have abstained from discussing these matters, of our reward when we want to bring forward this Bill. I say that it would be a monstrous scandal if the House adjourned at half-past ten when a question of this kind remains to be discussed. If this House is to retain the respect of the nation it must conduct its business in a business-like manner, and I ask seriously is it a business-like transaction, having fulfilled the particular Government business to-night, that you should adjourn at half-past ten? This is an urgent matter, upon which we are all agreed, waiting to be discussed, and which could be dealt with in a quarter of an hour. If the right hon Gentleman had not moved the adjournment of the House we might now have disposed of it to the satisfaction of the entire House, and we might have removed what is an intolerable grievance and insult to citizens of the country. Under these circumstances. I appeal to the House to take a reasonable, businesslike and conciliatory attitude on this matter, and give us the few moments that are necessary out of the hour and a half that remains. This question is of the utmost importance in Ireland, and millions of people in other parts of the Empire take a keen interest in it. I cannot conceive that anybody out of sheer malice or revenge, because they thought we had prolonged discussion on other occasions, could desire to deprive the Irish Members of this opportunity of discussing this matter. That indeed would be a very ungenerous thing for the House to do. I do not believe that that feeling is animating hon. Members opposite at all. I would appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite, as we have economised time during this sitting of the House, at any rate to give us the advantage of the few moments we ask for discussing this urgent matter, and I trust the right hon. Gentleman will not persist in his motion for adjournment, and will enable us to proceed to the discussion of this matter.

MR. FLYNN said the laws of the House were surely not like the laws of the Medes and Persians. The business of Supply ordinarily ran to 12 o'clock, but were they

to throw away an hour, or an hour and a half, of valuable time when Supply finished earlier, simply for the purpose of carrying out some cast-iron rule? The session had now lasted six weeks, and it was a remarkable fact that although the Irish party had some Bills they desired to bring forward only one had come before the House. Here was a chance of dealing with a grievance not only of Ireland, but of Great Britain. The sense of the House could be taken upon it in half an hour, and yet the Government seemed inclined to sit tight and stick to this stupid idea about taking no other business on Friday after Supply. This could not be quoted as a precedent, because it very rarely happened that Supply was finished before midnight. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to withdraw the motion for the adjournment, turn round and smile on his followers, and say "Let us go to a Second Reading." So far as he could see there would be no other opportunity of bringing forward the Bill this session.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) said the British Government were supposed to govern Catholics and Protestants with equal laws, but it appeared to him that Jews and heathen had a better chance in the empire than Catholics. They could never be governed with equal laws so long as there was a ban on their faith. So confident were the supporters of this Bill in the justice of their claim, that they were prepared to accept the decision of the House upon it without discussion. They were satisfied that every honest-minded man would vote for the Bill. He acknowledged that there were a few cranks who objected to it, but they were very few. Earlier in the evening the Irish Members abstained from discussing the Votes of money, because they wished to have the opportunity of bringing this Bill before the House.

*MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.): I hope the House will not set up any cast-iron rule on this occasion about allowing nothing but Supply to be taken on a Friday night, but will enable us to discuss this very important Bill. I speak as a member of the Protestant faith, and it is we, the members of that faith, who ought to be the most eager to wipe out the disgrace which this Bill proposes to remove. The disgrace does not reflect upon those who ask for this opportunity of discussing this Bill. It is upon the Protestants of this country that it rests. It is an unfortunate thing; it is a shameful thing; that in this Parliament for several years earnest and assiduous efforts to get an opportunity of wiping out this disgrace have been thwarted. Those who made those efforts have been deprived of the opportunity in the past, and they are again being deprived of it now. I say it would be more for the honour and credit of this House that this Bill should be allowed to-night to receive a Second Reading; and I therefore implore the Leader of the House not to be inexorable, but to allow this disgrace to be wiped out by allowing the Bill to be read a second time. If this opportunity is refused, the feeling of insult and wrong will be continued among the Catholics of the Empire.

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.) said it appeared to him that the time available for private Members' Bills was inevitably curtailed year by year. It was not unreasonable to ask that, when the Government business had been transacted, any available time should now be devoted to this Bill. It should

then be left to the opposers of the Bill, irrespective of party, to move the adjournment of the House. That was the practical test to put the Bill to.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend who has just spoken has not, I think, fully appreciated the exact circumstances of the case. Why was it that after Supply to-night the next Order of the day was a Bill in the hands of a private Member? The reason was that the Government had laid down as a rule and practice of the House that Friday should be devoted to Supply. The House may like or dislike that. If they dislike that rule, let them say so, and the immediate result will be that I shall put down a Government Bill as the second Order of the day, and no private Bill would ever have a chance. The whole difficulty which we are now suffering from would be obviated if I were to put down a Government measure at the end of Supply, and announce beforehand that I would not take it, but move the adjournment of the House. If the adjournment was not carried, the Government Bill would be taken. That is the course that would be adopted, and which was adopted for some time before the new Supply rule was introduced. In those days Friday was devoted first to Supply and then to Government business, but remonstrances were made to me as Leader of the House. I was told that it was not fair that I should use any time that was over for legislation. I yielded to them at the time, and I have abstained from putting down a Government Bill. Am I to be told that if the Government have abstained from using their own day for carrying on the legislation of the country, the gap is to be filled up with private Members Bills? If my hon. friend will think over the proposition he will see that it is an unreasonable one, and if the House should differ with the Government to-night as to the course I am advising the Government to pursue, it is the last time they will do it, for never again will I put down a private Member's Bill after Supply.

*MR. BELL (Derby): Why is this Bill on the Paper?

*MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman seems to think that I put it down. The hon. Member asks for information, and I will give it to him, as perhaps he is not so familiar with the practice of the House as some of us who have been longer here. As regards Government business, the Government put it down any day they please. Friday is a Government day, and therefore no Bill put down for that day by a private Member is taken until after the Government business has been finished. On the other hand, a private Member has a perfect right to put down his Bill any day he likes. Therefore the Government have only got to put down a Bill, or two Bills, or a dozen Bills, after Supply on Friday, and, of course, private Members would be absolutely excluded from any chance. We have no control over private Members, but we have to submit that when we have abstained from exercising our rights, it is rather hard that private Members should step in and violate the rule in their own interests. I hope I have made that clear to hon. Gentlemen opposite who are advocating the Second Reading of the Bill. Hon. Members from Ireland state that the Government owe them some little compensation for all the hard work they have been doing for the Government. I can assure hon. Members that, if there are hon.

Members on my own side of the House who consider that the action of the Irish Members during recent weeks has not been such as to recommend to the general

favour and attention of the House any of their requests, in the action we have taken on the present occasion there is no consideration of that kind nor any tincture or flavour of revenge. The course we have taken to-night is one which I have previously taken against the almost unanimous desire of my own friends, and they have again and again protested to the gentleman in charge of the general management of the business of the House against the hard-heartedness of the Government in insisting that after Supply was finished the House should adjourn. Hon. Members opposite say that this Bill is for the purpose of removing a great and standing scandal. I am not going to discuss the merits of the Bill. They have also mentioned that they have been fortunate in the ballot this year. Why has not this Bill had precedence on one of the occasions on which Irish measures secured priority on the Order Paper? Hon. Members are admirably organised, and when they are fortunate in the ballot they put down measures which commend themselves to the majority of Members on those benches. I do not say that they do not desire this Bill to pass; but they cannot have a pre-eminent, overmastering wish that it should pass, otherwise they would have taken care on one of the many days on which they have secured precedence to have placed it first on the Order Paper.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I would wish to point out to the right hon. Gentleman that the Irish Members have not been so very fortunate in the ballot. They have only obtained precedence for one Bill up to the present.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I have noticed two or three Wednesdays on which Bills with a most Hibernian flavour in their titles at all events had precedence. I have been in the House five-and-twenty years, and during that period I would be afraid even roughly to estimate the number of Wednesdays in which hon. Members have had precedence.

Let us put on one side altogether the merits or demerits of this Bill. So far as I know, I think the Bill is a very good one. I do not know whether it is a practical Bill, but to its principle I think most people will assent. One or two hon. Gentlemen opposite said it would pass without a word of comment, and it was so obvious that no one would desire to debate it. Is that the principle on which hon. Gentlemen manage their debates? Do they not discuss obvious propositions and occupy the time of the House?

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): We have allowed Bills to pass without discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not deny that hon. Members can on occasion show the virtue of silence. I am asking, is that habitual? Are they in that general state of grace in which silence is their obvious and ruling characteristic, and in which every common sense proposition maintained on this side of the House is received with respectful taciturnity on the other side? I think. Sir, that the expectation of silence is very often disappointed on whatever side of the House it is entertained. We may set aside all discussion as to the merits of the Bill, or the characteristics of the Party advocating it, because I can most truly say that neither of these circumstances have had the smallest influence in the decision which I venture to recommend to the House. The question is the management of our Fridays in Supply. I am glad that this Bill is one which, so

far as I know, is not of a controversial character. Had it been one which the Government looked upon unfavourably, we might have been accused of partiality. We cannot be accused of partiality on the present occasion, as we have no objection to the Bill. We are acting on a general principle, which I am sure the House ought to accept, and it in a moment of aberration we violated the established practice, I can only say that I should be obliged to see that it did not occur again by putting down on Fridays, not for the purpose of discussion, but for the purpose of preventing motions like the present, other Government business.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN said he could not hope to add weight to the appeal which had been made to the First Lord of the Treasury, but, as the Member who first introduced the Bill, he should like to say a few words on the motion for the adjournment. He introduced the Bill five years ago, and he then endeavoured to make it as unobjectionable as possible. In the course of his investigations he only found two hon. Members who objected to it, and their ground was that they thought it was intended to repeal the Mortmain Acts. There were then some words in the Bill which, in the opinion of lawyers, might be so construed.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot discuss the merits of the Bill.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN said he found hon. Members on the other side favourable to the Bill with the exception of the hon. Member for South Belfast, which he regretted, because everyone would regard the hon. Member as a conscientious and honest opponent, although sometimes fanatical. Whenever he had an opportunity of bringing the Bill forward he always informed the hon. Member of his intention, and he was sure his hon. friend who was now in charge of the Bill would also have informed the hon. Member for South Belfast if he were in the House that the Bill would be brought forward. His hon. friends desired to fight fairly and squarely. The Leader of the House said that he had no objection to the Bill, and that was something to remember, but in the words of a familiar quotation, "Perhaps it was right to dissemble your love, but why did you kick me downstairs? The House would have adjourned long ago if his hon. friend had been allowed to move the Second Reading of the Bill. The evil which it was meant to remove had been condemned by no less an authority than the Master of the Rolls in Ireland.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to discuss the merits of the Bill.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN said he would ask the House not to be led by the Leader of the House on this occasion. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of Fridays as if they had been created for the Government, but it would be in the recollection of the House that until recently Fridays were the property of private Members, before the Government appropriated them to their own use, as they were inclined to appropriate, all the time of the House. He hoped that the Catholics of Ireland, when they were next asked to fight the battles of the Empire, would remember how they had been treated by the Government.

DR. AMBROSE said that the right hon. Gentleman stated that the Irish Members had been very fortunate in the ballot, but they had only secured one Wednesday up to the present, when they brought forward a Bill for the benefit of over half a,

million of people. During the discussion of that Bill there were only fourteen Members on the other side.

*MR. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the question before the House, or with the observations made by the right hon. Gentleman.

DR. AMBROSE: The right hon. Gentleman said that the Government would themselves put down Bills, if private Members' Bills were to be brought forward on Fridays; but was it because they had neglected their duty that the Irish Members should be deprived of their opportunity? The right hon. Gentleman said that he himself was in favour of the Bill, and that reminded him that when his hon. friend the Member for East Mayo brought forward the Catholic University question last year, the right hon. Gentleman said he was passionately in favour of it, but asked the Irish Members not to go to a division. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman now, if he were passionately in favour of the Bill on the Order Paper, would he make it a Government measure?

MR. POWER said he desired to support the suggestion of his hon. friend. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that he approved of the principle of the Bill, and saw nothing objectionable in it, but if he approved so much of the Bill, why should he not make it a Government measure? That would be a test of the sincerity of the right hon. Gentleman, and if he did that, there would not be many dissentient voices, even on his own side. They were not responsible for the discussion on the motion for the adjournment. His hon. friend the Member for Waterford proposed an alternative, which would have obviated the discussion, but the Government refused to accept it. The right hon. Gentleman asked why, if the Irish Members were so much interested in the Bill, they did not put it down as first Order on one of the Wednesdays which had fallen to their lot, but he would remind the right hon. Gentleman that the Bill had been put down every day during the session, and it was not the fault of the Irish Members that it was not passed. He was sorry that the Catholic Members on the other side did not support the appeal to the Government.

MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside): We cannot ask the Government to violate the rules of the House.

MR. POWER said that if such an appeal were made the right hon. Gentleman would perhaps adopt the suggestion of his hon. friend.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.) said that the header of the House stated that the precedent quoted by his hon. friend the Member for East Clare did not apply, because of the fact that on that occasion he himself was absent from the House. But the right hon. Gentleman had representatives in the House who acted on his behalf, and therefore he held that the right hon. Gentleman was responsible. The right hon. Gentleman also said that he would in future put down Government Bills which would prevent private Members moving their Bills; but if the right hon. Gentleman neglected to do that, why should the Irish Members suffer for it? They claimed to have a right to discuss the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman used what he would call a very humorous and interesting argument. An hon. Member opposite, animated by a spirit of justice and fair-play, stated that he believed that the demand of the Irish Members was reasonable and just. The right hon. Gentleman immediately

jumped up, fearing that the disease would become contagious, and appealed to his party to follow him. The right hon. Gentleman had not treated the Irish Members fairly with regard to the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman asked why this Bill was not put down as the first Order on a Wednesday, but what was the necessity of putting it down on a Wednesday, when, as the right hon. Gentleman himself admitted, there was no opposition to it? The Irish Members were therefore justified in taking an ordinary occasion to bring forward the Bill. An hon. Member opposite appealed to the Leader of the House not to take up the Bill because an hon. friend of his was absent. Was it because one hon. Gentleman was absent on his own business, that the question of removing an insult to Catholics was to be postponed? That would be unworthy of the House of Commons. He observed with some sunrise that the hon. Member for the Ilkeston Division of Derby supported the Leader of the House, notwithstanding that on several occasions recently they had heard the right hon. Gentleman, the Leader of his party, protest against being ignored by the Leader of the House.

*MR. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the adjournment of the House.

MR. CULLINAN said, not being yet well up in the rules of the House, he hoped he would be excused. The arguments and actions of the Leader of the House, and the support which was given him by his party, convinced him that the Government were not disposed to give anything like fair-play or justice to the demands of the Irish Members. The action of the right hon. Gentleman was consistent with that which the Chief Secretary and other Members of the Government assumed, although they had honeyed words in their mouths when they answered the questions of the Irish Members.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.) said that the right hon. Gentleman had been good enough to express himself in favour of the principle of the Bill, and he was therefore appealed to to make it a Government measure. He should be very glad if the right hon. Gentleman would answer that appeal.

*MR. SPEAKER: The question as to whether the Government ought to make a Bill a Government measure or not, is not germane to the question before the House.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR said that the reason why he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to answer was that if he replied favourably the discussion might end.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.) said that, as the Member in charge of the Bill, he wished to point out the fallacy of one argument put forward by the First Lord of the Treasury as a reason why hon. Members should vote for the adjournment. The right hon. Gentleman said that if hon. Members broke through the customary rule of procedure on the present occasion, he would in future put down Government Bills after Supply. The right hon. Gentleman must think that the Irish Members were very blind, and that they did not know that there was a dearth of Government legislation. Where were the right hon. Gentleman's Bills? The only business laid before the House was the voting of money for the Army and Navy. In the most gracious Speech from the Throne;

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is getting very Faraway from the subject.

MR. O'DOHERTY said he was surprised that all the protests against the adjournment of the House should have come from the Irish Members. Where was the

voice of the hon. Member for Galway, or of the hon. Member for the Brightside Division of Sheffield, in support of the civil and religious liberty of their fellow Catholics? If the right hon. Gentleman wished to remedy the grievance, all he had to do was to tell the Government draftsman to introduce a section into the Statute Law Revision Bill, and the grievance would be wiped out. If the right hon. Gentleman would give an assurance to that effect, it would satisfy the Irish Members.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork County, N.E.) said he thought it was the manifest duty of a Protestant like himself, who was returned by a Catholic constituency, to oppose the motion for the adjournment. He did not intend to discuss the merits of the Bill, but he should have thought that the majority of hon. Members on the Opposition side of the House, who were always boasting of their religious toleration, and the Unionist Government, which said it was prepared to do everything for Ireland that an Irish Parliament could do, would have bailed with delight the opportunity which was afforded them of removing a great grievance. The Irish Members had again and again been obliged to point out that the professions of the Unionist party were merely empty wind, and their action on the present occasion would intensify the dissatisfaction of the people of Ireland with English rule, and also the demand that the action of the Irish Members, not only in Ireland, but in the House of Commons should be in the direction of compelling the Government to redress Irish grievances, if they would not redress them through a sense of fair play. As a Protestant he felt grieved that his coreligionists were not broad-minded and liberal enough to rise in their places and urge the header of the House to yield to the demand of the Irish Members. The argument and the justice were on the side of the Irish Members, and if their demand was refused they would be taught a lesson which they would take to heart, and they would show that in refusing to grant an opportunity for discussing the Bill the Government would not be advancing the progress of business in the House or bringing about a greater acquiescence on the part of the people of Ireland in English rule.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) said that the Government had wasted two hours in endeavouring to prevent the discussion of a Bill which did not meet with the opposition of as many members. The Irish Members knew very well how appeals in the past for facilities to discuss the Bill had been met. The right hon.

Gentleman, although he professed sympathy with the Bill, by his action refused to afford Catholics the religious liberty accorded to other denominations. To be consistent, the right hon. Gentleman should either make Catholics throughout the Empire criminals or make them free.

*MR. SPEAKER: That has nothing to do with the adjournment of the House.

MR. FLAVIN said that if the demand of the Irish Members were refused they would tell their constituents and also the Catholics of Great Britain how they had been treated. The Irish Members did not ask for anything but religious equality.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must endeavour to keep to the question.

MR. FLAVIN said that the Irish Members were only doing their duty in asking that they should be given an opportunity of discussing the Bill.

*MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth) said that hon. Members opposite had by the

rules of the House been able to keep up debates at great length, and it was then the duty of his hon. friends to remain in the House. Now by the rules of the House hon. Members should be allowed to go home after Supply had been finished. He

hoped the House would abide by the rules and accept the motion for the adjournment.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said the hon. Member who had just spoken had hardly grasped the meaning of the situation which had arisen. The hon. Member referred to the rules of the House, but was he present when it was pointed out earlier in the debate that on an occasion almost exactly similar the rules of the House were so far waived as to permit a motion for the adjournment on the part of the Government to be withdrawn in order that a private Member's Bill might be discussed? That was an almost exact parallel. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury said it was impossible to depart from precedent, that Friday being a Government day it was essential that nothing but Government business should be taken. But there was no rule so strong that it could not be departed from on occasion, and if ever there was an occasion when a departure should be made it was the present. He would not enter into a discussion of the details of the Bill, but would refer to it merely to the same extent as the right hon. Gentleman referred to it. The right hon. Gentleman said that the Bill was non-controversial. That was perfectly true. It was a Bill which had very few opponents in the House, and which the right hon. Gentleman himself declared he approved of. That being so, was it unreasonable that the Irish Members should oppose the motion for the adjournment, in order that they might deal with a Bill that was practically unopposed? When those who were interested in the Bill read the discussion it would be forced on their minds that although the right hon. Gentleman said he approved of the Bill, there was some hidden objection to it on the part of a section of the Government. The First Lord of the Treasury was generally on such occasions so admirable in his manner, and so bland and suave in his tone, that he succeeded too often in softening down the natural feeling of resentment entertained by the Irish Members; but he took the liberty of telling the right hon. Gentleman, speaking for himself, and he believed also for many other Irish Members, that he was getting heartily sick and tired of his conduct. Hon. Gentlemen opposite boasted sometimes that their party was pre-eminently the party of the aristocracy, and the gentlemen of England. [An HON. MEMBER: Order, order!] If that was out of order, he would withdraw it. He would repeat that he was getting tired of the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman, who was continually saying to the Irish Members, "I quite agree with your contention, which is most reasonable, I am personally strongly in favour of the measure you desire to pass "; but the end of all the fine and honeyed speeches of the right hon. Gentleman was that his majority of 150 went into the division lobby against the Irish Members. That occurred on the Catholic University question.

*MR. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. Gentleman will keep to the question before the House.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he merely alluded to the;

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not in order on a motion for the adjournment in discussing the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman on other questions.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he was referring to the Catholic University question in order to illustrate tin attitude;

*MR. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. Member will endeavour to pay some slight respect to the ruling of the Chair. He is persisting in a line of argument which I have twice told him is nut in order.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he would deal with what the right hon. Gentleman himself had said in his speech. He said he had no objection to the principle of the measure, but in the same breath he told the Irish Members that he would give them no help to carry out what he himself said they were justly entitled to.

That attitude of continually expressing a desire to meet the wishes of the Irish Members while doing nothing to carry them out was an attitude which he himself was heartily sick of, and it illustrated the emptiness of the professions of the Government to rule Ireland with a fair and equal hand. If the Bill referred to religious orders which were respected by the majority of the Protestant Members of the House, would not the rule have been strained in favour of it? From one point of view, indeed, he was glad the Government had adopted the attitude they had, because it went to prove that while the Irish Members go plenty of sympathy there was still an

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex, F.

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bain, Col. James Robert

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)

Arkwright, John Stanhope

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

Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Arnold Forster, Hugh O.

Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)

Bignold, Arthur

attempt, though not so open as it used to be, to treat Irish Catholics with contempt, and he sincerely hoped that not only Irish Catholics but their co-religionists throughout the Empire would resent the action of the Government. An hon. Gentleman opposite said that he could not ask the

Government to break the rules of the House. It was not a question of asking the Government to break rules; it was asking them to do for this Bill what they did for a Bill last year. As a Catholic himself he was not a bit ashamed to express his determination, in spite of every rule of the House and every action of the Government, to protest as strongly as he could as long as an insult, which no fair minded man approved of, on the Catholics of Ireland and the Empire was retained on the Statute Book.

MR. MACDONA (Southwark, Rotherhithe) said that as an Irishman himself he protested against the disrespect shown to the Leader of the House.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: What about the disrespect shown to Catholics?

MR. MACDONA: Of all men in the House his right hon. friend did most to support Roman Catholics in Ireland, and no one could go further than he had.

*MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members on either side of the House are not entitled to discuss the general question.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: On a point of order, might I be allowed to suggest that the hon. Gentleman should be allowed to continue his defence of the Leader of the House?

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 148, Noes, 53. (Division List No. 116.)

Bigwood, James

Haslam, Sir Alfred S.

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Bill, Charles

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale

Purvis, Robert

Blundell, Col. Henry

Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)

Randles, John S.

Bond, Edward

Higgingbottom, S. W.

Rasch, Major Frederic Came

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Hogg, Lindsay

Remnant, James Farquharson

Brookfield, Col. Montagu

Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.

Rentoul, James Alexander

Bull, William James

Lawrence, William F.

Renwick, George

Bullard, Sir Harry

Lawson, John Grant

Richards, Henry Charles

Caldwell, James

Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)

Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge

Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Rigg, Richard

Causton, Richard Knight

Leigh, Sir Joseph

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Charles T.

Cautley, Henry Strother

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Levy, Maurice
Seton-Karr, Henry
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Smith, H C (Northumb. Tynesd.
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Spear, John Ward
Charrington, Spencer
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Spencer, Rt Hn C. B. (Northants
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Macdona, John Cumming
Tennant, Horold John
Colston, Chas. E. H. Athole
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgun, Gow'r
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Majendie, James A. H.
Thornton, Percy M.
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Manners, Lord Cecil
Tollemache, Henry James
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Tomlinson, William Edw. M.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Meysey Thompson, Sir H M.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Cranborne, Viscount
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Valentia, Viscount
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. F.
Cust, Henry John C.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Wason, J. Cathcart (Orkney)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Morrell, George Herbert
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Dunn, Sir William
Mount, William Arthur
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Nicholson, William Graham
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Finch, George H.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Wodehouse, Hon. A. (Essex)
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Parkes, Ebenezer
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Gordon, Hn. J E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Rbt. Wellesley
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'amlts)
Pemberton, John S. G.

Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Penn, John
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Mr. Anstruther and Mr. Hayes Fisher.
Greene, Sir E. W. (Bury St, Ed.
Plummer, Walter R.
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G (Mid'x
Pretymann, Ernest George
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Doherty, William
Ambrose, Robert
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Bell, Richard
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Dowd, John
Blake, Edward
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N
Boland, John
Joyce, Michael
O'Malley, William
Burke, E. Haviland
Leamy, Edmund
O'Mara, James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lundon, W.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Philipps, John Wynford
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Power, Patrick Joseph
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cullinan, J.
Murphy, J.

Redmond, William (Clare)
Delany, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Sullivan, Donal
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Duffy, William J.
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Ffrench, Peter
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Gilhooly, James
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Adjourned accordingly at five minutes after Twelve of the clock till Monday
next.