

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/mar/6>

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 6th March, 1901.

Another Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

MORTON CARR DRAINAGE BILL.

"For amending certain provisions in force with respect to the Morton Carr Drainage, in the county of Lincoln; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

ALDERSHOT GAS AND WATER BILL

CALEDONIAN RAILWAY BILL.

CRAWLEY GAS BILL.

DUBLIN ST. JAMES' GATE BREWERY TRAMWAYS BILL.

GATESHEAD AND DISTRICT TRAMWAYS BILL.

GRAVESEND GAS BILL.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL

HORLEY DISTRICT GAS BILL.

LEATHERHEAD GAS BILL.

LONDON, TILBURY, AND SOUTHBEND RAILWAY BILL.

SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL.

WELLS WATER BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

PETITION.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Bromley; Reading; Sunderland; Gravesend; Hebden Bridge; Halifax; Plymouth; Burslem; Holyhead; Normanby; and Ashton-under-Lyne; to be upon the Table.

POOR LAW OFFICERS SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Levenshulme; Hammersmith; Coventry; and Barton Regis; to be upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Manchester; Doncaster; York; West Ham; Temperance Union of the Society of Friends; Glasgow (two); Greenock: Millom; and Driffeld; to be upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Greenock; Ayr; and Fraserburgh; to be upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

Copy presented, of Annual Report and Accounts of the Governors for the year 1900 [by command]; to lie upon the Table.

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS (EXCESSES), 1899-1900.

Copy presented, of Statement of the Sum required to be voted in order to make good Excesses on certain Grants for the year ended on the 31st March, 1900 [by Command]; Referred to the Committee of Supply, and to be printed. [No. 77.]

SUSPENSION OF MEMBERS (5TH MARCH).

MR JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I desire. Mr. Speaker, to bring under the notice of the House a question of privilege arising out of the painful scene which took place here last night. It will. Mr. Speaker, be within the recollection of the House and yourself that a number of hon. Members of this House were reported to you by name by the Chairman of Committees as having disregarded the authority of the Chair by refusing to take part in a division. In this report to you by the Chairman of Committees certain hon. Members were named and were subsequently suspended from the service of the House, and they were removed by force. The question of privilege which I desire to raise is that several of those hon. Members were reported to you. Mr. Speaker, by the Chairman of Committees as having disregarded the authority of the Chair, without proper steps having been taken to identify them, and in the removal of those hon. Members violence was used of a character;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; It is not a question of privilege which the hon.

Member is raising; it is purely a question of order. If the hon. Member has any definite point of order to raise, or has any question to put as to something that was out of order, I will answer him. This is not a question of privilege upon which he can base a motion nor upon which he can make a speech.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I am very sorry that, unfortunately, I was not in my place last night when the scene took place, but I have noticed by the report in the papers of what took place that you. Mr. Speaker, stated; if you are correctly reported; that a protest against what had taken place could subsequently be made. What I desire to bring under the attention of the House is that, as a matter of order as well as a matter of privilege, although I would claim it as a matter of privilege; [Ministerial cries of "Order, order;"] The question I rose to ask is in regard to the names reported to you of certain Members who were reported to you without proper steps having been taken to identify hon. Members. As a matter of fact, I have satisfied myself that some of the hon. Members who have been suspended had actually gone into the division lobby to take part in the division before the scene arose in the House. This is a matter of such grave importance affecting the right and privileges of the Members who have been suspended that I think an opportunity ought to be given to me of raising the question now.

*MR. SPEAKER: It is clearly not a matter of privilege as it stands at present, but a question of order. If there is any instance of the kind mentioned by the hon. Member in which any hon. Member has been reported to me wrongly, and if there has been a mistake, then the proper course would be for the hon. Member to communicate with me; and I regret he did not take that course last night; and inform me that, in point of fact, he did not refuse to leave the House and take part in the division. I am quite certain that the House will not desire to proceed with this matter at the present moment until the hon. Members alluded to have communicated with me. I am quite sure that the House will at once remedy the mistake if it has occurred.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): With all due respect to you, Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit that this is really of very vital importance. I will put this question. I am

speaking of two concrete instances of two colleagues who are known to myself. I an hon. Member of this House is removed by violence from this House;

*MR. SPEAKER: There is no question of privilege at present before the House. The hon. Member is now proceeding to comment again upon the proceedings in the House, and he is out of order.

MR. DILLON: Surely I am entitled, as any hon. Member of this House is entitled, to submit to you a question on a point of order, which is a question of privilege. If you rule that it is not in order. I shall accept your ruling without question, but I think I am entitled to submit my case.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have already said that it is not a question of privilege. If, after I have given a ruling on the point, I allow this question to be raised a nun by the hon. Member, I do not know where it will end.

MR. DILLON: I may be stupid in this matter, but it does seem to me that the question which I wish to raise has not been accurately raised by the hon. Member for Waterford, who spoke before me; and I think the House of Commons might, in a case of this kind, listen to me for a few minutes. The particular case I want to raise is not the case of the bon. Members who refused to leave the House last night, but the case of two hon. Members who stopped me when I was coming into the House and asked me to bring their case under the notice of the Chair. They inform me that they went into the lobby, and were afterwards forcibly removed with violence by the police. I am not in the least desirous of questioning your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I think that I am entitled to a clear ruling upon this point. My point is this: if an hon. Member of this House who has not in any way infringed the rules of order, by error on the part of the Clerk of the House who has wrongfully reported his name to you and to the Chairman, is removed by violence by the officials of the House and debarred from taking part in the debate,

is that not a question of privilege which may be raised by a colleague when the hon. Member alluded to is debarred from attending here to state his own case before the House?

*MR. SPEAKER: I do not know what are the facts which the hon. Member states. Does the hon. Member say that two of those hon. Members who sit on those benches, whom I requested to leave and who refused to leave, were removed by violence? Is he speaking of their case?

MR. DILLON: No, Mr. Speaker. My complaint is that two hon. Members stopped me when I was coming into the House to-day, and stated that yesterday when the division was called on they went into the lobby to vote, but when the doors were unlocked and the names reported one of the Clerks of the House look their names down as having disobeyed the ruling of the Chair, and reported them to the Chairman. I there fore put it to you, Sir, whether that is not a question of privilege, and whether I am not entitled to raise the case of these two hon. Members, who are now wrongfully debarred from coming into the House, as a question of privilege?

*MR. SPEAKER: No; for this reason: the Chairman of Committees reported to me that those hon. Gentlemen were present, and refused to go into the lobby, and the House has ordered their suspension. They are prevented from coming here. If

they will communicate with me and state to me what the facts are, then the matter may be brought before the House. At the present moment it does not seem to me that it is in a position to inquire into this matter unless the hon.

Members themselves make these allegations.

MR. DILLON: With all due respect. Mr. Speaker, the two hon. Members I allude to have commissioned me to make this application on their behalf, for they stopped me at the outer door as I was coming down to the House. I have always understood that a question of privilege must be raised immediately. What are these two hon. Members to do? May I communicate with them again, and, if they authorise me with a written communication to raise this question.

shall I be allowed to deal with it as a question of privilege? I understand that if you do not raise a question of privilege immediately, you are then debarred from raising your point. This is one of the most serious questions of privilege.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Members referred to will communicate to me their precise statements upon the matter, then the House will deal with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: How can they communicate?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Under the circumstances of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, which I do not desire to question. I will ask the permission of the House to move the adjournment of the House "to call attention to a matter of definite and urgent public importance; namely, the action the Chairman of Committees in reporting to you certain Members of this House as refusing to take part in a division and disregarding the ruling of the Chair, without proper steps having been taken to identify them, and the application of violence to certain Members of this House."

*MR. SPEAKER: That resolution cannot be moved now, because it has been held over and over again that any question affecting the ruling of the Chair, or calling into question the action of the Chair, must be raised upon a substantive motion of which notice has been given, and it cannot be done upon a motion for the adjournment of the House.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: That means precluding any possibility of raising this question at all this session, unless the Government see their way to give us an opportunity. I will ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in view of the grave importance of the question which affects the rights of Members who allege that they were wrongfully treated in the matter, whether he will give the House an opportunity to discuss it.

THE FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The ruling, Mr. Speaker, which you have just given practically amounts to this: that the House will have an opportunity of discussing this question as a matter of privilege as soon as the hon. Members who think themselves aggrieved have communicated with yourself in a proper manner, and the facts are laid before the House; then the House may discuss it.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is so.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If that be, as is intimated to me from the Chair, an accurate statement of Mr. Speaker's ruling, it is clear that the opportunity which the hon. Gentleman desires will be given without the intervention of the Government as soon as the facts are laid before Mr. Speaker, and it will then be open to

discussion.

MR. DILLON: It is exceedingly important that we should know where we are. Your ruling, as I understand it, is that when you have received a communication from the two hon. Members to whom I have referred it will be competent for us to discuss a question of privilege; but will that only be a question of privilege as applied to those two hon. Members?

*MR. SPEAKER assented.

MR. DILLON: I understand that to be your ruling. I should like to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he considers that a full discussion of the whole incident? Anybody who has had any experience in this House of debates on questions of privilege knows that the rules of order are very tightly drawn, and we shall be absolutely confined to the discussion of the grievances of those two hon. Members, in regard to whom the question of privilege is raised, and we shall not be in a position to discuss the whole incident.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand from the question of the hon. Gentlemen the Member for Waterford that what he desires is an opportunity of discussing the case of these two hon. Members who regard themselves as being aggrieved. That opportunity will be granted as a matter of privilege as soon as the hon. Members have communicated with Mr. Speaker. Now the hon. Gentleman desires that an opportunity should be given for discussing what has occurred to the other hon. Members who were

suspended. I am considering that, and also what means may be taken to prevent its recurrence. I think it is possible; but I make no statement at present; that I shall be able to make a statement within a few hours regarding an opportunity being given to discuss both questions.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Perhaps I ought to read again the terms of my motion, for the right hon. Gentleman is under a misapprehension. The motion I asked leave to make had reference to the action of the Chairman of Committees, in reporting to you, Sir, certain Members of this House as refusing to take part in a division without taking proper steps to identify them, and the application of violence to certain Members of this House. I hope that if we do get an opportunity of considering the possibility of preventing the recurrence of these scenes in the future, the right hon. Gentleman will take into account in that connection the inadvisability of attempting to close after one night's debate a Vote of £17,000,000.

*MR. SPEAKER: The Clerk will now proceed to read the Orders of the Day.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): On the point of order, Sir;

*MR. SPEAKER: It is too late.

MR. POWER: It is on a point of order Mr. Speaker.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have already called on the Clerk to read the Orders of the Day.

AN HON. MEMBER: We did not hear what you did call.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOT- LAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk Burghs): The Bill which I have the honour to introduce is intended to remedy what has been felt ever since the passing of the Police

Act of 1890 to have been an injustice and an anomaly so far as the police force of Scotland is concerned. In that year the then Lord Advocate brought in a measure for the superannuation of constables in Scotland, and in introducing it he laid great stress upon the arduous nature of their duties, and upon the importance of attracting to the force a good class of men and pointed out that the prospect of a suitable retiring allowance, depending as it did upon good conduct and on a good record, would undoubtedly have the desired effect. So far so good, but unfortunately this Act, though a step in the right direction, placed the Scottish police in a position of considerable inequality as compared with their English brethren. The English Bill passed with very little alteration, whereas the Scottish Bill was very much changed, to the serious disadvantage of the Scottish police.

And now I must ask the patience of the House while I endeavour to explain the difference between the two Police Acts. The English Act gives very large discretionary power to the local authorities in determining the qualifying periods of service and the rates of pension. It gives the option of adopting any scale of pension between the maximum and the minimum scales fixed by the Act, and it gives the option of adopting an age qualification for a pension. The result is that the police authorities in connection with the larger forces, where many years experience had been acquired in the working of superannuation funds, have adopted the maximum scale of pensions without an age limit, and the authorities which had adopted an age limit and a medium scale of pensions gradually abandoned that position, so that at present the maximum scale of pensions in the English Act, without an age limit, is the rule generally throughout England. What is now proposed for Scotland by this Bill is that the conditions of service and rate of pension should be the same as in England. The English Act gives power to a police authority to fix an age limit and also any scale of pensions between the following minimum and maximum limits. If a constable has completed fifteen, but less than twenty-one, years approved service he gets, in ease of infirmity of mind or body, an annual sum of not less than one-sixtieth nor more than one-fiftieth of his annual pay for every completed year of approved service; from twenty-one to twenty-five years service, a pension of not less than twenty-sixtieths nor more than twenty-fiftieths of his annual pay, with an addition of not less than two-sixtieths nor more than two-fiftieths for each completed year of service, above twenty, always, of course, upon a medical certificate of infirmity; above twenty-five years an annual sum of not less than thirty-sixtieths nor more than thirty-one-fiftieths of his annual pay, with an addition of not less than one-sixtieth nor more than three-fiftieths for every year above twenty-five years service, so that the pension shall not exceed two-thirds of his annual pay. But in the Scottish Bill these discretionary powers were deleted, and the period of service when a constable could retire on pension on a medical certificate was fixed at twenty years, and the fixed scale of pensions was reduced below the minimum in the English Act, and an age and length of service limit fixed, which make the prospect of a pension so remote as materially to lessen its value, seeing that only a small proportion of the men are likely to earn the maximum pension.

Previously to the passing of the Act the police authorities, in many cases, granted better ex gratia allowances to men who were forced to retire through infirmity than the pensions under the Act. In England a constable is entitled, under a medical certificate, if incapacitated for the performance of his duty by infirmity of mind or body, to a pension after fifteen years service. In Scotland no pension can be granted under twenty years service. In England, after twenty-five years service, a constable may, without a medical certificate, retire and claim his pension; but in Scotland he can only do so on condition that he is fifty-five years of age, or sixty years if above the rank of a sergeant. The English constable, on completing twenty-six years service, may receive two-thirds of his annual pay, while the Scottish constable, after the same service, only receives twenty-six-sixtieths, or considerably less than half pay. For instance, an English constable, whose weekly pay is 27s. would receive, after twenty-six years service, 18s. per week, while a Scottish constable with the same service would receive only 11s. 8d. per week, making a difference of 6s. 4d., and he would only receive, that if incapacitated for duty, or if he had attained fifty-five years of age. The English constable has thus the advantage not only of receiving a higher rate of pension, but of having a shorter period to contribute to the fund, notwithstanding the fact that the rateable deduction from the pay of both for the pension scheme is the same; namely, 2½ per cent. per annum. Nor does the difference end here. The Scottish constable is tied down by the age limit. He must commence the service before he is twenty-five years of age, and cannot retire under fifty-five years of age, and consequently he must serve thirty years before he is entitled to even a limited proportion of his pension. Compare this with the English constable's twenty-six years of service, which enables him to obtain a pension five years before the Scottish constable can claim one. The Scottish constable can only earn the maximum pension of two-thirds of his annual pay on completing thirty-four years service. Such, briefly stated, are some of the inequalities and anomalies to which the police force of Scotland is subjected as compared with England, and the Bill now before the House would put an end to this state of matters, and is a measure of justice to which they are fully entitled. As a mere question of policy, and apart altogether from the merits of the case, it would be wise on the part of the Government to take up the question and to give facilities for the passing of the Bill. The duties of the police in Scotland are as onerous and exacting as are those of England, and the difference of treatment in respect of pensions is tending, and will tend more and more, to weaken the efficiency of the Scottish police by inducing the most energetic and promising men to seek the better treatment and pay existing in England, and also in preventing the retirement of officers who have met with injury, or who have reached an age when they are unable satisfactorily to perform the arduous duties imposed upon them. Now, I am at a loss to understand why such an assimilation of the law of Scotland to England should not take place, and why the Scottish police should not be placed upon the same level. No further contribution is asked from the imperial funds (I am sure the Chancellor of

the Exchequer would smile at that), nor is it at all likely, judging from the past experience of all the most important centres of police authority in Scotland, that anything will be required from the local rates. I say that it is not at all, likely, as the House will see from the published and official statements of the amount of accumulated funds arising from the Exchequer grant, and from the deductions from the pay of the constables and other sources. From the published official statement of the Corporation of Glasgow Police Department, employing one-fourth of the whole police of Scotland, I find that no less a sum than £;11,037 6s. has been added to the fund in the one year ending 15th, March. 1900, and to show that this is no solitary year, there has been since the passing of the Act in 1890 an accumulation of no less than £;117,993 17s. 3d. Edinburgh has an accumulated fund of £;15,305; Dundee, of £;18,973; Aberdeen, of £;12,207; Ayr, of £;2,394 is. 3d.; Hawick, of £;1,370; Hamilton, of £;1,879; Stirlingshire, of £;7,040; Ayrshire, of £;13,841; Aberdeenshire, of £;7,847. I need not go through every police fund in Scotland, but I make the statement that not a single police authority in Scotland has ever had to put its hand in its pocket in connection with the fund, nor is it likely that, if the Bill passes, they will require to do so. It is, of course, impossible to calculate exactly what may be the additional burden thrown upon the fund if the terms of the English Act are given to Scotland, as it has to be borne in mind that the Bill is so permissive that the police authority may give anything above the minimum; but assuming that they give an average between the maximum and minimum. I do not anticipate that it would involve a very large additional sum, probably not more than 25 per cent. For instance, the amount of pension paid by Glasgow for the year ending 15th March, 1900, was £;5,474 19s. 5d., and, if this Bill pass, probably the additional cost might be estimated at £;1,400 to £;1,500 per annum, still leaving a very large surplus of not less than £;4,000 per annum. It has now been seen that nothing is asked from the imperial Exchequer, nor yet is it likely that anything will be required from the local rates. This is,

perhaps, the most important point, but in addition the terms of the Bill are heartily approved of by almost all the best authorities on the subject. His Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland has for many years past urged the desirability of the amendment proposed. The Convention of Royal Burghs of Scotland, consisting of ninety-four burghs, having 187 representatives, almost entirely provosts and other members of their respective town councils, and having lengthened municipal experience in the administration of the police force, are in favour of the amendments proposed by the Bill. Last, but not least, three-fourths of the Scottish Members of Parliament support the principles of the Bill, and no doubt many of them will take an opportunity to-day of saying so.

In conclusion I would ask the kindly co-operation of the English and Irish representatives, seeing that this Bill imposes no new burden upon the taxpayers, and only seeks to have the law established in England assimilated to that of Scotland. For these reasons I beg to move the Second Reading of this Bill.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): I only rise formally to second the motion of my

hon. friend. It seems time that the case has been put forward so fully I that really there is nothing more to be said. The case for the Bill is that we only ask for Scotland what the English have in their own local authorities, and which, so far as I know, has worked very well up to the present time. I do not think that in this country there has been a single complaint by any of the local authorities. I would further point out that in this matter Scotch opinion is almost unanimous, so far as this Bill is concerned. I think we are entitled to a dash of Home Rule in proposing this measure, this afternoon. I think that three-fourths of the Scotch Members at least on both sides of the House are pledged to vote for it, and I appeal to Irish Members that that is a strong reason why they should give us their support on the present occasion. I notice on the Paper a motion by the hon. Member for Mid Lanark to the effect that this Bill he read a second time this day six months. I am nearly always glad to follow the leadership of the hon. Member for Mid Lanark, but I am sorry that I cannot do so on this occasion. I cannot conceive, myself, why any Scottish Liberal or Member should oppose this Bill. In Scotland we believe in decentralisation, and in giving local bodies charge of their own affairs, and surely we ought to be in favour upon a question of this kind of safely trusting to their good judgment and their good sense. It seems to me that the mere fact that we are proposing to give them this power does not necessarily mean that they are going to exercise it. They can deal with the question, as they think best, and the ratepayers will be the masters of the situation, for they can elect men who will carry this question out in accordance with the wishes of the ratepayers. It seems to me that we are advised to take a very safe step this afternoon, for we are asked to endorse a certain permissive principle which they will have power to exercise if they wish it. Many of the local authorities even in England have not exercised this power. We say that the Scottish policeman is as good as the English policeman, and he ought to have the same benefits given to him if the local authorities consider he deserves them. I have much pleasure in seconding this proposal.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time. MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): It is perfectly true, as has been stated by the mover and seconder of this motion, that over three-fourths of the Scotch Members are pledged in favour of this Bill; but that fact makes it all the more necessary that this House should be made aware of the merits of the Bill which the Scotch Members have so suspiciously pledged themselves to support. The police are an organised body in Scotland, and at the last election they took the precaution of using their influence by putting certain questions to the different candidates, pointing out that it was simply a matter of putting them on an equality with England, and they got promises of support from Scotch Members who did not then sufficiently understand the merits of this case. I am perfectly willing that the hon. Members from Scotland who are pledged in favour of this Bill should get whatever benefit they may derive from their support of it, but I think that they should at least give an opportunity for the case against the Bill to be presented to the House. What I object to is that, at an election, people with private and personal interests of

their own should take advantage of that opportunity to force certain subjects upon their Members and exact pledges from them. I have always taken up the position that I will never give any pledge upon a matter which personally concerns any of the voters. I consider that it is downright bribery to say that you will vote for a Bill by which certain people will get certain pecuniary advantages. The hon. Member who moved this Bill said that Glasgow contained one-fourth of the whole police of Scotland. I may point out that the Corporation of the City of Glasgow are unanimously opposed to this Bill.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk Burghs): Question!

MR. CALDWELL: You may question it, but it is a fact. This Bill is supported mainly by officers who are at the age of retirement, and they are more interested in the retiring allowance than the rank and file, who are more interested in the matter of pay than in pensions. It is obvious that in considering pensions you must also consider the question of pay. An increase of pay is better for the rank and file of the constabulary, because it is an immediate advantage, while the pension is deferred, and might never be reached; and even if it were reached it I would always be improved by an increase in the pay. With regard to the question of the efficiency of the police, I maintain that it will be best promoted by having a moderate pension scheme, such as will enable the local authorities to give the largest possible pay, and in that respect there is no room whatever for complaint with regard to the local authorities in Scotland. The rate of pay varies in different localities, and if the local authorities think it is too little they can make it up in regard to the pay in such a way that the remuneration of the police would not be affected one iota in Scotland any more than in England. I intend to show that it is absolutely necessary that the pension fund for Scotland should not be interfered with, and that this matter

of pay is one which is always open for a local authority to undermine.

We are told that the sole reason for this Bill is that England has got certain things, and that Scotland also should have them. That seems to represent the whole argument in favour of the Bill, and scarcely any other argument has been introduced. It has not been maintained that the system in England is superior to the system in Scotland. Now what is the difference between the two Acts of Parliament in the case of England and Scotland? In 1890 both these Acts passed through the House at the same time, based upon the same lines, except in regard to the variation of the power given to the local authority. The age at which a policeman may retire in Scotland is fifty-five, and he can retire with two-thirds of his salary after thirty-five years service. So far as that pension is concerned, it is better than is now given to civil servants as a rule. What is the difference in the case of England? In England the pension is rather less favourable than in Scotland. The hon. Member told us that there were a great many cases in England where they did not take advantage of the latitude given by the Act. According to the English scale they are required to serve up to the age of fifty-five before they can claim two-thirds of their pay. The only difference in England is that a certain latitude is allowed to local authorities in the adoption of the maximum scale. I notice that there was no attempt made to defend

this power of variation in the case of local authorities in England as regards the pension fund. What is the result in England? In Manchester and some other places a man can retire after twenty-six years service.

We talk about removing grievances. Are there not grievances in England at the present moment as regards the powers of the local authorities to create differences?;and yet the contention is that Scotland should be put on an equal footing with England, although England is not on an equal footing itself, one part with another. That is a contention which is, of course, overlooked altogether. England has got the power;and this is the whole point of the Bill;to let its local authorities give whatever sum they think proper

within certain fixed lines. What you I want to do now is to give Scotland the same power of varying the pension fund, to which every man has an equal and moral right. The public money belongs to one man as well as to another, and they all pay equally into the fund, and yet you want to give the local authorities power to vary the rights of men which are absolutely and morally equal. We know why it is that you want this power of variation. This Bill is an example of it.

We know perfectly well that the influence of the police on Members of Parliament has been such that they have practically got a unanimity in their favour which I venture to say would not be displayed towards any other proposal. What would be the result if this Bill were passed? The police would begin to squeeze the local authorities, if they were allowed variation in this matter, on the subject of pensions, and the result would be that one local authority would give way and the others would follow like a flock of sheep through a hole in the hedge. The principle of the Scottish Act is that the pension fund is a fund to which each policeman pays equally. He has an equal right to the, public money, and of course he is entitled to an equal share corresponding to his pay. Yet we are told that this Bill is to create equal rights in Scotland; that is to say, equal rights to the local authorities to produce variations and grievances. If this Bill were passed, local authorities would begin to be squeezed in the same way that Members of Parliament have been squeezed, and there would probably be difficulty with the working classes, who have no pensions themselves and who would feel aggrieved if the local authorities granted pensions to the police. If there is any subject on which there is no room for local fighting at nil, that subject is the subject of the police, and for this reason;that unless the police have got the goodwill of the public at their back their usefulness is gone. Once raise questions of conflict between the workers on one hand and the police, on the other, and you destroy the usefulness of the police force. Why was a fixed scheme provided in the Scotch Act? For the very reason that there should be no variation between the different localities; and yet we are

now told that because England has the power of variation. Scotland should necessarily follow her example. Have we anything else in Scotland that England has not got? I think we pay school teachers in Scotland better than teachers are paid in England. Undoubtedly they are entitled to it, and no one proposes to bring down their salaries to the level of English salaries. The answer always given in connection with this Bill is that we are doing an injustice to the policemen of Scotland. Before the Act of 1890 they had no pension fund at all.

In that year they got that Act without paying a penny into the pension fund, so that there is no room for the contention so far as the police are concerned that they have really any grievance. Reference has been made to the case of Birmingham, where the local authorities have adopted to the full extent the powers of the Act. I have got excerpts to show that in all cases where, local authorities have gone to the full extent of the Act, the effect has been to create a deficit in the funds. A man retires on his pension whenever he is qualified, because if he continues to serve he may commit some fault and lose his pension, and the result is that in some places not more than ten per cent. of the men remain in the service after twenty-six years service. Will anyone say that a man of forty-seven or forty-eight years of age, after twenty-six years service, is a man who ought to be compulsorily pensioned at two-thirds of the highest pay he has ever earned? So far as the Scotch Act is concerned, we have always treated the police as a purely local matter, because we have divided our police fund into localities, and we look to the police as purely local. But there is no variation as regards pensions. If you give power to exercise an option, and if it is exercised, it is this House that will be responsible, and ratepayers will look into the question as to whether they were protected by their representatives when the local authorities were given such a power. Of course it may not be compulsory, but that is the evil of it, because you will have in each district any amount of variation, and you will destroy the efficacy of your police force.

I daresay the Lord Advocate knows perfectly well the Act of 1890, and it is with reference to that that I wish to point out some circumstances to show why it was that this Act for Scotland was deliberately made different from the English Act. The House of Commons had the English Act before it, and yet they deliberately, and for reasons which shall give, made the Scotch Act different. In Scotland, of course, no pension fund practically existed, and there was no power to get compulsory pensions before the Act of 1890. Various attempts were made by both Liberal and Conservative Governments to establish a pension fund which would fall upon the rates. These Bills were opposed, and the result was that neither a Liberal nor a Conservative Government could create a pension fund which would fall upon the rates. In 1890 an opportunity was offered, and the Government created a pension fund which does not fall upon the rates at all. That pension fund consisted of £40,000 taken out of the Custom and Excise grant which was given to Scotland, and of course if that money had not been given for police pensions it would have been available for some other Scotch purpose. It is Scotch money, to which all Scotchmen have practically an equal right, and it was devoted to this pension fund. Then there was some other money handed over for the fund, such as fines from the police and the proceeds from the sale of old clothing; and in addition each policeman was to contribute two and a half per cent. of his salary. The portion contributed by the police themselves to the fund amounted to about £10,000 a year out of £64,000, or a little less than one-sixth, so that I take it over five-sixths has been practically contributed out of public money, which belongs to the ratepayers of Scotland, and which if not applied to the pension fund would at least be available for the benefit of

the rates. The object of the Government was, and it was stated at the time, to create a pension fund from which the police would be able to draw their superannuation without there being any possibility of a claim on the local rates. And it was on that footing that the Bill was carried through. To show how carefully the scheme was prepared, I may say that the Bill was submitted to a Select Committee of the House, and that the Committee had before them Mr. Finlaison, actuary to the National Debt Commissioners, secretary to the Commutation Board of the Metropolitan Police, and the best expert actuary in the country. After careful investigation he gave it as his opinion that the pension scheme would so work out that for thirty years at least there would be no possible chance of any burden, falling on the rates, and that after that provision should be made in some other way. The hon. Member who moved the Second Reading of the Bill gave us his calculations. The facts stated by the hon. Member were right, but his deductions were absolutely wrong. The actuary's argument was that when the pension fund was begun there would be very few pensions at first; but when you brought in a number of men to the force with the idea of pensions they would remain in the service, and gradually the scheme would work out in such a way that in thirty years it would begin to come down the hill. The capital sums to the credit of the local authorities are getting on every year, but it must be borne in mind that according to the best expert authority in the country the pension fund would certainly remain solvent for thirty years, but after that it would probably be a burden on the rates. So far matters have gone much worse than when the scheme was actually propounded. What, the actuary told the Committee was that he based his figures upon a force of 4,055 men he did not make any allowance for an increase, because he said if they got rid of a lot of old men a few younger men would be able to do the work, and that therefore the force would not be likely to increase. He took the average pay at £;71 5s. 9d., whereas the average pay now is £;72 10s. He did not allow for that increase in pay, or for the increase in the number of men from four thousand to five thousand. What insurance company at the present moment would say that the pension fund was in a solvent state? The actuary also based his calculations on the assumption that fifty-five years was to be the age at which a policeman was to be retired, and that he should serve thirty-five years before he got his pension. But now a policeman need not wait for thirty-five years to get his pension, because if he is incapacitated in body or mind he can be pensioned after twenty years service. If, therefore, were to introduce a new pension scheme that will enable men to be retired after twenty-six years instead of thirty-five years, after only having made twenty-six instead of thirty-five years contributions to the fund, it will soon be absolutely insolvent. I would therefore point out to the Lord Advocate that if we are going to introduce variations into the pension scheme, and if we are going to keep it on the lines of the Act of 1890. We will require to introduce some new source of revenue to meet the increased burden which will be imposed. Where are we to get this increased revenue? The money cannot be obtained from Imperial funds, and where therefore, is it to come from? The Bill states that any deficit in the money is

to be paid out of the local rate. That is where the money is to come from. The Government scheme of 1890 was dealt with in a most careful manner. It was submitted to a Select Committee, evidence was taken from experts, and the Bill was afterwards discussed on Report, and also on the Third Reading. It was a most carefully prepared Government measure, but now it is proposed to sanction a Bill which will upset that scheme, but which makes no provision whatever for the additional money which the new obligations will require. It is most important that as regards the question of policeman's pensions there should be no possible risk of criticism on the part of the ratepayers. In this Bill you are going to open the door to criticism, not only because you propose to provide a new burden of taxation, but because you propose to allow the local authorities to exercise an option which, as I have pointed out, they have no right to exercise, as regards a fund to which each man contributes his share, and to which every man has an equal right.

It will be seen that this subject is not quite as simple as hon. Members think. It is not a matter in which we in Scotland should do what England does. That is no answer at all. We do our own business according to our own ideas, and it is no answer to say that because England does a thing therefore we should do it also. That argument is brought forward because it suits this particular case. I am interested in this matter because I am a county Member. To whom is entrusted this power of making a variation in the pension scheme? The power is entrusted to the police authorities. Who are the police authorities in Scotland? They are the standing joint committees, only a minority of whom are representatives of the ratepayers who will have to pay this burden of taxation. In the case of poor rates in Scotland, half is paid by the owner and half by the occupier, but in the case of the police rate the whole is paid by the occupier.

MR. RENSCHAW (Renfrewshire, W.): I should like to correct the hon. Member. Half the police rate is paid by the occupier and half by the owner.

MR. CALDWELL: I may be wrong as regards the rate, but I am not wrong as regards the joint committees, so that the principle for which I contend is exactly the same. Why should we give this power to bodies which are not fully representative of the ratepayers? Why should we entrust to them the power of putting an increased burden on the local rates. We have always objected to the standing joint committees. We have always contended that in the county districts the ratepayers should have the same opportunity of dealing with the police as they have in the boroughs. To my mind, that is a sufficient objection for county Members to take as regards this Bill. If this Bill passes you will throw into a vortex the police on the one hand and the ratepayers on the other. There is a working class population in my own county. They work harder than the police, and they have been tempted by the prospect of old-age pensions. All that is, it appears, in the distance, and yet this House is now asked to increase the pensions of the police. If this Bill is passed. I venture to say it will succeed in creating irritation, and that the effect will be most disastrous as far as the efficiency of the police force is concerned. The promoters of the Bill say that they have got the opinion of the Convention of Royal Burghs. Who imagines for a moment that the Convention of Royal Burghs has any weight in Scotland? It

is more susceptible of being got at by the police than any other body. It is not said that the promoters have the consent of the trades unions in Scotland. Why, it was the power of the trades unions in 1885 that prevented a Liberal Government from introducing a pension scheme. Have the trades unions been consulted, and have they given their consent to this Bill?

MR. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk Burghs): May I ask the hon. Member if the trades unions have objected?

MR. CALDWELL: Why, they are the parties who have always objected. The police are organised, and they have been able to capture the Scotch Members in favour of this Bill. Do you imagine that this matter will rest at this stage? What has become of the Municipal Workers' Association in Glasgow? Did the promoters of the Bill get the consent of that association, which has influence enough to return members on the town council? Hon. Members know many of the leaders of that association; one of the greatest being Mr. John Ferguson. He is opposed to the Bill; the Corporation of Glasgow and the Police Board are opposed to it. I candidly confess that I have been unable to get any Scotch Member to second my motion for the rejection of the Bill, so completely has the situation been got at. At the same time. I am not alarmed, and even alone I will stand up against this Bill, and hon. Members will find that greater interest is taken in the question than they imagine when they again come before the people of Scotland. I am not in a position to move my Amendment, though at the end of the discussion I will challenge a division. I acknowledge the poverty of the situation, but I may say that I shall be astonished if the Government accept this Bill. Mark you, this Bill is either a good Bill or it is not, and therefore should be accepted or rejected in its entirety. Its object is to assimilate the law in Scotland to the law in England, and there is no room for any compromise. Why not therefore pass the Bill in its entirety or reject it?

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick): I disagree with the hon. Member who has just sat down, after a full and interesting examination of the question, is saying that there is no room for compromise. I think; and many Scotch Members will agree with me; that is the reason why the hon. Member has not been able to find a seconder for his motion. The question undoubtedly is one which wants looking into, but at the same time I am by no means ready to accept all that my hon. friend behind me has advanced. No question is involved of any charge on Imperial funds. It is simply a question of what we are to do with our own money, which ten years ago was devoted to this special purpose of police pensions, and also whether money is to be taken out of the rates in order to assist the fund. The hon. Member who introduced the Bill said he did not anticipate that the Bill would include any charge on the rates. I do not agree with that, but I think in any case it would be absolutely necessary to have full actuarial evidence on the subject, and I confess I would be extremely astonished if Mr. Finlaison, or any other actuary, would endorse the view of the hon. Member. No one nowadays; whatever may have been the case ten years ago; grudges the provision of pensions for the police in Scotland. The bulk of the fund is mainly made up out of £40,000 a year, which

was the Scotch grant under the Act of 1890, the deductions from the men's salaries forming a very small part of it. The question is one between the ratepayers and the police. Hitherto hon. Members have only heard the police, who, I believe, approached every Scotch Member at the last election, and did so with so much propriety and modesty, and in such a more reasonable spirit than other bodies of civil servants are in the habit of doing, that they found hon. Members very willing to listen to them. Still, I think there is a very great danger likely to arise from the fact of such a large number of civil servants having the franchise and approaching Members. It is calculated to lead to the exercise of unfair and undue pressure. In the grosser cases, of course, such pressure is rightly resented. But there are so many shapes of it that it is impossible to draw the line firmly. There are so many shapes of the desire to use influence on behalf of a man for improving his position, that when that position depends on what he receives from the Government there is, I repeat, very great danger to individual Members for the intervention in electoral proceedings of civil servants. But with regard to the police, I certainly think they have put forward a prima facie case. Of course, there is no question whatever that there is a considerable difference between their position in England and Scotland. The only question is, whether there is a conclusive argument for making the position the same in the two countries.

I will turn for a moment to the history of the Act of 1890. I take especial interest in that Act. Because it happened to come before the first Committee on which I had the honour of sitting; the first Committee composed exclusively of Scotch Members. The proposals of the Bill were fully and thoroughly discussed by that Committee. It will be remembered that in that year two Bills were brought in at once; one for England and the other for Scotland. The terms of the two Bills were, I think, identical, and the view of the Government in bringing them in was that there should be uniformity in the two countries. But what happened in the two Committees? The Scotch Bill was referred to a Scotch Committee and the English Bill to an English Committee. The views of the English Committee were pretty liberal and generous, and were very favourable to policemen; in fact, the Bill was extended in one direction and another so as to benefit the police more than was proposed in the original scheme. But in regard to the Scotch Committee, its anxiety was to produce a solvent scheme. We took evidence from Glasgow and other places, in addition to listening to the police witnesses. We restricted the scheme in various ways, and we took the strongest precautions to ensure that it should be solvent. Of course, there are two ways of looking at this matter. The English scheme undoubtedly involved dipping into the pockets of the ratepayers. You have a fixed Exchequer contribution both in England and Scotland, and. Of course, there is no question of applying to the Exchequer for an enlargement of that contribution. Then you have other sources of revenue, and both in England and Scotland the balance is guaranteed by the Police Fund. If there is any deficiency it has to be made up by the local ratepayer. Ten years ago the view of Scotch public opinion undoubtedly was in favour of a solvent scheme, and while a guarantee was given to make up any deficit in cases of accident, it was

insisted that the scheme should be one in which the risk under the guarantee should be infinitesimal. They got such a scheme. But in England it was not, so, and the English ratepayers have to make good the deficiencies of their scheme. They will presently have to make good a great deal more than they do now. In England, as things stand at present, each county and borough has its separate fund. Some pay their way, others do not; and the deficiencies in many cases of the annual income is very considerable. The whole income at present, however, is £363,000. The expenditure is £370,000, and thus there is a deficiency at the present moment for the English counties and boroughs of £7,000. Of course, the charge is an increasing one and it will continue to increase enormously. While the capital is increasing but slightly, the income almost stationary, and the English ratepayers will have consequently to make good a very considerable deficiency in coming years. In London the case is a much stronger one. The deficiency each year is very large. It is increasing with what seems to be alarming rapidity. In the year 1896-97 the deficiency was £80,000, in the following year it was £93,000, in 1898-99 it was £109,000, and in the next twelve months it rose to nearly £121,000. I have not the slightest idea for how many years that rate of increase is going to continue, but it certainly will for some time. In Scotland our position is quite different. There we have an Exchequer contribution of £40,000, and in the last ten years the funds for the counties and boroughs have accumulated so that we get an income of £9,400 by way of dividend. The stoppages from the men's pay come to about £10,300 and the income from other sources to about £4,500. In only one or two instances; those of small authorities; has there been any deficiency; indeed, the total amount which has to be made up from the rates is less than £500, and that will, of course, be repaid in a short time. We have an income at the present time of £64,500, while our expenditure is only about £22,500; therefore a large fund is being laid by from year to year. As the result of nine years working we have accumulated a sum of £388,000 for the benefit of the pension scheme. That does not in the least prove that we can afford to pay away a large part of that £388,000, because, as has been pointed out already, year by year the expenses are increasing, and the maximum outgoing will not be reached for at least another thirty years. By that time it will be necessary to have a very much larger fund laid up than we have at present. These questions were gone into most carefully by the actuary whose name has been several times mentioned in the course of this debate. But, on the whole, our position, I think, is rather better now than it was anticipated it would be. We thought that after eight years working we should have accumulated £318,000; we have, in fact, accumulated a great deal more. But, on the other hand, we anticipated that at the end of that period our expenses would be £18,000, whereas they are now £22,500. I do not agree with the hon. Member opposite that the actuarial position, on account of the circumstances he mentioned, is necessarily worse than it was when Mr. Finlaison drew out his estimate. But it must be borne in mind that various changes favourable to the fund were made in the Bill when it was before the Committee, although I cannot say exactly to what extent those changes improved its actuarial position. On the other hand,

other changes were made which involved greater expense. I think it would be perfectly reasonable, after ten years experience of the fund, that we should set Mr. Finlaison, or some equally competent actuary, to examine the position, and tell us how we stand in regard to it. If we are able, with financial safety, to give any better terms to the police. I am sure there will not be the slightest opposition to our doing so for we have no desire to heap up money for the benefit of posterity. But I confess I do not think there is room for very much alteration in that respect.

Other questions must, of course, be considered. Hon. Members, in dealing with this matter, ought to have properly before them the question whether they can, with safety, give any further advantage to the police out of the fund as it at present stands. Can we modify the terms on which the police receive pensions? Beyond that, there is a further question on which, for my part, I confess I have as yet quite an open mind, and that is: do the ratepayers consider the advantages of a fund on a similar scale for Scotland as that which prevails in England are so great that they are willing to incur some expenditure for the sake of getting it? It is clear that the greater temptations in England do, to a certain extent, injure the Scotch police force and its power of getting thoroughly good men. We do not pay the same rate of wages in Scotland, as in England. But we have to consider whether the ratepayers and local authorities believe that the effect of paying a different scale of wages does injure them to an extent which can be appreciated in money. Are they willing, in order to get rid of that damage to the police force, to undertake certain further liabilities, and to give a more generous scale of pension to the police, with the knowledge that in future years there may be a call on the ratepayers' purse? That is a question which the police cannot be expected to consider. But we do want to have the views of the local authorities upon it. Again, I very much desire to have the views of the different local authorities upon the question whether they wish that we here should establish a uniform scale, or whether they desire that there should be that local option which is given to the English police authorities. Of course, if they tell us that they desire the amount of choice which the English authorities have, I should feel absolutely prepared to support the change. But my belief is that they would rather not have it. I think we should find they would say that it is for this House to lay down what it thinks is right, and that there should not be an opening for local pressure from people who have the work to do, and for whom one may have the greatest liking and respect, because if there were such an opening it would produce on each locality exactly the same difficulty that my hon. friend was so cautious about in regard to the views of Members

of this House. These are the questions which have to be decided before we can either pass or reject this measure. They cannot possibly be decided on the floor of this House. They cannot possibly be decided without hearing evidence, and therefore, I hope that the inclination of the Government will be to accept the Second Heading of the Bill, and then to refer it to a Select Committee upstairs, which can take full evidence. That Committee, of course, should be mainly Scotch. But I confess that I would rather it was not purely a Scotch Committee,

as was the case ten years ago. We have got an alternative system, and there are in this House a good many gentlemen familiar with the merits and disadvantages of that system. I think that on our Committee we should be very much benefited by having the assistance of two or three English gentlemen who would be willing to give attention to that subject; and therefore, under the circumstances, I hope the Bill will be allowed to pass its Second Reading, and will be sent to a Committee upstairs for consideration.

*MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness-shire) said he desired to associate himself with the remarks which fell from the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark in regard to the peculiar danger of public civil servants or police or constables banding themselves together to intimidate timid and nervous candidates for Parliamentary honours.

But he supported the Second Reading of the Bill on account of the experience he had gained as the chief magistrate of one of the Scotch cities. It was of the very greatest importance for the efficiency of the police force that the law of Scotland should be assimilated to that of England, because of the constant drain of the best men from Scotland to England for the sake of the benefits which they received in the latter country. He did not see why a Scotch policeman in Glasgow should work under different conditions from a Scotch policeman in Liverpool or Manchester. He was one of those who thought that a Scotchman should not get worse treatment than an Englishman, even if he were a policeman, and he saw no reason why a Scotch policeman should be better paid or better pensioned in an English city or county than in a Scotch city or

county. In the interests of the police force it was absolutely necessary that the law of England and Scotland should be assimilated, because in Scotland under present conditions they did not get or retain the best class of men. He believed that last year there had been no fewer than 390 resignations of good and efficient policemen who were dissatisfied with the conditions of service in Scotland, and a very large proportion of them had, he believed, come to England and joined the police force here. The Bill had been supported by the great majority of the Scotch constituencies, although it had been opposed by the Glasgow Town Council; whether unanimously or not he could not say. It had also been supported by the Convention of Royal Burghs. He did not associate himself with what had been said by an hon. Member regarding the Convention of Royal Burghs. The hon. Member had declared that that was a body that was held up to ridicule; but some people laughed at Parliament, and even some Members of Parliament were held up to public ridicule. It should be remembered that the Convention of Royal Burghs was composed of representative magistrates and councillors of the burghs all over Scotland, and surely their wishes should be respected. He supported the Bill also because it was permissive, and the local authorities could adopt it or reject it as they liked.

SIR WALTER THORBURN (Peebles and Selkirk) supported the Bill as a simple matter of justice to a very deserving class, than whom, morally and physically, a better could not be found either in England or Scotland. He could not understand the objection of his hon. friend the Member for Mid-Lanark, who suggested that hon. Members on both sides of the House had been pressed or influenced to support this measure from some political motive. He could say for himself that,

with the exception of a sergeant, not a single policeman had ever mentioned the Bill to him. He supported the Bill simply because it was just and fair to the police force of Scotland. It was a purely permissive Bill, and if any local authority objected to its provisions it need not adopt it. The Bill was supported by many of the public bodies in Scotland, and undoubtedly by the vast majority

of the Members for Scotch constituencies. The only exception was the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark, and he hoped that the hon. Member would withdraw his objection and allow the Bill to be read a second time without a division. He also hoped that the right hon. the Lord Advocate would show a friendly interest in the Bill, so that it might become law during the present session.

*MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) said that, while he supported the Second Reading of the Bill, he was not to be held committed to the style of drafting its varied provisions, which indeed were very complicated and involved. He did not think that the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark in his emphatic and somewhat diffuse argument had really touched the main principle which underlay the provisions of the Bill. That principle was that the police force in Scotland, which was not inferior in ability, character, or efficiency in discharging their duties, should be put, on the point of emoluments, and, quoad pension, on the same footing as the English police. Who could object to that? A good deal had been said in the course of the debate as to the application of the screw; but a practice of that kind required two parties. They might have the screw applied, but the person to whom it was applied must be considered; and he was slow to think that his colleagues in Scotland were so soft as to be squeezable in that particular. Surely experience was that if a man took his stand in opposition to a demand, whether of a political or religious kind, and gave a reasoned explanation for his dissent to his constituents, these did not undervalue him on account of the manly attitude he had taken up. His reasons for supporting the Bill were slightly different from those given by hon. Gentlemen who had preceded him. He had had experience in regard to the working of the police in Scotland from an official point of view. For some years he had had a share in superintending the whole system of public prosecution in that country, and nothing during his entire term of office struck him more than the manner in which the Scotch police discharged the delicate duties committed to their supervision. Under the system of public prosecution in Scotland, the police were to a large extent, and of necessity, the agents in advance of the Crown in all criminal prosecutions. The Crown officials had, therefore, daily reports from the police in regard to their responsible duties, and these showed most vividly the extreme tact and great efficiency with which the constables discharged their duty. Why, then, should these men not be put on a footing of equal right in point of emolument with their colleagues south of the Tweed?

There was one other point in regard to the police in Scotland which he wished to emphasise. He did not believe that there was any part of His Majesty's dominions, certainly no part of the United Kingdom, in which the police were more truly peace officers than in Scotland. The law in Scotland was so

administered that it was only in the rarest instances that the policeman was looked upon as an oppressor of the people; he was uniformly regarded as a protector. The policeman was truly a guardian of the peace, and considered himself better employed in the prevention of crime than in its detection after being committed. These were his reasons for supporting on principle the Second Reading of the Bill. But the House ought to be grateful to the hon. Members for Mid-Lanark and Partick for making allusion to the actuarial considerations which should be kept in view, although in regard to these he felt no great alarm. The measure was, after all, permissive. He hoped his hon. friend opposite, in indicating his assent to this application of the principle of local option, would not object to its being adopted in another department which was closely allied to police administration; namely, the liquor traffic. There would be two considerable advantages in the appointment of a Select Committee to consider this Bill. In the first place the members of the Glasgow Corporation, the ablest and most powerful in the kingdom, would be able to show to the Select Committee what was their view of the finance of the measure, and if their view was supported actuarially it would serve to emasculate or to extinguish the Bill altogether. He himself had no fear of such a result. His other point was that the Select Committee would be useful in furnishing a guide to the local authorities in adopting the option conferred upon them by the Bill. In conclusion, he hoped that the which Select Committee would not protract their investigations so long as to kill the Bill, but that their efforts would be directed to making it, from an actuarial point of view, a sound measure.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Bute-shire): Perhaps it will be convenient to the House, as the subject has been fully debated, that I should state now the view of His Majesty's Government on the Bill. We are entirely in sympathy with the object proposed by the Bill. I have certainly great pleasure in corroborating from an even longer official experience than the hon. and learned Member for Hawick Burghs what he said in regard to the conduct of the police in Scotland. I can only say that I do not think I ever had to make a complaint about the police in Scotland. The peculiarities of the police force and the services required of them make them undoubtedly proper subjects of a pension, because it is quite obvious that a policeman to be efficient must be in the full vigour of life, and it would be unfair to turn him adrift the moment that vigour ceased as the result of the faithful discharge of his arduous duties, although he had still many years to live, and was too old to enter into another employment. But the question of superannuation ought also to be looked at from the point of view of economy. A policeman is much more valuable after he has had a certain amount of training; but the body which pays for the training should have the advantage, of the trained article. Undoubtedly it is the case that, under the present system, Scotland is to a great extent used as a training ground for the English police; and I entirely corroborate, from what I myself know, the statement made in that respect by the hon. Member for Inverness, on whose first intervention in the debates of this House I may be allowed to congratulate him. Holding these views. I am entirely favourable to the objects sought to be effected by the Bill.

The hon. Member for Mid-Lanark, in one of his least impassioned utterances his morning, asked me if I did not wish to pass this Bill. I am personally quite willing that the Bill should pass, but I must give the reasons for an attitude which I am almost sorry to take up; namely, that the Bill should not go through the ordinary procedure, but should be remitted to a Select Committee. It is all very well to say that the change proposed to be imposed by the Bill is merely permissive, and that consequently no burden is necessarily put upon the rates. That is an argument which may be carried too far. It has not been the practice of Parliament to give unlimited powers to local authorities without knowing at least what is the worst that a local authority can do. This is a burden which, if I may use the expression, is a very insidious one, because if the authorities in any locality adopt the higher scale and put on the burden, they may do so with the very comfortable feeling that that burden will not fall on their shoulders in their own time. It is rather straining the consciences of some people to ask them to adopt a measure which will impose a burden, when they know perfectly well that the burden will fall only on their successors.

It is absolutely necessary from a business point of view to remember how this movement for police superannuation originated. In 1890 two parallel Bills were brought in by the Government dealing with police superannuation in England and Scotland. In England police superannuation was an old story. It began with an Act as long ago as 1840 for the counties. There was a borough Act in 1848; and then both boroughs and counties were put on an identical footing in 1859. Accordingly there was an actual system in England which had been running for fifty years, and to a certain extent for a longer period. From a practical point of view let us see, then, what was the state of affairs in which Parliament legislated in 1890? I hold in my hand a Return of the Home Office relating to police superannuation, dated 20th May, 1890. In that Return I find that there was practically a capital fund available for police superannuation purposes in England of £1,172,969. At the same time there were available resources statutorily ear-marked for the same purpose amounting to over £80,000 odd per annum. So that the problem to be faced in England at that time was to put these various police funds upon a thorough working footing in order to give the constables an absolute right to a pension. That object was effected by an Imperial contribution of £300,000 a year. In 1888 the deficiency which had to be met out of the rates was £182,460, and in 1898 I find that the deficiency to be met out of the rates was £154,000. That is, I think, evidence that the scheme which was started in England was a sound one. But what had you to do in Scotland? You had to inaugurate an absolutely new system. There was not a pension fund in Scotland at all, except that the burgh of Greenock redeemed the reproach by the possession of a fund with the modest capital of £800. Therefore there had to be a creation of the fund in 1890. May I remind the House what the creation of the fund really means? If you start a fund for the first time with a contribution of £40,000 a year you will have plain sailing at the beginning, because the great body of the men will not have served their time for a pension. But the stress and burden will come in the future. The purpose of the Bill is the assimilation of Scotland to England in the matter of

police, superannuation; but it is to be noticed that although the English Act is textually copied in the matter of scale, nothing is said of the ear-marked funds which appear in the English Act. In 1890 the Government felt that it would be necessary to make an investigation as to what was needed to establish a fund for Scotland, and the matter was remitted to a Select Committee. What the Select Committee did was to take the funds as they found them. They took £;40,000 of an Imperial contribution, and the contributions statutorily devoted under the amended Section 16 to the police force, and they arranged a scale on a proper actuarial basis in which there would be a state of equilibrium. In this they were assisted by Mr. Finlaison. In the course of his evidence that gentleman assumed that the retirement from the police force would take place at the age of fifty-five, that the average salary would be £;80, and that the pension would be £;46 13s. 4d. He also assumed that the capital would be invested and accumulated at two and a half per cent. per annum. On these assumptions he found that up to the thirtieth year

there would be no stress; that in the period between the thirtieth and forty-fifth year there would be a certain call on the rates; and after the forty-fifth year the number of new pensions would be exactly balanced by the number of deaths of pensioners, and that the fund would reach a proper state of equilibrium. Mr. Finlaison assumed that the force would number 4,100, which was modified to 4,278, that the ultimate number on the pension list would be 1,730, and that the ultimate charge would be £;80,750 a year. But take the returns of last year. The police force was then not 4,278, but 5,114. If you take 5,114, that would involve an extra ultimate pension charge of £;16,000. Without saying that Mr. Finlaison was wrong, I think I have shown enough to make it clear that there have been such increases that we cannot count too much upon the safety of a margin.

What would happen if you introduce the new scale under this Bill? It is said that not only is its adoption optional, but that it may fluctuate between the minimum and maximum; but if there was a fluctuating scale the last state would not be much better than the first. From the paper issued by the chief constables of Scotland, I find that in 1895, in England, 166 police forces adopted the maximum scale, twenty the intermediate scale, and only one the minimum scale. In other words, practically the whole police force of England adopted the maximum scale. The hon. Member for Mid-Lanark said that some local authorities would adopt the maximum scale, and that the others would follow like a flock of sheep through a hole in a hedge. The hon. Member might have put it in a more Parliamentary way; like Radical Members following him into the division lobby. Well, if the maximum scale were adopted, and the constables retired at forty-seven years of age, that would increase the number on the pension list from 1,730 to 3,300 or more, and the pensions would be increased from £;46 13s. 4d. to £;53 6s. 8d., which would make the ultimate pension charge more than double the pension charge calculated by Mr. Finlaison.

I think I have said enough to show that really we cannot adopt this Bill, as it stands, in the dark, without further

inquiry. We cannot ask the Scotch local authorities to accept the Bill unless we

show them what the ultimate charge is to be. I do not agree with the anticipations of the hon. Member who moved the. Second Reading of the Bill, that there would be no charge on the rates; but I do not myself see why the rates should not be called upon to assist this very proper fund. The local authorities, however, should know how much they have to be called upon to pay. If you take the English figures (including the metropolis) you find that, so far as the rates are concerned, they bear 11% of the total expenditure; but if you take the Scotch figures; of course we know we have not yet reached the period of stress; the rates only bear 7% of the total expenditure. Taking the English figures, the Exchequer grant; I give merely the percentages; was 39%; the total revenue of the pension funds, dividends and interest, 13%; deductions and stoppages from pay, 14%; other receipts, 20%; rates. 11%; Taking the corresponding percentages in Scotland they are: Exchequer grants, 61%; dividends and interest, 14%; deductions and stoppages from pay, 16%; other receipts, 6%; rates 7. I have now shown that the Scottish ratepayers would not pay very much if called upon to the same extent as their English brothers; in other words, I do not adopt what was said by the hon. Member for Partick when he indicated he did not think the scheme should go on unless it was in that state of financial solvency that an insurance company would consider it. From the speech of the hon. Member I gather that the scheme should be financed from sources other than the rates.

MR. PARKER SMITH said his statement was that the ratepayers should be made acquainted with the financial position of the scheme, so that they should know where they were.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I entirely agree with that. Holding these views. I propose, on behalf of the Government, to accept the Second Reading of the Bill upon the understanding that it will be sent to a, Select Committee. When it gets there, the Government will be willing to give such assistance as they can, so that the precise actuarial position may be ascertained, and then if, in the full light of day, the Scottish Members wish to pass the Bill, the Government will offer no objections.

*SIR LEWIS M'IVER (Edinburgh, W.) wished to remind the House that the question before them was the granting of a permissive power; a discretionary power; to local bodies in Scotland equal to the power enjoyed by corresponding bodies in England. But it was most important on a Second Reading for the Hon e to know with what it was dealing. He viewed with alarm the ready acquiescence of the Government on condition that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, as he had always understood that in this House such a proposal was a polite form of infanticide What he wanted to understand from the Lord Advocate was whether the Government were in earnest about giving the Bill all reasonable facilities. If they were to understand the Select Committee to which the Bill was to be referred would be appointed with no loss of time, and that facilities would be afforded to get through the necessary work that would put the House in possession of the actuarial facts, he would advise the promoters of the Bill to accept the offer of the Government.

MR. RENSCHAW said the debate had been of very great interest, and the matter which was under discussion was a very important one to the local bodies of Scotland. The question had been discussed mainly from the police point of view, rather than from the point of view of those who had charge of the police arrangements. It was a matter of satisfaction to him that the hon. Member for the Border Burghs had commenced to have more confidence in these authorities than he appeared to have in the past. He was aware that the local authorities in Scotland had realised that the differences in the system of pensions in England and Scotland militated against their retaining the best of their forces in Scotland. From that point of view, he thought every local authority in Scotland would welcome the opportunity of redressing any real grievance, that could be proved to exist at the present time. He hoped, however, they would not fall into the evil that accompanied the existing English system, because the permissive and optional system appeared to him to be a very dangerous one. The Lord Advocate, in his figures, stated that something like 16 per cent. of the English force, had adopted the maximum principle under the provisions of the English Bill. His opinion was that they should take great care to avoid the evils in the English Bill, and have one uniform system; and he hoped the result of the consideration of the Bill in Committee would be to produce a useful measure that would enable them to give the police that to which they were entitled; namely, quite as good a pension as was given to the police in England.

*MR. WALLACE (Perth) said that he only rose to ask whether he properly understood what the Lord Advocate put before the House. Hon. Members were perfectly disposed to see this Bill sent to a Select Committee, if such a course did not mean the death of the Bill. If he understood the hon. Gentleman to mean that if, after examination before the Select Committee, it was found that the Bill was a working Bill, the Government would assist the House in passing it, not merely by abstaining from any active opposition, but by giving the assistance by which alone a Bill could be carried through the House; if that was a part of the proposal, there would be no objection to the Bill being referred to a Select Committee.

MR. WYLIE (Dumbartonshire) thought that the mover of the Second Reading of this Bill had acted wisely in bringing this question before the House. English police enjoyed superior advantages not because they were a superior body of men, but because it was the custom in England to pay larger salaries than were usual in Scotland. Small salaries were a relic of the old times when Scotland was poor, but in late years the prosperity of Scotland had been progressing by leaps and bounds. He quite concurred with the remarks of the Lord Advocate that even if there should be a small addition to the rates, the people of Scotland were quite able to afford such an increase. Therefore that should not be any hindrance to their acceptance of the Bill. He repudiated the accusation which had been made as to bribery of the Scotch Members by the police; he at any rate had heard nothing of such a thing.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said this which all Scotch Members, with the distinguished exception of the Member for Mid-Lanark, took the same view, and

they did not want a nominal Second Reading which would be equivalent to the extinction of all hopes of further procedure. He ventured to ask the Lord Advocate to tell them whether, if the Select Committee to which the Bill was referred approved of it, the Government would give such facilities as would enable the sense of the House to be taken on the measure.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: "My intentions are strictly honourable." There is no idea of shelving the Bill. I distinctly undertake, so far as in me lies, to see to it that the Committee is properly appointed, and that the Report of that Committee shall be submitted, if possible, to the House. Of course, it must be understood that I am not master of the time of the House, and cannot give an absolute guarantee. The starrng of a Bill, while exempting it from the operation of any Order which cuts down all but Government business, does not give a guarantee that sufficient time to pass that Bill against any obstruction which might arise in the House, would be, afforded. If hon. Members will look after obstruction, I shall be able to look after the starrng of the Bill.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham) said, though it might not be thought in good taste for an English Member to intervene in a Scotch debate, he, thought he was justified in doing so in order to draw attention to two or three matters which the mover of the Bill might take into consideration when the Bill made its appearance before the Select Committee. They would have to be prepared for a very large increase of the pension fund, and there was also the question of the waste of men which took place under the English system. Many men of thirty-five years of age who were entitled to a pension, but who could go on well to the age of fifty, took their pensions at that age to protect them, because if they staved longer in

the service the pension might be lost, possibly through some breach of discipline. The promoters of the Bill would also do well to put in some additional sum for extra pay. Those were a few questions which they would do well to consider when the Bill got before the Select Committee.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie) declared that the people of Scotland wanted an efficient police force. They could not have it if the best men were taken away by the competition of English counties and boroughs. This Bill would tend to check that competition, and it was for that very purpose that this Bill was introduced.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a, second time.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) said that, in view of the attitude taken by the Ford Advocate, he proposed that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee. He trusted that the Government would do all they could to help the measure.

MR. CALDWELL said he was astonished that the mover of the Bill should be I asked to have it referred to a Select Committee. He saw no reason for such a course being adopted; the Bill had better be passed at once. It had I passed the Second Reading unanimously, and had he been one of its promoters he would have advised that the opportunity should be seized to pass it into law. Let it be sent to a Grand Committee, pass it through Grand Committee, put it down as the first Order after Whitsuntide, and the Bill would certainly pass. He warned the mover that

he was adopting a dangerous course and, as he thought, a wrong one, and if the Bill failed to pass he hoped he would not be blamed.

Bill committed to a Select Committee.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE TO CROPS, ETC., BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. HUDSON (Hertfordshire, Hitchin): The Bill which I desire the House to read to-day is a very short one, containing only one clause of five lines, but it is a Bill which will do away with the hardships from which all those who farm land by the side of railways suffer; who now see their crops damaged by fire caused through sparks or cinders emitted by railway engines, and are unable to claim compensation, the railway companies claiming to be protected by statute. All that is asked by this Bill is that railway engines should be put on the same footing as locomotives which travel upon the roads, and made liable for any damage they do. It will probably be said by the representatives of railway companies that the railways have adopted the best known methods for preventing the emission of sparks from the engines, and no doubt the different lines vary materially in this respect, thousands being seen on some lines and very few upon others. What is the secret? That on some lines a spark catcher is inserted in the funnel of the engine. If that was done with all engines very little damage would result.

In support of this motion I might read an anonymous letter which I received a few days ago with the intimation that it might suit my business. Not knowing what my business might be, I opened the letter and read;

"If fire break out in the shocks or standing corn, and it be destroyed, he that kindleth the fire should surely make restitution."

That is really the principle which is embodied in this Bill. I notice that no Amendment to the Bill has been put down. I suppose that the railway directors who occupy seats in the House either admit the justice of the measure or think that the Bill is of such small importance that it is not worth their while to oppose it. Without detaining the House further, I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

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

*MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) speaking in support of the Bill, said the object of the Bill was to put railway locomotives upon the same footing as road locomotives. It was only fair that if through the emission of sparks from the engines they damaged the crops of the farmers whose land lay by the side of the railway, the company should be made liable. In the previous session this question had been brought to the attention of the Board of Trade, and questions were asked as to whether the President of the Board of Trade was aware that the railway engines did not carry spark arresters, or in any case whether any inspector had looked into the engines to see if they did carry spark arresters, and the reply of the right hon. Gentleman was No; that the Board of Trade, although they were supposed to see to the spark arresters, were not in a position to do so. A great many of these so-called sparks, were not sparks at all, but cinders varying in size from a quarter of an inch in length to an inch

and a half, and it was only reasonable to suppose that if these were thrown into a held of growing corn they would do a great deal of damage. It was almost impossible to trace the engines which emitted these sparks, but in the case of *Twinch v. Great Western Railway* a man actually saw the fire begin, and he was able to trace the train and the locomotive. The case went to trial afterwards, and damages were assessed against the railway company. There was another case, against the Midland Railway Company. In that case the sparks were seen coming out of the engine. But these cases were notable exceptions, and generally nobody could trace the sparks when they came from an engine. Very often the damage was done in the dark, and in the case of an express train it was almost impossible to trace the engine. If the railway companies took reasonable precautions, and had their engines fitted with spark guards, that damage would not be done. The guards were taken out of the engines in order that the speed might be greater. Last year he asked a question of the First Lord of the Treasury about the bringing forward of This Bill, and the right hon. Gentleman stated that the President of the Board of Agriculture had not had notice that a great deal of damage had been done. The Central Chamber of Agriculture in a very short time afterwards gathered information with respect to the serious and widespread injuries inflicted on agriculturists throughout the country on account of fires caused by sparks from engines. The Return related to seventy-five separate fires in eleven different counties. The law had been laid down that railway companies had a statutory right to run locomotives along their own lines, and so long as they took reasonable precautions and were not guilty of negligence they might do what they liked on their own lines. They were not liable to pay compensation for damage unless they failed to take reasonable precautions. He thought he had shown that they did not take reasonable precautions in this matter. In order to attain a high rate of speed they took out the spark protectors or arresters which were intended to prevent the fire and cinders from coming out. In dry summers there were many farmers whose crops were liable to be set on fire by sparks from engines, and it appealed to him that this was especially so in the case of the southern railways. Crops might be absolutely destroyed by fire and yet no compensation was allowed. Surely he had made out a good case. If the railway companies obtained statutory powers which gave them a great monopoly, they certainly were supposed to run their railways without causing loss or damage to their neighbours. Surely when they did great damage to the property of men who were in many cases small farmers, it was not unreasonable that they should pay for it.

MR. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): The damage complained of in Scotland from this nuisance is more in respect of woods than crops, and the excellent measure which is now before the House could not have been introduced at a more appropriate period of the year, because it is during the month of March that in Scotland at all events, most damage is done to plantations. A plantation of my own was set on fire by sparks from engines no fewer than eleven times in the course of one month, but, although the particulars were taken down at the time by witnesses, was advised by my legal agent that it would be useless to bring the matter before the courts, because it was hopeless to expect any

compensation.

Last year, when various questions were being asked the President of the Board of Trade on the matter, I asked whether the increase in the number of fires in recent years, which I think is indisputable, I was not due to the great increase in the number of rapid trains, and the President of the Board of Trade said he had no information on the subject. The Royal Scottish Arboricultural Society sent out circulars, with schedules, which were filled up. I think a copy of the Returns was sent to the Board of Trade, but at any rate thirty-one examples of fires were given, twenty-one of which related to woods and plantations. The damage done in the twenty-one cases of woods and plantations amounted to £2,300, and in only nine of these was application made to the railway company for compensation, and in one of the nine only was the claim (of £4) paid. The feeling is that it is useless to go to the court, because it is impossible to obtain any compensation. The damage to the agricultural crops is also considerable. It is estimated at about £830. This Hill is called the "Sparks Bill." I think it should be called the "Live Coals Bill," for the size of the sparks is anything between one and two inches. I remember once on a journey between Stranraer and Ayr watching the coals as they were ejected from the engine, and the size of the coals was enough to set any place on fire. It would be impossible under these circumstances to keep any plantation free from the risk of fire.

It should surely be possible to prevent this state of things. I believe it is stated that there is a remedy before the law, but that is not our experience, and it has been laid down by high legal authority on the law of railways that there is no such remedy. An example is given in the case of the owners of a flax store near a railway line. The place was set on fire by a spark from a passing engine, and the proprietors brought an action for damages, on the ground that the engine was improperly constructed, in respect that it had no spark arrester. In reference to that case. "Deas on the Law of Railways" contains the following: "The defenders maintained that in the more modern engines the use of spark arresters had been given up, both because they impaired the efficiency of the engine and because other means as efficacious to prevent the issue of sparks were adopted. The House of Lords held, affirming the First Division, that no negligence had been proved against the company; and the observation was made by Lord MacLaren, that railway companies are not under a legal disability to improve the efficiency of their engines merely because such improvement may tend in some degree to increase the risk of setting fire to adjacent property."

In delivering judgment in the case referred to, the Lord Chancellor said; "It is now well-settled law that in order to establish a case of liability against a railway company, under such circumstances it is essential for the pursuers to establish negligence. The railway company having the statutory power of running along the line with locomotive engines, which in the course of their running are apt to discharge sparks, no liability rests upon the company, merely because the sparks emitted by an engine have set fire to adjoining property. But the defenders, although possessing the statutory power, are undoubtedly bound to exercise it reasonably and properly, and the test whether they exercise the

power reasonably and properly appears to me to be this. They are aware that locomotive engines running along the line are apt to emit sparks. Knowing this, they are bound to use the best practicable means, according to the then state of knowledge, to avoid the emission of sparks, which may be dangerous to adjoining property; and if they, knowing that the engines are liable thus to discharge sparks, do not adopt that reasonable precaution, they are guilty of negligence, and cannot defend themselves by relying upon the statutory power. About the law as I have thus expressed it, I do not think there is any controversy between the parties to this litigation."

What we maintain is that reasonable precaution has not been adopted, and that serious damage is done for which at present there is no remedy. I beg cordially to support the Bill.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock): As a farmer coming from a constituency where fires have occurred through sparks from railway engines, I desire to express gratitude to the hon. Members who are moving and supporting this Bill, and to express the hope that it will pass, as it surely is most reasonable to provide that where damage is done by fire from engines compensation should be paid by the owners of those engines. As has been pointed out by the hon. Gentleman who moved the Second Reading of the Bill, locomotive engines used on the road are already liable for compensation for damage caused by fire, and it cannot be anything but reasonable that the same principle should apply to fire caused by railway engines. It is needless for me to assure the House that agriculturists do not fail to appreciate the advan-

tage of railway communication in their districts, but at the same time we feel, as has been proved, I think, by the hon. Member, that these fires occur largely from the lack of precaution and care on the part of the railway companies. We think that if the railway companies in case of neglect had to pay for that neglect, they would be far more careful to avoid causing fires. I would say this further; farmers find it difficult enough already to carry on their industry with a fair degree of success, without having unnecessary difficulties of this kind placed in their way; and I venture to say that the present moment is most opportune for this Bill. If it is passed it will do considerable good to agriculturists, and to the owners of plantations and fences, and will not cast an unreasonable burden on the railway companies themselves.

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): There is undoubtedly a good deal to be said for this Bill. There is a good deal of hardship caused, especially in dry summers, by sparks from engines, and undoubtedly both in England and Scotland a good deal of damage is done, not only to plantations, but also to the various crops close to the railway. But I do not think that the matter is quite so simple as my hon. friends who moved and seconded the Second Reading seem to think. They founded their arguments in favour of the Bill on the fact that locomotives on highways are obliged to pay for any damage that they may cause. It seemed to me that they have totally forgotten that in the one case the locomotive passes along the highway which is provided by the county council or the nation, or whoever it may be, at no expense to the owner of the locomotive unless he happens to live in that particular parish; but the railway company

have paid considerable sums for the land on which their engines travel. They have not only paid the owners for the land, but they have caused a considerable improvement in the value of the adjoining land by bringing railway communication into the districts in question. My hon. and learned friend the Member for the Hitchin Division says that compensation has been paid above the market value of the land which is purchased. I think I have shown that a railway company is in a very different position from the owner of a road locomotive. A railway company, after having spent large sums in buying the land and making the line, must surely be allowed to carry on its business. If damage is done through the negligence of the company, then undoubtedly compensation should be paid. My hon. friend who seconded the Bill spoke of the coals which came from the engines. Did he photograph the coals when they came out, or how did he know that they came out?

MR. JEFFREYS: I can answer that. They were seen to fall out of the engines.

MR. BANBURY: My hon. friend says there are no Amendments put down. I do not think we can put Amendments down at this stage. Amendments are put down on the Committee stage, and I certainly intend to put down an Amendment, which I hope will be carried. In remedying what is perhaps a hardship we must take care that we do not create another hardship. It seems to me that the Bill is very carelessly drawn, for this reason; the Bill says "where damage is caused to crops, hedges, or plantations." Supposing that the crops, hedges, and plantations are there, they cannot be moved away; but I think it ought to be carefully indicated that the Bill should apply only to growing crops, and not to crops left carelessly by the side of the railway. There is nothing in the Bill to prevent a man having a damaged crop from collecting it and putting it in an exposed place by the side of the railway, where it would be exposed to the sparks from passing trains, and then coining and saying, "This has been burned by the railway company. It was an excellent crop at the time it was gathered in." We know that such things are done, and they will be done in future.

Therefore, before this Bill passes into law I think it should be carefully safeguarded by words which will show that it is only to apply practically to growing crops. The Amendment? put on the Paper last year was to insert the word "growing" in front of the word "crops." I do not know whether that is a proper Amendment, which would carry out my object, but there are lawyers in the House, and if it is wrong they will correct me. I should think that it is very important that in safeguarding the interests of the farmers it should be borne in mind that railways are of great importance to the country, and that a sum equal to nearly double the amount of the National Debt is invested in them. We should not allow ourselves to be actuated too much by sentiment.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said he was not quite sure that he could not rest the case against the Bill on the speeches of the mover and seconder. They limited their arguments to cases where it could be shown that there was negligence on the part of the railway companies. In such cases the law of England applied, and no Bill such as this was necessary. If his hon. friend had shown any case in which the existing law would not really suffice to punish a

railway company for negligence, he could understand the bringing forward of the measure. If these cases of damage arose from the failure to use proper spark arresters, the owners of the crop, or plantations had their action at law. They had chosen the wrong remedy by coming to Parliament with this Bill.

He was not acquainted with the procedure before Scotch sheriffs, and he did not know why proof was more difficult in Scotland than in England. So far as Scotland was concerned, the remedy should be so to amend the procedure under the Scotch law as to obtain the result that, where negligence had been shown, the consequence of that negligence should be visited on those liable for it, and who the law said already should suffer for it. It was no use appealing to the analogy of the road locomotive. By the law applicable to road locomotives, if negligence was proved, but was shown to be the negligence only of the driver or stoker of the locomotive, the owner of the locomotive got off altogether. In the case of railway locomotives, although the company's servants might be guilty of negligence, the railway company alone was liable. If the Bill passed, the law would revert to the provisions of the ordinary common law of nuisance, and if sparks from engines were a nuisance, railway companies would be liable. If they were not they would possibly not be made liable even if this Bill passed. He found from reference to the best-known text-book on the law of torts, that in order to prove nuisance it

was necessary to prove that the property was used in a manner not necessary to the ordinary enjoyment of the property. Therefore if they passed this bill they would find themselves no better off. Parliament had as clearly as possible laid down that the property railway companies had to be used for a specific purpose; the running of trains; and that purpose could not be carried on without a certain amount of risk. That risk had been fully discounted by compensation, and was more than set off by the fact that in many of the parishes the railway companies paid as much as 75 per cent. of the rates. In the case of some parishes the railway companies paid the whole of the rates. If they passed this Bill, not merely would they make a new departure in the fundamental principles of our law, but a great injustice would be done. He submitted that the grievance was one of procedure and proof, and not of the substantive law of the case. The substantial justice of the case did not require that railway companies should be made liable for this particular kind of damage. He respectfully asked the House to reject the Bill.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN (Kent, Tunbridge) said the hon. Member for Peckham had urged that the Bill ought not to pass because the owners of the railways had spent a lot of money buying the land and constructing the lines, that was perfectly true, but they had not bought the adjoining land. If in the conduct of their business they did injury to property on that land, and were guilty of negligence, they should pay compensation. His right hon. friend the Member for the Hallam Division said that Parliament had conferred certain definite rights on railway companies, and that there was no reason now why they should go back on that.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY: I said that Parliament had conferred certain rights and laid certain duties on them.

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN said the locomotives were now provided with forced draught. It was quite likely that the conditions had so changed that it was perfectly right the law should be amended. Railway companies naturally objected to this Bill, and would like to throw agriculturists back on all the legal technicalities involved in proving negligence in order that it might be impossible for them to obtain compensation. What agriculturists wanted was a simple Bill by which they could get rid of these technicalities. They felt they had a legitimate grievance, and asked Parliament to deal with it.

SIR E. DURNING - LAWRENCE Rill (Cornwall, Truro) said he had several times suffered from fires, one of which destroyed nearly 100 acres of trees. Many thousands of pounds would not have repaid him for that damage. Compensation was nothing to him; what he wanted was prevention. The House might not be aware that quite recently the chimneys of nearly all the locomotives had been lowered to the smallest possible level. The railway companies should be compelled to adopt means to prevent the emission of sparks, so that fires could not take place.

MR. BELL (Derby): I just want to say a few words as to how this Bill affects the employees of the railway companies. What has hitherto been said has had reference to the effect on other people, and I desire to intervene from another standpoint. I have had considerable personal knowledge of railway working, and I am not without experience of fires caused by sparks from engines. I have witnessed such fires, and I have knowledge of cases where compensation has been paid by railway companies for damage done in that way; and I have known cases where damage has occurred by reason of arson having been committed; cases in which the crops alongside the railway have been set on fire, not accidentally by sparks from an engine, but willfully by some persons or persons unknown.

As to this Bill, I do not say for a moment that I am going to oppose it but I am bound to declare that, as it stands, it is not framed in a manner that satisfies me. It seems to me to leave too much scope for evildoers; that is to say it seems to me to make railway companies responsible for the acts of ill-disposed persons. The hon. Member who moved the Second Reading said there were many cases of fires in which they could not trace the engines from which the sparks had come. If such is the case, I fail to see how you can rely upon the Bill to bring home responsibility against the railway company and show that it was the railway engine which set fire to the crop or the wood.

Where proof is forthcoming, I certainly hold that the railway company should be responsible. To my mind, it is desirable that a provision should be inserted in the Bill requiring railway companies to adopt protectors or spark arresters to their locomotive boilers. I happen to know that the absence of such things very often operates to the detriment of the employees themselves, who are perfectly innocent of offence in the matter. If the Bill passes in its present form, the companies might issue instructions to their employees, ordering that they should not allow sparks to be emitted from the engines. The case would be similar to that of the emission of smoke from locomotives. The London County Council, in a large number of instances, prosecute railway companies for allowing smoke to be emitted from their locomotives. When these prosecutions take place the companies

punish their employees by fine or suspension. Hon. Members here will agree with me that it is a matter of great difficulty, nay, that it is a matter of impossibility, to work engines with coal without some smoke being emitted, therefore I say that the companies in inflicting punishment inflict it for what their men cannot help. That is why I have risen to say a few words on this matter.

The hon. Gentleman who spoke last referred to railway companies making their engine chimneys lower than usual. I deny the accuracy of that statement. It is not that the chimneys are lower than usual, lint that the boilers are getting higher than usual. The height of the chimneys is exactly the same as it was when the boilers were much smaller. We know that the public demand greater speed; they want to get from one point to another in much, less time; and the result of all this is that the engines have to be worked much harder, and the difficulty of working the trains is much greater for the employees. Therefore there is some danger of their being subjected to fines and suspensions if the Bill passes as it is in its present form. If in Committee the Bill can be so amended that the object in view can be attained without injuring the railway companies in cases in which they are not guilty and without injuring the employees in cases where they are not guilty, even though the company may have been negligent in not providing against the emission of sparks from their engines, I shall be glad to see it amended. I hope those in charge of the Bill will bear in mind the few remarks I have made on these particular points, and so make the Bill easier to pass from the employees' point of view, the companies' point of view, and also in the interest of those who suffer through these fires.

MR. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said the hon. Member seemed to be afraid that the Bill would have the effect of punishing the railway companies for the burning of crops with which the companies had nothing whatever to do. He was quite sure that those who were introducing this Bill had no such desire. The object was that the companies should be made liable when negligence had been proved against them in the construction of their engines. It was all very well to tell poor farmers that they had their remedy at law. At present, even if they were fortunate enough to detect the particular engine that caused the fire, the duty was cast on the farmers of proving that that particular engine was negligently constructed. If this Bill became law, all they would have to show was that sparks came from an engine running on the company's line. He hoped the House would recognise that that was a very reasonable and proper distinction in the interest of those who had crops growing in the neighbourhood of a railway. His hon. Friend the Member for Beckham sat for a constituency which could hardly be described as an agricultural one. The "crops and growing timber" in Beckham were almost a negligible quantity. His contention that a farmer might collect damaged crops and pile them up in the neighbourhood of a railway was ridiculous. Prevention was much better than compensation. If the onus was cast on the railway companies of paying for damage when it was proved that they had caused it, they were perfectly capable of preventing that damage, and they would prevent it.

MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby): Some of the arguments adduced this afternoon in support of the Bill are not likely to commend themselves to the House. We have had Moses instanced as a legislator. An hon. Member said he was going to follow Moses. But will he accept Moses as an authority in dealing with the land question? Is he prepared every fifty years (I think it was) to redistribute the whole of the land of the country, and to resettle the land system? Another hon. Member said he should support this Bill because he had had his wood burned. There is no argument which this House resents, and rightly resents, more than a personal argument; the demand for a change in legislation because of a personal injury. I would not support the Bill for a moment, if a hundred different crops had been injured, unless there was a general grievance. What I complain of is that the Bill has been supported on both sides because of personal injury suffered. Such an argument ought not to have been put forward in support of the measure at all. The question the House has to consider is a very simple one. Is there a hardship made out in the present state of the law? Does the present law put the onus in the right place? If it does not, ought it to be changed? Perhaps hon. Members who support the Bill have not brought forward as many cases of injury received as might be found, but I think it is the experience of every Member who has been before an agricultural constituency, that if one matter is mentioned to him by the farmers who have railway lines running through their farms it is that they are suffering from this grievance, and at the present time have no adequate remedy.

The hon. Member for the Hallam Division opposed the Bill first of all because, I think he said, he was a railway director. That is not a reason likely to commend itself to the House. He opposed it secondly because railway companies in some parishes paid 75 per cent. of the rates. What about the parishes in which they pay only 5 per cent. I Are they to pay damages where they pay 5 per cent. of the rates, and no damages where they pay 75 per cent? What have the rates imposed upon the railway companies to do with this grievance of the farmers? All the advocates of the measure are called upon to prove on this motion for Second Reading is that a grievance exists. I submit that the fact that farmers have constantly suffered from this damage is not met by the answer that the railway companies are unfairly rated in other parishes. I think the hon. Member for Derby made a lair criticism of the Bill when he said the language is not as accurate as it ought to be. That, however, is a reason for not rejecting the Second Reading, but for amending the Bill in Committee, and if the Bill gets into Committee, as I hope it will, the hon. Members responsible have already made an offer to make the Bill as thorough, as simple, and as effective as possible, and it will have to be all those things if it is to work with any measure of success.

COLONEL MILWARD (Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon): Nobody who travels a great deal by railway can doubt that there is a case for some Bill of this kind. Every summer there are crops destroyed by sparks from engines. The advocates of the railway companies appear to be rather frightened as to the injury this measure will inflict upon the companies. I do not believe this House would ever pass a measure which was unjust to railway companies; the railway companies are

far too largely represented and have far too many spokesmen for that to happen. I do not like to quote America, but the fact remains that this pamphlet by Professor Shaw, who was employed by the Royal Agricultural Society to visit America, and see what was done there, will have to be answered by the companies. There is no doubt that in America year after year improvements have been made; these arresters become more and more scientific; they do not stop the draught, or prevent the engines attaining a, very high rate of speed, but they do prevent the emitting of these hot cinders or sparks which set fire to the crops. What is done in America can certainly be done in this country. I admit that the railway companies ought to have a considerable allowance of time, perhaps a couple of years, in which to adapt these arresters to their engines, but it is perfectly evident that it can be done, and is done, without any great expense to the companies. Therefore, in the interests of the farmers I think this Bill should be allowed to go to Second Reading in order to be considered in Committee, and the interests of the railway companies can then be safeguarded as far as is necessary.

MR. PERKS (Lincolnshire, Louth): I am the representative of an agricultural Division, and also, to some extent, a railway director. I can therefore take a perfectly dispassionate view of this little Bill. It seems to me that the grievance is not so serious a one as has been represented, It is practically a question of who is to bear the expense of the insurance. It is unquestionably the fact; and the hon. Member for the Tunbridge Division would have known it if he had been at a familiar with compensation cases; that a landowner in selling his land to a railway company or the construction of a line receives very considerable compensation for those very dangers to which allusion has been made. Therefore, if the railway company is now to bear the whole onus of compensating the farmer or landowner or tenant for loss by fire, it will practically pay twice over for the same thing. But the grievance is of much smaller dimensions than one would suppose from the exertions of this professor who has been travelling the country photographing cinders at the expense of the Royal Agricultural Society. Looking at the matter as a comparatively small one, and believing that as soon as the law has been accurately ascertained it will be the duty and well within the power of either the farmer or the railway proprietor to pay the small insurance necessary for protector against this danger, I shall certainly support the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): As a representative of an urban constituency I bring an open mind to this matter. I want to put one point to the House which has not yet been much dealt with. This evil, and it is an undoubted evil, arises very largely from the omission of the railway companies to take proper steps to secure those improvements in engines which would prevent sparks and cinders being scattered. I am afraid the difficulty of proving negligence under the existing law is practically deterrent, and makes it really impossible for the farmers to obtain, compensation. As between the two interested parties, the railway company, whose plea is that they have done all they can to avoid negligence, and the farmer, who is entirely passive in the matter, I am inclined to think, on the principle of abstract justice,

that the onus of proof ought rather to attach to the railway company than to the farmer. But I do not think it necessary to go quite so far as that. I believe the grievance of the whole question arises from the fact that the companies rely on the difficulty of proving negligence, and do not take the proper precautions which are taken in other countries. I believe they will not do this unless the liability is thrown upon them, and therefore, although I do not at all deny that there is some difficulty in the matter, I think we should find, if this Bill is passed, the first thing the companies would do would be to use those inventions which are used in other countries, and by way of prevention more than by way of providing for damages we should get rid of this grievance.

*SIR JOHN STIRLING-MAXWELL (Glasgow, College): I think the House ought to realise that the claim made on behalf of the railway companies is nothing less than that the companies have an inherent right to burn other people's property.

I admit frankly that in the result this Bill will probably go further than appears on the surface, and perhaps further than is indicated in the Memorandum attached to the measure, but I am quite prepared to join issue upon the general principle that these companies have the right to burn other people's property.

It is quite obvious that railway companies do acquire land in order that their trains may run to the benefit of the public, that their engines must work in all seasons of the year, and that accidents must occasionally arise from sparks; but the question is, whether the expense of those accidents ought to be borne by the railway companies, or by the unfortunate people through whose property they run.

I have no doubt whatever that the expense ought to be a charge on the railway companies. The question of woodlands raised by the hon. Member for the Leith Burghs has not been much touched upon. In the case of woodlands the crop is of much greater value than ordinary agricultural produce, because it is of longer growth. The interpretation of the law as it at present stands is a great discouragement to the increase of woodlands in parts of the country where woodlands ought to be increased. No one who knows the highlands of Scotland, or the waste-lands in the north of England

or in Ireland, can doubt that it would be a great advantage to the country if those districts were afforested, and no one who knows anything about the economy of forestry can doubt that such plantations are most profitable when they are in the neighbourhood of cheap transit for the wood that is grown. That is precisely where it is most dangerous to grow wood. A person wishing to make a plantation in the neighbourhood of a railway must face the fact that on each side of the line a waste space of eighty yards must be left, then a deep trench provided to stop the surface-fire of heather or other inflammable materials on the ground, and a strong hedge planted. I know that those circumstances have been a strong deterrent. The question of the course taken by railway companies to prevent the escape of sparks has been raised. I cannot pretend to be an expert on the construction of engines, but I do know that whether or not, railway companies take precautions they certainly expect their engines to create fires during dry weather, because on such occasions the lines are patrolled, so that the possibility of fire is in the minds of the directors. Under these circumstances, I sincerely hope that this Bill will not only pass its Second Reading, but will

be carried into law.

MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.): This very innocent measure proposes to introduce a very grave legal anomaly. The general law is supposed to be infringed in regard to a class of cases of negligence extremely limited in character, and to the detriment of an industry which, though sufficiently large in its scope, is only one of many industries carried on in immediate contact with our railway systems.

I submit to the House that the existing law under which the railway companies have to conduct their enterprises is quite a sufficient protection to private property. It is the duty of a railway company to take all due care in the construction of their engines, in the provision of their appliances, and in the actual working of their locomotives. This Bill does not propose to infringe that general rule; it introduces an exception not applicable even to all the machinery in connection with the locomotives on our railway systems, but in connection only with that very small department of its mechanical appliances which has

relation to the emission of sparks. I ask the House if they will pass a measure of legislation, in regard to which the rule applicable to the imposition of liability upon a railway company remains the same in regard to all their mechanical appliances, except when you come down to such details as are concerned in the emission of sparks, in regard to which subordinate class of mechanical appliances there is to be a liability on the railway company, although it may be that they have used the utmost degree of care to prevent any accident occurring. I submit that that is a very grave anomaly. Under the law as it now exists, if a farmer suffers injury to his crops or hay stacks by the emission of sparks, he has only to show that there is a spark-catcher well known which might be introduced by the railway company in connection with the construction of their engines. He certainly does not, suffer from lack of sympathy on the part of the jury, and if a sympathetic agricultural jury come to the conclusion that a spark-catcher might easily have been obtained by the railway company and ought to have been attached to the engine, the farmer is entitled to compensation. It is said that the law has become unworkable because negligence can never be proved. I entirely dissent from that proposition. In my own experience I have known many cases in which negligence has been proved, and I have known many more cases which the railway companies have settled out of court, because they knew that with an agricultural jury the farmer would have had all the chances in his favour. What is graver still is that this is a protective measure in the interests of a particular industry. The farmer, and the farmer alone, is to be protected, and he is to be protected not in regard to all his property, but in regard only to a very narrow class of property. His crops, haystacks, hedges, and perhaps woodlands, are to be protected, but if his house is burned down, from exactly the same cause and under the same circumstances, this measure gives him no protection whatever. And what is to happen to other industries than agriculture? If I am the proprietor of a mill, and the roof of my mill is fired by a spark, I am to be ruined without compensation,

but the fortunate farmer whose crop close by is consumed by fire, caused by I perhaps the same engine, is to be in the happy position of being provided by the railway company with a complete indemnity. Under this measure there is to be one law for the farmers and another law for the rest of the community; one rule applicable to agricultural property and an entirely different rule, enforced on different principles, applicable to other portions of the community. This would but render confusion worse confounded, and for these reasons I ask the House to reject this unprincipled measure.

MR. JACKSON (Leeds, N.): I desire to say a few words against this Bill. I am quite willing to accept the challenge of the hon. Member who desired to place before the House the issue that the railway companies claimed the liberty to burn other people's property without compensation. I think the hon. Member did not do justice to his own knowledge of the present law.

SIR J. STIRLING MAXWELL: I frankly admit the railway companies have the right under the existing law;

MR. JACKSON: I will endeavour to make good my proposition, if you will permit me. What is the procedure by which a railway company obtains power to make its railway in the first place? My hon. friend appears to ignore altogether the fact that the railway company, when it takes land for the purpose of making a railway, pays compensation not only for the value of the land, but also for all consequential and future damage it may do. ["No."] I am not surprised that hon. Members dissent from this view, because it shows that they are really not aware of the law as it stands at present. It is open to the landowner, and the landowner exercises his option, to make a claim not only for the value of the land, but for all incidental and consequential damage to the remainder of his property. He is at liberty to set up a specific claim before the arbitrator if there is a risk of damage to his property, and he has therefore to let the land to the farmer at less rent, and the arbitrator will give him compensation for that. ["No."] Somebody says "No." Several cases have come within my own recollection;

*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): Does the right hon. Gentleman mean to say that the owner of the land can get compensated for the contingent risk of having his woodlands burned by sparks?

MR. JACKSON: Yes, I do.

*MR. HEMPHILL: There is no instance of it in the books.

MR. JACKSON: I mean if his land is taken. If a railway is made through a district for the first time, some land must be taken along the whole length of the line. Of course it is possible, but very improbable, that the limit of the land the company wished to take might just extend to the boundary of the land of that particular owner, and in that extremely improbable case the rule to which I have referred would not apply. It applies only when a portion of a man's property or land is taken. I may put it in this way. If a landowner has 100 acres of land, of which twenty are taken for the purpose of a railway, he has it within his power, as regards the remaining eighty acres, to set up a specific claim. If he can prove to the arbitrator that there is any danger of his suffering loss from sparks emitted on the railway, he can substantiate his claim

for compensation. What the railway companies desire in all fairness is, not to be at liberty to burn other people's property, but to be protected from having to pay twice for the same risks.

The case which has been made out for this Bill is insufficient, I think, for this House to act upon in setting up the anomaly in law to which the hon. and learned Member opposite has so clearly called attention.

Let me point out what the position of the railway companies is. A railway company exercises its powers under statutory authority, and it has at the same time a statutory obligation. The company is liable for all cases of damage where either the engine has been improperly constructed or negligence in using it has been proved. The company therefore has compensated the landowner for his land; it has paid compensation for the risk of injury as regards the future; it has a statutory obligation to run its trains by means of these engines, and there is no known method by which this danger can be escaped. In that case Parliament has said, and I think fairly, that unless you

can show that it is within the power of the railway companies to take adequate precaution against this danger, they ought not to be called upon to do that which is an impossibility. Therefore I venture to say that so far as the railway companies are concerned they are entitled to ask the House to reject this Bill. There is a perfect and perfectly simple remedy, which has been referred to by the hon. Gentleman for the Louth Division. It is in the power of the farmer to insure his crops against this risk for an almost infinitesimal charge. If there is the slightest proof of negligence the law is open to the farmer, and he can get compensation, so that it is not a fail position in which this Bill seeks to place railway companies. I think the case for the Bill has not been made out, and I hope the House will reject the measure. I have been hoping that we should hear from the President of the Board of Trade the views of the Government on this matter, so that the House should have their guidance in coming to a decision.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): In the few words I shall address to the House on the subject of this Bill it must be clearly understood that I am expressing not the opinion of the Government as a whole, but only my personal view.

This is a measure which has really more to do with the Department of my right hon. friend the Minister for Agriculture than with that over which I preside. It is essentially a Bill in the interests of agriculture. I notice that if the Bill was passed it would apply only to crops, hedges, or plantations, so that if by a spark from an engine an accident occurred to a store of any sort the owner of such store would be obliged to have recourse to the existing law, whereas the change in the law now proposed would apply to farmers, and farmers alone. As has been pointed out, the measure would not apply to all damage done even to the property of farmers, but it is an undoubtedly important change of law in regard to principle. If only the question of value were at issue, I do not think the amount of damage would be very great; but, as I say, the Bill if passed would introduce a very important alteration of principle into the law.

The present law governing the liability of railway companies has been very

clearly stated by more than one speaker this afternoon. What is proposed by the Bill is, in a very limited number of cases, to change the whole, principle of the law, and to say that a railway company should be liable, although no negligence whatever has been brought home to them. In the Memorandum affixed to the Bill the analogy of road locomotives is invoked. I would point out, however, that the cases of road and railway locomotives are entirely different, because the former are not confined to a single road, nor do the proprietors own the roads over which they travel, and no compensation has been paid in respect of adjacent lands.

If we once admit an important change of principle of this kind, will it be possible to resist further changes in the same direction should they be proposed? Suppose, for example, that a horse harnessed to a carriage were frightened by the passing of a railway train, and ran away; if the principle of the Bill is accepted, it appears to me it would be impossible to resist a claim for compensation in such and other cases.

These, in my opinion, are the objections to the present proposal. I do not deny that there may be difficulty in certain cases in proving negligence. At all events, it is possible that railway companies have not taken sufficient care in

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Allen, C. P. (Glouce., Stroud)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Craig, Robert Hunter
Allsopp, Hon. George
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Ambrose, Robert
Bull, William James
Crombie, John William
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Bullard, Sir Harry
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Burke, E. Haviland-
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Burt, Thomas
Cust, Henry John C.

Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Butcher, John George
Dalziel, James Henry
Atherley-Jones, L.
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Caine, William Sproston
Delany, William
Baird, John George Alexander
Caldwell, James
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Balfour, Maj K. R.(Christch'rch
Cameron, Robert
Dillon, John
Banes, Major George Edward
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Barlow, John Emmott
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Hartley, George C. T.
Carew, James Laurence
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton
Doxford, Sir Win. Theodore
Bell, Richard
Causton, Richard Knight
Duffy, William J.
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Cavendish, K. E. (N. Lancs.)
Duncan, James H.
Bigwood, James
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Dunn, Sir William
Black, Alexander William
Chamberlain, J. Austen(Worc.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Boland, John
Channing, Francis Allston
Bond, Edward
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Charrington, Spencer

Elibank, Master of
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Cochrane, Hon. Thos H. A. E.
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Boyle, James
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Ellis, John Edward
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Colville, John
Emmott, Alfred
Broadhurst, Henry
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Faber, George Denison

every instance to secure that their locomotives are provided with spark-preventing appliances. I do not know what my right lion, friend behind me may have to say to this, but I would earnestly suggest to him that his company, in concert with other railway companies, should look into this matter, and ascertain what are the best appliances used in other countries for the prevention of sparks. If they did that, and it was shown that the companies had adopted the best possible appliances, then the present law would probably be held to be sufficient to meet the evil. Speaking for myself, I shall vote against the Bill.

MR. RENSRAW rose to continue the debate.

MR. JEFFREYS: I beg to move that the Question be now put.

*MR. SPEAKER: Although the Bill has been under discussion but a comparatively short time, it appeared to me before the hon. Member rose that the debate was almost exhausted. I shall therefore, under the circumstances, accept the motion. Question, "That the Question be now put," put, and agreed to.

Question put accordingly, "That the Bill be now read a second time."

The House divided: Ayes, 307; Noes, 80. (Division List No. 40.)

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Fenwick, Charles
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Finch, George H.
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Rentoul, James Alexander
Fisher, William Hayes
Macdonald, John Cumming
Richards, Henry Charles
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

M'Calmont, Col. J.(Antrim, E.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
M'Crae, George
Roche, John
Flynn, James Christopher
M'Dermott, Patrick
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Forster, Henry William
M'Iver, Sir Lewis(Edinbro, W.
Russell, T. W.
Carlit, William
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, N.)
Sackville, Col. S. M. Stopford
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H.(City of Lond.
Majendie, James A. H.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Malcolm, Ian
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Gordon, Hn. J. E.(Elgin & Nairn
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Schwann, Charles E.
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby
Markham, Arthur Basil
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
Massey Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Graham, Henry Robert
Maxwell, W. J. H.(Dumfriessh.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B)
Grant, Corrie
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire
Green, Walford D.(Wednesb'y)
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Greene, Sir E. W. (Bury St. Edm
Milton, Viscount
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Griffith, Ellis J.
Milward, Colonel Victor

Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Groves, James Grimble
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Gurdon, sir W. Brampton
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Hall, Edward Marshall
Moon. Edward Robert Paey
Spear, John Ward
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Mooney, John J.
Spencer, E. (West Bromwich)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G.(Midx
More, Rbt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Stanley, Edward Jas.(Somerset
Hamilton, Marq. of(Londond'y
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Hammond, John
Morrison. James Archibald
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Morton, Arthur H. A.(Deptford
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Motion. Edw. J. C.(Devonport)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th.
Mount, William Arthur
Stroyan, John
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Murphy, J.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Hayden, John Patrick
Murray, Col. Wyndham(Bath)
Sullivan, Donal
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G.(Ox. Univ.
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Nicholson, William Graham
Taylor, The dore Cooke
Heath, James(Staffords, N. W.)
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.
Tennant, Harold John
Heaton, John Henniker
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Thomas, Alfred(Glamorgan, E.
Helder, Augustus
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Thomas, David Alfred(Merth'r
Helme, Norval Watson
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Thomas, F. Freeman Hastings
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipperary Mid
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.
Tollemache, Henry James
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Tomkinson, James
Holland, William Henry
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Tully, Jasper
Hoult, Joseph
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo. N.)
Valentia, Viscount
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
O'Kelly, James(Roscommon, N
Wallace, Robert.
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
O'Malley, William
Walrond, Rt Hn. Sir William H.
Hudson, George Bickersteth

O'Mara, James
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Warner, Thomas C. T.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Palmer, George Wm.(Reading
Welby, Lt.-Cl. A. C. E.(Taunt'n
Joyce, Michael
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
White, George (Norfolk)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Parkes, Ebenezer
White, Luke (York. E. R.)
Kennedy, Patrick James
Partington, Oswald
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Peel, Hon. William Robert W.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Lambert, George
Pemberton, John S. G.
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Lawson, John Grant
Percy, Earl
Wilson. A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Perks, Robert William
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Pilkington, Richard
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pirie, Duncan V.
Wilson, J. W.(Worcestersh., N.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Plannner, Walter R

Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)
Leighton, Stanley
Power, Patrick Joseph
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Leng, Sir John
Price, Robert John
Wylie, Alexander
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Young, Commander (Berks, E)
Lloyd-George, David
Pym, C. Guy
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Randles, John S.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Jeffreys and Mr. Munro Ferguson.
Lough, Thomas
Rankin, Sir James
Lowe, Francis William
Reddy, M.
NOES.
Aird, Sir John
doubling, Edward Alfred
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Anstruther, H. T.
Cray, Ernest (West Ham)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Arrol, Sir William
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)
Balcarres, Lord
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Parker, Gilbert
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)
Harwood, George
Penn, John
Banbury, Frederick George
Henderson, Alexander
Platt Higgins, Frederick
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants)
Higginbottom, S. W.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Horner, Frederick William

Renshaw, Charles Bine
Brigg, John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Rickett, J. Compton
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbysh.)
Jackson, Rt. Hn. Wm. Lawies
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cawley, Frederick
Joicey, Sir James
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea
Rutherford, John
Chapman, Edward
Kimber, Henry
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Coddington, Sir William
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. T. Myles
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Kitson, Sir James
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
knowles, Lees
Thornton, Percy M.
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Laws, Andrew Bonar
Mason, J. Cathcart (Orkney)
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)
Lawrence, William F.
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W. R.)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Davies, Sir Horatio D.(Chath'm
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Wilson, H. J. (York, W. R.)
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J.(Manc'r.
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Fielden, Edwd. Brocklehurst
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart

Firbank, Joseph Thomas
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
Yoxall, James Henry
Fison, Frederick William
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)

Goddard, Daniel Ford

M'Laren, Charles Benjamin

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Lawson Walton and Mr. Cohen.

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Melville, Beresford Valentine

Gordon, Maj. Evans-(Tr. Hmlts

Middlemore, J. Throgmorton

Bill read a second time, and committed for To-morrow.

UNIVERSITY OF WALES (GRADUATES)

Bill to extend the privileges of the Graduates of the University of Wales,
ordered to be brought in by Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Alfred Thomas, Mr. Humphreys-
Owen, Mr. Kenyon, and Colonel Pryce-Jones.

UNIVERSITY OF WALES (GRADUATES) BILL.

"To extend the privileges of the Graduates of the University of Wales,"
presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon
Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 88.]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

First Report brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 8.]

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

First Report brought up and read; to be upon the Table, and to be printed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A.J. BALFOUR: I think it would be for the convenience of the House that I
should now announce that we do not propose to-morrow to take the appointment of
the Committee on the Civil List as was originally intended, but that the first
Order of the Day to-morrow will be an amendment of Standing Order No. 21. The
Amendment will read as follows;

"Provided also, that if any Member, or Members acting jointly, who have been
suspended under this tinier from the service of the House, shall refuse to obey
the direction of the Speaker, the Speaker shall call the attention of the House
to the fact that recourse to force is necessary in order to compel obedience to
his direction, and the Member or Members who have refused to obey his direction
shall thereupon, and without further question put, be suspended from the service
of the House during the remainder of the Session."

I give no notice with regard to the Gentlemen who did, unfortunately, refuse to
obey your riding, as it is evidently impossible to deal with persons during
their enforced absence from this House. I also beg to give notice that I shall
suspend the Twelve o'clock Rule to-morrow for the purpose of carrying the
amendment of the Standing Order.

Adjourned at five minutes before Six of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 7th March, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

CITY OF LONDON (SPITALFIELDS MARKET) BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. GRAY (West Ham, N.) said it would not, fortunately, be necessary for him to detain the House for more than a few moments. This Bill made provision for the repurchase by the City of London of Spitalfields Market. Many centuries back a market monopoly was granted to the City of London, long before the borough which he had the honour to represent came into existence. It was felt that the time had now arrived when that monopoly should be broken through. He fully concurred that this Bill was one which could not be properly discussed in the House. It required investigation by a Committee upstairs, and he was glad to know that the promoters took the same view, and were prepared to have that full inquiry. It was under-

stood that the other Bill referring to the same subject should go to the same Committee, and he did not therefore intend to press tin; motion which stood in his name.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said he understood that the hon. Member in charge of the Bill acquiesced in the arrangement that the two Bills on this subject should go to the same Committee, and he, too, therefore did not press his opposition. Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

DUBLIN (EQUALISATION OF RATES) BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

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

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover) said he wished in a few words to state the position of the Government in regard to this measure. It would be within the recollection of many hon. Members that a very similar Bill passed the House in 1899, but was abandoned owing to inability to arrive at an agreement in regard to the Lords' Amendment. A similar Bill was also passed by the House last year, and he might mention en passant that the ratepayers had already expended £54,000 in seeking to achieve the object aimed at by this Bill. The Bill of last year was referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses; a Committee of a very-representative character, which unanimously recommended that legislation should be pressed on Parliament following upon the lines of the Loudon Equalisation of Rates Bill. The Leader of the House, when that recommendation was pressed upon him, promised to give it careful consideration, and undertook to inform the promoters before November whether the Government would or would not be, in a position to lend its aid to carry such a Bill during the following session. But the General Election and the reconstruction of the Government rendered [it impossible for them to redeem that pledge. The Government

had examined the present Bill, and had found that it was drawn in almost exact accordance with the recommendation of the Committee. But it must be borne in mind that the cases of London and Dublin were not exactly on all fours. London constituted an entity of local government, but in Dublin there were several

entities, and there was a danger that some hardship or injustice might arise to the townships concerned from the purely automatic effect of such a measure. The question was to what extent they would benefit from the road lighting and sanitation. The Government would, therefore, feel bound to introduce Amendments to safeguard the townships in that matter. They would not oppose the Second Reading, but it must be perfectly understood that their Amendments must be embodied in the Bill.

MR. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour), on behalf of the promoters, undertook to accept the Government proposals, and MR. MOORE (Antrim, N.) also, under the circumstances, withdrew his opposition to the Second Reading.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

LONDON RIVERSIDE FISH MARKETS BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

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

MR. LOUGH said he did not propose to press his opposition to this Bill, although he considered that it was a very bad one. He was, however, confident that when it came to be considered by a Committee it would not be allowed to pass. It set forth statements which he, for one, could not accept, as to the right of the City Corporation to establish markets outside the City boundaries. This question of markets was a vital one to the people of London, and should the Bill pass through the Committee he proposed to reserve to himself the right at a later stage to oppose it.

MR. GRAY said he wished to make the same reservation. He understood, however, that the promoters were willing

that the Bill should be subjected to careful investigation upstairs, and he, therefore, would reserve his opposition. Personally, he thought that the City of London ought not to have the right to prohibit the establishment of markets in great towns which had grown up since the time it was granted its monopoly.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

THAMES LIGHTERMEN BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. ALBAN GIBBS (London), in moving the Second Reading of this Bill, said it was intended to make further provision for navigating lighters and barges on the Thames and in the Port of London, and altering for that purpose Section 66 of the Watermen and Lightermen Act. It was claimed by the Watermen's Company that barges and lighters working in the Port of London and on the Thames between Teddington Lock and Gravesend should be navigated only by men whose qualification was a licence from the Watermen's Company. This Bill, therefore, destroyed a monopoly. If these lightermen went out on strike and refused to navigate barges, the owners had no remedy at all. It was quite true that they could get people in to do the work, as long as the lightermen were on strike, but supposing they had engaged a man to navigate a barge at eight o'clock in the morning, if any lighterman choose to present himself at one o'clock on the same day they were bound to get rid of the man first engaged and to take on the

lighterman. Now, the foreign, trade of the Port at Loudon, represented something like 252 millions sterling, and much of it was dealt with by lightermen. It was of great importance that this matter should be looked into, especially when, as happened recently, the lightermen came out on strike for something like three months, with the result that the whole trade was disorganised and the Port of London greatly injured. The difficulty arose from the fact that the owners of barges were unable to navigate their own vessels, and were compelled to employ licensed watermen. He did not think anything could be said against the desirability of making it possible for lightermen to work their own barges. At present the greater part of the work was done by tugs, and the lighterman simply sat in the stern of the barge, which was tugged down the river by steam, and received his pay when he condescended to call for it. His hon. friend opposite had put down an, Amendment to the effect that this Bill ought not to be proceeded with while the Royal Commission on the Port of London was sitting. But in the opinion of the promoters of this Bill this was not a matter which was referred to the Royal Commission. Moreover, it was a matter of great urgency that the Port of London should be protected and enabled to do its own work. He therefore hoped that the Bill might be allowed to pass. But if his right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade considered that this really was a, matter which was referred to the Royal Commission, and which, therefore, could not properly be proceeded with in this House, he could only say that he would urge very strongly upon him that he should do his best to induce the Royal Commission to take this particular work in hand, and to issue an interim Report. Of course if that were done he would withdraw the Bill.

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

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central) said he had no doubt whatever that this subject was within the reference to the Royal Commission on the Port of London. The Royal Commissioners had themselves taken the same view, for a day or two ago he received a letter from the Watermen's Company, in which the following passage occurred;

"The Royal Commission on the Port of London have notified the Watermen's Company that their rights and privileges are to be inquired into by them, and have allowed the company to be represented by counsel before them."

Under the circumstances it would be very undesirable for this House to take into consideration a Bill dealing with the matter. As to the suggestion of his hon. friend that the Commissioners should be invited to make an interim Report, he was quite willing to bring that to their notice and to leave it for the Commissioners themselves to decide whether or not it was expedient to do so.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Humlets, Poplar) said it seemed to him, without going into the merits of the question, that it would not be right, under the particular circumstances which had been drawn attention to, to press the measure, and he was therefore very glad that it was to be withdrawn.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Bill withdrawn.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills. That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, viz.;; Metropolitan Electric Supply Bill.

Ordered. That the Bill be read a second time.

DUBLIN CORPORATION (MARKETS, ETC.) BILL. (BY ORDER.)

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (SPITAL-FIELDS MARKETS) BILL. (BY ORDER.)

SHIPLEY IMPROVEMENT BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Read a second time, and committed.

PAISLEY GAS PROVISIONAL ORDER.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892, relating to Paisley, ordered to be brought in by The Lord Advocate and Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.

PAISLEY GAS PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order under the Burgh Police (Scotland) Act, 1892, relating to Paisley," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 89.]

SELECTION OF MEMBERS FOR SER- VICE ON PRIVATE BILL COMMITTEES ;EQUAL TREATME

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil) said the Instruction which he proposed to move spoke for itself, its intention being that equal treatment should be given to all Member's of the House alike, and he ventured to think that the present was a most opportune time for moving such an Instruction, having regard to the fact that this was a new Parliament. A practice had of late grown up to exempt barristers and others who did not care to serve on Select Committees. No such intention existed when such Committees were originally set up, and the practice should no longer be permitted. In the minds of most lion. Members, serving upon these Committees was nothing less than drudgery, and in many cases only performed from a high sense of public duty. A Return which was published in connection with this subject showed that half the Members of the House never served on a single Committee throughout the last Parliament, the result being that half the Members of the House had done the whole of this unpleasant work.*

A large number of those who did none of this work were barristers, who claimed exemption, and what lie desired to put a stop to was any favour of this kind being granted to a particular class. Of all people in the world, of all Members of the House, barristers were least entitled to this privilege. They were specially fitted, from their legal training, to sit upon Committees, where the duties consisted of hearing and sifting evidence, and they were men who made the least sacrifices and had most to gain of any class of men who entered Parliament.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it be an Instruction to the Committee that, in selecting Members to serve on Committees for the consideration of Private Bills, exemption shall not be granted to any Member on the ground of

*The Returns showing the service of Members on Private Bill and Select Committees are included in the Appendices to the last volume of Debates each session.

his private profession, business, or avocation, and all Members shall receive equal treatment and consideration."; (Mr. D. A. Thomas.)

*MR. HALSEY (Hertfordshire, Watford), as Chairman of the Committee of Selection, objected that the motion, if carried, would limit the scope and would take away all discretion from the Committee of Selection as to the choice of Members who should serve. If it were carried, the Selection Committee would be no longer able to select: they would have no choice; they would have merely to establish a sort of rota, every Member in turn having to serve, no matter how unsuitable he might be for the particular Committee for which he was selected. The existing instructions to the Committee were sufficient, in his opinion, and in the opinion of his predecessor, Sir John Mowbray. Therefore he thought the motion should not be accepted, but that the hands of the Committee of Selection should be left free. Neither practising barristers nor any other class had a right to be exempted on the ground of their profession or avocation, but on the other hand it was not right to say that no exemption should be given to any person on any ground. Every application for exemption should be considered on its merits, and the Committee should deal with each case as it came before them. All Members were bound to serve on Committees when called upon, and they ought not to be relieved of their duty except under special circumstances. The power in the hands of the Committee of Selection was a very great power; it was exercised with the greatest care. The way in which the Committee did its work was advantageous to Parliament, and, in his opinion, it would be undesirable to reconsider the rules. Admittedly committee work was much more arduous than in former times, owing to so many more measures coming before it, and it was as much the duty of Members to serve on Committees as to attend the sittings of the House. He was glad to say that

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Rhondda)

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Barlow, John Emmott

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.

Bam, Colonel James Robert

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.

Ambrose, Robert

Balcarres, Lord

Bell, Richard

there were encouraging signs that Members were becoming more alive to this duty, and this session fewer Members had endeavoured to raise objections than had been the case for a long time past. On the other hand, he was pleased to say he had had many applications from, young members eager to serve on Committees, and those applications would be encouraged. Under those circumstances he urged the House to leave well alone and not to accept the motion of the hon. Member.

MR. FLYNN (Cork Co., N.) did not desire to occupy the attention of the House for

more than a moment, but as admittedly there were many Members of the House who never sat on Committees, he thought the motion ought to be supported.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington. W.) supported the Instruction on the ground of the equality of all Members of the House so far as their duty to their constituencies was concerned. He was glad to learn that many new Members were, as had been suggested, desirous of serving on these Committees, but many new Members not in the position of distinguished lawyers, bankers, or merchants; Members representing Labour constituencies; devoted their time and did their duty as members of these Committees, whilst others were allowed to shirk their duty by obtaining exemptions. This was a matter which affected the whole of the Members of the House, and it was monstrous that one set of Members should receive exemptions which were not extended to all. The fact of the matter was that a certain number of Members wished to have the honour of sitting in the House, but shirked doing their fair share of this arduous and distasteful work. He cordially supported the Instruction.

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 130; Noes, 282. (Division List No. 41.)

Boland, John

Hayden. John Patrick

Partington, Oswald

Boyle, James

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-

Pemberton, John S. G.

Brand, Hon. Arthur G.

Helme, Norval Watson

Pirie, Duncan V.

Brigg, John

Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.

Power, Patrick Joseph

Bullard, Sir Harry

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

Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Burns, John

Hope, J. F. (Shef'ld, Brightside

Rasch, Major Frederic. Carne

Burt, Thomas

Horniman, Frederick John

Reddy, M.

Caine, William Sproston

Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)

Redmond, William (Clare)

Caldwell, James

Joicey, Sir James

Renshaw, Charles Bine

Cameron, Robert

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Carew, James Laurence
Joyce, Michael
Russell, T. W.
Channing, Francis Allston
Kearley, Hudson E.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Kennedy, Patrick James
Sandys, Lt.-Col Thos. Myles
Cogan, Denis J.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col.W.(Salop)
Schwann, Charles E.
Colville, John
Labouchere, Henry
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lambert, George
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Delany, William
Leng, Sir John
Soares, Ernest J.
Dickinson. Robert Edmond
Lloyd-George, David
Stevenson, Francis S.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Lough, Thomas
Strachey, Edward
Duffy, William J.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Sullivan, Donal
Elibank, Master of
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Fardell, Sir T. George
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Has tings
Farrell, James Patrick
Mather, William
Thompson, F.W.(York, W.R.)
Flower, Ernest
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Warner, Thos. Conrtenay T.

Flynn, James Christopher
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Weir, James Calloway
Furness, Sir Christopher
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
White, George (Norfolk)
Garfit, William
Murphy, J.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Newnes, Sir George
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Gordon, Maj. Evans (T'rH'mlts
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Grant, Corrie
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Wilson, Henry J.(York, W.R.)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex)
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Wodehouse, Sir J.T (Huddersfd
Guthrie, Walter Murray
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Young, Commander (Berks, E.
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Yoxall, James Henry
Hardie, J. Keir (Mcrrthyr Tydvil
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Harrington, Timothy
O'Kelly. J. (Roscommon, N.)
Mr. D. A. Thomas and Mr. Fenwick.
Harwood, George
O'Mara, James
Haslem, Sir Alfred S.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Bowles, Capt. H.F. (Middlesex)
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Brassey, Albert
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Aird, Sir John
Broadhurst, Henry
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Allsopp, Hon. George
Brodrick, Rt Hon. St. John
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Dewar, T.R (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo.
Anstruther, H. T.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Dickson-Povnder, Sir John P.
Arkwright John Stanhope
Burdett-Coutts. W.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Arrol, Sir William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Dillon, John
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Carble, William Walter
Dimsdale, Sir J. Cockfield
Atherley-Jones, L.
Causton, Richard Knight
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Cavendish, V. C.W.(Derbysh)
Duncan, James H.
Baird, John George Alexander
Cawley, Frederick
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Baldwin, Alfred
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Dyke. Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r

Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Edwards, Frank
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Chaplin, lit. Hon. Henry
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Balfour, Maj. K.R. (Christch.)
Charrington, Spencer
Ellis, John Edward
Banes, Major George Edward
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Emmott, Alfred
Barry, Sir Francis T (Windsor
Coddington, Sir William
Faber, George Denison
Bartley, George C. T.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Farquharson, Dr. Robert,
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Ferguson, R. C. Mun'ro (Leith)
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Bigwood, James
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Bill, Charles
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Finch, George H.
Black, Alexander William
Craig, Robert Hunter
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Blake, Edward
Cranborne, Viscount
Fisher, William Hayes
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Fison, Frederick William
Boulnois, Edmund
Crombie, John William
Fitzroy, Hon. E. Algernon
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth

Radcliffe, R. E.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Macartney, Rt. Hn W.G. Ellison
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Forster, Henry William
Macdona, John dimming
Reid, James (Greenock)
Foster, Sir M. (London Univ.
Maconochie, A. W.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
M'Ciae, George
Ridley, Hn. M.W. (Stalybridge
Gibbs, Hn A.G.H. (CityofLond.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Ratcme, Rt. Hn. Chas Thomson
Gibbs, Hn.Vicary (St. Albans)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Gordon, Hn. J.E. (Elgin&Naim
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Roche, John
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, N.)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Greene, Sir EW (B'ry S. Edm'ds
Majendie, James A. H.
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Gretton, John
Malcolm, Ian
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Griffith, Ellis J.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Groves, James Grimble
Markham, Arthur Basil
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Hain, Edward
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E.(Wig'n
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert

Hamilton, Rt Hn. Lord G (M'd'x
Maxwell, W. J.H. (Dumfriessh.
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nd'rry
Mellor, Rt. Hon. J. William
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Middlemore, John T.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Milner. Rt. Hon. Sir Eredk. G.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Harris, E. Leverton (Tynem'th
Milton, Viscount
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H.(Renfrew
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Mooney, John J.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N.W.
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Heaton, John Henniker
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Helder, Augustus
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Spencer, RtHnC. R. (Northants
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Stanley, Hn.Arthur (Ormskirk
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Morley, Rt. Hon. J. (Moutrose)
Stanley,Edw.James (Somerset
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)
Morrell, George Herbert
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Horner, Frederick William

Morton, A. H. A. (Deptfo'rd)
Stroyan, John
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Mount, William Arthur
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hoult, Joseph
Mowbray, Sir Robert Grav C.
Talbot, RtHn.J.G.(Oxt'd Univ.)
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversh.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Thornton, Percy M.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Myers, William Henry
Tollemache, Henry James
Hughes, Col. Edwin
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Tomkinson, James
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. L.
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Tomhnson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Nicholson, William Graham
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tritton, Charles Eruest
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Tufnell, Colonel Edward
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Tully, Jasper
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Valentia, Viscount
Kimber, Henry
O'Malley, William
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Kinloch, Sir J. George Smyth
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Wallace, Robert
Kitson, Sir James
Palmer, Sir C M. (Durham)

Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.
Knowles, Lees
Palmer, George W. (Reading)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Law, Andrew Bonar
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Warr, Augustus Frideriek
Lawrence, William E.
Parkes, Ebenezer
Wason, E. (Clackmannan)
Lawson, John Grant
Paulton, James Mellor
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E (Taunton)
Lee, Capt A. H. (Hants, Fareh'm
Percy, Earl
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Perks, Robert William
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pilkington, Richard
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(Birm
Leighton, Stanley
Plummer, Walter R.
Wills, Sir Frederick
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Powell, Sir Frances
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Price, Robert John
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Purvis, Robert
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pym, C. Guy
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Lowe, Francis William
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. (Kent)
Randies, John S.
Mr. Halsey and Mr. Sydney
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Rankin, Sir James
Buxton.

LONDON UNDERGROUND RAILWAYS.

Lords Message [5th March], communicating a Resolution relative to the appointment of a Joint Committee on London Underground Railways, considered.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith), in moving that the House do agree with the Lords in this resolution, said that no less than fourteen Bills had been presented to Parliament that session dealing with tube railways. He had consulted with the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and the President of the Board of Trade, and they had come to the conclusion that to refer all these Hills to a Joint Committee would be the best course to pursue. It was obvious that before any of these Bills could proceed there were certain questions which must be determined, such as the shape of the tube, the method by which the power was to be applied, the precautions, if any, which might be taken against vibration, the damages which were to be paid to lessees and occupiers who might suffer from the working of these tubes or from any annoyance, and, perhaps the most important question of all what were to be the lines of communication of these tubes. Those were matters which must occupy the attention of Parliament for a considerable time. It was proposed that power should be given to the Joint Committee to say what Bills were not to be proceeded with that session, and the probability was that none of the Bills would be proceeded with that session. But if the Joint Committee, as he hoped it would, arrived at conclusions on these broad principles this session, it would enable those who proposed to bring forward such Bills to proceed on clear lines next session.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Resolution.";(The Chairman of Ways and Means.)

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would get the authority of both Houses to consider the relationships of these tubes in connection with parks and open spaces, and also with the preservation of ancient buildings.

*MR. J. W. LOWTHER said that probably those subjects would come under the terms of reference, but he would call the attention of the Chairman of Committees of the other House to the matter.

Question put, and agreed to.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.:(The Chairman of Ways and Means.)

PETITIONS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

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

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Driffield; Greenock (three); Ratcliffe; Kirton-in-Lindsey; Scotter; Whiteinch; Falkirk: Cranstonhill; and Lewisham; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS (PARTICULARS OF PIECE WORK WAGES) (PEN-MAKING).

Copy presented, of Order of the Secretary of State, dated 12th July, 1900, applying, with modifications, the provisions of Section 40 of the Factory and Workshops Act. 1895, to Factories and Workshops in which is carried on the making of Pens [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

GOLD COAST.

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the Ashanti War, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CHINA (No. 2, 1900).

Copy presented, of Despatch from His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg respecting the Russo-Chinese Agreement as to Manchuria [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

COLONIAL REPORTS (ANNUAL).

Copy presented, of Report No. 317 (Jamaica. Report for 1899–1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

AGRICULTURAL RATES ACT, 1896.

Return ordered, "in the following form, showing for each Parish in the several Poor Law Unions situate wholly or for the most part within the counties of Carmarthen, Carnarvon, Dorset, Essex, Leicester, and Yorks (West Hiding) the rateable value of Agricultural Land and other property, respectively, in the years

Country, Poor Law Union, and Parish.

Rateable Value on the 20th day of July, 1896.

Rateable Value on the 25th day of March, 1899.

Total amount of Poor Rates collected in the year ended Lady Day;

Estimated amount, based on Rateable Value, of Poor Rates collected in respect of Agricultural Land and other property, respectively.

Year 1895–6.

Year 1899–1900.

Agricultural Land.

Other Property.

Agricultural Land.

Other Property.

1896.

1900.

Agricultural Land (Rate at same amount as that in respect of other property).

Other Property.

Agricultural Land (Rate at one-half of that in respect of other property).

Other Property.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.

£;

£;

£;

£;

£;

£;

£;

£;

£;

£;

;(Mr. Henry Hobhouse.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;NEGOTIA- TIONS WITH GENERAL BOTHA.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the case that communications have been passing between Lord Kitchener and General Botha, and whether he can inform the House of the nature of those communications.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): There have been communications, but the Government are not in a position at the present time to make any statement on the subject.

REVERSE AT HELVETIA.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether an officer with eighteen men held a post during the attack on Helvetia against a greatly superior force of Boers after the main garrison had surrendered; and whether he can give the name of this officer, or state that lie has been commended.

1896 and 1899; the amount of Poor Rates collected in the years ended the 25th day of March. 1890 and 1900; and the estimated proportion of such Hates collected in respect of Agricultural Land and other property;;

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): No official communication to this effect has been forwarded by Lord Kitchener. I have invited Lord Kitchener to forward any such case for such prompt reward as he may

think fitting.

MILITIA OFFICERS; SENIORITY.

MR. LAWRENCE (Liverpool, Abercromby): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the case of subaltern officers in embodied Militia battalions in South Africa, who are candidates for commissions in the line, and are placed at comparative disadvantage to those Militia officers who by staying in England are able to pass the examinations for direct commissions, and thus gain a year or a year and a half seniority in the Army; and whether he will take steps to treat such officers who are on service in the field more generously by allowing them, on receiving their commissions in the line, to reckon the time served at the front for seniority and relative rank in the Army.

MR. BRODRICK: We have done all that was possible to prevent Militia candidates for commissions from being placed

at a disadvantage by reason of their service in South Africa. On the occasion of each of the competitions held since Militia battalions went to South Africa, a liberal proportion of commissions has been allotted to units in South Africa, to compensate for inability to compete. These commissions bear the same date as those given to successful competitors at the examination. Lord Kitchener will grant fifty commissions in the pre-sent month. The hon. Members proposal to antedate commissions so as to cover the period of service in South Africa with Militia battalions would involve the supersession of many officers, and is, I fear, impracticable.

COURTS-MARTIAL.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will direct that no officer shall be penalised through the decision of a court of inquiry or court martial without being given the opportunity of making his own defence.

MR. BRODRICK: Certainly, Sir. The military authorities inform me that they are not aware of any case in which an officer has been penalised through a decision of a court martial or court of inquiry without his view of the case being before them, and I will take care that no such case occurs.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY OFFICERS; PAY AND ALLOWANCES.

MR. SETON-KARR (St. Helens): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the effect of placing officers commissioned with the Imperial Yeomanry, now being recruited under the special Army Order of 18th January last, on the ordinary cavalry rates of pay, is that the lieutenants and second lieutenants receive less actual pay than the regimental sergeant-majors, staff sergeants, and sergeant-majors of such Yeomanry, and that the second lieutenants receive less actual pay than sergeants; whether, in view of such discrepancy, he will, under the circumstances, reconsider the rates of pay of the officers of such Imperial Yeomanry; and whether he will, at the same time, consider the advisability of raising the present grant to Imperial Yeomanry officers for personal equip-

ment and saddlery to a larger amount, in view of the facts that the present grant does not nearly cover the lowest-estimate of cost of such equipment, and

that officers of the Rhodesian Field Force forming part of the Imperial Yeomanry Force last year received for the same purpose nearly three times the amount of the present grant.

Mr. BRODRICK: So far as actual pay is concerned, the facts are as stated in the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question. But it must be borne in mind that the officer receives a gratuity at the rate of £100 a year, and colonial allowance at 3s. a day while in South Africa, which the non-commissioned officer does not. I am not prepared to reconsider now the amount of the grant for personal equipment, which was fixed after very careful consideration, and has been in force throughout the raising of the Imperial Yeomanry.

IRISH YEOMANRY PAY.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state upon what terms as to pay the Irish Yeomanry went to South Africa; whether the rate of pay was to be 5s. a day after twelve months service; and, if so, upon what date this rate begins.

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY to the WAR OFFICE (Lord Stanley, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The Irish Yeomanry received on enlistment the same rates of pay as the regular cavalry, as laid down by the Royal Warrant of the 24th December, 1899. The rate of pay for a private was raised by Royal Warrant of 13th February, 1901, to 5s. from the day following that on which they completed one year's service, or from the 1st February, 1901, whichever occurred first.

*MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): May I ask if the Irish Yeomanry proved themselves worth 4s. a day more than the poor Irish Fusiliers?

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order.

YEOMANRY RECRUITS; ACCOMMODATION AT ALDERSHOT.

Colonel LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the case of a batch of Yeomanry recruits who, on leaving London at 11.30 a.m. on 5th February and arriving unexpectedly at Aldershot, were told they were, not expected and must come again at six o'clock; whether he is aware that forty-six of them were placed in a room which could only accommodate twenty; that no rations were served out for twenty-four hours, that for fourteen days and nights the majority of them had to live in the clothes they came in. and that the kits were not served out to all until 10th February, the men having to eat their rations with their fingers; that this arrangement lasted for one month; that there was no discipline in the room, and only one parade at nine o'clock; that not one of these men was ever put upon a horse; and that these men were described in official language as having undergone one month's official training in riding and shooting; and whether he will cause an inquiry to be held into the circumstances, and take steps to prevent their recurrence.

Mr. BRODRICK: The difficulties in accommodating and providing for so many Yeomanry at Aldershot have already been fully explained to the House. The general officer commanding has personally dealt with these questions, and informs me that very few complaints were received. I believe that every effort has been made to cope with the difficulties, and that they were successfully and promptly dealt with, allowing for the circumstances that some 10,000 men have

had to be passed through Aldershot and equipped during the last six weeks.

Colonel LOCKWOOD: Do I understand that my statements are correct?

MR. BRODRICK: Well, Sir, I cannot say. I have referred many cases to Sir Redvers Buller. A large number were found to be incorrect; and I think it is much better to leave the matter in the hands of the general officer commanding.

Mr. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Will the attention of the Commander-in-Chief be called to this matter?

MR BRODRICK: Yes, Sir. I have forwarded the letters, but it has been found that many emanate from one Yeoman.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): Will the right hon. Gentleman say why this class of recruits are called Yeomen, which is precisely what they are not?

Mr. BRODRICK: Yeomen are mounted troops, and that is exactly the class of troops that these recruits are intended to be.

RIFLE RANGES.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if any new rifle ranges have been completed since last September; and, if so, how many: and if any old rifle ranges have been closed; and, if so, how many since that date.

Lord STANLEY: The ranges at Parkhurst, in the Isle of Wight, and at Kilbride, in Ireland, have been completed since the date named. The only War Department range closed in the same period is the Les Landes range in Jersey, which was only used for field firing, and of which the lease has expired.

SALFORD BARRACKS.

MR. LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state who are the purchasers of the Salford Barracks, sold under the provisions of the Barracks Act of 1890; what is the amount realised by the sale; and to what purposes will the site and the purchase money respectively be applied.

LORD STANLEY: The Salford Barracks were sold to the Corporation of Salford for £38,500. The site is, I understand, to be used by the corporation for the erection of artisans' dwellings. The purchase money has been applied to the purposes of the Barracks Act and the issues from the Consolidated Fund reduced accordingly.

WEST INDIAN TROOPS AT ST. HELENA.

Mr. DILLON (Mayo, E.) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether on the 2nd of January last a number of West Indian troops now stationed in St. Helena raided the town with clubs and razors tied to sticks; whether a number of the people were injured, several women beaten, and some children cut with the razors, and twelve of His Majesty's sailors injured; whether the West Indian soldiers broke out of barracks, and set their officers at defiance; whether when they were ordered to leave the town they refused, and threatened to blow up the town; and, if so, will he state what punishments have been inflicted; and whether the West Indian troops have been removed from St. Helena.

MR. BRODRICK: There was a quarrel between the sailors and the West Indian detachment, some men of which created disturbances; several had razors tied to sticks, and one is said to have had a club. Some few of the inhabitants were

injured, but no women are reported to have been beaten or children cut; five sailors were injured. Several West Indian soldiers broke out of barracks, though they are not reported to have set their officers at defiance. They hesitated to march next morning, but eventually did so. Nothing is known of any threat to blow up the town. In consequence of the disturbance the detachment was moved at once to Sierra Leone, where fifteen men were tried by court-martial, six men were convicted and sentenced to terms of imprisonment varying from six weeks to six months, seven were acquitted, and two are still in hospital awaiting trial.

Mr. DILLON: With this experience will the right hon. Gentleman give an undertaking that these regiments of coloured troops will not be moved into the more civilised portions of the Empire?

MR. BRODRICK: No. Sir. I cannot give any such undertaking.

LUDGERSHALL BARRACKS.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the attention of the War Office has been directed to the insanitary condition of the village of Ludgershall, close to which large barracks are to be erected, and in which the War Office owns much property; if so, what steps it is proposed to take to remedy the present state of affairs.

MR. BRODRICK: The War Department property does not include the village of Ludgershall, and the new barracks will be two miles from the village and separated from it by a range of hills. The question of the improvement of Ludgershall has, however, not been lost sight of, and is under consideration.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: Is it not the fact that the War Office is the lord of the manor of this village?

MR. BRODRICK: I cannot say with out notice.

MILITIA PAY.

MR. FREEMAN-THOMAS (Hastings): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Militia non-commissioned officers and men will in future receive Army rates of pay and messing allowances when called out for preliminary drill or annual training.

MR. BRODRICK: I purpose to touch on this question in introducing the Estimates. RETURN;NAVY (FLEETS).

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can say when the Return, Navy (Fleets), is likely to be circulated.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): It is now in the proof stage, and its issue will be pressed on as quickly as possible.

H.M.S. "BRITANNIA"

Mr. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any provision will be made for the time lost by the naval cadets on the "Britannia" by reason of their being sent home owing to the recent epidemic on board that ship: whether the fees paid for the term will be returned or accounted for; and whether he will take prompt measures to see that a suitable ship is provided for the naval cadets.

Mr. PRETYMAN: The time lost by the cadets on board H.M.S. "Britannia" will be made up later on,

and there will, therefore, be no occasion for returning fees. The cadets have been sent home for three weeks, and efforts are being made to render the "Britannia" fit and healthy for continued use as a cadets' training ship until the new college now being erected on shore is available. In such case it will be unnecessary to provide other accommodation for them, but if the efforts to render the "Britannia" free from infection should fail in their effect special arrangements will, of course, be made.

ROYAL VISIT TO THE COLONIES; THE "OPHIR" ; ENGINE - ROOM STAFF AND CREW.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty if he will state the reasons for the arrangement by which the Royal Navy furnished the deck complement of the steamship "Ophir," while the owners provide the engine-room complement instead of the Royal Navy.

I beg at the same time to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether he will explain the arrangement made with the owners of the steamship "Ophir" as regards wages, victuals, clothing, and discipline of that part of the complement provided by the owners dining Admiralty charter.

MR. PRETYMAN: It was considered that as the engineers of the Orient Company, accustomed to working the engines of the "Ophir," remained in charge of her machinery during her forthcoming voyage, the company should provide the whole of the engine-room staff. A subsequent decision has been come to to limit the staff provided by the company to the engineers and a few special ratings, the remainder being supplied by men of the Royal Navy. The portion of the crew of the "Ophir" not belonging to the Royal Navy have been entered under special conditions approved by Order in Council, which places them under the Naval Discipline Act, and they are paid the rates of pay agreed upon with the owners of the "Ophir," who victual the entire complement of the ship, including these men. Uniform is supplied at the cost of the Crown.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB: I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether, before Vote I of the Navy Estimates is proceeded with, he will cause to be issued to the House a Return showing the nature and number of officers, petty officers, and men, and their rates of pay respectively, of the engine-room staff of the steamship "Ophir," provided by the owners during the Admiralty charter.

MR. PRETYMAN: I shall be happy to cause such a Return to be issued if the hon. and gallant Member will move for it, or I will send him the statement direct, whichever he prefers.

ADMIRALTY COAL CONTRACTS.

MR WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether the Admiralty entered into contracts last November for the supply of coals over 1901 at prices ranging from 19s. to 21s. per ton; and, if so, how many tons were contracted for.

MR. PRETYMAN: The answer to the first part of the question is in the affirmative. The quantity contracted for was about 400,000 tons.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: How is it that the hon. Gentleman the other night told me the Admiralty never made contracts

MR. PRETYMAN: We were discussing the excess quantities required, and not the minimum.

EXPENDITURE ON NEW CONSTRUCTION.

Sir JOHN COLOMB: I wish to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty a question of which I have given him private notice; whether the figures quoted in The Times to-day as to the amount of the expenditure on new construction, short of the Votes, are figures for the current year, or for some previous year.

Mr. PRETYMAN: The figures are not in respect to the current financial year. They are figures relating to the year ended March, 1900, and have already been dealt with in the statement of the, First Lord.

† See page 483.

NAVAL ORDNANCE STORE DEPARTMENT.

Commander YOUNG (Berkshire, Wokingham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether a Departmental Committee has been appointed at the Admiralty to investigate into and reorganise the affairs of the Naval Ordnance Store Department; and, if so, whether the Committee will be asked to report the advisability of officering the department by Naval officers, and whether the Committee's attention will be drawn to the many promises given to Secretary of State for India, but with the House of Commons by the Parliamentary Admiralty officials that the Admiralty would appoint Naval warrant officers to berths in this department as vacancies occurred.

MR. PRETYMAN: Yes, a Committee has been appointed, and the matters referred to are being considered by them.

INDIAN RAILWAY STOCK.

MR. J. E. CORDON (Elgin and Nairn): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can state the cause for the continued refusal by the India Office and the Bank of England to explain to the 15,000 shareholders of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company the details and methods recently employed: in calculating the average rate of interest received and paid on Indian Government Stock in London during the two-year period under consideration; whether he is aware that the amount of stock referred to in this contract and by the Bank of England is about £120,000,000, but that by an oversight the Bank of England has omitted from the calculation about £100,000,000 stock, and only dealt with that proportion which was invested in during the two-year period; whether he is aware that this intrusion of the key-word "invested," instead of "received" is contrary to all precedent; and what steps will be taken to satisfy the shareholders of the Great Indian, the Bombay, and the Madras Railway Companies that the India Office itself feels a direct responsibility for the due completion of their contracts.

The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): (1) The letter from the Bank

of England dated the 9th November, 1900, which gives all the information, in my possession as to the methods employed in calculating the rate of interest, Was immediately communicated to the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company, and if the hon. Member likes to move for the correspondence in continuation of that already given to the House, I have no objection. (2, 3, and 4) The hon. Member is no doubt aware that, under the contract, the decision as to the rate of interest lay, not with the decision as to the Governor of the Bank of England;

and that his decision, when challenged, was upheld by two courts of law. This appears to me to create a very strong presumption that it was a sound and proper decision; but, in any case, the Secretary of State is bound, like the company, to accept it and to act upon it. He has no option in the matter.

COOPERS HILL COLLEGE.

Mr. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will explain why Sir Charles Bernard's recommendation not to reappoint a separate salaried President, to Cooper's Hill College was not adopted; and whether he can inform the House, if this recommendation had been adopted, what annual saving would have resulted therefrom since 1895.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The recommendation made by Sir Charles Bernard was not ignored. On the next vacancy, in 1896, Colonel Pennyquick was appointed to the Presidency on the understanding that he should in addition discharge the duties of professor of engineering. But after two years experience he strongly urged that he ought to be relieved of his professional duties, and to this the Secretary of State in Council, on the advice of the Board of Visitors, finally agreed. The saving which resulted from the combination of the two offices was about £;600 a year. The salary of the President is £;1,000 a year.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, whether the Board of Visitors recommended the dismissal of Mr. Hurst, accounts instructor; and, if not, who did so; and whether his successor has yet been appointed.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The Board of Visitors recommended that the proposal of the President for a change in the system of tuition in accounts should be adopted; and this involved the retirement of Mr. Hurst and the appointment of a lecturer who should be conversant with the system of the Indian Public Works Department. Put as there is no course of lectures on accounts in the summer term no fresh appointment has yet been made.

Mr. O'MARA: Well, I cannot find it in the Report.

Then, Sir, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state how many new teachers have been appointed to Cooper's Hill College, and how many more it is proposed to appoint under the Report of the Board of Visitors, dated 24th July, 1900; what will be the total sum of the salaries of all these new appointments; what was the total sum of the salaries of the teachers who have been dismissed; and what reduction in the yearly cost of the teaching staff will result therefrom.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The number of new teachers to be appointed is four, and their salaries will amount to £;1,367 per annum. The salaries of the retiring professors and lecturers amounted to £;3,087, showing a saving of £;1,720. Against this must be set the proposed increases in the salaries of the remaining teachers, amounting to £;300. The net saving in salaries is therefore £;1,420 per annum.

INDIAN FAMINE COMMISSION.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the evidence of 7th February before the Famine Commission of Mr. Lely, Commissioner in Gujarat, to the effect that, owing to the exhaustion of the soil, the fall in price of sugar and cotton, the

disuse of the old custom of grain storage for home consumption, and the loss of 70 per cent, of their cattle, there has been a complete breakdown among the cultivators of Gujarat; and whether, seeing that Mr. Lely repeatedly urged a suspension of 15 per cent, of the revenues last year in Gujarat, he can state the grounds on which the Bombay Government refused to remit more than 20 per cent.; is he aware that owing to the force of circumstances only 28 per cent, could be collected; and can he explain why the proposed suspensions of revenue were not earlier made known to the people.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been drawn to the evidence before the Famine Commission of Mr. Dalai, Famine Commissioner in Baroda, showing the benefit to the suffering cultivators of the wells constructed by the Baroda State in the Kadi district; and whether, with reference to Mr. Dalai's statement that the people of Kadi are less poor than those of Ahmedabad, he will consider the desirability of extending the benefits of this system to the neighbouring British district of Ahmedabad.

LORD G. HAMILTON: As the circumstances to which the hon. Member's questions refer are now being inquired into by a Commission in India, I must await the arrival of their Report before I can express any opinion on the subject.

NEW INDIAN PROVINCE.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can state the area approximately, of that portion of the proposed new province situate beyond the present frontiers of His Majesty's Indian possessions, and stated to be as comprised in the political agencies of Dir, Swat, Chitral, the Khyber, the Kuram, Tochi, and Wano; and the estimated annual cost of the military occupation and political administration of these trans-frontier regions under the proposed scheme; and will the cost of maintenance be made an Imperial charge, this being a matter of Imperial defence.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The aggregate area of the present agencies will not be affected by the substitution for their control of the authority of the Government of India in the place of the authority of the Government of the Punjab. I have no estimate of their present extent. Until the details of the transfer are settled I cannot estimate the annual cost. The charges will continue to be borne, as they are at present, by the Government of India.

PUNJAB ADMINISTRATION.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India will the subtraction from the Punjab of its four western districts and placing them under the Political Department at Simla or Calcutta withdraw them and their populations from the jurisdiction of the Chief Court at Lahore and from the ordinary revenue and public works administration of the Punjab Government; and can he say if any dissents or opinions have been recorded pursuant to the Act of 1858, Sections 25, 24, in course of the correspondence and proceedings of the Secretary of State in Council during the working up of the scheme for organisation for the proposed new province; and whether such dissents or opinions will be placed before Parliament at an early date in accordance with Sections 54, 55, of the Act of 1858.

LORD G HAMILTON: No final decision has been arrived at on the matters mentioned in the first part of the question. The answer to the second part of the question is in the affirmative, and the Papers relating to the subject should be in the hands of the House in the course of a few hours.

CHINA;RUSSIA AND MANCHURIA.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has yet received any confirmation in writing of the promise given orally to the British Ambassador in St. Petersburg that the occupation of Manchuria by the Russians is to lie neither virtual nor actual; and, if not, whether he expects to receive such confirmation; and it so, at what time.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The despatch from His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg reporting his conversation with the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs on the subject of the Russian occupation of Manchuria to which the hon. Member refers will be presented to Parliament at once. The text of this despatch was seen and approved by Count Lamsdorff at the end of last month.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: Has the written assurance been received or not?

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: My answer-to that is that the contents of the despatch were approved by Count Lamsdorff.

CRIMEAN LOAN OF 1855.

MR. BILL (Staffordshire. Leek): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the negotiations with the Turkish Government concerning the Crimean Loan of 1855, to which he alluded in the debate on the Civil Service Estimates on 15th June of last year; have been concluded; and whether any arrangement has been arrived at for the conversion of the loan.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I have nothing to add to the answer which I gave to the hon. Member for Warrington on the 14th of December last, which was to the effect that the negotiations were still suspended.

TRADE OF MACEIO AND PERNAMBUCO.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Consular Report for 1899 on the state of trade in Maceio and Pernambuco has now been received by the Foreign Office, and when will it be published, if that has not been done yet.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The Consul has explained that his Report has been delayed in consequence of the difficulty experienced in obtaining the requisite statistical details; but that he hopes shortly to be able to furnish it.

LEAD OXIDE IN EARTHENWARE GLAZE.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Foreign Office will take steps to stop the introduction into this country of any china or earthenware from other countries the glaze on which contains lead oxide in excess of the amount allowed to manufacturers in this country.

† See The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxiv., page 246.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: This question should not be addressed to my Department.

MR. COGHILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state what steps he proposes to take to prevent the sale of earthenware and

china to the public described as leadless glazed, but the glaze upon which it is well known in many cases contains an appreciable quantity of lead oxide.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I understand my hon. friend to suggest fraudulent misdescription, and not danger to health. The ordinary law provides a remedy in such cases, and I do not feel called upon to take any steps in the matter.

MEDICAL WITNESSES' EXPENSES.

MR. LAWRENCE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether lie will explain on what grounds medical witnesses in England and Wales are allowed only one guinea, per diem, while in Scotland they are paid two guineas, with further sum added for each case, and in Ireland the fee of one guinea only requires an attendance in court of three hours in the town of residence, and is changed to two guineas with travelling allowance in case of other towns; and whether he will authorise an inquiry into the matters, with a view to remedy the inequality of remuneration referred to.

*MR. RITCHIE: I do not think the fees of medical witnesses can be touched without dealing at the same time with those of other witnesses, and this I am not prepared to do in view of the largely increased cost of prosecutions which might be the result of such a revision of the present scale.

VALUATION APPEALS.

MR. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand, Westminster): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if lie can say (1) how many appeals under the Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1861), entered for hearing at the County of London? Quarter Sessions in the list of 1901 have been tried by the Court up to and including 23rd February, 1901; (2) how many of such appeals have been allowed and how many dismissed, and whether with or without costs in either case; (3) and whether the Court has reviewed its judgment in any of the above appeals; and, if so, with what result.

*MR. RITCHIE: The figures are, respectively (1) 82; (2) 76 allowed, 13 with, (63 without, costs; 6 dismissed, 5 with, 1 without, costs; (3) 1; original judgment affirmed.

NEW POLICE BUILDINGS (SHEPHERDESS WALK); REHOUSING OF PERSONS DISPOSSESSED

MR. HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that the public authorities have purchased an area now covered by cottage property in Shepherdess Walk, City Road, and that no provision has been made, or is proposed to be made, for the rehousing of the persons of the working class thus displaced; and whether he will take steps to compel the provision of houses for these persons.

*MR. RITCHIE: I think my hon. friend is misinformed. Only five houses have been acquired by the Metropolitan Police in the neighbourhood of Shepherdess Walk, and under Section 5 of the Metropolitan Police Act, 1886, from which the powers of purchase are derived, as under other Acts giving similar powers in London, the obligation, to rehouse does not arise unless twenty or more houses occupied by the labouring classes are taken.

REHOUSING; GREAT NORTHERN AND CITY RAILWAY.

MR. HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Great Northern and City Railway Company have demolished, as a result of secret purchase by their contractors, dwelling-houses occupied by the poorer labouring classes in Poole Street, Wickham Street, and Wiltshire Row, Shore-ditch, and have thereby displaced about 250 persons of the working classes, whose work compels them to live in the neighbourhood, without providing or proposing to provide any accommodation for the persons thus unhoused: and whether he proposes to take steps to compel the Great Northern and City Railway Company to rehouse persons of the working class whose dwellings the company purchases for the purpose of creating a depot of the company.

*MR. RITCHIE: I am informed by the Great Northern and City Railway Company that the facts are not as suggested in the first part of the question, but that the lands referred to have been openly acquired by the contractors working for the company for purposes of offices, yards, and so forth in connection with their works. If so, as the lands have not been acquired by the company, I have no such power to compel the provision of rehousing accommodation, as I might have, by statute if the houses were being purchased by the company under their Acts.
REHOUSING; LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

MR. HAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that Broad Street Buildings, Whitecross Place, Wilson Street, Finsbury, recently the property of the Land Security Company and occupied by 585 of the poorer labouring class, have now been transferred to the Chief Manager of the Estate Office of the London and North Western Railway Company, and the tenants given notice to quit; whether these buildings are in process of being cleared of tenants and demolished, and the land handed over vacant to the Railway Company to be used for the extension of that Railway Company's Broad Street Goods Station; whether his attention has been called to the fact that the acquisition of working class dwellings for this railway company's purposes through a secret agent enables the railway company to escape their statutory obligations in contravention of Standing Order 183A; and if he will give particulars of other purchases made by the London and North Western Railway Company in the same or a similar manner throughout the United Kingdom; and whether he will state the measures he has taken, if any to mitigate the hardships to the working class tenants concerned, and to prevent overcrowding in congested districts of the metropolis.

*MR. RITCHIE: I am informed by the London and North Western Railway Company that the property referred to has not yet been transferred to them, but that they have entered into a conditional agreement to purchase it. The case appears to involve questions as to the rehousing of displaced labouring class persons, with regard to which I am bound to say that I consider the attitude adopted generally by this company to be very unsatisfactory. Without answering the latter parts of the question in detail, I may say that the "whole matter is engaging my most serious consideration.

POLICE GRIEVANCES.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the

Home Department if in the event of grievances arising in any police force, county or borough, whether caused by matters of preferment, dissatisfaction over pay and allowances, time of service., or other legitimate cause for complaint, to what responsible officer of the Crown can these difficulties be referred.

*MR. RITCHIE: County and borough police forces are by statute under the control of local authorities. The Secretary of State for the Home Department is the Minister most closely concerned, but he has no responsibility except in cases where the efficiency of a force is impaired, or where there is unsatisfactory administration of the pension fund; nor has he any power of direct intervention in matters of dispute between individual constables and the authorities under whom they serve.

TEA LOTTERIES.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the fact of several convictions which have recently taken place for the illegal retail sale of tea upon a species of lottery system, notably at Coventry. Blackburn, Bury (Lanes.), Handsworth, and Hull; and, seeing that similar illegal forms of trading, have existed within the metropolitan area for some years past without prosecutions being brought by the police, whether he will direct the attention of the Metropolitan Police authorities to any case brought under his notice forthwith with a view to bringing the offenders to justice.

*MR. KITCHIE: The convictions referred to in the first paragraph of the question have not been brought specially to my notice. Sale-of-tea lotteries were begun in the Metropolis in 1895, and proceedings were promptly instituted, with the result that the defendants entered into an undertaking to discontinue such practices. Since that date no case has been brought to the notice of the Metropolitan Police.

VACCINATION AT UETHNAL GREEN.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAG-GREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he will state how many prosecutions have been instituted by the vaccination officer of the borough of Bethnal Green since the passing of the Vaccination Act, 1898; (2) how many convictions were obtained; (3) and how many of the fines imposed remain unrecovered; (4) whether he is aware that most of the persons prosecuted were unable to defend themselves effectually owing to ignorance of the procedure provided under Section 2 of the aforementioned Act; and, if so (5), is he prepared to allow a remission of the fines imposed.

*MR. RITCHIE: It would be impossible to give the information asked for in the first three queries without a search of the police court records or without reference to the guardians, and the work of obtaining the information would involve much time and labour. I have no reason to suppose that persons prosecuted under the Vaccination Acts in Bethnal Green have found any greater difficulty in defending themselves than persons similarly prosecuted in other places: but if the hon. Member will furnish me with full details of any case in which he thinks the defendant has suffered injustice I will inquire into it.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAG-GREE: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is

aware that vaccination prosecutions in Bethnal Green and adjacent boroughs are being rigorously pursued against persons who have a conscientious objection to vaccination, and have resulted in convictions owing to the difficulty encountered by the accused persons of proving that their objection is based on a conscientious belief; and, seeing that in this respect and owing to loss of time and wages which is occasioned by the process of asserting their objection under Section 2 of the Vaccination Act, 1898, that Act does not give full relief to objectors, whether he purposes adopting any steps by which the operation of that Act might be rendered more easy and effective in future.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I am not myself aware of difficulties of the kind referred to in the first paragraph, of the question, and I should regret if any such difficulties were experienced.

The answer to the second part of the question must, however, be in the negative.

FOOD ADULTERATION PROSECUTIONS MISTAKES OF PUBLIC ANALYSTS.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that in several prosecutions recently against tradesmen for the alleged sale of adulterated articles, notably at Portsmouth and Hackney, it has been shown that the public analysts on whose statements action has been taken have been guilty of grave mistakes; and whether he can take any steps to prevent respectable tradesmen being unjustly summoned upon erroneous certificates.

MR. WALTER LONG: I have communicated with the public analysts as regards the two instances referred to by my hon. friend. I find that certificates given by them in two cases were not upheld on reference to the Government Laboratory. The circumstances do not appear to show, however, that the analysts were open to blame-In one of the cases the analyst seems to have taken special care in the matter. I have no power to take any steps for the purpose mentioned in the last paragraph of the question, and I may say that, speaking generally, it appears to me that the tradesman is sufficiently protected by the power to have an analysis verified at Somerset House.

UNCLAIMED MONEYS AT THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE (Sussex, Horsham): On behalf of the lion-Member for North Hackney, I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can inform the House as to the amount of unclaimed dividends and other unclaimed moneys in the custody of the Bank of England; and whether there is any precedent for the application of such moneys to the public service, the Exchequer being liable to refund such moneys to proper claimants.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Various funds of the nature of unclaimed dividends in the hands of or under the control of Government have from time to time been applied to the public service, the Exchequer remaining liable to refund the money to any persons who may subsequently prove their claim. I am not aware of any-precedent for dealing in this manner with funds outside the purview of Government. At the present time unclaimed dividends on British Funds are under statute handed over by the Hank

after ten years to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt. Unclaimed dividends on India Stocks are similarly surrendered to the Indian Government. The amounts at present in the possession of the Bank of England are: British Funds, £34,575; India Stocks, £41,496. The amount of other unclaimed dividends in the possession of the Bank is inconsiderable. With regard to unclaimed money of private customers, the Bank is, of course, in the same position as other banks.

SCHOOL BOARD OFFICIALS AS MEMBERS OF COUNTY COUNCILS.

MR. HORNER (Lambeth, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been called to the recent election to the London County Council

of a schoolmaster who holds an appointment under the London School Board; whether it is permissible for a public official of the London School Board to use the time he should be devoting to his official duties for any other purpose than that for which he is paid by the ratepayers; and what steps he proposes to take.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GOULSTON, Cambridge University): No; my attention has not been called to the matter. The only regulation of the Board of Education bearing on the matter is to be found in Article 85 (e) of the Code.

MR. HORNER: But has he not ceased ipso facto to be an official of the London School Board?

SIR J. GOULSTON: My hon. friend must ask the London School Board.

MR. HORNER: The information has been asked for, and no reply was obtained.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.

MR. TOLLEMACHE (Cheshire, Eddisbury): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether his attention has been called to the reported discovery in France of a cure for foot-and-mouth disease; and if he will cause inquiries to be made on a subject of such great importance to the agricultural community.

MR. WALTER LONG (for MR. HANBURY): The attention of the veterinary officers of the Board of Agriculture has been directed to the statements to which my hon. friend refers, and they will keep themselves informed of any further developments of the matter. I may say, however, that in view of the special characteristics of foot-and-mouth disease, it is not likely that the discovery of a remedy for it will lie of much assistance to the Department in keeping this country entirely clear from it, a result which I trust may soon be once again secured, as it was from 1887 to 1891, and again from 1895 to 1899.

SWINE FEVER.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he is prepared to advise that compensation be given owners in case of deaths resulting from swine fever when such deaths are occasioned by the carelessness or incompetence of the veterinary surgeon employed by the Board of Agriculture.

MR. LONG (for Mr. HANBURY): The power to pay compensation in cases of swine fever only extends to swine slaughtered by order of the Board of Agriculture in the exercise of their powers under the Diseases of Animals Acts. Any complaints

with regard to the conduct of veterinary surgeons employed by the Board would always be fully investigated and such action taken as the circumstances might require.

ELECTION PETITIONS.

MR. J. E. GORDON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether his attention has been drawn to the misuse of the Election Petition Courts by persons, lawyers, and laymen, who to their own pecuniary advantage employ themselves in making serious but fictitious charges against Members of this House with impunity; and whether the law has any penalties for such conduct.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINEAY, Inverness Burghs): The procedure in the Election Petition Courts is no doubt capable of being abused, but I am not aware that this has been done for the sake of any pecuniary advantage. There is great difficulty in entirely obviating the danger of abuse without throwing obstacles in the way of recourse to the Courts in proper cases. I may refer my lion, friend to the Report of the recent Committee on Election Petitions in 1898.

AN HON. MEMBER: Has the lion, and learned Gentleman considered the judgment of the judges in the Cocker-mouth petition?

SIR ROBERT FINEAY: Yes, Sir; and I certainly agree with the conclusions arrived at.

ELECTRIC RAILWAYS;SUPPOSED RISK TO ALBERT MEMORIAL, ETC.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he has considered the risk to the Albert Memorial and the Albert Hall which may be caused by the proposed electric railway at Kensington; and whether he proposes to institute inquiries and to take action should the reports be unfavourable.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): Yes, Sir. The matter is under careful consideration as regards the Albert Memorial, but for the Albert Hall I am not responsible. The Government are in communication with the promoters of the Bill, and any necessary precautions for the safety of the Memorial beyond those provided in the Bill will be insisted upon. There will, of course, be other Government interests to be protected.

INTERIOR CEYLON TEAS.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if his attention has been drawn to the fact that quantities of inferior Ceylon and other teas alleged to contain microbial products dangerous to health are being sold in bond in London at prices ranging below 4d. per pound; if the Customs officers have taken and analysed any samples of such teas, and with what results; and what amount has been seized and destroyed during the last twelve months; and if, in the interests of public health, he is willing to consent to an inquiry into the best methods of checking the sale of such unwholesome teas by determining some minimum standard of purity, and by securing a proper analysis of such teas before they are blended with other teas.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire): Since my hon. friend put his notice on the Paper, he has been good enough to send me papers on the subject, and I should be obliged if he would postpone his question till Monday, to give me time for their

consideration.

REGISTERED LETTERS;COMPENSA- TION.

MR. THORNTON (Clapham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the statement and table of figures printed on the back of the envelopes made to enclose registered packets, that, subject to the conditions published in the Post Office Guide as to registration, compensation for loss or damage is given in respect of inland registered packets of all kinds according to the following table which includes a fee of 2d. to secure compensation limited to £;5; and seeing that this statement may lead the public to believe that by paying the "2d. registration fee they are ensuring repayment in full up to £;5, of money which has been registered but which is lost in course of post, instead of the £;2 limited by the above-mentioned conditions, whether he will give instructions that on all future issues of such envelopes a clearer statement shall be printed of the amount of specie recoverable through registration in the post.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In view of the distinct reference to the conditions published in the Post Office Guide the Postmaster General thinks that no misapprehension ought to arise as regards the amount of compensation payable; but after careful consideration of the subject he has come to the conclusion that it will be safer to discontinue the table of rates now printed on the backs of the official registered letter envelopes, and merely to notify that compensation for loss or damage is given in respect of inland registered letters and packets subject to the limitations and conditions printed, in the Post Office Guide under the head of "Registration and Compensation."

MANCHESTER TELEPHONE OPERATORS.

MR. SCHWANN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can say what is going to be done with regard to the female operators in the telephone department of the General Post Office, Manchester, who were transferred to the General Post Office from the National Telephone, Company in 1897, with regard to an advance in their wages; and whether, seeing that they are all senior operators of from eight to fifteen years experience in telephone work, but have had no advance for three years, though juniors of three years experience are said to be receiving higher wages, and that various applications have been met with the statement that the question is under consideration, he could, if these statements be correct, conic to a decision in favour of an increase of wages.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In reply to the hon. Member I have to state that the Postmaster General is in. communication with the Treasury on the subject of the position and pay of the telephone operators at Manchester and elsewhere; and he hopes to be in a position to announce a decision very shortly.

POSTAL TELEGRAPH CLERKS' ASSOCIATION.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, having regard to the fact that the secretary of the metropolitan branch of the Postal Telegraph Clerks' Association applied for leave of absence to attend the annual business meeting and conference at Manchester on the 7th March, and that the postal officials took

fourteen days to consider the application, and in view of past difficulties, whether the Postmaster General will direct that no obstacles are to be placed in the way of officials of trades unions in the Post Office performing the legitimate business of their organisation.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: All facilities, consistent with the proper performance of the work of the department and with the proper discipline of the service, are allowed to officers of the department who apply to attend the annual meetings of the Postal Telegraph Clerks' Association and similar bodies, on the legitimate business of those bodies. The delay in according leave, complained of in the present case, was in part due to the fact that the officer concerned did not in the first instance provide efficient substitutes on his duty.

INFECTIOUS DISEASE AT SOUTH UIST.

MR JOHN DEWAR (Inverness): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether the Secretary for Scotland is aware that,

although it is stated in the Fourth Annual Report of the Local Government Board for Scotland (1898), page xxiii., that the Commissioner for the Local Government Board made an exhaustive inquiry into an outbreak of infectious disease in South Uist, it is true that the Commissioner refused to take the evidence of the clerk to the Parish Council of South Uist, who was the first person officially most conversant with the facts at issue; and, seeing that the parish council complained to the Lord Advocate and the Secretary for Scotland as well as to the First Lord of the Treasury of the misstatement of facts and refusal by the Commissioner to take evidence, whether any steps have been taken to inquire into or to rectify the statements complained of as misrepresentations by the parish council.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (MR. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am informed by the Local Government Board that they are not aware that their Commissioner ever declined to receive the evidence of the clerk to the parish council. On the contrary, the clerk to the parish council was cited to Lochboisdale with other witnesses but was unable to be present, being stormstaid at Castlebay. Any books and documents which the clerk might have produced were produced by the inspector of poor. It is not the intention of the Local Government Board to reopen the inquiry which they consider sufficient.

TREATMENT OF PAUPER CHILDREN IN IRELAND.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Local Government Board for Ireland have issued an order compelling boards of guardians in Ireland to supply out-nursed children with clothing; whether he is aware that there are boards of guardians who out-nurse children, and make arrangements with the foster parents to clothe and rear these workhouse children with their own children, with the view of removing the taint or appearance of pauperism; whether he can say if it is the intention of the Local Government Board, under the new rule, to compel out-nursed workhouse children to wear poorhouse suits when attending schools which they attend: and whether he will request this rule to be withdrawn by the Local Government Board.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The order referred to in

the first paragraph requires guardians to provide suitable and sufficient clothing for orphan and deserted children placed outside the workhouse with foster parents. So far from it being the intention of the Local Government Board to compel these children to wear pauper uniform, the order expressly requires that the clothing shall not be of such shape or colour as may denote connection with the workhouse; and, moreover, with a view to avoid uniformity in the clothing, it was further pointed out that particular care should be taken that the materials, shape, and colour should not be alike in all cases. The Board are not aware of any case in which foster parents arrange with guardians to clothe the children. Any such arrangement involving payment to the foster parents by the guardians would be contrary to the regulations.

ROSCOMMON SCHOOL TEACHERS' FEES.

MR. HAYDKN (Roscommon, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that there are several schools in Roscommon district the teachers of which have not yet been paid equivalent for results fees, although the annual examinations were held in those schools early in December; and, seeing that the said equivalent for results should have been paid with teachers' ordinary salaries on 15th January, whether he can state when this money will be paid the teachers, and what is the cause of delay.

MR. WYNDHAM: Some delay was occasioned, I understand, by the necessity for correspondence; but the equivalent for results fees is in course of payment to schools which were examined in December in this and other districts, and in nearly all cases payment has been actually made.

LIVE STOCK IN COUNTY MONAGHAN.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the County Council of Monaghan, under The Technical and Agricultural Act, 1899, invited each district council in the county to formulate a scheme for the locality interested, that the Monaghan Rural and Urban District only allotted £130 for the improvement of live stock while Carrickmacross Rural District Council required £600 for this purpose, and that at a meeting of the Live Stock Committee, held in the town of Monaghan the scheme from Carrickmacross District Council was not considered, and that the Monaghan District scheme was made the basis for expenditure; whether he is aware that at the meeting of the Live Stock Committee in Monaghan, Mr. Cordon, of the Technical and Agricultural Department, stated that if £600 was carried instead of £260 the Department would not sanction it, which caused the members present to adopt the smaller sum; and will he say if Mr. Gordon had power to state the views of the Agricultural Department without consultation with that body, and if he will direct that a larger sum than £260 be spent on the improvement of live stock.

MR. WYNDHAM: It was the Live Stock Committee of the Monaghan County Council who themselves decided the amount to be allocated from the local rates to the county live stock schemes. This amount, which the Department approved, makes, together with the grant from the Department, a total of £520 applied to the improvement of live stock in the county Monaghan. Mr. Gordon, the Department's

representative, did not interfere or advise the committee in fixing this amount, but he gave his opinion that the Department would not sanction a proposal which was made by the non-members that a sum of £;600 should be applied from the local rates for the schemes in the Carrickmacross Rural District alone.

ULSTER WINTER ASSIZES.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, although it was originally promised that the Ulster winter assizes should be held in Armagh every fourth year, they have been held there only

once; and whether, seeing that Armagh is as central, and in possession of as good railway and other accommodation, as Derry, Omagh, or Belfast, he will see that this grievance is redressed by the holding of winter assizes in Armagh.

MR. WYNDHAM: A question similar to this was addressed to my right hon. friend the Attorney General by the hon. Member for East Mayo on Tuesday last.

†. I have nothing to add to the reply given to that question.

LOUGH NEAGH.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a large part of the district surrounding Lough Neagh has been flooded to such an extent during the past winter that in many of the houses of the inhabitants water for several weeks covered the floors to a considerable depth; and whether, seeing that epidemics of fevers and other like diseases have usually followed that state of matters in the past, he will direct the Local Government Inspector to visit and report upon the sanitary state of the district with a view to the adoption of measures to prevent such diseases in the district during the summer; whether his information shows that the drainage scheme planned and carried out by the Irish Board of Works has failed to provide the relief from flooding promised for it by their engineer; whether he is aware that the chief cost of the complete scheme of drainage has been assessed on and paid for by the tenant farmers of the district; and whether he will take immediate steps to have the drainage of the district for which the people have paid conflicted at the public expense.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board have received resolutions from local bodies to the effect that part of this district is subject to floods, but they have no information that epidemics of fever have resulted from such flooding.

The works of the drainage district, which were completed in 1859, were entirely successful for the purposes sought to be effected for a number of years. The cost of the works in 1859 was charged in the

† See page 583 of this volume.

usual way on the interests of the proprietors. I am not in a position, without further inquiry, to state to what extent increased rents have been imposed on the tenants consequent upon the improvements. I am not prepared to introduce in the present session legislation similar to that introduced and subsequently withdrawn in 1889.

IRISH MAYORS AND COMMISSIONS OF ASSIZE.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the mayor of the city of

Waterford is entitled, under charter of Charles I., to be included in the commission of assize for the city of Waterford; and whether he can give any explanation of the fact that the present mayor of the city has been excluded from the commission issued for the spring assizes this year.

*THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (MR. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): With my right lion, friend's permission. I will reply to this question. I have not as yet been able to procure the patent to which the question refers. My impression is however, that it only qualified the mayor to sit as a member of the commission, not entitled him. I would refer the hon. Member to an answer given by me on the 20th of February last year to a question put by the hon. Member for East Clare for the explanation why the mayors of the different assize towns in Ireland have been omitted from the commission of assize.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he will be kind enough to inform the present House of Commons the reason why these mayors who are qualified, if not entitled, to sit on these commissions, and have been so sitting from time immemorial, have been suddenly struck off?

*MR. ATKINSON: I have already explained that they have not been struck off. Their names simply have not been included. The positions which they occupy make them liable to be parties in litigation likely to come before the judges, and that is the reason why they have not been associated in the commission.

KILLARNEY LAKES.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that barbed wire fences have been erected by the Earl of Kenmare along the Ross Castle entrance to the Lakes of Killarney; and that a large number of visitors have complained of the existence of these barbed wire fences; and whether, having regard to these complaints, he will take steps to have these fences removed.

*MR. ATKINSON: The fact is as stated in the first paragraph, though, so far as the police are aware, no complaints have been made by tourists of the existence of the barbed wire fences. It is permissible to place barbed wire on the fence of a public road unless it be in such a position as to amount to an obstruction. I am not aware whether the wire has been placed along the public road in the present instance, but in any case I am informed that it is the intention of Lord Kenmare's agent to remove the wire without delay.

ARMAGH MAGISTRACY.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number and religious beliefs of the resident magistrates in county Armagh.

MR. WYNDHAM: The county Armagh is comprised in the districts of three resident magistrates, all of whom, I believe, are Protestants.

IRISH SCHOOL INSPECTORS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will grant the Return respecting school inspectors in Ireland, notice for which stands on to-day's Paper.

MR. WYNDHAM: The number of Inspectors of National Education in Ireland is

eighty-six. A list of their names and various ranks is published in Thorn's Directory. I am inquiring whether a Return containing this information, supplemented by the dates of the appointments of the inspectors, should be published as a separate Parliamentary Paper, or whether it cannot be embodied in the Annual Reports of the Commissioners which are laid before Parliament. As at present advised, I am not prepared to consent to the Return in the form asked by the hon. Member.

CLIN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL.

*MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, West): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a resolution by the Board of Management of the Glin Industrial School in reference to the want of railway or steamship accommodation, to Glin, whereby the school board is put to expense in obtaining its supplies, which would be reduced if the steamboat plying between Limerick and Tarbert called at Glin; also is he aware of the hardship that the children from the various unions in said county undergo in travelling on outside cars to the school; and whether he will take steps to have the steamboat plying between Limerick and Tarbert call at Glin, and also have a light railway laid from Foynes to Tarbert viâ Shanagolden, Ballyhahill, and Glin, which would be a benefit to the public and render access to said industrial school easier.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Waterford Steamship Company are willing that their steamer should call at Glin provided that certain conditions, which have been communicated to the Board of Management of the Industrial school, are fulfilled. There are no funds available for the construction of the railway suggested in the question.

BIRR AND PORTUMNA RAILWAY.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the fact that the Government have already consented to give a grant of £12,000 in aid of the reconstruction; of the Birr and Portumna Line, and that the International Railway Corporation have offered to spend £12,000 more in its reconstruction, if necessary, and also to equip and work the line, he will allow the line to be re-opened.

MR. WYNDHAM: As already stated by me, the proposals of the International Railway Corporation have been brought by the Irish Government before the Treasury, who did not see their way to hold out any expectation that they will consent to a grant of £12,000 in aid of the reconstruction of the line.

LONGFORD SPRING ASSIZES.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the address to the grand jury of county Longford at the spring assizes on 4th March, complimenting them on the entire absence from all serious crime of the county of Longford, and stating that it was a matter of the greatest satisfaction to find the general condition of the county so peaceful and orderly; and will he, in view of this fact, direct the police to discontinue all interference with the organisation of the United Irish League.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have seen a newspaper report of the judge's address to the grand

jury at Longford assizes on the 4th inst. The judge's observations, so far as I can gather, appear to have been based on the number of cases in which bills were submitted to the grand jury, and did not refer, as alleged, to "the entire absence from all serious crime of the county of Long-ford" The police do not interfere with the organisation of the United Irish League.

UNITED IRISH LEAGUE AT BALLINALEE.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he explain by whose order County Inspector M'Dermott, with District Inspectors Rodwell and Millar, attended by 100 policemen armed with rifles, proceeded to Ballinalee on Sunday last to prevent the East Collumbkille fife and drum band from Playing outside the League rooms in Ballinalee, in which the North Longford executive of the United Irish League was holding its monthly meeting; is he aware that these policemen kept following the band up and down the village of Ballinalee, and refused to

allow them to stand for a moment at any house; can he explain what was the meaning of such conduct considering that the band had come a long distance merely to exercise; whether he is aware that no public meeting of any kind was intended or attempted, and no person or persons were boycotted or in any way interfered with in the neighbourhood; and whether the county inspector ordered this display contrary to the advice and wish of his subordinate officers; and will an [inquiry be made into all the circumstances of the case.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have called for a detailed report dealing with some of the allegations contained in this question, and would prefer to postpone my reply until I have received the report. Perhaps the hon. Member will repeat the question on Monday.

TENANCY OF IRISH GRAZING TRACTS.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that those in occupation of the grazing tracts in the congested districts of Ireland are only eleven months tenants, and therefore have no interest in the land, he will use his influence with the Congested Districts Board when contemplating the purchase of such lands, with a view to induce it to treat directly with tin; landlord and not with those eleven months tenants.

MR. WYNDHAM: This question will be brought before the Congested Districts Board at its next meeting on the 15th inst., and I must ask the hon. Member to defer it, therefore, until after that date.

IRISH LANGUAGE IN IRISH SCHOOLS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in order to enable Irish National teachers to meet the desire that at present exists for the teaching of the Irish language in Irish National schools, the Commissioners of National Education will establish classes for the teaching of Irish to teachers during the summer holidays, as they have already done in the case of manual instruction, and also to establish Saturday or evening classes for the same purpose.

MR. WYNDHAM: There are no funds at the disposal of the Commissioners for the purpose stated.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if it is not a fact that the managers of schools in Ireland are at present unable to find teachers who can teach the Irish language, in consequence of the lack of funds?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot by way of question and answer across the floor of the House debate a question which can be raised on the Estimates.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Could not the right hon. Gentleman suggest that a special Estimate should be put on for this purpose?

MR. WYNDHAM: It is too late to suggest any addition to the Estimates for the present year.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Supplementary Estimates are not unknown.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Neither are Votes on Account.

DUBLIN POSTAL STAFF.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, as the scale of the male supervising force was increased at last revision, a proportionate increase will be granted to the female supervising officers of the Dublin staff; whether the Postmaster General will remedy the grievances of the Dublin female telegraphists, as numbers of them have been for years at their maxima, and are constantly performing supervising duties: whether the Postmaster General will, by increasing the number of female supervising appointments in the Dublin General Post Office, abolish the practice of female telegraphists supervising; whether the proposed increase in the Dublin female staff is to be made by giving appointments to telegraphists drafted from other offices; and whether it was in consequence of this drafting that no competitive examination was held in Dublin last December for female learners: and will the Postmaster General now have the proposed increase in the Dublin female staff supplied altogether from candidates chosen after open competitive examination, thus giving opportunities to candidates who have been preparing for these examinations.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is not aware that the scales of salary for the male telegraph supervising staff at Dublin were increased at the last revision. The scales for the female supervising officers are those proper to their class at offices such as Dublin, and no reason is seen for increasing them. As regards any addition to the number of supervising appointments, this question will be dealt with on its merits in the revision now under consideration; but, as stated in the answer given on the 28th ultimo, the number of such appointments cannot be increased merely in order to afford promotion to telegraphists at the maximum of their scale. It was found necessary during the course of the year 1900, and pending the revision at Dublin, to provide by experienced assistance for the increase of work in the telegraph office; and a small number of telegraphists were, in these circumstances, transferred to Dublin from other offices, thus rendering a competitive examination in December, for female learners in Dublin, needless. It is proposed to make the transfer permanent in the case of any officer who satisfies the requirements of the post to be filled. It is necessary in order to provide for emergencies that such transfers should be occasionally made, and while the expedient is not resorted to unless in exceptional instances it is not possible to forego its use.

IRISH GOVERNMENT PRINTING.

MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the printing required for the office of Clerk of the Crown and Peace in Ireland, not merely in connection with franchise and jurors' lists and Crown business, but also for the purposes of its equity business, is obtained at the expense of the local rates; and whether, seeing that the various fees paid by the public in connection with the latter business are lodged to the credit of the Treasury, the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury will direct that the printing be supplied from the same source.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member has been misinformed. No printing is required in connection with equity business, and all books so required are supplied by the Stationery Office, on application. Local rates bear no expenses in connection with such business.

THE ROYAL DECLARATION AGAINST ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has taken through the usual channels any steps to ascertain if a Bill to modify the Royal Declaration would pass without serious opposition from any organised section of the House, and would thus facilitate instead of impeding public business; and whether his attention has been drawn to the numerous resolutions now being passed by public bodies against the idolatrous terms of the Royal Declaration.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: This question is on precisely similar lines to many which have already appeared on the Paper, and which I have already answered. I have nothing to add to the many statements I have already made to the House.

COLONEL NOLAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether he is going to bring in a Bill, and whether he has ascertained through the usual channels what time it would occupy to pass.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think the hon. and gallant Gentleman has any right to ask me questions as to how or whence I derive my impressions as to the time to be taken up by any Bill.

COLONEL NOLAN: I apologise to the right hon. Gentleman, but I should like him to give me some information on this subject.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether he has received resolutions of protest against the idolatrous terms of the Declaration from the Limerick Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: That does not arise out of the question.

THE NEW COINAGE.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will consider the propriety of postponing the issue of any new coinage having on it the head of the King until decimal coinage is introduced.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The new coinage must be settled in the course of the current year. I do not think that the country is prepared for any fundamental change such as the question suggests.

ELECTORAL ANOMALIES; IRISH REPRESENTATION.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having

regard to the fact that the Romford Division of Essex numbers no less than 33,000 electors, and is increasing that number by about 5,000 per annum, and has only one representative, he will consider the advisability of permanently suspending two of the writs of Irish Members and issuing them to that portion, of the county of Essex comprised in the Romford Division.

MR. FLYNN (Cork County, N.): Did the hon. Member before putting the question consult the Irish Members whom he has asked to back his Bills?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am quite aware that my hon. friend's constituency is perhaps the greatest of the many great anomalies which at present signalise our Parliamentary system. But I think that his method of dealing with those anomalies is somewhat crude. I do not think I can promise him legislation on those lines.

ROYAL VISIT TO THE COLONIES; SUGGESTED VISIT TO INDIA.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAG-SEE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it would be possible to include in the course of the forthcoming tour of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to the Commonwealth of Australia and the Dominion of Canada a visit to the Empire of India, where the presence of the Heir to the Throne with his consort would be regarded as a most gracious compliment by the princes and peoples, and be productive of beneficent results similar to those which followed the memorable visit thirty years ago of His Majesty the King as Prince of Wales.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to my hon. friend I have to say that the pressure upon the time of their Royal Highnesses is so great that it would be impossible, I am afraid, to carry out the scheme which he suggests.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman as to the business of the House, and especially with regard to two points; on what days he proposes to take the appointment of the Committee on the Civil List, and the statement of the Secretary of State for War on the Army Estimates. I would also ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it would not be desirable, seeing that that statement, if all things we hear are, true, will be of unusual complexity and importance, that the discussion should be postponed until Members have the opportunity of considering it in print.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As regards the Civil List, my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer will bring forward his motion as the first Order on Monday next. The arrangement for to-morrow stands; namely, my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War will make his statement, with Mr. Speaker in the chair. I think the right hon. Gentleman's request that there should be an adjournment after the statement is made is reasonable, and I shall be glad to comply with it. The business to be taken after the statement will probably be the Army Estimates; and they will be taken also after the motion with regard to the Civil List is disposed of.

SUSPENSION OF MEMBERS (5TH MARCH); POLICE IN THE HOUSE.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I desire to ask by whose orders a body of police entered this House last Wednesday morning; under whose command the police were when inside the House; and whether since Oliver Cromwell entered the House with

soldiers in 1653 there is any precedent for the entry of soldiers or police into the Commons Chamber for the purpose of forcibly removing members of this House.

*MR. SPEAKER: To whom does the hon. Gentleman address the question?

Mr. DILLON: I addressed the question to you, Sir; but perhaps I ought to have addressed it to the Leader of the House.

*Mr. SPEAKER: I have no objection to answer it, though, strictly, it is not a question that ought to be addressed to me. The police entered this House by my orders. They were under the immediate control of Inspector Scautlebury. As to the historical question, I am afraid I have not made the necessary research.

THE CASE OF MR. JORDAN.

*MR. SPEAKER: I have to inform the House that I have received the following letter from the hon. Member for South Fermanagh (Mr. Jordan). It reached me yesterday afternoon.

To the

6th March, 1901.

Right Honourable William Gully,
Speaker of the House of Commons.

Sir,

I, the undersigned Member of the House of Commons, desire to bring the following facts under your notice.

On this day I was reported by the Chairman of Committees to you as having refused to leave the House when a division was called, and having defied his ruling. There is no foundation for that statement, as I did leave the House when the division was called, and only returned to it, in common with the other Members in the lobbies, when the Chairman announced his intention of reporting those Members who did not leave the House.

I am now prevented from entering the House, and I desire to claim my right to enter the House, and discharge my duty to my constituents.

(Signed) JEREMIAH JORDAN.

Upon receipt of that letter I informed the hon. Member for East Mayo that I thought, as it raised a strong prima facie case of error in the report, the hon. Member was entitled to have the advantages of priority; such as are given to questions of privilege; in order that an alleged mistake directly affecting the Parliamentary position of an hon. Member may be corrected, and therefore I informed him that I would call him on early with his motion. At the same time, I desire to state that this decision arises out of the special circumstances of the case, and must not be taken as a precedent in any way for the proposition that where the House has suspended a Member, and in order to rescind that order and to restore him again to the House, he is entitled to any privilege. He is not entitled, as such, to any privilege. The other point to which I would call attention is that, in granting precedence to this motion as a matter arising out of the special circumstances of the case, discussion upon it must be confined strictly to the question whether the hon. Member for South Fermanagh is the victim of error, and whether in point of fact he did disobey the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. DILLON: The motion I have to make is as follows: "That the Order made on Tuesday, 5th March, suspending twelve Members from the service of the House, be rescinded in so far as it applies to Mr. Jordan." I must not be taken as accepting the view that the other Members mentioned in the Order;[Cries of "Order" from the Ministerial benches.] I would be out of order in entering into that matter on this motion, and I allude to it only for the purpose of safeguarding myself from an inference which might very easily be drawn from the form of the motion I now submit to the House. I pass from that subject, merely placing on record my belief, gathered from the evidence of colleagues, that besides Mr. Jordan there were several others mentioned in the Order who did not defy the authority of the Chair, but some of whom at a later period did refuse to obey the Chair through indignation at the treatment they had received. In recommending this motion to the House, it will plainly be necessary for me very briefly to recall to the memory of the House what occurred on this Wednesday morning. I was not present myself, and I have collected the facts. [Cries of "Order."] Hon. Members might give me fair play. We may have an angry debate by and by, but this is a matter on which I have always known the House of Commons to give fair play. This is a question of an injustice, as I claim, inflicted upon a Member of this House, who has just as good a right, as far as his action is concerned, to sit here and take part in the debates as any other Member. I wish to explain the absolute necessity under which I lie of giving a brief resume of the facts of Wednesday morning, in order to establish my case. I shall do nothing more than that. Why do I lie under that necessity? It is because there is on the official record of the House a distinct statement on the authority of the Chairman of the House, that he had observed Mr. Jordan to be one of the Members who had refused to obey his ruling. I am not entitled to do what some hon. Members apparently, from the interruption I heard a moment ago, thought I was entitled to do; namely, appeal to Mr. Jordan's letter and claim the privilege that the hon. Member for South Fermanagh should be taken at his word. I am not in a position to base my case upon that moral claim, because there is a conflict of testimony between the statements in that letter and the official record of the House, the declaration of the Chairman that he had himself observed Mr. Jordan as one of those who refused to obey his ruling. That places upon me the absolute necessity of endeavouring to establish my case in favour of Mr. Jordan. I have collected the facts from three sources; the official record, which I hold in my hand. The Times report, which is rather full, and which, although it has no official value, is, on quantum valeat, considerable testimony, and the evidence of my colleagues, and of some other Members whom I have consulted as to what happened. The official record is as follows; "Several Members refused to leave the House to proceed to the division lobby. Whereupon the Chairman directed the doors to be unlocked in order to report the matter to the Speaker. "Mr. Speaker resumed the chair. "The Chairman reported, That several Members, the hon. Member for South-East Cork, North Kerry, South Tipperary, North Meath, North Leitrim, East Limerick,

North-East Cork, West Cavan, East Tyrone, South Fermanagh, East Cork, and West Cork, had refused to leave the House and proceed to the division lobby when directed to do so by him."

Therefore the Chairman is responsible for stating that of his own knowledge. The official record proceeds;

"Mr. Speaker appealed to the hon. Members in the interests of the House not to persist in their refusal to obey the Chair."

But note that this is a very important matter, because the record in this case, I will contend, is inaccurate.

"But the said hon. Members having repeated their determination not to leave the House for the division;"

"The said hon. Members having repeated their determination." Now, I am authorised on the part of Mr. Jordan to say that he did not refuse in the first instance, that he went into the lobby to vote like all the other Members, and, in the second place, he did not repeat his determination. It was an intention which he never entertained, and therefore in both these particulars I have to maintain that the official record is inaccurate. That will, I think, make it clear to hon. Members that my motion is very simple. I have consequently to impugn the authority of the Chairman on a matter of fact, and to impugn the correctness of the official record of the House in two particulars. I take, as my first evidence, The Times report, and I think hon. Members when they listen to it will see the enormous importance, even supposing the report is not minutely and verbally accurate, the enormous importance of the account of the transactions given in The Times. This is what The Times report says;

"The CHAIRMAN: Order, order; If the hon. Members decline to proceed to the division lobbies, I must report the circumstances to the Speaker.

"Mr. P. M'HUGH: Bring in your policemen [cheers], but we are not going to divide.

"The CHAIRMAN then despatched a message to the Speaker.

"Members now came back from the lobbies and re-occupied the benches, while Mr. Nicholson, one of the Clerks at the Table, proceeded to the Irish benches to take the names of the recalcitrants."

That clearly shows;and I have abundant other evidence to the same effect;that the names of the so-called or supposed recalcitrant Members were actually being-taken down in. as J contend, an utterly irregular fashion by one of the Clerks of the Table, and that the Chairman had called the division off and Members on both sides had commenced to troop back from the lobbies.

Now, that is my first point, and my statement, which I am authorised and requested by Mr. Jordan to make,

is that when he heard the division called, he immediately obeyed the order of the Chairman, that he proceeded into the "No" lobby and remained in the "No" lobby until he heard the division was off, and that he then returned to the House along with a number of other Members on these benches. On his return to the House after he had obeyed the order, he was met by one of the clerks, who, with a pencil and paper in his hand, took down his name as one of the recalcitrant Members. I proceed with The Times report. The Chairman on the

return of the Speaker, reported and spoke as follows;

"Mr. Speaker, I have to report to you, Sir: that during the course of the division I had put the question which I was ordered to put by the House as a result of the division upon the closure. During the course of that division a certain number of Members of the House declined to leave their seats [loud Nationalist cheers] and to proceed into the division lobbies. I requested them more than once to proceed, but I gathered from the observations which fell from these hon. Members or some of them that they declined to proceed. Thereupon I thought it was due to the House, in the position in which we found ourselves, that I should follow the precedent which had been set on a former occasion and ask you, Sir, to return to the chair. It was impossible for me, Sir, to see all the hon. Members who declined to leave their seats, but I may say that among those whom I was able to observe"

;note, confirming the official record;

"were the Members for South-East Cork, North Kerry, Smith Tipperary, North Meath, North Leitrim, East Limerick, North-East Cork, West Cavan, East Tyrone, South Fermanagh, East Cork, and West Cork."

MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that, as he is quite aware, no attack must be made on the action of the Chairman of Committees except upon express notice.

"Mr. DILLON: All I was saying was that, as a matter of fact, the Member for South Fermanagh did not decline to leave the House. He went into the lobby as I have already stated, and it was on his return from the lobby, after obeying the Chair in the fullest sense, that his name was taken down and returned as one of the recalcitrants. That is the story which I have to tell to the House from the hon. Member himself, and in a most important particular it is confirmed by The Times report, because, as hon. Members will recollect. The Times report declares that the Clerk at the Table was busy taking down the names of Members after Members on all sides of the House had returned to the House. What I contend is that in this instance a departure was made from the usual practice, and that, as a matter of fact, the names submitted to you, Sir, were, at all events to some extent, collected by one of the clerks at the Table, and that in the case of Mr. Jordan, and in some other cases which I am not bringing before the House for various reasons, a mistake was made owing to that fact. It may be said;and I have no doubt it will be said;why did not Mr. Jordan, when the Speaker, on returning to the chair, made an appeal to hon. Members to obey the order of the Chair, stand up and declare that his name was wrongfully reported? I must deal first of all with what actually occurred. According to the official record and the report of The Times, you, Sir, addressed a question to hon. Members collectively as to whether they persisted in their determination not to clear the House. There was then no division going on;

*MR. SPEAKER: The names of hon. Members had been called out by their constituencies, and I did not call on hon. Members collectively, but only on those whose constituencies had been named.

Mr. DILLON: I recollect that fact perfectly, and I was coming to it. I have made careful inquiry on this point, and I am assured that your question, I Sir, was

answered by a shout from the Irish benches, and in the general uproar and excitement it would have been perfectly impossible for anyone to say, as regards all those Members, whether all of them declared that they were determined to persist in their refusal. That is a very important point, and I assert on behalf of Mr. Jordan, an absent Member, that he did not answer Mr. Speaker in that sense; that he had no intention of offending against order; and that he did not offend against order. The only precedent exactly on all fours which I have in my mind was that of 21st May, 1896, when the Chairman interrupted the proceedings on the Agricultural Land Rating Bill and sent for you, Mr. Speaker. What occurred on that occasion?

* MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is now proceeding to discuss the conduct of the Chairman on Tuesday night. He is not entitled to do so. The discussion must be entirely confined to the question of whether there was or was not an error in the report he made. The hon. Member cannot go into the precedents and say that the Chairman should have acted in such and such a way, as was done on previous occasions. That is to attack the conduct of the Chair.

Mr. DILLON: But, Sir, I am entitled, surely, to use any argument calculated to carry my point, which is of importance to the discussion. I do not desire to attack the Chair, but surely my mouth will not be closed on the all-important question to the fate of my motion; namely, as to why Mr. Jordan did not reply when you, Sir, made the appeal from the chair. I maintain that it was impossible for anybody in the circumstances to judge, when that collective appeal was made, whether Mr. Jordan was a party to that refusal.

*MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to avoid attacking the Chair.

MR. DILLON: Certainly, Sir. I was only alluding very briefly to the fact that on a previous occasion, when a similar suspension took place, you, Sir, asked each individual Member, myself included, this question; "Do I understand the hon. Member also to decline to leave the House?" Mr. Dillon: Yes, Sir, I do decline." Then you asked Dr. Tanner and each other Member, man by man, and each admitted his offence and his intention to persist in that offence in spite of your appeal. Then and then only you took action against those Members. I was not for a moment endeavouring or desiring to find fault with your procedure, but I mention that case for the purpose of explaining how it came to pass that an error may have arisen, and you may have been led to think that Mr. Jordan was defying the Chair. In this instance Mr. Jordan left the House, as he tells me, without waiting to be removed from it; and the only point of controversy is why he did

not rise up and there and then protest against being named. In this instance, according to my information, all those Members who did stand up were shouted down. I am told that even a right hon. Gentleman on the Front Opposition Bench endeavoured to address the House, and it was impossible in the state of excitement which prevailed for any man; much less for one, of those incriminated; to get a fair hearing for his statement. In the temper and excitement which prevailed, it was not unnatural for an hon. Member, smarting under a sense of great injustice, and guilty of no breach of the rules, to think that the wisest and most dignified course to take was quietly to walk out of the House. That is

my case. I do not wish to enter into anything which is not essential to it, and therefore I beg to move.

COLONEL NOLAN seconded the motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order of the House made on Tuesday, the, 5th day of March, suspending twelve Members from the service of the House, be rescinded so far as it applies to Mr. Jordan.";(Mr. Dillon.)

"*The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith): After the letter which you, Sir, have read from the hon. Member for South Fermanagh, I desire frankly and at once to say that I admit that I must have made a mistake. Therefore, as far as I am concerned, I have no objection whatever to the, acceptance of the motion. But I think, at the same time, that it is due to myself as well as to the House to explain as briefly as may be the circumstances in which that mistake arose. I am sure I shall receive the sympathy of a great number of Members of the House in the very difficult position in which I found myself. The difficulty was much increased by the fact that a great number of Gentlemen on Tuesday night challenged my decision, and refused to leave their places. In order to make certain I jotted down, as far as I could judge from my position at the Table, the names of those Gentlemen whom I saw remaining in the House and refusing to leave; but, in order to make absolutely certain, I requested the Clerk at the Table to be kind enough to obtain the names of the Gentlemen who refused to leave. Whilst that proceeding was going on it is perfectly obvious, after what has fallen from the hon. Member for East Mayo, and his statement of the circumstances; it is perfectly obvious that certain hon. Members returned to the House. But I must point out that it was not until my list was completed that I sent to ask you, Sir, to return to the chair. The only objection which I have to make to the statement of the hon. Member for East Mayo in his relation of the circumstances is the statement that I sent for the Speaker before my list was completed. That is not so: I completed my list, verifying it from the list which I had received from the Clerk at the Table: and it was not until that list was completed, and I saw those Gentlemen in the House, that I formally sent for you. Mr. Speaker. I have no doubt that the mistake arose from the fact that the hon. Member for South Fermanagh was under the impression that the Speaker had been sent for and thereupon returned to his place; and so his name came to appear on the list. I take upon myself full responsibility for the mistake which occurred. I admit that it was a
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt Sir Alex. F.

Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn

Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Brassey, Albert

Dewar, T. R. (Trillick, S. Geo

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Dickinson, Robert Edmond

Aird, Sir John

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Dimsdale, Sir J. Cockfield
Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Allsopp, Hon. George
Ballard, Sir Harry
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Carlile, William Walter
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Cautley, Henry Strother
Duke, Henry Edward
Arrol, Sir William
Cavendish. R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Ashmead-Bartleet, Sir Ellis
Cavendish. V.C.W. (Derbysh.
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cecild, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Bagot, Capt. Joscelyn FitzRoy
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Chamberlain, lit. Hon. J. (Birm.
Faber, George Denison
Bain, Col. James Robert
Chamberlain, .) Austen (Worc'r
Fardell, Sir T. George
Baird, John George Alexander
Chapman, Edward
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Balcarres, Lord
Charrington, Spencer
Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. (Manc'r
Baldwin, Alfred
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Clare, Octavius Leigh

Finch, George H.
Balfour.Rt.Hon.G.W. (Leeds)
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Balfour, M J. K. R. (Christch
Coudington, Sir William
Fisher, William Hayes
Banbury, Frederick George
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fison, Frederick William
Banes, Major George Edward
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose-
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Bartley, George C. T.
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Bathurst, Hn.Allen Benjamin
Colston, Charles E. H. Athole
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Beaeh,Rt.Hn.SirM.H(Bristol)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Forster, Henry William
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants.
Corbett. A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Foster, Sir M. (Lond. Univer.
Beckett, Ernest William
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Garfitt, William
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Gibbs,Hn A.G.H.(CityofLond.
Bigwood, James
Cranborne, Viscount
Gibbs, Hn.Vicary (St.Albans)
Bill, Charles
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Cross, 11. Shepherd (Bolton)
(Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middle'x
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Gordon.Maj Evans-(TrH'ml'ts

mistake, and I am extremely sorry that it occurred. I apologise to the House and to the hon. Member for South Fermanagh for any inconvenience which he may have suffered.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: After the statement of the Chairman of Committees, and after what has fallen from the hon. Member for East Mayo, I have no doubt that the House will, Without further discussion, agree to the motion of the hon. Member.

Question put and agreed to.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE (EXEMPTION FROM THE STANDING ORDER).

Motion made, and Question put. "That the proceedings on the Amendment of Standing Order No. 21, if under discussion at Twelve o'clock this night, be not interrupted under the Standing Order, Sittings of the House."; (Mr. A. J.

Balfour.)

The House divided:: Ayes, 304; Noes 181. (Division List No.42.)

Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Rentoul, James Alexander

Goschen, Hn. George Joachim

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft

Richards, Henry Charles

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth)

Ridley, Hn. M. W (Staleybridge

Graham, Henry Robert

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson

Gray, Ernest (West Ham)

Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison

Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)

Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds

Macdonald, John Cumming

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Grenfell, William' Henry

MacIver, David (Liverpool)

Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye

Gretton, John

Maconochie, A. W.

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Greville, Hon. Roland

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Round, James

(Groves, James Grimble

M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill

M'Iver. Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W

Russell, T. W.

Guthrie, Walter Murray
M'Killop, Jas, (Stirlingshire)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Hain, Edward
Majendie, James A. H.
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Malcolm, Ian
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse
Hambro, Charles Eric
Manners, Lord Cecil
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Hamilton, RtHnLordG(Middx
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
Hamilton,Marq.of (Londond'y
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn. W.F.
Seely,(Capt J. E. B. (Isle of Wight
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Maxw'ell,RtHnSirHE(Wigton
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Harris, E. Leverton(Tynem'th
Maxwell,WJH(Dumfriesshire
Shaw-Stewart,M. H. (Renfrew)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Milner,RtHon. Sir Frederick.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Heath, Arth. Howard (Hanley
Milward, Colonel Victor
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks.
Heath, James(Staffords,N.W.
Molesworth, Sir Lew is
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Heaton, John Henniker
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon
Spencer, Ernest(W.Bromwieh)
Helder, Augustus

Montague, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Henderson, Alexander
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. M.
Hoare, Ed. Brodie (Hampstead)
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Stock, James Henry
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Morrell, George Herbert
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Hogg, Lindsay
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Stroyan, John
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Bright' de
Morrison, James Archibald
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Horner, Frederick William
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Mount, William Arthur
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hoult, Joseph
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Uni.)
Howard, Capt. J. (Kent Faversham)
Muntz, Philip A.
Tennant, Harold John
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Hozier, Hon. James H. Cecil
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Thornton, Percy M.
Hindson, George Bickersteth
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Myers, William Henry

Tufnell, Col. Edward
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Valentia, Viscount
Jackson, Rt.Hon.Win.Lawies
Nicholson, William Graham
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Nichol, Donald Ninian
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Johnston, William (Belfast)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Webb, Col. William George
Kenyon, James (Lanes., Bury)
Parker, Gilbert
Welby. Lt.-Col. A.G.E (Tauntn
Kimber, Henry
Parkes, Ebenezer
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John L.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Whitmore. Charles Algernon
Knowles, Lees
Pentberton, John S.
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Penn, John
Williams, Rt Hn J. Powell (Bir.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Percy, Earl
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Lawrence, William F.
Pilkington, Richard
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Lawson, John Grant
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wills, Sir Frederick
Leeky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Plummer, Walter R.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)

Lee, Capt. A.H. (Hants, F'areh'm
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Pryee-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-
Leighton, Stanley
Purvis, Robert
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Pym, C. Guy
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Randies, Joint S.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Rankin, Sir James
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S
Ratcliffe, R. F.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Reid, James (Greenock)
Sir William Walrond and
Lowe, Francis William
Remnant, James Farquharson
Mr. Anstruther.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Rhondda)
Ambrose, Robert
Atherley-Jones, L.
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Barlow, John Emmott
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc. Stroud)
Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. Henry
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Beaumont, Wentworth C.B.
Harmsworth, R. Leicester

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Bell, Richard
Harrington, Timothy
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Black, Alexander William
Harwood, (George)
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Blake, Edward
Hayden, John Patrick
Partington, Oswald
Boland, John
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Paulton, James Mellor
Boyle, James
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D).
Perks, Robert William
Brigg, John
Heime, Norval Watson
Pirie, Duncan V.
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Power, Pairick Joseph
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Hobhouse, C.E. H. (Bristol.E.)
Price, Robert John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Horniman, Frederick John
Reckitt, Harold James
Burke, E. Haviland-
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Reddy, M.
Burt, Thomas
Joicey, Sir James
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Jones, David Brynmor (Swan'a
Redmond, William (Clare)
Caine, William Sproston
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Rickett, J. Compton
Caldwell, James
Joyce, Michael
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Cameron, Robert
Kearley, Hudson E.
Robson, William Snowdon

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Kennedy, Patrick James
Roche, John
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Kinloch, Sir J. George Smyth
Roe, Sir Thomas
Carew, James Laurence
Kitson, Sir James
Samuel. S. M. (Whitechapel)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Labouchere, Henry
Schwann, Charles E.
Causton, Richard Knight
Lambert, George
Scott, (Has. Prestwich (Leigh)
Cawley, Frederick
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Colville, John
Leng, Sir John
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lloyd-George, David
Soares, Finest J.
Craig, Robert Hunter
Lough, Thomas
Spencer, RtHnC.R. (Northants
Crombie, John William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Dalziel, James Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Strachey, Edward
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
Sullivan, Donal
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
M'Crae, George
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Delany, William
M'Dermott, Patrick
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-shire)

McKenna, Reginald
Thomas, Alfred(Glamorgan,E.
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
McKillop, W. (Sligo, North)
Thomas, David Alfred(Merthyr
Dillon, John
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Thomas, F.Fresman-(Hastings
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Duffy, William J.
Mather, William
Tomkinson, James
Duncan, James A.
Mellor, Rt. Hn. John William
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Dunn, Sir William
Mooney, John J.
Tally, Jasper
Edwards, Frank
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Wallace, Robert
Elibank, Master of
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Walton, JohnLawson(Leeds,S.
Ellis, John Edward
Morley,Rt. Hn.John(Monirose
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan
Emmott, Alfred
Morton, E.J. C. (Devonport)
Weir, James Galloway
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Moulton, John Fletcher
White, George (Norfolk)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Murphy, J.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Farrell, James Patrick
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whiteley, George(York,W. R.
Fenwick, Charles
Newnes, Sir George
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Ferguson, R.C.Munro (Leith)
Nolan,Col. John P. (Gal way,.N

Williams, Osmond(Merioneth
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Wilson, Henry J. (York,W.R.
Eurness, Sir Christopher
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Wilson, John Durham, Mid.)
Gladstone, Rt Hn Herbert John
O'Brien, James F. N. (Cork)
Wodehouse.Hn. Armine(Essex
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Brien. K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Woodhouse,SirJ.T.(Hudrsfld.
(Grant, Corrie
O'Connor, James (Wicklow,W
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Yoxall, James Henry
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
ODonnell,T. (Kerry, W.)
Haldane, Richard Bunion
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
TELLERS FOE THE NOES;
Hammond, John
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Mr. Broadhurst and Mr.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
D'Malley-William
Channing.
Eardie,J.Keir (MerthyrTydvil
O'Mara, James

NEW BILLS.

TROUT KISHINO ANNUAL CLOSE TIME (SCOTLAND).

Bill to provide an Annual Close Time for Trout Fishing in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland and Mr. Anstruther.

TROUT FISHING ANNUAL CLOSE TIME (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To provide an Annual Close Time for Trout Fishing in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 90.]

BURIAL GROUNDS (SCOTLAND).

Bill for the better regulation of Burial Grounds in Scotland, ordered to be

brought in by The Lord Advocate, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland, and Mr. Anstruther.

BURIAL GROUNDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"For the better regulation of Burial Grounds in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed [Bill 91.]

AMENDMENT OF STANDING ORDER No. 21.

Standing Order No. 21 read.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I shall best consult the interests and the dignity of the House if in introducing the Amendment to the Standing Order which is in my name on the Paper of the House I abstain wholly from any irritating topics, and, as far as possible, from anything in the nature of unnecessary comment. The unhappy incidents of Tuesday night, or Wednesday morning, are so fresh in the recollection of the whole House that it would be superfluous were I to recall them to the House, or to dwell upon them at any length. It is sufficient for me to say, and it is the justification, after all, of this proposed change of the Standing Order, that there was at that time an offence committed which, if not a new offence, certainly was never committed to the extent and with the aggravation which attended it on that occasion, and that this offence under our Standing Orders as they now are meets with no summary punishment at all. The Members of this House who were named by you, Sir, and were suspended by the House, are at this moment suffering from the week's expulsion from this House, which is the penalty inflicted by the Standing Order. But the fact that after they had been so suspended from their service in the House they resisted, even to violence, your directions that they should leave the House is a crime against the order of this House which receives, and can receive under our system of summary jurisdiction in this House, no punishment at all.

The House is aware that up to a comparatively recent period the power of the House to deal with those of its Members who had offended seriously against its rules depended on what I may call the traditional powers of this House; the common law powers, if I may so call them, to borrow a phrase from the law of the land. Those common law powers, however, are rather cumbrous and elaborate in their application; and although they still exist in their full force, and although I think it is very undesirable in any way to interfere with them, the House has felt from time to time that it is absolutely necessary in the interests of order in this House that its powers of summary jurisdiction should be increased. There are two Standing Orders on which that power of summary jurisdiction depends. There is Standing Order No. 27, which deals with disorderly conduct. Under that Standing Order it is in the power of Mr. Speaker, or the Chairman of Committees, to order any Member who is guilty of disorderly conduct at once to leave the House, and the Member so ordered is suspended from the service of the House during that sitting. No division is taken; the judgment of the House is not called upon to confirm the judgment of Mr. Speaker, or the Chairman; and, as a consequence of that order, as the natural result of it, the sentence is in itself of the lightest possible description. The other Standing Order which deals with this matter is Standing

Order No. 21, which is the Standing Order I propose to amend by the resolution standing on the Paper. Standing Order 21 differs from Standing Order 27 in this, that before any penalty is inflicted upon a disorderly Member he is named by the Speaker of the House, and the House has an opportunity of expressing its opinion as to whether he should or should not undergo the consequent penalty. The House being thus called on to back up the authority of the Chair, the penalties described in Standing Order 21 are of a more severe description than those Standing Order 27. A Member may be suspended, is suspended, for the first offence in a session for a week, for a second offence for a fortnight, for a third or any subsequent offence for a month. It is that Standing Order which I propose to amend by adding a clause which shall provide a penalty; I do not say whether an adequate or an inadequate penalty; but a penalty which, as it seems to me, is the most proper we, can fix upon.

This is a new penalty for the further offence of resisting Mr. Speaker's direction. This contingency that Mr. Speaker's direction should be resisted was not prominently before the House, happily, at the time when these Standing Orders in their present shape were framed. Our subsequent experience has been of a kind to bring that possibility very prominently before us, and I do not think, having regard to what occurred on Tuesday last, we can leave that offence wholly undealt with. It will be observed that unless some change such as I propose is passed in the rule, the existing penalties almost stand in the way; they are a certain obstacle in the way; of dealing adequately with the punishment of physical resistance to Mr. Speaker's order, because a Member having been suspended is relieved of any further attendance in the House for a week. You could not proceed next day to deal with these Gentlemen who are now suffering from their suspension, because they cannot be in their places. They are necessarily and by our order absent; and we think it would not be proper to deal in their absence with men who have no opportunity of alleging any extenuating circumstances. Therefore it is absolutely necessary that we should provide some immediate summary and, if possible, adequate and proper punishment for this additional offence. This does not pretend to be a general reform of those Standing Orders which deal with disorderly conduct, Those Standing Orders I think in some particulars deserve revision. I think the time of the House might be well devoted at some period less crowded with necessary business than the present to a re-survey of the Orders. But I make no such proposal at the present time. I merely come forward with an immediate method of dealing with an immediate evil. I do not ask the House to regard the Standing Order as it will be amended as a perfect embodiment of the expedients we should take for dealing with disorder. I only say it would be very greatly improved, and would not be wholly insufficient to deal with the evils which experience has shown us we have to fear.

I trust the House will unanimously agree to this. [Nationalist laughter.] I do not know whether I am to interpret that interruption as indicating that hon. Gentlemen, that any hon. Gentlemen in whatever part of the House we see them, think we ought to be quite helpless in the face of any member who commits a crime against the order of this House more

aggravated in its character, I think, than any other crime of which we have knowledge. Disorderly conduct may take many forms; it may be more or less aggravated, but when disorderly conduct reaches the pitch of absolutely refusing to obey the direction of the Speaker to leave the House, everybody will feel that a discredit is cast upon our proceedings which it is impossible for us patiently to tolerate. Even those hon. Gentlemen who most sympathise with; or, let me put it, least condemn; what took place on Tuesday night, even they, I think, will feel that the Government and the House would show themselves unworthy of their traditions and unworthy of the duty which is cast upon them to keep the proceedings of this House orderly if they did not take the first occasion of providing a punishment; an adequate punishment; for an offence the danger and reality of which have been so painfully and so impressively brought to our notice by the unhappy events of two days ago. I beg to move this motion. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Standing Order No. 21 be amended by inserting, after line 27, the words, 'Provided also, That if any Member, or Members acting jointly, who have, been suspended under this Order from the service of the House, shall refuse to obey the direction of the Speaker, the Speaker shall call the attention of the House to the fact that recourse to force is necessary in order to compel obedience to his direction, and the Member or Members who have refused to obey his direction shall thereupon, and without further Question put, be suspended from the service of the House during the remainder of the session.'"; (Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

Questions proposed, "That those words be there inserted in Standing Order No. 21."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: (Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman has acted wisely and has set a good example to all Members of the House in the calm, dispassionate, and

moderate tone in which he has spoken of this very delicate question. We all speak with a perfect consciousness of the heated atmosphere which might easily arise, and which we have seen within but a few hours existing in this House; and I trust that, whatever view we may take of the proposal of His Majesty's Government, we shall endeavour to imitate the example which the right hon. Gentleman has set us. What strikes me principally in looking back on the deplorable events of the other night is this, that it is an instance of what may often happen to us in the course of our lives; that we are to a large extent oblivious of the degree to which many of the circumstances of our life and the conditions of society rest upon physical force. It is rather a humiliating fact when one comes to recognise it. Although we must be more or less aware of it, it is not the less odious a thing when it thrusts itself in its naked power upon us. Undoubtedly it is the ease that, after all, the rules of this House, which usually work so quietly and equally, rest for their ultimate authority upon force. It seems to me that the other night we had that force displayed to us in a way which was very repulsive to the feelings of every one of us, and which certainly did not add to the dignity and the credit of the House of Commons. To that we were reduced by the grossly disorderly conduct of some Members. I am finding no fault whatever with the action of the authorities of the House, or of

you, Sir, in authorising the introduction of the police; but I can confess frankly, and I think I shall be approved in this by many Members of the House, if they will be frank in acknowledging their own feelings, that it is this introduction into the House of a body of police for this painful duty that has struck so heavy a blow at our dignity. What we have to do, it seems to me, in any rule that we pass is to make our rule such as to avoid the necessity of any such display of force in the future.

In criticising or passing some observations upon the particular proposal of the Government I would wish, in the first place, to make one thing clear; that a somewhat unusual course, as I think, has been followed in this matter. This is not a thing affecting party or political divisions. It affects the honour and dignity of the House; and I am much mistaken if it is not a fact that on all similar occasions in any Government, when the Leader of the House had a proposal of this sort to make, not in the interest of the Government, but in the interest of the dignity of the House, there was some consultation beforehand with those who sat opposite him, with those who did not share his views in all political matters, and who are not entitled to be consulted where it is a mere question of the mode of prosecuting Government business. This was not done on this occasion, and the first that my friends and I knew of this proposed rule was when the right hon. Gentleman read the terms of it at the Table yesterday.

In coming to the actual proposal I would point out some respects in which, at all events, the new rule might, I think, be amended. I think the House will follow me in this; that where a Member behaves in a disorderly fashion and is named, and is suspended from the Chair, in the usual and recognised manner, there are three separate stages, as it were, possible. There is first of all, the possibility of a Member of his own accord, under the compulsion, of course, of the decision of the House, but under no other compulsion, removing himself from the House. A further stage is when the public officer appointed for the purpose; the Serjeant-at-Arms; goes up to a Member and calls upon him to obey the order of the House and remove himself from the precincts of the House. He subjects himself, no doubt, in one sense, to force, but it is only constructive force. The Serjeant-at-Arms may touch the Member lightly on the shoulder and formally ask him to leave. That is legal force, but not physical force. Then with a friendly sign. hon. Members have obeyed without a murmur. Their idea of their own independence of action was vindicated, but they obeyed under compulsion. Up to that point, I think, a member is within his right, as it were, if he choose to take that course. The other night we came to a further stage, to which we have not been accustomed. There was actual physical resistance to this legal compulsion; and there lies the danger to the order and decency of our proceedings against which we ought to guard. Now I think that there ought not to be any intervention of a new rule previous to the occurrence of that last stage; and I would suggest, not by way of moving an Amendment or suggesting even that I should move an Amendment to the rule, that after the first word "Speaker" in the third line there should be inserted ;I have jotted the words down hurriedly;"if a member shall refuse to obey the direction of the

Speaker and disregard the action of the Serjeant-at-Arms in enforcing that decision." The rule would then read;

"If any Member, or Members acting jointly, who have been suspended under this order from the service of the House, shall refuse to obey the direction of the Speaker, and disregard the action of the Serjeant-at-Arms in enforcing that decision, the Speaker shall call the attention of the House to the fact that recourse to force is necessary in order to compel obedience to his direction," and so on. That is the point at which we pass from a perfectly orderly proceeding to that which is necessarily disciplinary. I think it is there that the new provision, which would guard us against this sort of proceeding of which we complain, should come in. I think the adoption of the addition I suggest would make a great difference in the way in which the Rule would be regarded by a large number of Members of the House; if the new provision did not intervene too early, as it were, and if it was only after there was clearly a danger of actual physical force being required that we should proceed to the strong measure contemplated by this Order. I think that would sufficiently guard against a recurrence of such a scene as we all deplore, and at the same time it would leave Members free to adopt a certain form of protest, which they may consider a dignified form of protest, against the enforcement of the rule of the House.

Another point upon which I think the debate will probably disclose some difference of opinion is as to the extent of the punishment inflicted. The whole of a session is a very long time; [HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh]; when the occurrence takes place at an early period of the session; you practically disfranchise a constituency. Well, I name it as a point upon which I think difference of opinion will be found amongst men who are just as anxious as any hon. Member opposite to prevent such scandals as we saw the other night, and to vindicate the dignity and honour of the House, I leave it there. Of course there is not a word to be said, and I am not one to say a single syllable, by way of excuse for what happened; there can be no excuse, much less justification or palliation, in one sense. But there may be, circumstances when there has been an unnecessary occasion given for a state of feeling leading and contributing to such conduct, and I venture, before, I sit down, merely to point out, in a word or two, that when you have a Vote on Account, which you take by the closure in one night, for a sum large enough to carry over the Government till the end of the session, that is rather a strong order.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: On a point of order, Sir. The right hon. Gentleman is, I will not say criticising my conduct in moving the closure the other night, but saving it was a very strong order. [An IRISH MEMBER: So it was.] I have no objection to that if I have the right of reply, but I do not think the charge ought to be made if I have not the right of reply.

*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman has the right of reply.

MR A. J. BALFOUR: On a specific charge?

*MR. SPEAKER: I was going to say that it is not relevant to go into the question of the history of the debate through which this disorder arose.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: All I argue for is this, that in framing and applying a rule of this sort we must not forget that there may even be a series of circumstances in the conduct of the business of the House which lead to a very great exasperation of feeling, and, therefore, make it not unnatural that hon.

Members should sometimes take up a strong position in opposition to the ordinary course of business. I go no further than that. We must bear that in mind when we are laying down rules

of this kind, which have the effect of preventing disorder, yet may do so in such a way as to appear to interfere with the privileges of Members and their constituents. That is all I wish to say in reference to what you, Sir, have said, I had no intention of going into the question of the circumstances which led to the incident before us. Of that incident I have nothing but condemnation to express, and my only object is to assist the Government, if they will allow us to do so, in framing such a rule as, without being unnecessarily severe, may have the effect of preventing the development amongst us of those scenes of violence which we all so deeply deplore.

MR. DILLON: On a point of order. I have some Amendments to move which I think will come in before the right hon. Gentleman's.

*MR. SPEAKER: Dose the right hon. Gentleman move?

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: No, Sir.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I wish, to associate myself with both the right hon. Gentlemen who have spoken in the expression of a desire to discuss this matter calmly, and not to import any heat into the discussion, it is my intention to follow that line. I do not know whether I shall succeed or not. [A laugh.] Yes, because the House must in fairness recognise, that I come to the consideration of this question from an entirely different standpoint to that of either one or the other of the right hon. Gentlemen. From the point of view of the calm consideration of this matter, I think the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House would have been well advised if he had postponed for a few days bringing this matter before the House. However, I trust that none of what I may call that bad blood which arose the other night still exists, and that we may be able to discuss the subject with calmness.

This new rule is of course directed against the Irish Members; but I desire to say that in my opinion it is a matter which concerns the House of Commons and the Parliament of England

and its British Members far more than it concerns the Irish Members. I have risen to protest against this rule, and, leaving aside just for a moment the peculiar Irish aspect of the question, I would venture to impress upon the House that in a free assembly, or what professes to be a free assembly, the enactment of penal provisions such as these is a hateful and degrading proceeding, which is not to be tolerated unless in the first place it is absolutely necessary, and, in the second place. I suggest he had the duty thrown upon him of seeing that the particular proposal that he made was the least oppressive and the least degrading he could devise to effect the object he had in view. Let me ask, is any change of this kind in the Standing Orders of this House necessary in order to prevent proceedings such as those which took place on Tuesday? The proposal

of the right hon. Gentleman is justified in his mind, and in the mind of the majority of this House, by the proceedings of Tuesday night; and it will be in your recollection, Sir, as no doubt it will be in the recollection of the right hon. Gentleman, that yesterday afternoon, when I desired to discuss the whole circumstances connected with that event, I was unable to do so on a motion of privilege, but the Leader of this House said;

"Now the hon. Gentleman desires that there should be an opportunity for discussing what has occurred; I suppose for considering also what means may be taken of preventing its recurrence."

And then he went on to say that he would make a statement and a motion which would give me that opportunity.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the hon. Gentleman is unintentionally misinterpreting what I said, or it may be that I expressed myself badly. The point raised was whether there would be an opportunity of discussing the case of the hon. Member for South Fermanagh and the case of another Gentleman which the hon. Member for East Mayo desired to raise yesterday. When Mr. Speaker explained that it could not be raised yesterday, I got up and said that, although it could not be raised yesterday, I understood from Mr. Speaker's ruling that it could be raised on some subsequent occasion. I then added that there would be an opportunity given for discussing how such scenes could be prevented. That is all I intended to convey.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I do not wish to raise any conflict of recollection between the right hon. Gentleman and myself, but he will forgive me perhaps if I read the words in The Times report. The right hon. Gentleman is quite right in saying that I had raised the narrow point of these two Members; but my hon. friend the Member for East Mayo asked an additional question with reference to the discussion of the whole subject. Then the Leader of the House spoke as follows;

"I understood from the question of the hon. Member for Waterford that what he desired was an opportunity of discussing the case of these two gentlemen who regard themselves as being aggrieved. That opportunity will be granted as soon as they have put themselves in communication with Mr. Speaker. Now the hon. Gentleman desires that there should be an opportunity for discussing what has occurred, I suppose, for considering what means may be taken for preventing its recurrence."

And he goes on;

"I think it possible; although I can make no statement at the present time; I shall be able to make a statement within a few hours for an opportunity to be given to the House to discuss both these questions."

I have only alluded to that matter to explain the line I intend to take in the few remarks with which I shall trouble the House. Admittedly this proposed rule springs out of the proceedings of last Tuesday; and I feel that if the proceedings of last Tuesday are to be used as an argument justifying the passage of this proposal, I am entitled to consider what those proceedings were.

In the first place, I say to right hon. Gentleman that, speaking generally, if the government of this House is in the future to be carried on by closure, by

the suppression of adequate discussion, upon large Estimates, then not the most stringent rule which the wit of man can devise will save this House from a recurrence of scenes which no man in any part of the House desires to see interrupting the course of business here. For the proceedings of Tuesday last I say there is no precedent. The right hon. Gentleman may tell me that there have been other occasions in recent years when the discussion on Votes on Account for large sums of money was confined to one night. I say that within recent years there is not one single precedent of a Vote on Account of this magnitude being passed after one night's discussion; and especially there is no precedent of such a Vote, covering a multitude of subjects, including millions of money affecting Ireland and Scotland, being passed after only one topic of discussion had been raised. I saw in the Daily News to-day;["Oh, oh!"];I give it for what it is worth. Hon. Gentlemen will perhaps allow me to remark that what I am going to quote from the Daily News is not an impersonal statement in a leading article, but a statement from the well-known House of Commons correspondent of that paper. In that he states that he was aware of his own personal knowledge that the Leaders of the Opposition were approached by the Government as to the Votes to be discussed on Tuesday, and were asked to select the first Votes; and the Opposition selected the Education Vote and the Board of Trade Vote; that the education discussion went on and that the, closure was moved, cutting out the discussion on the Board of Trade as well as other things, without any word of explanation being given here to the Leaders of the Opposition with whom this understanding had been arrived at.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There was no such understanding.

A Member OF THE FRONT OPPOSITION BENCH: Oh yes, there was.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I am not making this statement, of my own authority. If it is wrong, of course it can be corrected. But what I do want to say on my own authority is that, having taken particular pains myself to make inquiries in every unofficial quarter of the House. I ascertained, I satisfied myself at any rate, that it was the universal impression that no attempt would be made to closure the Vote on Account. Under these circumstances very many Members left the building. I left and a number of my colleagues also;a number of Members from all sides of the House, under this impression, left. And then suddenly, after twelve o'clock, after only

the one subject had been discussed, the closure was moved, and there occurred what I will say, with a full sense of my responsibility, was a natural ebullition of feeling on the part of a number of Members in this quarter of the House. They have been told since that they ought not to have objected to this procedure because all the items mentioned in the Vote on Account could be discussed afterwards in Committee of Supply. But those who make that statement forget that it was only the other day that an additional day for the discussion of Irish Estimates was refused by the right hon. Gentleman, and that we are confined to three days out of the whole session for the discussion of the multitude of questions arising on Irish Supply. It has been stated that, what I have called the ebullition of feeling on the part of a number of my colleagues

;as I venture to assert with great malice in some of the newspapers of the country;was a premeditated and deliberate action on their part. I desire to give that the most unqualified and absolute denial. I am sure that even those who are most bitterly opposed to the line I take in the House will believe me when I say that it was absolutely unpremeditated, and that no one was more astonished than I was next morning when I opened my newspaper. I say it was a natural ebullition of feeling on the part of a number of Members of this House, and if it was an isolated instance of the closure I would not use that epithet. But this procedure on Tuesday night was part and parcel of a deliberate system of closure which has been put into operation this year. We are told that the discussions on Estimates must be scamped because certain financial arrangements must be completed by 31st of March, the House having met on 14th February. Is that an argument? Next year, perhaps, the House will not meet until 1st March, and then the same argument will be used;"You must have less discussion this year because there is less time." No, Sir, that is no answer, no argument.

The fact is there is and there has been on the part of the Government and of the majority of the House for a number of years a deliberate attempt put on foot to stifle the voice of independent criticism of the Estimates, and to reduce to an absolute nullity what is the first and greatest constitutional right of this House;namely, discussion of grievance before the voting of money. I assert deliberately that the whole, moral responsibility for what occurred on Tuesday last rests on the Leader of the House. The Leader of the House of Commons has a post of great responsibility;not merely responsibility to the Government, whose business he is trying successfully to manage, but the higher and wider responsibility for the freedom and efficiency and the dignity of the House of Commons. And I say from the double point of view, both of the interests of the Government and the wider interests of this deliberative assembly, he is morally responsible for what occurred. I have been in this House now for a considerable number of years, and my experience has been that Government has never in the long run gained by what I may call Parliamentary sharp practice, by an attempt to use constant closure and by an attempt to deprive the voice of independent criticism of free utterance. Any such attempt that I have ever witnessed by either of the great English parties has recoiled upon itself, and this is a case in point. What has the Government gained by, without the slightest intimation or notice, closing this seventeen millions of money? It was done, we are told, in the interests of time. What is the result? You have dislocated entirely your programme of business, and you have had to give up to another thorny and most dangerous subject time, which could be usefully and quietly employed in the further discussion which was necessary. And from the point of view of the House of Commons as a great deliberative assembly, which boasts that it is the mother of Parliaments, which boasts that it is a free assembly, what is the result? I regard the action of the right hon. Gentleman from the point of view of the English Parliament as absolutely fatal. Does the saving of a few hours, even if you had succeeded in saving a few hours, to convenience the Government in the passage of Supply, compensate you for having the credit and renown of this assembly dragged in the mire as it was on Tuesday night, and, as I venture to

assert, dragged in the mire as it is being dragged to-night, when you are proposing

this monstrous resolution? Year by year you have been lowering and degrading the status of this Parliament; step by step you have been depriving it of its historic rights, privileges, and freedom. If I were to regard this solely as an Irish Nationalist, I might perhaps find in that fact some consolation, because, after all, having robbed Ireland of her Parliament and having compelled us to come across the water to your Parliament, it cannot but be some consolation to us to find that the price you have to pay is so high and bitter.

Is there no remedy possible for the state of things that has arisen except the enactment of these penal regulations? I will say respectfully to the House of Commons the remedy is to be found, not in these penal regulations, which, however you may devise them, may be broken, and, if this system goes on, no doubt in the future will lie broken; the remedy lies in the more considerate government of the affairs of the House, and the abstention from tyrannical interference with the fair liberty of discussion. I believe that this proposal is unnecessary, and that you can deal with the situation that has arisen better by leaving the rules as they are and showing more consideration to private Members. Therefore, on the ground of want of necessity, I say the case for this resolution has broken down.

Apart from that, the resolution itself is, in my opinion, a most extravagant one. I remember well when, in 1880, Sir Stafford Northcote, then Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House, was proposing the original very moderate rule dealing with the suspension of private Members for a day or a week, he recognised the danger of leaving it in the power of any person, no matter how highly placed, by naming a number of men to suspend them from the exercise of their function as Members. He said on 28th May, 1880;

"They recognised the importance of giving the Speaker and Chairman of Committees an opportunity of putting a stop to an offence on the spur of the moment but they did not deem it right to give to any authority, however high, acting upon short notice, the power of suspending Members for a considerable time."

That was the original view expressed when the resolution was first introduced. I well remember coming down to the House in 1882, when the proposal was made to extend that Order and make it more oppressive; I well remember how Lord Randolph Churchill fought this proposal line by line. I remember well his phrase, which rang through the House when he denounced the proposal to suspend Members for one month, as a last resort, as "a ferocious and savage" proposal. Now it is proposed to leave in the hands of the Chairman of Committees or the Speaker; because that is what it comes to; the power of naming any number of men for disorderly conduct, and then following on that comes their suspension practically. [Cries of "No."] Yes; the interruption is puerile. The Speaker or the Chairman of Committees names the men and the House then votes for or against their suspension. That is quite true. But have we not had the experience this afternoon of how docile the House is in accepting the motion to expel men whose names are read from the Chair, even although some of those men have not been in

the premises at all? I take the constitutional ground that you have no right to suspend the action of a Member of Parliament for a whole session. It is a penalty in very many cases not inflicted upon him. I know that a great number of the Members of this House do not regard their attendance here as any great pleasure or privilege. I know a number of Members whose attendance in this House means for them practically ruin in their professions, and who come here simply from a sense of public duty, and' who would not suffer in the slightest degree if you suspended them for the remainder of the session. But you are inflicting a penalty on the constituency, and a penalty upon the constituency for an act to which the constituency cannot possibly be privy in any way. If you answer me by saying that the constituency ought not to elect men capable of such conduct, then I say;"Have the courage of your convictions and expel the men." Ah, Sir, the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich is the only man I have come across so far who is perfectly frank and honest in this matter. He has the courage of his convictions. He is going to move a proposal to the effect that instead of being suspended indefinitely we should be imprisoned indefinitely. I congratulate the noble Lord in being

thorough in this matter, although I confess I am rather surprised that he did not put into his Amendment not imprisonment, but the block. From the purely Irish point of view I desire to say that the Irish Members regard this rule with indifference and contempt;with indifference because no penalties you can devise, will have the effect of deterring us from doing what we believe to be our duty, and with contempt because the penalties inflicted in this way we regard not as a reproach, but as an honour. I say that if you go on, if the House of Commons goes on, upon the lines on which it has embarked in this matter, the logical result, and the only logical result, is the disfranchisement of Ireland. I am not sure that that would not be far better. I am sure it would be a far honester system than the present one. As long as you deprive Ireland of the substance of constitutional government and preserve the empty form by bringing us here to this Parliament, where we are always in a permanent minority as compared with the representatives of another country and another nation;so long. Mr. Speaker, as that is the case you will have in your midst a foreign element. There is something deeper in this matter than mere ebullitions of temper on the one side or mere new rules on the other. There is something deeper, something that goes right down to the bed-rock of this Irish question. The Irish Members, brought as they are to this House, are a foreign element in this House, and just like a foreign substance in the human body, when they are here;

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon. I do not consider myself a foreign substance.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I hope I am more experienced and more sensible than to take any notice of the interruption. I say that, just as in the human body the presence of a foreign substance is a constant source of irritation and a constant source of danger, so the presence of a foreign element in this Parliament is the same, because the foreign element is made up of a body of men who are with you, but not of you; a body of men to whom the ancient glories and the great traditions of this

House have no meaning; a body of men who regard this House and this Parliament simply as instruments for the oppression of their country; and in dealing with such an element I assert that no rules the wit of man can devise can possibly save your Parliament from being injured and degraded in the eyes of the world. Sir, that is the penalty that this country is paying to-day for the Union, and will continue to pay for it as long as it lasts. I say, therefore, that we treat the whole of these new rules with indifference and with contempt. I say that every such rule as you are proposing to-night is a weakening and degrading of your own Parliament, and the passing of every such rule as this amounts to the turning, if I may so say, of a searchlight upon the system of government in Ireland, which will expose the system to the knowledge and criticism of the nations of the world. It discloses to the world the fact that, with all your constitutional forms, you hold one portion of the so-called United Kingdom simply by brute force. I say to you, under these circumstances, speaking for myself and, I believe, for many, many Irish Members, go on with your new rule, suspend, expel, and imprison Members, we will not be in the smallest degree deterred. So long as we are forced to come to this House to endeavour, in the midst of a foreign majority, to transact our Irish business, we will use every from of this House, every right, every privilege, every power which membership of this House gives us; we will use these things just as it seems to us to be best for Ireland, quite regardless of the opinion and so-called dignity of British Members, and absolutely careless of the penalties you may devise for our punishment. In conclusion I would only say that my own strong feeling is this, that if in your effort to hold Ireland, according to your present system of government, by force, you degrade and paralyse, and in the end destroy, this famous Assembly, it will be but a just retribution upon you for the baseness and the cruelty with which you destroyed the free Parliament of the Irish people.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it is necessary for me to reply on the main question to the two speeches before we go into Amendments to this resolution. I shall deal very briefly with the two speeches to which we have just listened. The Leader of the Opposition made some complaint against the Government that they had not consulted hon. Gentlemen opposite. I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that nothing could give me greater pleasure than to ask his co-operation in matters concerning the common interests of the House; but what was done yesterday was done rapidly, and I am sorry there was no opportunity for consultation. The right hon. Gentleman has suggested an Amendment to the rule, which I think in substance would be an improvement, and if he will move it we will accept it, or if he prefers that it should be moved from this bench my hon. and learned friend or some other Member of the Government will move it, or something substantially identical with it, at a later stage of our debate. I now turn to the speech of the hon. Gentleman, which was going to be pitched, as he told us, in a calm key of dispassionate discussion.

MR. J. REDMOND: I said I would do my best.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is true the hon. Gentleman said he would do his best. The hon. Gentleman is a great ornament of debate in this House, and I can hardly believe from what I know of him that a person of so great oratorical ability

could so completely and so disastrously fail in carrying out the intentions with which he set out. If the hon. Gentleman intended to be conciliatory, that intention most certainly evaporated under the influence of his own oratory at a very early period of his remarks.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I said calm, not conciliatory. It is not an occasion in my view for conciliation on my part.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman says he was not conciliatory, I can hardly describe his speech as "calm." The hon. Gentleman was good enough to say, among other calm observations, and amid the vociferous cheers of his friends, that the whole burden of responsibility for the unhappy incidents of Tuesday last rests upon my unhappy head. The hon. Member has described me as attempting to play the tyrannical master to the House, as unduly curtailing debate, and as consequently affording, if not a justification, at all events some excuse for the strange and unhappy proceedings with which Tuesday night's discussion terminated.

Let me remind the House, by giving a bare statement of facts, what the situation is with regard to Supply. The hon. Gentleman said the excuse the Government put forward for moving the closure at twelve o'clock was that it was necessary to get Supply by 31st March. Sir, that is not the main reason why I moved the closure on Tuesday night, nor was that proceeding of so strange and unprecedented a character as the hon. Gentleman appears to suppose. The hon. Gentleman talked as if we were voting seventeen millions for the services of the year in a manner which would abstract the subjects to which the money was to be devoted from any further discussion by the House. The hon. Gentleman knows that that does not represent the facts. The old practice of the House was that a Vote on Account, as it was merely in anticipation of the Estimates, was not an occasion on which subjects could with advantage be raised. For reasons which I need not go into, discussions in Supply became longer and longer, more and more inconvenient to the Government of the day, and more and more were carried on until late in August, under what were admittedly impossible and disastrous conditions. Now, the result was that two or three Votes on Account were at different times put forward, and the House, being deprived of legitimate opportunities for discussion, naturally took advantage of the Votes on Account to raise matters of importance. All that was subsequently altered, with the approval of the House, and new Supply rules were introduced allowing a maximum of twenty-three days for Supply, distributed evenly over the session, so as to give Gentlemen on both sides full opportunity for discussion of the actions of the Government. A division on a Vote on Account on the first night is an almost necessary corollary of that rule, because as long as the Vote on Account is included in the twenty-three days, if it goes over two days it takes away one day from the regular discussion of the Estimates. To the Government that matters nothing, as the total amount of time taken for the Estimates cannot exceed twenty-three days. Feeling that that was so, I did, with the approval of the House, move the closure on the first night of the debate, not merely in 1901, but in 1900, 1899, 1898, and in 1897; and I venture to say that every man who occupies my position, so long as the Supply rides continue, will feel himself

driven, in the general interest, to do the same, so that miscellaneous and vague discussions on Votes on Account shall be ended as soon as possible, thus allowing as much as possible of the twenty-three days for genuine discussion on the items in the various Estimates laid before the House. That is a simple, straightforward statement of the motives which animated me, acting with my colleagues, not only this year, but last year and the years before, as I have stated. I have never suggested in any of the discussions on the Supply rules that the Vote on Account should take more than one day; on the contrary I have always said that in order to carry on the business of the House decently and in order it was entirely inexpedient that we should give more than a day to that preliminary stage.

The hon. Gentleman accuses me of trying to burke discussion. I do not want to be egotistical, but I say that this Government has done more to make discussion in Supply a reality than any previous Government has done, and the freedom of debate of which the hon. Gentleman complains has never been so largely enjoyed in Supply as during the last Parliament, and as I hope it will be during the remaining sessions of the present Parliament. The hon. Gentleman says that he and his colleagues come to this House as citizens of an oppressed nationality, and that when they do come here they are not allowed a fair share of debate. Has the hon. Gentleman sat here through all the debates conducted by his friends in the course of the present session? Does he know that this oppressed nationality has taken up one-

fourth of the whole time which has been occupied in debate during the present session? The session is not old, it is still young, but the hon. Gentleman and his friends had two Amendments on the Address, and they occupied the greater part of the time on every other Amendment to the Address. Since Supply was brought in they have made endless speeches. If I remember rightly, they have made no less than eighty-four speeches, and forty-three of these were made in Committee of Supply. This is the gagged nation'; These are the Gentlemen who are not allowed to open their lips by a tyrannical Minister'; The House has listened with weary patience to attacks made, not upon politicians, for they are indifferent to those things, but upon the honour and courage of our troops and their conduct in the field. Can anybody say, even the most fanatical partisan, that this House has not proved itself, in this session as in all previous sessions, tolerant to views, however opposed to them and however expressed, so long as they are believed to represent opinions honestly held by even the smallest section of the Opposition?

The hon. Gentleman did not disguise from us towards the end of his speech, when the calmness with which he began had completely disappeared, that he regarded with pleasure, or without displeasure, the fact that his countrymen had inflicted by their conduct a great injury upon the honour and the tradition of this House. He told us that he and his friends were foreigners in a strange land, and that, like any other foreign body introduced into an organism, it produced inflammation, disease, and, as he almost hinted, ultimately death. I will venture to urge upon the House that these concluding words of the hon. Gentleman are ample justification of the rule which, he says he is going to

treat with contempt. He does not wish that the traditions and the honour of this House should be maintained. Sir, I confess that there is no Member of this House from whom I should have heard those sentiments with greater pain. The hon. Gentleman is endowed above his fellows, above. I had almost said, any man in this House, with the talents which would enable him to be, what so many of his countrymen have been in the past, a distinguished ornament and Member of the greatest free assembly in the world. If he elects deliberately, and for some unknown motive, to use those talents or encourage others to use their talents in a manner destructive of the honour and dignity of this House, I can only say that the hon. Gentleman is not only doing a great disservice to the Empire of which he is a citizen, and of which, I imagine, he still wishes to be a citizen; he is not only doing a great disservice to that Empire, but he is doing the greatest of all disservices to that portion of the Empire in which he professes to be particularly interested. He tells us that scenes like that on Tuesday night are the penalty we pay for refusing Home Rule to Ireland; a scarcely veiled threat; and are at intervals to be used, if we permit them to be used, to force us, as by a process of torture, to dismember the Empire which we are guarding. Sir, the hon. Gentleman forgets that under the Home Rule scheme which he accepts the blessing of freedom from the presence of Irish Members, as he would describe it, is not to be vouchsafed. The foreign body is still to be in the organism.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I assure the right hon. Gentleman that we have no such desire. When that was proposed, it was proposed by an English party, and was accepted by us, because we thought it was not worth while; [Cries of "Order."] My point is, we do not want to be here.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not going into a discussion on Home Rule. I did not start it; I do not wish to continue it. But I hope hon. Gentlemen above the gangway, if they still take any interest in that question, will take note of the view expressed by the hon. Gentleman of the form in which alone Home Rule would be agreeable to the Irish nation. Sir, I have said sufficient, I think, to defend us who sit on this bench, on whom the responsibility of guiding the House finally rests, to absolve us from the charge so recklessly levelled against us of having unduly curtailed the liberty of Members. I hope I have answered that fully. And as for the main subject of our discussion to-night, I venture to say that if any stranger had come into the gallery for the first time, not knowing what occurred on Tuesday except by report, after hearing the hon. Gentleman's speech, he would have said that that speech, especially its closing portion, was the amplest justification for the measure we are proposing from this side of the House.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): The right hon. Gentleman has wandered over a very wide field in his speech, and I have no intention of following him, but perhaps I may be allowed to say a few words in this debate upon the proposal immediately before the House, namely, the Amendment to the Standing Order No. 21. I share the pain and humiliation that must have been felt by every Member of the House when I read the record of those proceedings on Tuesday evening. I think the introduction of the physical element on that

occasion was a degradation to this House of Commons; I was about to say it was a crime, but it most certainly was a blunder. We who recollect the late Mr. Parnell and the discipline that he maintained in the Irish ranks, discipline without which no party in this House can be effective; we who remember Mr. Parnell recollect that when he found occasion to protest against the proceedings of this House, even to the extent of refusing to obey the orders of the Speaker or Chairman, he did so in a dignified manner. In cases of this kind the late Mr. Parnell was content to retire after a tap on the shoulder from the Serjeant-at-Arms. I venture to say that hon. Members from Ireland would have been better advised if they had followed that example. I have no sympathy whatever; on the contrary, I condemn it root and branch; with anything in this House that requires the introduction of the police within this Chamber. I hope I have made myself clear in that matter.

That, however, does not exhaust the question. I notice that, as the discussion has gone on, other circumstances of that night have been dealt with, although there was an attempt earlier to narrow the discussion. Before a Vote on Account of £17,000,000, carrying the Government on through many months, is put from the Chair

such an arrangement ought to have been made as would have enabled the different items to be discussed, but in this case the whole evening was consumed by the interesting discussion on education. Then the Leader of the House came in and moved the closure on that £17,000,000 at the close of the evening, and I say without fear of contradiction that such action is reducing our proceedings to a perfect farce. The right hon. Gentleman has said something about the history of Votes on Account; but, if he will allow me to say so, I do not think he was quite accurate in that history, and no doubt he is relying for the statement upon information supplied to him by some other person. Everyone knows that a Vote on Account is dealt with in an exceptional manner, and it ought not to be included in the twenty-three days allotted to Supply. The proceedings of the other evening are sufficient to illustrate that point. I for one complain that the scene of the other night was led up to, and was the consequence of the manner in which the business was conducted. There certainly was a want of method with regard to the arrangement of the business of the House. The right hon. Gentleman himself had to apologise because he had not taken the usual courteous step of consulting the Leader of the Opposition. Was there ever such a state of things before? The amendment of our Standing Orders is a most serious thing, and when this omission on the part of the right hon. Gentleman was referred to he gets up in an airy way and says that time did not permit him to do so. There was ample time for the Leader of the House during the whole of yesterday to consult the Leader of the Opposition. That argument will not stand a moment's examination.

All our Standing Orders have been drawn up with very great care, and this particular Standing Order No. 21 was the subject of a great deal of discussion in the year 1882, and it was protested against at the time by a man who knew this House better than most Members who have ever sat in it; I allude to the late Lord Randolph Churchill. He protested against it in the strongest manner, and I

think it is absurd for the right hon. Gentleman to come down here to-night and move this addition to the Standing Order in the way he has done. As it stands on the Paper the Amendment is drawn in the most slovenly fashion. The Leader of the Opposition has pointed out already one defect in it, and his suggestion has been accepted. When you have previously amended these rules the Amendment has always been made on the motion of a Committee. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was chairman in the year 1886 of a very important Committee, which examined into the rules of our procedure, and he knows very well how much every recommendation of that Committee was discussed before arrived at. I should not think for a moment of voting for the Amendment now on the Paper.

I pass from this point, and I say boldly and unhesitatingly that what you have to rely upon for the preservation of dignity and order in the proceedings of this great assembly are the personal qualifications and the character of those who are elected to the position of Chairman and Speaker and the general spirit and sense of the House. No Standing Orders will bind men who are determined to disobey them. Moral force is the only force that is effective in this case. The right hon. Gentleman pointed out at the beginning of the session that it is on the spirit that pervades the House that you must rely for preserving the efficiency and the dignity of its proceedings. I can find no word strong enough to express my alarm and disapproval of the rashness of this proceeding on the part of the right hon. Gentleman, and, as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, there is great danger in the words as they stand on the Paper. For my own part, as a Member of this House who yields to no man in the desire to maintain the dignity of this great place as an instrument of public good, I do not feel myself at liberty to vote for the proposal put forward in its present form.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I rise to propose an Amendment to the motion.

MR. DILLON: On a point of order. I have an Amendment on the first line which is of very great importance, and

I may be shut out from moving it if the Attorney General moves his Amendment now.

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member is prepared to move his Amendment now, I have no doubt the Attorney General will give way.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): I have another point of order. I am sure that there is a very general feeling that the general discussion on the main question should go on and a vote be taken upon it. I want to know, if the Attorney General moves his Amendment now, will we be precluded from continuing the general debate?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will not be precluded from entering into the general question now. There is no Amendment before the House.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): May I ask, on a point of order, whether, if hon. Members desire to continue the general discussion, they will be shut out from so doing by the Attorney General moving an Amendment at this stage?

*MR. SPEAKER: If there is a desire to continue the general discussion, it would

be more convenient that it should take place before an Amendment is moved. I had no information of any such general desire.

*MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.): I wish to ask whether it is not in accordance with our usual practice and custom that, when a number of Members desire to move Amendments on different parts of the main motion, the proceeding should be so adjusted as that these Members should not be deprived of the opportunity of presenting their Amendments? Some of us feel very strongly in regard to this question.

*MR. SPEAKER: The proper and more convenient course would be if the Amendments were laid on the Table. There is no Amendment on the Table. I have every wish to accommodate hon. Members.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: If there is a general desire that my Amendment should come further on in the discussion I am prepared to give way.

*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I wish to say a few words on the main question, and they shall be brief. I think, however, that the great majority of the House is agreed that if any possible means could be adopted to prevent a repetition of the deplorable scenes of Tuesday night they should be taken. Although I would be glad to see the resolution amended in certain respects, I certainly should support it in the main. The great majority of the House is so agreed on the point of general regret for the scenes that have occurred that it is hardly necessary for me to dwell upon them. My purpose in rising, mainly, is to express my deep regret that the closure was moved the other night. I do not think the moving and the carrying of the closure were any justification for what happened, but I want to say a very few words with regard to the defence made by the First Lord of the Treasury for moving the closure on a Vote of Account. I do not believe that there is any precedent for closing a large Vote on Account when only one single item on that Vote had been discussed. At all events, I do not recollect such a closure before. My memory may be in error. Possibly the only precedent for it was during the discussion on the Jameson Raid, which of course was a matter of great interest, and caused much excitement in the House. But even on that occasion there was a, two nights debate on the Vote on Account. What was the, defence of the First Lord of the Treasury? He said that every single item of the Votes would be open to discussion on a future occasion. If that happened in practice it would be a very good defence, but no one knows better than the right hon. Gentleman that it never does happen. This is not a charge which I bring against the present Ministry alone. Over and over again it has been proved that discussion in Supply of the most important subjects has been constantly burked. Therefore that is a strong argument against closing the Vote on Account. This is one of the few occasions on which we can discuss everything. [Mr. BALFOUR was understood to dissent.] Well, this is one of the very few opportunities of discussing most important questions. What was the course of procedure that night? A special subject was brought forward, a very important subject, no doubt; an Amendment was moved, and the result was that no other subject could be discussed; and hon. Members were encouraged to speak in order to keep the debate going [HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!] I make this general

statement, which I am quite able to prove. I simply say that this was an occasion on which above all others the closure ought not to have been applied. There were many subjects of great importance that ought to have been discussed. I do say that the rights of private Members have been so grossly infringed upon within the last few years, and the discussion of great public questions has been so frequently burked, that it is time independent Members made a protest. The idea that by closing the debate on the Vote on Account you thereby ensure discussion of most important subjects in Supply is a purely fantastic idea of the Leader of the House. I blame the Leaders of the Opposition very much on this point; for of recent years Members on the Front Opposition Bench have not fulfilled their duty in insisting that important subjects should be discussed. They might have done a good deal to support independent Members in this respect. I think this is an occasion on which, in view of the turn which the debate has taken, independent Members are justified in making protest. I venture to enter that protest, because I feel very strongly the taking away from the House as a whole what I regard as one of its greatest privileges; namely, the insistence on the discussion of grievances before granting Supply.

MR. BROADHURST: I think if anything could justify the complaint which has been made to-night it has been the heated passion displayed in the course of the debate by the Leader of the House. He made a most passionate appeal to his followers to support this motion, by a reference to subjects which had not been mentioned in the debate; I mean, the speeches of hon. Gentlemen from Ireland parties to Army affairs in South Africa. We have evidence sufficient to-night to show us that the decision to move this Amendment on Standing Order No. 21 was taken on the high-tide of excitement of the Government in regard to the proceedings the other night. The right hon. Gentleman had to admit to the Leader of the Opposition that he had not consulted him because he had not time. Why, to come down to the House and move an Amendment to the Standing Orders which will disfranchise constituencies for six months at a time, is a proceeding which ought not to have been taken in heat and hurry, and without proper and due consideration. Now, I was here the whole of the night on Tuesday, and of course I never took part in supporting any Member of this House in disobeying the Orders of the House. But had you, Mr. Speaker, been here during the whole of that evening, had you been a witness to the accumulating indignation of the House between ten and twelve o'clock, you would not have been so surprised that something irregular should arise before the House closed. Those of us who were here at the time were discussing a subject of the utmost importance to the interests of our country, the question of education; and many of us had no opportunity of taking part in the debate because of the short time at our disposal. Then, the only member of the Government who was present for the greater part of the night was the Vice-President of the Council, who was left without the patronage and sympathy and support which he might have received from other members of the Cabinet during the debate. That was the condition of things that led up to the excitement which culminated in the unfortunate and regrettable incident on the benches below the gangway.

The Leader of the House has, with all the marvellous skill of which he is so great a master, tried in the two or three speeches he has made to-night to locate this as a question between the Members for Ireland and his own party. No, Sir, this is a House of Commons question. I would like, if the Leader of the House will permit me, to take the liberty to remind him that there are still other parties in the House than that which owns allegiance to his sway and great power. There are still a few Liberals left, and we as well as Irishmen are concerned for the liberty of the House and the freedom of action of its Members. I am here to-night to say that we have known occasions when disobedience to the orders of the House by an hon. Member has borne great fruit, and produced great results for the welfare of a large section of the community. I remember when the late Mr. Plimsoll, then Member for Derby, came down to the House and gave an exhibition of his earnestness almost amounting to a threat of violence to the Leader of the House. And the immediate result was the passing of the Shipping Act of 1876, which formed the basis of many Acts which followed, and which have saved the lives of thousands of British seamen.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is going beyond the limits of discussion on the point before the House.

MR. BROADHURST: Probably I am, and I am not surprised. I took an active part in the proceedings in those days. Although not at the time a Member, I was within the precincts of the House and saw the whole proceedings, and I know, from my subsequent official connection with the work, what was the great blessing that resulted from it. I say that it is our duty to resist any inroads on the liberties of the House, or upon the freedom of Members, to take such action as they may think proper before granting Supply to the Government. I rather think that the disposition so prevalent in a distant part of our Empire is travelling with great rapidity towards our own country. I have heard it rumoured that some hon. Members desire to strengthen this sentence of exclusion which the Leader of the House has proposed by imposing a sentence of penal servitude, or something of the kind, for disobedience to the rules of the House. What we want is more tact in the general control of the business of the House. In the great Parliament of 1880, with which the First Lord of the Treasury is so intimately acquainted, and of which I am sure he has the most lively recollection, many scenes and incidents took place. I admired the skill with which he and his friends succeeded on those occasions in drawing attention to themselves and to the subjects which, for the time, they espoused. Sir, notwithstanding the high state of obstruction in that Parliament, of which the right hon. Gentleman was one of the leaders, some of the greatest measures of our time were passed; and it is only a want of skill in the management of business on the part of the Front Government Bench that has produced that state of things which led to the revolt on Tuesday night. I hope sincerely that we shall have an opportunity of voting upon the main question before Amendments are introduced on it. I am sure we shall take a large number of Members into the Division Lobby against tampering with our liberties, and I hope the motion will be defeated. When the passions of the moment have cooled down, let the Leader of the House take counsel with the Leader of the Opposition, and then take the

House into his confidence, We are all concerned for the honour and dignity of Parliament, and if there is any good ground for mending or modifying the present rules of procedure let it be done with due consideration, and with the advantage of the experience of men in all parts of the House. In that way we might arrive at a discussion of the subject with something like reason, and with some hope of doing something effective for the better control of the Members of this House. I do think that the Leader of the House must admit that he has been most ill-advised in taking this hasty step. He himself has had to admit already that he was so hasty that he had not time to think of the Opposition. He had got it into his mind that there was only one side in the House besides the Irish Members; but he has learned to-night that there are other parties in the House, and that he has shown a want of consideration of the due proportion of things. As I have said, I hope we shall have an opportunity of voting against the main question, and that we shall have a majority against the motion. We might then refer the matter to a Committee representing the whole of the parties in the House. We should not then run a further risk of impairing the authority, the dignity, the honour, and what respect is left to the House of Commons after ten years mismanagement by the Tory party. There should be no attempt to patch up for party purposes

and party conveniences the ancient rules and customs of this great House of Parliament, the mother, as it has been called, of the free institutions of the world. Then we should allow time to consider the proposed changes in moments of coolness, and not rush helter-skelter at express speed through the destruction of our liberty such as is proposed by the Leader of the House.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): It is my intention to vote against the resolution of the Government, not for the reason that it goes too far, but that it does not go far enough. The proposed Amendment to the Standing Order will not prevent a recurrence of the disgraceful scenes of Wednesday morning. In my opinion, when any Member defies the authority of the Chair after being called upon to leave the Chamber, the sitting of the House should be suspended for a quarter of an hour. The galleries; the strangers', the ladies', and the reporters'; should be cleared, and the contumacious Members or Member should be forcibly removed in the presence only of the police. I think that in that case there could be no advertisement for any Member wishing to be turned out of the House, and the Members would walk out quietly. I think that to suspend to the end of the session, which may be only a week or a fortnight, a Member who has been guilty of conduct that would disgrace any parish council in Great Britain, does not cover the case. The resolution does not go far enough, and will prove a mere farce. Hon. Members from Ireland have definitely stated that it is their intention to repeat these scenes and these tactics of Wednesday morning. (Cries of "No" from the Irish benches.) I do not wish to advertise the paper, but hon. Members will no doubt know to which one I refer. In that paper several Members of the Irish party who were removed from the House on Wednesday morning had been interviewed, and they stated that they proposed to go on again with these disgraceful proceedings. The hon. Member for Waterford stated that the most stringent rules which the wit of man could devise will not prevent a repetition

of these scenes. Something must be done if we wish to maintain the dignity of a Parliament ruling four hundred millions of human beings under just and equitable laws. (Cries of "No" from Irish benches.) If you have any laws in Ireland which are not just, there is a desire on every side of the House to remove them. But when you come here and say that you are a foreign element, and intend to bring disgrace on everything connected with Parliament, you must remember that when you do so you insult not only Parliament, but the Empire.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Off with our heads!

MR. MARKHAM: The first Lord of the Treasury has referred to the attacks made by hon. Members sitting on the Irish benches on the soldiers of the Empire. Let me say to these hon. Members that in behaving as they have done they are damaging the interests they wish to serve. In the course they have taken these Irish Members are the worst enemies of Ireland. If they would only come here and present their case to the House with moderation, I am certain the House wishes to do what is right. I trust my fellow countrymen will never be coerced into doing what is wrong.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Neither will we.

MR. MARKHAM: While hon. Members choose to defy the authority of the Chair, and attempt to make this House nothing more nor less than a pot-house, not only lowering Parliament, but the nation at large. I say that the time has come when a protest should be made against it. Members should have the courage of their convictions, and never mind whether Ireland be disfranchised or not. If Ireland chooses to send representatives to this House who refuse to obey the laws and rules of order, then let Ireland be unrepresented. There is no injustice done to them by that, if the decencies of law and order are not observed in this House by hon. Members from Ireland. If they will not conform to them, then let them remain away. No injustice whatever would be done to Ireland, and the course I suggest would be merely following the dictates of common sense.

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

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): The House of Commons has in its long and splendid history witnessed many strange sights. It has seen its privileges invaded by a monarch, its doors have been barred and locked, and access refused to Members by a soldier, and I have myself seen a Member duly elected to this House dragged across the lobbies and the corridor, and ejected from the building, although the House was glad enough and willing enough to admit afterwards that they were wholly wrong, I have seen a free fight on the floor of this Assembly, originated not by the Irish Members, but by English. Members; but I think that a sadder or more terrible sight was never witnessed in this occasion I voted against the First Lord or any other legislative Assembly in Europe than the scene of Tuesday last. I am one of those Irish representatives who deeply deplore what took place, and who sincerely regret the dishonour done to this House and the injury that I believe has been done to Ireland by it. Feeling that, I shall vote for any reasonable resolution that will make a recurrence of such scenes impossible in the future, and that will punish any offender who violates to that extent the order and rules of this House. I desire, having

said so much, to state two things. I am with those who have said to-night that there is some responsibility for this trouble elsewhere than on the Irish benches.

Let me say that I voted on Tuesday night for the closure. I say that frankly, but I did not vote for the closure because I thought it ought to have been applied. I voted for it simply because of the exigencies of Supply, and because of the difficulty of the position in which His Majesty's Government was placed as to time. That was the real reason that made me vote for the closure, and if I had had the opportunity I should have voted for the granting of this £;17,000,000 on Account. But I do think that the First Lord of the Treasury has gone a little out of his way to vindicate the closure on the Vote on Account after one day's discussion. I remember that in the year 1892 I was engaged in discussing the Chief Secretary for Ireland's salary, and he was a Home Rule Chief Secretary. I was engaged discussing it on a Vote on Account, and when the discussion had lasted one day the Vote was closed, and the present First Lord of the Treasury supported me in resisting the closure. It is all the same whatever Government is in power, for they will use the rules upon the Order Book to secure their own purposes, and the House of Commons may make up its mind that these weapons now used against Irishmen may be used against Englishmen as well. As I stated before, my objection to the closure was on account of the exigencies of Irish Supply. I made a strong appeal to the First Lord of the Treasury for Irish Supply, that is, to give us four days instead of three. That appeal of mine was refused, and on that occasion I voted against the First Lord of the Treasury, and I was not the only Ulster Member on this side who voted against him on that occasion. It was refused, and the Vote on Account was put the other night. I am bound to say that it was a startling proposal to vote £;17,000,000, £;2,000,000 of which were for Irish services, without a word having been said upon anything in the Vote but an English subject. There are a great many new Members in this House, and the Irish party is to a large extent made up of new Members. I was a close observer of what took place the other night, and on the question of the closure being put an Irish hon. Member desired to speak upon the motion, but he was pulled down to his seat by those sitting near him. What I want to point out is, that there are a great many hon. Members in the Irish party who are new to the House, and who are not aware of the strictness of the closure rule, and who in ignorance of that fact took opposition to that rule, which, had their leaders been present, they would not have taken.

I heard the speech of the hon. Member who spoke last with great pain. What is the use of any English Member coming down to the House of Commons and lecturing Irishmen? Of course, I know that it was a new Member who did it, for no man who had been in this House for years would have ever have dreamt of doing it. It is one thing to address sound arguments to the House, but quite another thing to lecture Irish Members and tell them that England would do this and that. Irish Members do not care a row of pins for that sort of argument, which, instead of doing good, does harm. What I rose principally to state to-night is this. This House of Commons must never forget one important fact; that when they

are dealing with Ireland and with the representatives from Ireland who sit on the opposite side of the House they are dealing with a country and with men who pay an unwilling allegiance to it. I say that the statesman who leaves that out of sight, the politician in this House who refuses to recognise it, misses the whole fact of the situation. We are governing in Ireland a people without the consent of the over whelming majority of those people. In all our dealings with Ireland, and in all our dealings with hon. Members opposite representing Ireland, I say that we ought never to lose sight of this fact, and in everything we do we ought to try to conciliate and to meet the arguments and the desires of those representatives, so far as they can be met within the principles professed by the Government on this side of the House. We ought to conciliate and try to meet these men as far as it is possible to do it. Conciliation will go a long way where coercion will break down utterly. My point is that it is no use for English Members sitting on these benches to lecture Irishmen, and they had better recognise at once that the Irish Members in this House are fighting England in the only way in which they can fight her. They have their constituents at their back, and the sterner the fight the better the constituents will like it. It is a lamentable thing, a hundred years after the Legislative Union, that this spirit, this reckless spirit, should still prevail. Disorder cannot be tolerated; disobedience to the Speaker and the rules of the House must be put down with a stern hand; and I shall vote to-night to do it; but the disorder is far deeper seated than Members on this side of the House appear to think, and it will require far different treatment than the imprisonment suggested by the noble Lord to remove it. The treatment will have to be far different. The House,

recognising the fact that these men are unwilling guests there, that England destroyed their own Parliament, must first of all try to conciliate them, and meet their wishes so far as they can be fairly and honourably met consistently with the principles the Government were placed in power to support.

MR. DILLON: On behalf of the Nationalist Members I think I will be expressing their feelings when I thank the hon. Gentleman for the remarkable speech to which we have just listened. He is one who has been a great opponent of ours in the past, and he is still a champion of the Union, and I warn the members of that party in this House that if they are wise they will listen to the voice of an Irish Unionist who knows something about the subject. For my part, I do not believe in the possibility of maintaining the Union, but I believe if it had a chance it would be on the lines of the speech of the hon. Member; in making an attempt to prove to the Irish people that we are wrong in our contention. For if the people of Ireland come to believe that their representatives here will not get a fair hearing, and are subjected to treatment that would not be meted out and a spirit displayed to them which is not displayed to any other section in the House, then you will increase the disaffection in Ireland, and convince the Irish people that they have been quite right all along, and have no reason to look here for justice. I listened to the speech on this side of the House to which the hon. Gentleman alluded in his speech; that was the speech of a Liberal Imperialist, and I gladly accept him as an example of that abominable creed. The

Tories opposite are Liberals compared to him, and in the course of this debate, so far, I have heard nothing from Members opposite of insult or of a desire to increase the severity of this "scandalous and ferocious rule"; to adapt the words of Lord Randolph Churchill. It has been reserved for a Liberal Imperialist to turn round and talk to Irish Members in the fashion that we used to hear in '80 and '81. There are some of us who remember those days, in which we were patriots. Time vindicated our efforts, and the measures we were then howled at for advocating have been placed upon the Statute Book, and the spirit which existed in those days has died completely out, and I for one, who passed through them, know this, that there are men who are now ashamed of the part they took in them. In the opinion of the hon. Member to whom I allude, the wording of the motion is much too mild. I have a great deal more experience than he, and when he comes to my age he will have learnt that the tone and spirit which he, displayed is precisely the tone and spirit which would make the maintenance of order and decency in any assembly in the world absolutely impossible. Nobody knows, Sir, better than yourself that without some good feeling, without some sense of respect for every Member, without that sense which makes every man feel in his own person the humiliation of a colleague, no rules ever devised in any assembly in the world would preserve decency or order. I maintain; and I have been twenty years in the House, and I have never taken part in such a scene as that which took place on Tuesday night last; that if the Government think that by tightening the bond more and more every day, by cutting off year after year, as they have done for the last five years, what I might call safety valves for the expression of opinion, and trusting to and relying alone upon coercive legislation; if they think they will improve the order and decency and respect of this House, they are preparing for themselves a most painful disappointment. There was a time, comparatively recently, when this assembly contrasted very favourably for the order and decency of its debates with any legislature in the world. That day has gone by. The scene of Tuesday night could not be paralleled in the French Chamber, nor in the Reichstag at Berlin, and if the spirit displayed in the ludicrous and absurd Amendment of Lord Hugh Cecil was to govern the proceedings of the House the time would soon come when the British House of Commons would occupy the same position in the opinion of Europe as the Austrian Reichsrath does to-day. I do not desire to see that. I believe, and always have believed, and I have governed my conduct for twenty years in that belief, that within the rules of order in this House the power of an organised Irish Party, supported by our people at home, is sufficient to win the rights of Ireland, and, believing that. I do not want to have a recurrence of these disgraceful scenes in which we suffer; but if you rely on coercion, if you drive any large section of the House into a repetition of Tuesday night's scenes, we will not be the greatest sufferers.

I would ask hon. Members in all seriousness when they are addressing themselves to the consideration of this question, which seems to have been put before the House by the First Lord of the Treasury with singular callousness and want of thought, whether this rule is not important in its wording? I think it is an

odious thing to hear the Leader of the House talk about the "punishment" of Members. The House, of course, must insist on maintaining its rules of order, and whatever measures are necessary to enforce the authority of the Chair and the order of debate the House is entitled to take, but you must always remember that it is your colleague who is subject to disciplinary action, and having purged his conduct he becomes your colleague again, and you must not forget that men who are guilty of breaches of order are not criminals, and we are bound to assume that they are incited, whether right or wrong, by some conviction of public duty, and so long as they are going to be your colleagues in future, in going upon this theory of punishment you are on the wrong road, which will lead only to disaster. It should not be a question of punishment; it should be merely a question of such discipline as may be necessary to enforce the ruling of the Chair.

Now, I listened with astonishment to the speech delivered by the First Lord of the Treasury. When he was introducing this rule he made a statement which I am compelled to characterise as an absolutely inaccurate statement. He said that this scene the other night was an outrage on the part of the Irish Members without parallel. I challenge that statement, and say it is absolutely contrary to fact. No doubt the scene of policemen promenading up the floor of the House was unparalleled. Since the day when Oliver Cromwell marched into the House surrounded by soldiers and seized

the mace and carried it away, no such scene has been seen, but when the First Lord of the Treasury said it was an unparalleled outrage committed by Irishmen I absolutely deny it. I will take two cases where outrage committed by hon.

Members not Irish were infinitely greater than that of last Tuesday night. The Irish Members last Tuesday night are regarded as felons. I say that statement is absolutely contrary to the facts. No doubt the bringing of a large body of police on to the floor was unparalleled, but the Irish Members offered violence to nobody until they were assaulted by a large body of police. What happened in the Committee of this House in 1893? It is within the recollection of many of the older Members of the House. The case is very analogous to the present one.

The closure had been moved by Mr. Gladstone. When the hour was coming when the automatic closure was to operate, the Opposition of that day put up Mr.

Chamberlain, the right hon. Gentleman who is now Secretary for the Colonies, and at ten minutes to the hour he made a speech of the most ferocious and inflammatory character I have ever listened to. He was put up with the deliberate object of exciting passion. He compared Mr. Gladstone to Herod upon his throne calling to be adored. What was the result? Twenty Members of the House refused to leave their seats and to clear the House for a division. The clamour and the disorder far exceeded what, according to what I have heard, occurred on Tuesday night. They defied the Chairman of Committees. Who were those twenty Members? They are all Ministers and officials since. Amongst them were the hon. Member for East Worcestershire (the son of the Colonial Secretary), the hon. member for South Tyrone, and the hon. Member for Fulham, who is now a Lord of the Treasury. These men refused in precisely the same way, and committed the same offence which the Irish Members committed on these

benches, but they were under less provocation; because on that occasion in 1893, they committed it as the result of a cold-blooded conspiracy. They were not taken by surprise, their leader was not absent; their leader was there goading them on to the fight. They had full warning that the closure was coming. Irish Members are held up to execration in connection with the incident of two nights ago. But what happened in the case of the English Members on the occasion to which I have referred? The House was in a wild state of confusion, and Englishmen of the Tory and Liberal Unionist Party were openly defying the authority of the Chair. One hon. Member seized another hon. Member by the collar and endeavoured to throw him on the floor. It was the greatest outrage I have ever heard of in the House. It was an outrage because an English Member committed that violence on an hon. Member of this House without any provocation. That hon. Member is a Lord of the Treasury to-day. That outrage was the worst ever committed in the House of Commons in my memory, and, so far as my reading goes, the worst ever perpetrated in the history of the House.* It led to a free fight on the floor of the House. Mr. (now Lord) Peel, who was then Speaker, when he returned to the Chair, and Mr. Gladstone, a man who had at heart the honour and dignity of the House and of the humblest of its Members, and whose leader-ship was very different from that under which we sit to-day; Lord Peel and Mr. Gladstone spoke words of conciliation and of soothing. What did Lord Peel say? He said, "Let there be no recriminations and let the incident cease."

Now, Sir, one of the things I complain of in the proceedings of the other night is this. I was not here, but I understand there were no words of conciliation, and I am told that the tone of that bench [the Ministerial Bench] was one of insult and contempt. I say deliberately that I do not care in what part of the world you have a large assembly of men, whether it be in Vienna, Berlin, New York, or London, if you attempt to govern a body of free men forming the Members of legislative assemblies on these lines, if you throw away conciliation, and abandon the

*There is an instance, in 1678, of "giving of blows" between two Members on the floor of the House. See *The Parliamentary History*, vol. iv., page 1045.;ED.] policy of give and take, it is impossible to carry out that rule which we all desire. I thought it necessary to make that protest, because I repudiate again in the most emphatic manner in reply to the statement of the First Lord of the Treasury that this was a gross outrage perpetrated on the House. It was nothing of the sort, because no Irish Member offered violence of any kind until the police came in and endeavoured to pull them out of the House. Their resistance up to that time was passive resistance, which has again and again been indulged in by other Members of the House. Your own Members have done it, and, of course, they were treated in a different manner because they were English. I repeat again, that the reason of the feeling which has been displayed in regard to this resolution is because the offence on this occasion was committed by Irishmen. If it had been committed by Englishmen, or by any other section of the House, an attempt would have been made at conciliation, and no such penal rule as this would have been proposed.

I come to another case almost equally in point. Some of us remember the days of Charles Bradlaugh, a man I learned to like and have a respect for. Those who were responsible for his maltreatment came to regard him with respect. The case of Mr. Charles Bradlaugh is an instructive case from two points of view. First of all in regard to the different way you treated an English constituency. I desire to associate the privileges of the constituency with those of the Member. You cannot dissociate them. Charles Bradlaugh for two or three years deliberately and repeatedly defied the Speaker and the rules of order in this House. He marched into this House and sat on the cross-bench when an unsworn Member, and over and over again he walked up to the Table and stood there defying the Speaker. He was again and again conducted down by the Serjeant-at-Arms. He himself administered the Oath in defiance of rule and the repeated ruling of the Speaker. This was done deliberately and not as the result of excitement, a sudden impulse of passion, or as a protest against the action of the Ministry. At last the Speaker

ordered the Serjeant-at-Arms to remove Mr. Bradlaugh from the precincts of the House. That was an occasion which few of us who witnessed it will ever forget. It was in 1881. Mr. Bradlaugh was seized by a great number of messengers in the House, and just outside the door of the House he was dragged with great violence, while he was kicking, struggling and using his gigantic strength to the utmost extent of his ability. He was dragged across the lobby in presence of crowds of people, dragged down Westminster Hall, and expelled into Palace Yard. No doubt he had been guilty of much worse and more persistent breaches of the rules of the House and the authority of the Chair than any Member on these Irish benches. After this dreadful scene a question of privilege was immediately raised, and Mr. John Bright, an honoured name in this House, came back after witnessing the spectacle, and used the following words;

"I will put the question to hon. Members opposite and also to some hon. Members on this side of the House; Where are they leading us?"

That is the question I put to Ministers to-night. That question was received with jeers and contempt by the Gentlemen who were the majority in those days; the vast majority in this House. They had, of course, the idea, which has been expressed here to-night, that Mr. Bradlaugh had inflicted a gross outrage on this House. But Mr. Bright, with the true instinct of a constitutional statesman, saw behind Mr. Bradlaugh the constituency that sent him into the House. He saw that the constituency was struck at and wounded through the Member who was dishonoured. You are struggling now not with one constituency but with several constituencies. At the end of that struggle; which was maintained for four years and ended in the capitulation of the Government; every Member admitted in his soul that Mr. Bradlaugh was right. Apply the lesson to the position of to-day. Rules, orders, and regulations are of no avail to deal with this evil. The real master factor of the situation is that we have the constituencies at our backs. The Irish people will not think worse of the Irish party for what has happened. The noble Lord's proposal is to imprison us all, while the Liberal Imperialist would disfranchise Ireland. If you expelled the Irish Members from this House you

would at once have an Irish Parliament in Dublin, and the Irish Secretary would find we are more trouble in Dublin than we are here. The Gentlemen who make these proposals are novices in this business. Bigger men than they will ever be have tried their hand at crushing the Irish representatives; Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Forster, and Mr. Trevelyan did their best, but were finally converted. The First Lord has tried and seems inclined to try again, but I do not think he will listen to the proposal which has been made. The truth of it is, we are old hands at the game. I was suspended within a week after I took my seat twenty years ago. You will never preserve order and decency by brutality and coercion, nor by such insolence as we have listened to;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That is not the way in which to refer to the speech of another hon. Member.

MR. DILLON: I withdraw the word "insolence" and substitute "offensive-ness." The experience of twenty years ought to have taught the Leader of the House that in dealing with Irish Members you can do infinitely more by a little give and take than by any amount of coercion. I say with confidence that if on Tuesday night the sitting had been suspended and two or three hours given to the discussion on the Vote on Account on Thursday, the scene would have been entirely avoided. Would not a small concession of that character have been an infinitely less evil; if we are discussing an evil at all; than the dreadful introduction of a large body of police into this House for the first time, and the scenes of violence which occurred?

Another very important point is that you have a new House to deal with. As regards our own Irish Members it is very important. Dozens of Members are not accustomed to the sudden closure of debate; they do not understand the machinery of a Vote on Account. It is all very fine to give us a long history of the procedure with regard to Votes on Account. The First Lord ought to have looked at these benches and seen that accidentally a great many of the senior Members of our

party were absent, and that the benches were crowded with young men who were inexperienced in the ways of the House. He would have taken all these circumstances into consideration if he had been a man fit to lead the House. The hon. Member for Waterford was perfectly justified in saying that a large share of the moral responsibility for Tuesday's occurrences rests, and will in the opinion of a great body of this House rest, on the shoulders of the First Lord of the Treasury.

I propose to move an Amendment raising an extremely important issue. This proposed resolution is an extraordinary and enormous increase of the punitive powers of the Chair. In all our previous discussions it has always been held that the Chair should not have the power to sentence any Member of the House at his discretion to a severe punishment, but that that power should be reserved to the House itself. Then the rule was extended to Standing Order No. 21, giving to the House authority to suspend for the first offence for a week, for a second offence in the same session for a month, and for a third offence for the remainder of the session. Moreover, the House in those days had an amount of provocation which is really quite unknown to the present House. The scene which

occurred here the other night would be mild compared to it; at all events, it was a scene which, though very painful, did not last long. But the House which, in 1881 and 1882, originally passed this rule had for months; I might say for sessions; suffered from a series of scenes of violence, and defiance of the Chair, and prolonged all-night sittings, of which the House now has no conception. And yet all that that House could bring itself to do was to take the power of inflicting these graduated punishments. If the House turns to Standing Order No. 27, it will see that the only power ever conferred upon the Chair without a vote of the House was the power of ordering an individual Member to withdraw for the remainder of the sitting, and that is the only power the Chair now has. Standing Order No. 27, as I interpret it, and as it always has been interpreted, gives the Chairman the right to order individual Members to leave the House, naming them individually at the time when they are disorderly. My Amendment is that in line 1 of the resolution the words "or Members acting jointly" be omitted, and then the resolution would read "provided also that any Member who has been suspended." The proposal of the Leader of the House taken in its entirety places in the hands of the Chairman an enormous power of punishment unparalleled in the annals of the House, such as would enable him without a vote of the House to disfranchise constituencies for a whole session, and suspend Members for a whole session. My Amendment provides that in such cases Members should be dealt with separately. I have already alluded to what the Speaker did on a former occasion when five Members were reported, and when each of them was named one by one. The consequence of that precaution was that no question could arise as to a mistake in dealing with the matter. My contention now is, that if you give to the Chair this enormous power of punishment you should hedge round this power with all possible precautions, so as to prevent a mistake being made, as was made the other night, the result of which we saw to-day, when the Chairman of Committees was obliged to admit that he committed a grave error. I believe it was not one mistake alone that was made. I am inclined to think that two or three other Members were unjustly suspended also; at all events there is a great deal of doubt in regard to some other suspensions which took place, and if the mistake had such serious consequences in this case, what would it be to suspend a man for the whole of the session, if it were not absolutely clear that he was guilty of the offence charged against him? Therefore I hold there should be no difficulty in applying this rule to deal with each Member separately, and that would be all the more reasonable, in view of the fact that the punishment is to be inflicted without giving the House any opportunity of expressing its opinion. I must say that I think the system of wholesale suspension is a most dangerous system to introduce in this House, for it is bound to lead to the most ridiculous and most extraordinary mistakes. I myself went home from this House one night in the session of 1881, leaving an angry debate in progress, and when I returned at six o'clock in the morning I was stopped at the door and told I could not be admitted, that I had been suspended an hour before for obstructing the House. I remember another instance where a similar mistake was made. One of my colleagues was actually named and suspended when he was in mid-

Channel on his way to Ireland, owing to a mistake about his name. The same thing could easily happen now when we have so many O'Briens and O'Connors in our party. Therefore I say, that in the exercise of these punitive measures the Chairman should spare no precaution in order to be able to state to the House, from his own knowledge, and not through information supplied to him by a Clerk at the Table, that an hon. Member was an offender. I say, further, that when this House passed this Order giving you, Sir, authority to name a Member, it was never contemplated; no one even dreamt; that the Chairman would send a clerk round the House with a paper and pencil trying to ascertain the names of hon. Members who were alleged to be offenders. What happened on Tuesday night? The Clerk at the Table went down the House, took the names of some of my colleagues, and brought the list to the Chairman; then the Chairman picked out some names and omitted others. I say that sort of procedure is an outrage on the House, and one of the results of it was seen to-day when the Chairman of Committees admitted his mistake and expressed his regret for it. I say, then, with the most perfect confidence, that if the Chairman or Speaker is in doubt as to the identity of an hon. Member he should give that hon. Member the benefit of the doubt, for it would be far better to let off an offender for the time being than that an innocent man should be punished and subjected to the humiliation of being driven out of the House. For these reasons I now move the Amendment standing in my name.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment;

"In line 1, to leave out the words 'or Members acting jointly.'"; (Mr. Dillon.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The Government cannot possibly accept this Amendment. The whole rule was specially framed to meet the case of Members banding themselves together to resist the authority of the Chair. The proposal of the Government as it stands does not interfere with the right of naming hon. Members separately. I submit that it is clear to demonstration that, if several Member's are acting in combination, so as to render force necessary, it ought to be within the discretion of the Chair to name them.

MR. HARRINGTON (Dublin, Harbour) said no explanation had been given by those who spoke for the Government as to how this new rule would expedite the business of the House. If Members in such cases were to be taken out separately, surely it would be convenient to name them separately. It was not suggested that two or three at a time, or the whole lot together, should be seized by the police at the same moment and borne out all in a group. He wished to ask, what did the Government expect to gain by this new rule? If the Irish Members were prepared to co-operate with the Government in maintaining respect for the traditions of the House, this rule might be of some use, but if the Irish Members wished to disregard the authority of the Chair could they not, after having disregarded it, go back, and in the last week of the session get suspended one by one? If they did that they would be received by their constituents with open arms. In bringing forward this new rule the right hon. Gentleman was really reducing this question to a fine art, and merely giving those Members who wished to deny the

authority of the Chair an opportunity of bringing the House into ridicule and contempt at the end of every session, when they might disregard the Chair, and the whole of them might be suspended in the last week of the session. How did the right hon. Gentleman propose to deal with an hon. Member who was suspended and sent back to his constituents? There was not a single Member on the Irish benches who would not be returned again without the slightest opposition within a week of his suspension.

*MR. SPEAKER: The question now before the House is the omission of the words "Members acting jointly." The hon. Member must confine himself to the question before the House.

MR. HARRINGTON said he would take the case of the Members acting jointly. If they were expelled and went back to their constituents they would be returned within a week, and then a further amendment of the rules would be necessary. Was the right hon. Gentleman prepared to receive them back? If the intention was to disfranchise certain constituencies, it would be necessary for the right hon. Gentleman to introduce a further rule, by which the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be precluded from giving the stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds to Irish Members. But even then there would be nothing to prevent these Irish Members from coming back to the House by making an interchange of constituencies. What he wished to point out was, that if there were people who wanted to cast discredit on Parliamentary institutions, this amendment of the Standing Order would put into their hands the very machinery which would bring the House into contempt.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman has given this matter his full consideration. The point made by the hon. Member is a fair one. He suggests that under this rule a whole group of Members might be suspended at one blow without the case of each, or the action of each one, being considered and proved. It is difficult to define the words "acting jointly," and that makes this Amendment absolutely necessary. I would like the right hon. Gentleman to explain to the House how "acting jointly" could be proved.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The words are already in Rule 21.

MR. LOUGH: Even so; but we had the House placed to-day in the most humiliating position of apologising unani-

mously to a single man, just because of those words. It was because of a hurried ruling of the Chair that certain Members had acted jointly that that humiliating apology had to be made, and we may be found in the same difficulty again if the words "acting jointly" are retained. My hon. friend wants that three, four, or five Members should not be suspended in a bunch, but that A, B, or C should be dealt with separately; and I certainly think that, if not his precise Amendment, some other should be adopted which will secure that every one shall have his case dealt with separately.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I cannot help thinking that these words are wholly unnecessary, although not from the point of view of some of the arguments which have been used. The words in Standing Order No. 21 were put in that where a number of Members had acted simultaneously the Speaker should have the power, instead of wasting the time of the House by naming and suspending one after

another, to name and suspend them en bloc. But under this rule you are not going to have any action of the House or motion made which would involve any loss of time. Each man will necessarily be dealt with separately. He has to be accosted by the Serjeant-at-Arms, and he has to show that he does not yield to the action of the Serjeant-at-Arms. You cannot deal with them en bloc; that is impossible. Therefore, not for some of the reasons urged, but in the interests of unburdening the rule of superfluous words, I think they should be omitted. Another thing is that the rule as it stands is very bad grammar.

*MR. BLAKE: The grammar is bad, no doubt, but our objection to the rule is much more serious. The hon. Gentleman has put before the House an enormous change proposed to be made with reference to automatic action on a word from the Chair. And consequently he must recognise the greater necessity of avoiding a repetition of that which was the deepest humiliation of these whole proceedings, when the House was obliged a little time ago to acknowledge that it had taken erroneous action, and had unjustly condemned a colleague. Up to this time the question whether a Member should be suspended has had to be put to the House. On certain conditions Members might be suspended en bloc, but generally it is done separately, and always by vote. But what is now proposed is that on the simple announcement by the Speaker to the House that a Member or a number of Members acting jointly have not obeyed his directions, without the House having any opportunity of dealing with the question, they are by that mere announcement suspended, and this for the whole session. You therefore propose by one stroke to enormously increase the punishment, and enormously diminish the security for justice being done. All that we now suggest is that you should name A, B, C individually, instead of referring to them en bloc. I do think that calm and cool deliberation will lead the House to see that the Amendment is moderate, and that the rule as it stands is not only bad in grammar, but bad in principle.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): The rule as it stands is capable of a very serious and unjust interpretation. Take the case that happened on Tuesday night. Twelve Members altogether were suspended because they resisted by force the order of the House. It is true they resisted nominally, but they did not resist the police men who were called in. What would be the result of an order of the kind proposed? Some Members might protest against what they regarded as an injustice, but might not be prepared to go to the extent of compelling physical force to intervene. Suppose two or three resisted the police, but forty walked out of the House on the suggestion of the Serjeant-at-Arms. Surely to suspend all these forty Members forthwith for a whole session would be a gross injustice, and the Leader of the House I cannot contemplate that result. On Tuesday night two or three Members took part in resisting the police, but there were others who did not carry disobedience to that extent. One hon. Member walked out of the House at the suggestion of the Serjeant-at-Arms, and it would be exceedingly unfair that his constituents should be disfranchised, as would be the case if you are going to deal with them en bloc.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The rule only applies to those against whom, jointly, force would require to be used.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Exactly; that is what I want to point out. The Chairman reports that a body of Members demand the interference of the police; but it may be that only two or three would persist in disobedience to that extent. This is a question of the rights of the constituencies, and not that of the Members. And it would be exceedingly unfair that some constituencies should be disfranchised, not for the offence of their Members, but for the offence of Members representing other constituencies. If the right hon. Gentleman does not see the injustice of that, he has made it perfectly clear that he does not want to maintain the dignity of the House, but that the object is to disfranchise the whole of the Irish Members and their constituencies.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): We are dealing with Standing Order No. 21, which already provides, as my hon. friend has stated, that where Members are merely acting jointly it is within the power of the Speaker to name them jointly, and by one division settle the question whether or not they should be suspended. Now we proceed to go a step further. I do not see the necessity for these words being put in. The process is this. Members are suspended by the vote of the House. They are ordered to leave the House, and they refuse to leave. The Speaker directs them to leave the house, and they refuse to obey his direction, and then the Serjeant-at-Arms must go to each man individually and not to the Members jointly. He cannot possibly do that. He goes to A, who may get up and go out, and therefore A would be out of the business altogether, and there would be no necessity for calling in physical force. But B might say, "No, I won't go," and thus refuse to obey the direction of the Speaker, or the summons of the Serjeant-at-Arms. Then the Speaker, this being done in the view of the House, and the Members witnessing what is going on, says that physical force is necessary to secure compliance with his order. Then this new order; would apply only to that Member.

MR. DILLON: No, to all the rest. Why not strike out the words.?

SIR HENRY FOWLER: You cannot put a dozen men out jointly.

MR. DILLON: Yes, you can. The right hon. Gentleman misunderstands me. It is not a question of putting them out. It is a question of suspending them for the rest of the session.

SIR HENRY FOWLER: It simply comes to this, that the Speaker reports to the House; and the House itself is the judge at that moment; that a certain Member refuses to obey the order of the Chair, and that it is necessary to use physical force to secure that obedience. Following upon that report the individual Member is suspended under the operation of the rule.

MR. CRIPPS (Lancashire, Stretford): I think that what we are discussing is a mere verbal amendment. This really means that any Member who does not obey the order of the Speaker when summoned by the Serjeant-at-Arms comes under the penalty of this Order. Under these circumstances, the words "any Member" would in themselves be quite sufficient. The words "or Members acting jointly" might well be left out, and then the new Order would be in the simplest possible form. It would cover any Member who disobeys the Order.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury has made it perfectly clear that he means to disregard all suggestions coming

from this side of the House, and to rely on his majority to carry the motion. It would appear from the way in which the new rule is drafted that the First Lord of the Treasury has not very much regard for grammar; but there is something more than slipshod grammar. It is admitted that the other night a mistake was made in regard to one Member. I can say of my own knowledge that a mistake was made

in regard to two Members. Constituencies all over Ireland are to be disfranchised for acts their Members have not committed. I cannot for the life of me conceive how the Government, after what has fallen from the hon. and learned Member opposite, will stick to the phraseology of the Amendment which was hastily drafted. Surely nothing can be clearer than the fact that on Tuesday night a mistake was made by the Chair, unwittingly, no doubt. Would it not be a very great matter that the Standing Order should be so simplified that the disfranchisement for the remainder of the session of a large number of Irish Members of this House should not take place? How do the Government treat this Amendment of the hon. Member for East Mayo? They put up the English Attorney General, who in a few offhand phrases, and without paying any attention to the context of the Amendment, says that there is really nothing in the matter, and that he cannot accept the Amendment. Members get up on the Front Opposition Bench and point out the reasonableness of the hon. Member for East Mayo, and the members of the Government sit tight and keep mum, and they will call their obedient followers to support them in the lobby. This is but another illustration of the spirit that underlay their action on Tuesday night when the closure was moved. Surely the Government have something more to say about the Amendment. The only independent Member on the other side of the House who spoke on this matter is the hon. and learned Member who recommended to the House the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Mayo. Are they going to do nothing but rely on their majority, whipped up by a fire-line whip, to carry the motion? The only reply we have from the Government on this Amendment takes the form of a conspiracy of silence.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): I think the Government might very well, without any loss of dignity, reconsider the position they have taken up on the Amendment. I ask them to do so for two reasons. Their object is the same as that of Members on these benches who support the Amendment.

For the life of me I cannot understand the object of the Government in refusing to accept the Amendment. Is it that they imagine themselves so much above criticism? [An HON. MEMBER: No.] Why is it? Every speech made in support of it has been reasonable, and the hon. and learned Gentleman behind them stated that the Amendment was reasonable and carried out the object the Government had in view. It seems to me that we have a strong case for protest in this matter. This is a reasonable Amendment and ought to be accepted. I say it is not the duty of the Government, and it is not the duty of the Leader of the House, to put the authority in the Chair in the position in which the resolution will place him.

This Amendment might be the means of suspending fifty-Members of the House, and it might disfranchise a large number of constituencies. The House is very much divided as to the real meaning of the rule, and the exercise of it may bring

about an intolerable situation and place the Chair in a position which would give rise to the greatest dissatisfaction to the House at a moment when it is least desirable that dissatisfaction should be felt. I appeal to the Leader of the House not to shut his ears to the views which have been expressed in support of the Amendment. I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman in the interests of those who propose this resolution, and in the interests of the Chair, to accept the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman has made a direct appeal to me, and I am very unwilling not to reply to it. He asks me whether the Government have come down to the House with this resolution in a stereotyped form determined to resist all Amendments and to fight the thing through without a comma or a stop being changed. I hope that we have manifested that we have not done so, for we have already accepted an Amendment; I do not say of very great importance, but certainly an Amendment of substance; proposed by the right hon. Gentleman opposite. I do not think that any hon. Gentleman on the other side of the House who has argued this question has been able to prove that the rule as it is drafted will produce injustice.

MR. DILLON: Really I take an entirely different view. I think the rule as drafted might have this result, that the Serjeant-at-Arms might approach one or two Members said to be acting jointly, and might then report to the House that the whole body were acting jointly. Then a number of Members quite willing to go out might be suspended.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that result is possible under the Amendment suggested by the right hon. Gentleman, and we must consider the rule as if it were amended. The Serjeant-at-Arms would have to touch each Member separately.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: Then why do you want the words in?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The point I was putting to the House was that nobody pretends that injustice would occur.

MR. DALZIEL: Yes; we all feel it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman's own Front Bench say that they do not for a moment suggest that the words are likely to lead to injustice, nor do I see how injustice can be done.

MR. DALZIEL: It places on the Chair the duty of saving whether or not Members are acting jointly.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it extremely probable that Mr. Speaker also might make an appeal separately with regard to each individual if force was necessary, but I should imagine that in cases in which there was joint action the fact of each Member being separately touched would prevent the necessity of a separate appeal to the House in regard to each one of them. It surely is desirable that we should keep to the leading idea which governed the framers of the rule, that one of the most formidable dangers that this House runs is not from the isolated action of any individual disorderly person, but from the joint action of a number of Members. It seems clear that no substantial injustice can arise from the form in which the rule is drawn up. I think it is in conformity with the earlier part of the rule.

It keeps the continuity of the drafting from one clause of the rule to another,

and it keeps to the end of the rule that idea which dominated the original framers of the rule, that conspiracy or joint action to defeat the orders of the House on the part of any body of Members is one of the great dangers against which this rule is essentially directed.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): The right hon. Gentleman seems to have forgotten the ordinary rule of interpretation in law, namely, that when you find words which appear to be surplusage you are bound to try to find some other meaning for them. Our contention is that these words are pure surplusage, and I do not understand the right hon. Gentleman to argue that they are necessary. He refers entirely to the rest of the rule in order to find a certain model and style.

Nothing whatever is gained by keeping these words in, because all that Mr. Speaker has to do is to name each person individually. It is not a question of going to a division; it is not a question of consuming the time which divisions require; it is merely that an individual has to be named by Mr. Speaker. It is surely far better, in view of any possible accident that might occur, that Mr. Speaker should name each person individually than lump a number of people together. I agree with the hon. Member opposite, that this is purely a question of drafting. Any person, lawyer or not, who applies his commonsense to the rule and the draft order, and reads it leaving out these words, will see that all the object the Government can possibly have in view will be attained if this Amendment is accepted. Under these circumstances I make, one more appeal to them to give way on this point.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I think the rule has been framed in this form in order to cover the bungle made by the officials the other night in the case of the hon. Member for South Fermanagh. Under this rule it could be held that although a Member went into the division lobby, if he sat on these benches and some Irish Members were expelled he was acting jointly with them, and would be suspended also. These words introduce an altogether new element into the Standing Order; they import some of the conspiracy law, so that a Member who might be in any other part of the House could be held to be acting jointly with others, whereas the original rule was that they should be present together and disregard the ruling of the Chair. That is a very dangerous innovation. Even distinguished Members on the other side of the House cannot understand what the rule means in this form, and if you cannot understand it yourselves how can you expect us; uncultivated Members as we are called; to be able to follow it in all its devious windings? This conspiracy law can be stretched very far. I have been twice convicted of conspiracy myself;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is making no reference to the Amendment before the House.

MR. TULLY: I was trying to illustrate the danger of the resolution as framed by the Government by a case which came under my own knowledge. [Laughter.] This may be a laughing matter for lion. Gentlemen opposite, but it is framed especially for Irish Members, although it is very probable that the worst offenders and those to whom it is first applied may not be Irish representatives at all. These words "acting jointly" are very dangerous, and the Government would be well advised to accept the Amendment.

*MR. DUKE (Plymouth): I think it will be obvious to men who are familiar with the principles of drafting that the terms of description which are used in the Standing Order here proposed to be amended are Properly retained as the description of the class of Members with whom it is proposed to deal by this Amendment of the Standing Order, and for my part I agree with the Attorney General, if I may say so, in thinking that to drop in this part of the Amendment the form of words used in the existing Standing Order for the purpose of describing the persons to be dealt with by these punitive measures would involve some danger in the administration of the Standing Order. But I feel with hon. Members opposite that there is a danger that in the practice of the House the terms of the Amendment to the Standing Order would leave it open to the Speaker, or whoever might be exercising the powers conferred by the Standing Order, to deal collectively with, a body of Members who had brought themselves within its terms. I do not think that the proper mode of avoiding that danger is to omit the words of description which properly occur in the first line of the proposed Amendment. I think the proper mode would be to insert before the word "refuse" the word "respectively." Then the Member, or Members, of the House acting jointly, would be designated as persons who are appropriately to be punished by the action of the Chair, but there would be required a demand upon each Member severally for conformity to the order of the Chair. That demand would be made upon each Member for compliance and obedience, and if the individual refused to obey the order of the Speaker the penalty would follow. I am sure the Attorney General desires to have nothing in this Amendment to the Standing Order which would leave it possible for any such mistake as that of Wednesday morning to recur, and I think the suggestion I have made would leave both the principle of the Standing Order and the mode of its operation perfectly clear, and the case of each individual Member could be dealt with as might be necessary.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) said the proposal appeared to him to apply to Members who were jointly resisting the application of force. The meaning of the word was not very clear, and he would like the Attorney General to give some clearer explanation.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I think that if the Government yield to the Amendment moved from the opposite side of the House they will fall into a trap. The Standing Order as it stands provides for two cases; that of a single Member behaving in an improper manner, and also the case of a number of Members acting jointly. They are presumed to have been suspended, and if they are suspended at all, then, of course, they must be suspended for a week. This proviso adds a further punishment in

case, after having received the order from the Chair to leave the House, they refuse to obey that order. In that case the punishment is extended to the end of the session. The proposal, therefore, applies to two cases; single action and joint action. If the Government yield to this suggested Amendment, then the very ease which happened on Tuesday last will not be covered. The proposal clearly alludes only to such Members as refuse to obey the Chairman's direction, and I trust that the Government will not yield to this inducement which has been

offered.

MR. WALLACE (Perth): According to the statement of the last speaker, if Members act jointly they are suspended jointly, and afterwards you can deal with them individually. I presume that the Serjeant-at-Arms will approach each one of these Members and request him to leave, and then if they all refuse this rule comes into operation. Now, I have no wish to weaken the force of this resolution at all, but I do ask the Attorney General to consider this point, and inform us what he gains by keeping in these words. We have spent some hours discussing the point, and I do not think the words are necessary.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I agree that the discussion on this drafting Amendment has hardly been worth the time given to it. For the reasons given by the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth, I should like to adhere to the words "Members acting jointly," but what everybody appears to desire can be gained if we amend the Amendment which was originally suggested by the right hon. Gentleman opposite, by inserting after "shall refuse to obey the direction of the Speaker" the words "when severally summoned under the Speaker's orders by the Serjeant-at-Arms to obey such direction."

MR. CHAINING (Northamptonshire, E.): I suppose the object of this is to extend the rule to such deplorable scenes as were witnessed on Tuesday night. I think if you omit the words suggested you will be achieving that purpose, for they are admittedly surplusage. Even the Amendment suggested by the First Lord of the Treasury will not relieve the rule from the uncertainty which appears to prevail.

MR. DILLON: I have only got a word or two to say in reply to the First Lord of the Treasury. We know what happened on Tuesday night, and what is possible under the rule is that the Serjeant-at-Arms might order;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member has no right of reply on the Amendment.

MR. DILLON: I was simply going to say that I accept this Amendment, because I can get nothing better, and because it carries out to a considerable extent the object I have in view, although I think that object would have been accomplished better by my Amendment. I beg leave to withdraw my Amendment.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I beg to move in the third line after the word "Speaker" that occurs first, to insert the following words, "when severally summoned under the Speaker's orders by the Serjeant-at-Arms to obey such direction." I think these words prevent any possibility of doubt as to the meaning of our proposition.

Amendment to the proposed Amendment agreed to.

*MR. BLAKE: I must confess that I do not find that care taken in this proposal in regard to the announcement to the House of the offending Members which I think ought under such circumstances to be taken. There is nothing to say that the Speaker shall report to the House that A, B, or C are the persons who have refused to obey his direction. There is nothing to define upon whom the axe is to fall. The Speaker is simply required to announce that force is necessary in order that his directions may be obeyed. That seems to me to be an unsuitable method likely to produce added injustice. I suggest that after the words "Member

or Members" in the fifth line, the words "who have" be deleted for the purpose of inserting the words "named by him as having."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I accept that Amendment.

Amendment to the proposed Amendmend agreed to.

MR. DILLON: I propose to move an Amendment, if in order in doing so, to omit in line 6 the words after "thereupon" to the end, for the purpose of inserting, "be suspended from the service of the House for such period as the House may determine." I have not much hope of securing acceptance of this Amendment, but I do wish, before dealing with the proposed new Standing Order as a whole, to raise the issue in a clear and simple form as to whether you are going to put into the hands of any official the power to suspend a Member and practically disfranchise a constituency for possibly the greater part of a session. My proposal is that, the Speaker having reported to the House that certain Members have been named by him as having declined to act on his direction, and that force is necessary to compel them to do so, the House may proceed to deal with them as to the House seems best. I know that this will be open to the old objection that debate will ensue, and time be consumed. But I think if we are going to deal with five or six Members we should have a debate. It is, however, perfectly easy to amend the Amendment. The course of proceeding would then be, that the Leader of the House, having all the circumstances of the case in his mind, would report to the House on the report of the Speaker, and move a motion to suspend the Members for one month or six months. Consider what you are asking. It is to put into the hands of the Speaker a most unreasonable power; for, mark, towards the close of the session the punishment would be no punishment at all, but a farce. At the beginning of the session, however, there would be no alternative but to suspend for the whole of the session. I want to leave it to the House to assign the amount of the punishment, and I am prepared to accept an Amendment on my Amendment that the question should be put to the House for acceptance without debate.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, as amended, in line 6, to leave out from the word "thereupon" to the end of the proposed Amendment, as amended, in order to add the words, "be suspended from the service of the House for such period as the House may determine.";(Mr. Dillon.)

Question proposed, "That the words 'and without further Question put' stand part of the proposed Amendment, as amended."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman has put his Amendment before the House in two alternative forms. Under the first form, which was that put from the Chair, the House is to decide after debate on the length of the sentence of deprivation; but the hon. Member suggests another form, in which the rule would still be one of summary jurisdiction. As to the first form, the very fact that it permits debate would entirely destroy the value of the rule. It is absolutely necessary that there should be no debate. The rule must remain an addition to the summary jurisdiction of the House. The alternative form is open to this vital objection, which perhaps no one feels so keenly as I do. The idea is that the Leader of the House is to propose that "Mr. So-and-so" and "Mr. So-and-so" should be deprived of the right of sitting in the House for one, two, three, or

four months, according to the sweet will of the Leader of the House, and that that proposition is to be immediately decided by the House without debate. I have been called a great many hard names in the course of the debate; and I may be the tyrant which I have been represented; but I can assure the House that my appetite for absolute power would be surfeited long before I would consent to exercise the jurisdiction with which the hon. Member wishes to entrust me. Imagine the Leader of the House having to make, on the spur of the moment, a rough estimate of the relative wickedness of a number of Gentlemen, and proposing rapidly to the House punishments corresponding to the scale of wickedness. Imagine also the position of the House having to vote "Aye" or "No," without debate or deliberation, on the proposal of the Leader of the House. In neither form is the proposal of hon. Member admissible, and I hope the hon. Gentleman will not persevere with it.

*MR. BLAKE: The hon. Gentleman has pointed out a difficulty attending summary jurisdiction in the exercise of a discretion as to what punishment should be imposed, whether for one, two, three, or four months. I wish to point out the bearing of these difficulties in the plan which he himself has proposed to the House. He suggests with all the weight of his authority that the punishment should always be the extreme punishment. Under the rule the Member is to be suspended for the longest period for which you can suspend him at all. The very worst is to be done. And the opportunity of making that worst a little less, and of thus making the punishment a little more proportionate to the case, is what the hon. Gentleman now rejects, because his emotions will not permit him to discharge that pleasing duty.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): The supporters of this Amendment forget another fatal objection, namely, that it would involve the taking of another division, and they ignore the fact that the proceedings of the other night prove that it might be made physically and materially impossible to take a division at all. Unless that is provided against we shall play into the hands of those who organised these proceedings. ["Withdraw!"] I fully accept the statement of the hon. Member for Waterford that the proceedings of the other night were not organised, but after that experience it would be madness to assume that no such proceedings would ever be organised in the future. In making provision against such an occurrence the Government are doing no more than their duty. We must be ready for the same kind of thing being repeated, and any kind of rule which makes it possible for Members to make a division physically impossible will fail in its object. The desire of the hon. Gentleman is quite clear. He wants to have some differentiation made between offences varying in character. But the rule does that already. In any case there is an equally good way of obtaining the same object. If the rule provided that there should be this instantaneous and automatic suspension until the pleasure of the House was further known, the same object would be attained. But the rule as it stands secures that object, because there is nothing whatever to prevent the House from voting the suspension of any of its Standing Orders. The essential thing is that the House should remain master of the time and manner of taking any proceedings in the direction of clemency.

MR. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfordshire, St. Alban's): The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition said that the question of time would be one of the matters which would lead to great difference of opinion, and I imagine that the Amendment we are now discussing is moved because it is supposed that the proposal of the First Lord is too severe. But circumstances may easily occur in which it will not be severe enough. If such an offence as this rule is aimed at should come at the end of the session, the punishment proposed will be practically nil. I quite agree with the hon. Member for East Mayo that this is not a question of punishment at all. It is a question of protecting the House from breaches of its rules. It is essential that we should so protect it, and all who have heard the speeches of the hon. Members for Water-ford and East Mayo must see that they do not hold out any hope of our not having in the future such scenes as we have had in the past, but, on the contrary, they plainly threaten a repetition of those occurrences. I consider that it is a question not so much of the individuals who make these disturbances, as of the constituencies who return men to this House who are unable to conduct themselves properly; they should be taught by experience that this House will not tolerate such scenes, and they should have the opportunity of thinking over the matter until another Parliament has assembled, so that they can then select men who are more fit to occupy positions as Members of this House than those who have so disgraced themselves. This question has nothing whatever to do with whether the First Lord acted in a grossly tyrannical manner;[Cries of "Order, order!"]

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. VICARY GIBBS: I imagine I was going beyond the scope of the Amendment, but I could not hear your words, Sir, in consequence of the uproar. I consider that the time allotted under this Standing Order may be far too short instead of too long. This is a most serious question, involving the credit of the House in the country. If the House

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Carlile, William Walter

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Causton, Richard Knight

Fenwick, Charles

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Cautley, Henry Strother

Ferguson, R. C. M. (Leith)

Aird, Sir John

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

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

Allan, William (Gateshead)

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

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)

Cawley, Frederick.

Finch, George H.
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Allsopp, Hon. George
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.
Fisher, William Hayes
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Fison, Frederick William
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
Arrol, Sir William
Chapman, Edward
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Charrington, Spencer
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Flower, Ernest
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Forster, Henry William
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Foster, Sir M. (London Univ.)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fuller, J. M. F.
Baird, John George Alexander
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Garfit, William
Balcarres, Lord
Colston, Charles E. H. Athole
Gibbs, HnA. G. H.(CityofLond.

Baldwin, Alfred
Colville, John
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J.(Manch'r)
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Gladstone Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Balfour, Rt nGerald W (Leeds
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Balfour, Maj KR(Christchureh
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.
Banbury, Frederick George
Gorbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Gordon, Hn J. E.(Elgin&Nairn)
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Hartley, George C. T.
Craig, Robert Hunter
Gordon, MajEvans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Cranborne, Viscount
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Crombie, John William
Goschen Hon. George J.
Beckett, Ernest William
Cross, Alexanler (Glasgow)
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Bell, Richard
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Graham, Henry Robert
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Grant, Corrie
Bigwood, James
Cust, Henry John C.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Bill, Charles
Dalrymple, Sir (Charles
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Blundell, Col. Henry

Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Greene, SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-shire
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Bond, Edward
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Grenfell, William Henry
Boscawon, Arthur Griffith-
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.
Gretton, John
Bousfield, William Robert
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Groves, James Grimble
Bowles, T. Gibson(King'sLynn)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Brassey, Albert
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Duke, Henry Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Brown, Alexander H. (Shrop.
Duncan, James H.
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hambro, Charles Eric
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Dyke, Rt. Hn. William Hart
Hamilton, RtHnLordG.(Mid'x
Bull, William James
Edwards, Frank
Hamilton, Marqof(L'nd'nderry
Bullard, Sir Harry
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Harcourt, Rt Hon. Sir William
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph D.

Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashfrd
Burt, Thomas
Emmott, Alfred
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Butcher, John George
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Faber, George Denison
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'th
Caldwell, James
Fardell, Sir T. George
Harwood, George
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.

does not mark with sufficient severity its sense of what has taken place, it will lose its position in the eyes of the country. On that ground I think the Government, if they make any alteration in the resolution, should make it in the direction of increased severity rather than of leniency.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 413; Noes, 79. (Division List No. 43.)

Haslett, Sir James Horner
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Richards, Henry Charles
Hay, Hon. Claude George
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Rickett, J. Compton
Hayne, Rt. Hon.CharlesSeale-
Majendie, James A. H.
Ridley, Hn. M. W.(Staly bridge
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Malcolm, Ian
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Heath, James(Staffords, N. W.
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Heaton, John Henniker
Markham, Arthur Basil
Robertson, Herbert(Hackney)
Helder, Augustus
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Robson, William Snowdon

Heltne, Norval Watson
Massey-Main waring, Hn W. F.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Henderson, Alexander
Mather, William
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Maxwell, RtHnSirHE (Wigt'n
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Maxwell, WJH(Dumfriesshire
Round, James
Hoare, EdwBrodie(Hampstead
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Hobhouse, C. E. H.(Bristol,E.
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Russell, T. W.
Hobhouso, Henry(Somerset, E.
Milner, Rt. Hn. SirFrederickG.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Milton, Viscount
Sadler, Col. Sadler Alexander
Horner, Frederick William
Milward Col. Victor
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Horniman, Frederick John
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. ThosMyles
Hoult, Joseph
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Howard, Capt J. (Kent, Favers.
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Howard, J.(Midd., Tottenham
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Scott, Sir S.(Marylebone, W.)
Hozier, Hn. JamesHenry Cecil
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Seely, Charles Hilton(Lincoln)
Hudson, George Bickersteth

Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Seton-Karr, Henry
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Morrell, George Herbert
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm Lawies
Morrison, James Archibald
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Moulton, John Fletcher
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Joicey, Sir James
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea
Muntz, Philip A.
Smith, HC (North'm b Tyneside
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Smita, Samuel (Flint)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Soares, Ernest J.
kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Newnes, Sir George
Spencer, Rt. Hn CR (Northants
Keswick, William
Nicholson, William Graham

Stanley, Hon Arthur(Ormskirk
Kimber, Henry
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Stanley, EdwardJas(Somerset
Kinloch, Sir John G. Smyth
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Kitson, Sir James
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Stevenson, Francis S.
Knowles, Lees
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir JohnM.
Lambert, George
Palmer, SirCharlesM. (Durham
Stock, James Henry
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Law, Andrww Bonar
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Stroyan, John
Lawrence, William F.
Parker, Gilbert
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Lawson, John Grant
Parkes, Ebenezer
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Partington, Oswald
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw.H
Paulton, James Mellor
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G.(Oxf'dUni.
Lee, CaptA H(Hants. Fareham
Pease, Herb.Pike (Darlington)
Tennant, Harold John
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Peel, Hn. WmRobert Wellesley
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pemberton, John S. G.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Penn, John
Thomas, J A(Glamorgan, Gow'r

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Percy, Earl
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Leng, Sir John
Pilkington, Richard
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Leveson-Gower, FrederickN.S.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Thornton, Percy M.
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.
Plummer, Walter R.
Tollemache, Henry James
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Tomkinson, James
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Long, RtHn Walter (Bristol,S.)
Price, Robert John
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Lowe, Francis William
Purvis, Robert
Valentia, Viscount
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Pym, C. Guy
Wallace, Robert
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Randles, JohnS.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Rankin, Sir John
Warner, Thomas C. T.
Macartney, RtHnW. G. Ellison
Rasch, Major Frederick Carne
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Macdonald, John Cumming
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)
MacIver, David (Liverpool)

Reckitt, Harold James
Webb, Col. William George
Maconochie, A. W.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E.(T'unt'n
M Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John L.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim,E.)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W. R.)
M'Crae, George
Renwick, George
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Williams, Col. E. (Dorset)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Williams, RtHnJ. Powell-(Bir.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H.(Yorks.)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Woodhouse, Sir JT(Huddersf'd
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E. R.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Sir William Walrond and
Wilson, F.W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Mr. Anstruther.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
NOES.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Ambrose, Robert
Harrington, Timothy
O'Malley, William
Atherley-Jones, L.
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Mara, James

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Black, Alexander William
Jordan, Jeremiah
Pirie, Duncan V.
Blake, Edward
Joyce, Michael
Power, Patrick Joseph
Boland, John
Kennedy, Patrick James
Reddy, M.
Boyle, James
Labouchere, Henry
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Brigg, John
Lloyd-George, David
Redmond, William (Clare)
Broadhurst, Henry
Lough, Thomas
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Burns, John
MacDonnelli, Dr. Mark A.
Roche, John
Caine, William Sproston
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Cameron, Robert
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sullivan, Donal
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Carew, James Laurence
Mansfield, Horace Kendall
Tully, Jasper
Carvill, Patrick George H.
Mooney, John J.
Weir, James Galloway
Channing, Francis Allston
Murphy, J.
White, George (Norfolk)
Cogan, Denis J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph

Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Delany, William
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Dillon, John
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Duffy, William J.
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Yoxall, James Henry
Elibank, Master of
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Ellis, John Edward
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Farrell, James Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Mr. Patrick O'Brien and
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Mr. Haviland-Burke.
Hammond, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): Perhaps I ought to apologise, being of such junior standing and experience in the House, for introducing an Amendment of so much importance in the discussion of a question which is necessarily so delicate and in my opinion of the utmost gravity. I only venture to do so because my feeling in the matter is a very strong one, and if there be, as doubtless there may be, Members of longer standing who are inclined to criticise my action, I hope I may mitigate their ill opinion by the studied moderation which I desire to display.

I have listened with great interest to the greater number of the speeches delivered in this debate, and I think only that of the lion. Member for the Mansfield Division reflected the view I am anxious to urge upon the House. What is the feeling of the great body of sober and well-judging people in this country about violent disorder? I am not speaking of the past, I do not desire to speak of the past, I am speaking of the future; the disorder that has to be dealt with should

it arise under the Amendment of the Standing Order which has been proposed I am satisfied that the great body of sober, well-judging people of the community, who are, let us not forget, the true governors of the country, entertain feelings of repugnance against violent disorder which are not to be described by milder terms than abhorrence and contempt. If this House as a body

were to show itself unable' to deal with that kind of disorder, it would pass away as a body enjoying any moral authority, it would cease to be what the House of Commons has been in the past. I will not dilate at any length on the moral authority of the House of Commons. I will only submit two aspects of it. We hear often of the infringement of the rights of private Members, and it cannot be denied that there is going on a transfer of political power from the House of Commons to the Cabinet. I am not thinking of this Cabinet or of that, but of the Cabinet as an institution. The Cabinet is apparently an institution which is grow-

ing in influence and in repute with their countrymen; it is the House of Commons which is apparently losing it. Why is it that appeals for the rights of private Members fall, outside the walls of this House, on deaf ears? Why is it that nobody cares outside these walls about the rights of private Members? Because there is a deep-seated feeling that the House is an institution which has ceased to have much authority or much repute, and that when a better institution, represented by the Cabinet, encroaches upon the rights of a worse one, it is a matter of small concern to the country. But there is another institution in the country which the Members of the Opposition are accustomed to regard with great jealousy; I mean the House of Lords. Hon. Members opposite are accustomed playfully sometimes to remind us that, whereas we employ the closure or encroach on their rights now when we are in a majority, we will suffer when we are in a minority. I will venture to address a similar argument to them. The time may come when hon. Gentlemen opposite will be in a majority and they may be anxious to rally popular support in a contest or dispute with the House of Lords. In such a case, of course, the active matter in dispute is of great importance, but there is also the element of the moral authority of the two Assemblies that are in conflict. Is the moral authority of the House of Commons growing stronger as against that of the House of Lords? I would remind the House how the House of Lords was employed on Tuesday evening. There was a debate in which men of great eminence took part. There were sharp divisions of opinion and even sharp criticisms, but they were expressed with the utmost dignity and decorum; attributes which the great body of English people admire and expect in a Senate.

MR. DILLON: They have no closure.

LORD HUGH CECIL: The issue is of the greatest possible importance. If this House fails in moral authority, the whole balance of the Constitution is upset. If it decays, another set of institutions will take its place which we may live to regret, and hon. and right

hon. Gentlemen opposite perhaps more than anyone else, if they do not make a stand against that disorder which must destroy an institution in the esteem of the country. It may be said that the Amendment I intend to propose is of a more drastic character; that it militates against legitimate opposition, or might be used improperly against those who oppose a measure, perhaps with some extravagance, but still substantially fairly and properly. Let me remind the House of the most celebrated opposition of recent times; that to the Home Rule Bill. It may be held by hon. Gentlemen opposite that that Opposition was

unreasonably, obstructively conducted, but in no solitary case did any of those who were opposing the Home Rule Bill come in conflict with the Chair. In the last Parliament the Voluntary Schools Bill was vehemently opposed, but no Member was suspended during the proceedings upon it. On the Agricultural Rating Bill it is true that during an all-night sitting a large number of Members were suspended. But these cases would be beyond the scope of and would not be affected by the Amendment. The Standing Order as framed is not adequate to the gravity of the occasion in my view. Suspension is a remedy which varies in effect with the period of the session in which it is imposed. At the present time it would be very severe, later in the year less severe, and in July hardly a penalty at all. So it is not a good remedy. Violent conduct in the House is not only an offence against Parliamentary orders and manners, but an offence against the ordinary law of the land; it is a criminal offence. If the violence were done in the street those who committed it would suffer imprisonment. Why should violence when it is aggravated by a gross Parliamentary offence be more leniently treated here? Sober, well-judging people do not draw a distinction between Members of Parliament and other persons; if they do, it is to expect a higher degree of morality and orderliness from their legislators. "Why," they ask, "if a Member of Parliament is violent and assaults those acting in the execution of their duty, should he not be punished with the imprisonment which would

overtake one of ourselves?" I think the punishment of imprisonment will express our indignation against the offence, and that is one of the great objects of punishment.

Sir, I will end as I began, by appealing to the opinion of the community. In our country the constitution is not written in a document. It is not amended by formal legislation. It grows in one direction or another. It is hardly possible for an observer to trace its growth. A custom grows up one hardly knows how, and there is a change. Be sure of it, that if we neglect disorder it will gain a hold on the House, and the usefulness and power of the House will be gone never to return. Though we have conducted ourselves in a light vein, we are engaged in the gravest constitutional question which has been before us since the Home Rule Bill. It goes to the vitals of the Constitution. I have no scruple in moving that imprisonment should be assigned for the offence of violent misconduct. Imprisonment for such an offence in the House is not unknown. It was formerly the chief punishment for disorderly conduct in the House. On Tuesday night it would have been perfectly lawful for the Speaker to have committed every Member who was then guilty of disorderly conduct. What I am proposing is that the authority of the Chair, which may be exercised under the order of the House, should be exercised without the order of the House. A more constitutional proposal could not be made. I beg to move the Amendment of which I have given notice.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment;

"In line 6, after the word 'put,' to insert the words 'shall be committed to prison until the further order of the House, and shall.'";(Lord Hugh Cecil.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted in the proposed

Amendment, as amended."

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: My noble friend has moved an Amendment and he has made a speech. I draw a distinction between the speech and the Amendment. With the great body of the speech I agree. I thought his

speech an impressive statement of fact. I think many of the dangers which he has signalised are real dangers. I think it is true that if this House is to retain, as I believe it still retains, the great position which it occupies of authority in the country, it can only do so by seeing that its rules are respected and that order prevails within its walls. I do not go into certain, aspects of the question brought forward by my noble friend. He travelled into far regions. I feel that I could not with advantage, on the present occasion, follow him into the respective developments to which he referred of Cabinets and Parliament in the way of a balance, or the growing or waning influence of the House of Lords and the House of Commons. These are considerations which lead far beyond the necessities of the occasion, but they were not out of place in the speech of my noble friend, because he desired to present his own strong and earnest convictions of the vital interests with which we have got to deal in discussing the Amendment of the Standing Order now before the House. Therefore, though I cannot comment adequately in the space of a speech on his proposal, with the general trend of his argument I have no particular desire to quarrel; but when I look into his speech I find a lack of cohesion, a certain want of rigid political logic, between the means and the ends. Though the ends aimed at by my noble friend are excellent, the means are not, I think, likely to achieve them.

My noble friend took objection to our proposal on the ground that the punishment to be meted out will diminish as the session goes on, so that towards the end the punishment would be very small. My noble friend forgot to notice that that objection; and I think it is a weakness in the Standing Order; attaches as much to the Standing Order as it stands as it attaches to the Standing Order proposed by us. My noble friend is under the impression that a Member in prison towards the end of the session would not be released when the prorogation arrives.

LORD HUGH CECIL: Even a short period of imprisonment would be an improvement.

Mr. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Send for two resident magistrates.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My noble friend does not quite follow me. I was not touching on that part of his speech in which he seemed to indicate that the punishment we propose would be unequal. I was arguing that our punishment was unequal, and that the inequality attaches both to imprisonment by the House and to suspension. I leave that argument, because I understand my noble friend now abandons it. I am not at all sure that there may not be cases of disorder and violent acts for which the punishment provided would be totally inadequate; but remember we are dealing with a summary and automatic procedure, and that in dealing with that procedure it is essential that the punishment should not go beyond a certain amount. Now, Sir, let it be noticed that the House maintains all the powers it at present possesses. Nothing in this rule affects the existing powers, but it strengthens the action of the House in ordering suspension for the session. It is open to the House to amend the rule and inflict severe punishment. It is also conceivable; I trust it is only

conceivable, not probable, not measurably probable; that criminal proceedings might have to be taken against a Member of this House. After all, the immunities of this House do not extend to committing with impunity a crime in this House which out of it would be a punishable crime. But when my noble friend suggests that as part of an ordinary rule we should have this procedure, let me call the attention of the House to a few considerations. I gather that he feels that imprisonment is not a punishment that can be inflicted without the power of revision by the House. How would that work in practice? Let us suppose for the sake of argument that a deplorable scene, similar to that of last Tuesday night, again took place. If this rule were passed, the Members who were guilty of taking part in that scene would be at once sent to prison. For the rest of the session the question would always be arising, Is the House to release them or is it not to release them? How is that question to be decided? Is any Member to have the power of raising the question when he likes as a question of privilege? Is it to be brought forward, let me say, by the hon. Member for Water-ford whenever he thinks his friends have been sufficiently long in prison? Is he to have the right to say to the House that the sentence should be brought to an end? If it does not rest with individual Members, is it to rest with the Government? If it is to rest with the Government, I have to say to my noble friend that we cannot take upon ourselves this duty of considering and reconsidering how long the sentence ought to be of any Gentleman who has been imprisoned by the House. It is not a fair responsibility to put upon the Government. It is not a responsibility which, as part of the ordinary procedure, I should recommend the House to adopt, and it is inconsistent with the automatic and summary character of the whole of these proceedings. I therefore think that the machinery my noble friend proposes is open to the gravest objections. There is another objection. My noble friend regards imprisonment as a very severe punishment. I have known cases where a great deal of cheap martyrdom has been derived from imprisonment.

MR. DILLON: The Jameson case.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have known cases when a great deal of cheap martyrdom was very easily obtained by confinement as a first-class misdemeanant, and of course it is only as a first-class misdemeanant that this House has the power to confine anybody. And there have been those who have been cynical enough to suggest that a time might come when, as part of a conspiracy to excite sympathy outside the walls of this House; outside, perhaps, even the four corners of the United Kingdom; there might be a scene got up within the precincts of the House. I cannot imagine, if such a scene were got up with this dramatic intention, how that intention could be more admirably fulfilled than by committing to prison as first-class misdemeanants those who took part in that let me say, for a week at the end of the session. I strongly urge my noble friend to consider whether his own view would be furthered were we to accept his Amendment. For my own part, I feel quite clear that the House, in adopting this rapid, ready system of administering justice and meting out punishment, would be very ill-advised if it were to inflict a sentence, possibly perfectly proper in itself, but which would only be proper after all the

precautions of an elaborate trial. When I add to these considerations the fact that imprisonment itself may be a punishment more in appearance than in reality, and that it may call forth a stream of sympathy with the offender to which he is not entitled, I think all these considerations taken in their cumulative effect make a conclusive case against the proposal of my noble friend.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N. W.): I cannot help feeling a certain measure of respect for the manner in which the noble Lord, a new Member of this House, has lectured this ancient assembly. The House of Commons has become democratised, and there are hon. Members in it of all classes. It is the fashion of the class to which the noble Lord belongs to speak in somewhat supercilious contempt of the democratised House of Commons. But the noble Lord will permit me to say that through the vast multiplicity and complexity of the duties of Parliament there has been a tendency in recent years to concentrate power in the hands of Ministers, and to trench on the reasonable rights of private Members. There is none the less growing up among Members; at any rate, among thoughtful Members; the opinion that the abstraction of the time of the House of Commons by the Government is approaching something of the nature of a public scandal, which will have to be resisted at no distant date by very definite action on the part of private Members. Although I have been fifteen years in the House, I have never ventured to touch on questions of procedure previously, because I thought that such matters should more properly, be relegated to the care and discretion of the experienced and older Members.

I approach this subject with the greatest reluctance, but with reference to the Amendment of the noble Lord I may say at the outset that I do not think he has given due consideration to the practical effect of the operation of any such rule as he suggests. For

my part, I believe with a distinguished Member of the Conservative party now gone; Sir Stafford Northcote; that the greatest security for the decorum and dignity of this House is the placing of the fullest responsibility on the Members of the House, and that the more you apply restrictions and punishments the greater will undoubtedly be the sense of weakened responsibility, and the greater the risk of confusion. Does the noble Lord really suppose that he is going to raise the standard of honour and dignity of this House, and increase the sense of self-respect of its Members, by keeping permanently; or more or less permanently; a considerable contingent of its Members in prison? The idea is as fantastic as it is absurd. Further, let me ask the noble Lord not to test this question by his own fastidious notions of what imprisonment may mean. Does he suppose that the Irish Members are likely to be deterred from doing what they believe, rightly or wrongly, to be their duty by imprisonment? On the contrary, it would be an additional incentive. It would not be from any desire for cheap martyrdom, as the First Lord of the Treasury cynically observed. It would be from a desire to show that they are willing, in spite of any dangers and penalties, to serve what they conceive to be the interests of their country. In conclusion, I desire to say that I have at heart, as much as any hon. Member opposite the maintenance of the decorum and dignity of this House. I will go further, and say that I believe that the bulk of the Irish Members have the

honour and dignity of the House equally at heart, [Laughter.] Hon. Members may laugh, but I cannot forget; having been a long time in this House; that there was no man more jealous of maintaining proper discipline among the Irish party than the late Mr. Parnell. He resorted to obstruction, but never did he tolerate, encourage, or permit any deviation from the strict course of gentlemanly, honourable, and Parliamentary conduct. That is a view which I know will be shared by the older Members of the House. I consider that no greater stain or slur has in my humble judgment, been ever inflicted on the House of Commons; and I fully associate myself with what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition on the subject; than when it was invaded, no doubt in obedience to proper authority, by the police. By all means maintain the dignity and prestige of this House; but I for one believe that that object can best be secured by increasing and not by diminishing the sense of individual responsibility.

LORD HUGH CECIL: I do not think this is an occasion on which I can usefully serve any purpose by dividing the House against the Government. I would therefore ask to be allowed to withdraw my Amendment. [Cries of "No."]

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: The noble Lord having introduced this startling proposition ought certainly to allow the Members of the House to have the advantage of discussing it at some reasonable length. The noble Lord seems to have been greatly influenced in his decision by the speech of his relative the First Lord of the Treasury. I am sure the right hon. Gentleman must wish that all his speeches would have an equally ready effect on all Members of the House. But as the noble Lord has been kind enough to propose that certain Irish Members should be sent to prison because they perform what they conceive to be their duty in this House, I think he will admit that it is reasonable that Irish Members should be allowed to say a few words on the subject. Personally I should not have intervened in the debate were it not for what I undoubtedly thought was a rather ill-natured remark which fell from the First Lord of the Treasury on the question of imprisonment. He spoke of having some knowledge of cases; where they occurred he did not say, but we all know where he was alluding to;

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Not in Ireland.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND: The right hon. Gentleman now says that these cases were not in Ireland, and I am very glad to have that disclaimer, because I and a number of other Irish Members suffered imprisonment under the right hon. Gentleman's rule in Ireland, and the hard labour we had to perform, and the bread-and-water diet to which we were subjected, ought, at least, to have protected us from the cheap taunts of the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I was not thinking of anything that occurred in Ireland. The cases which I had in mind were not Irish but English cases, and cases of first-class misdemeanants.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I at once accept the disclaimer of the right hon. Gentleman, but it does not altogether impress me, because the right hon. Gentleman knows what a number of Irish Members suffered in the way of imprisonment for doing what they considered to be their duty.

Now the noble Lord is really very hard to please. We know that the historical

records of his noble house are stern and grim records in many respects, but surely he might have allowed the Irish Members to carry out what they conceive to be their duty in this House without subjecting them to imprisonment. What does the noble Lord mean? He belongs to a great family, which dominates every single great Department of the State; the Admiralty, the War Office, and the Foreign Office; and now it appears that nothing will satisfy him except to put everyone in prison who does not agree with him. All I can say is, that if this proposition is carried out it will not in the slightest degree deter any Irish Member from acting in the way he considers he ought to act, and further, I believe that there is not a single hon. Member in this House who imagines that there is any Irish Member who would be deterred by the paltry threat of a few months imprisonment from doing what he conceived to be his duty. A more outrageous and, at the same time, a more ludicrous proposal was never heard in this House. The noble Lord spoke at some length of public opinion and its effect on this House and on the House of Lords. I think his proposal to-night shows to some extent the state of abject panic into which public opinion in this country has allowed itself to drift in connection with the proceedings of Tuesday last. We hear of good feeling having been outraged, and of acts having been committed within the House which would not have been tolerated outside it. If illegal acts were committed by the Irish Members, it was to protest against what would be protested against by every portion of the community, against what I would call little short of the robbery of the taxpayers by imposing millions on millions of taxation at one sitting, without allowing a single representative from Ireland to say a word as to whether he thought that the taxation was to be expended justly or not. We are entitled also, in considering this Amendment, to consider the causes which led up to the scene which took place. I say that if a fair limit of time had been allowed for discussion no scene would have taken place, and I tell the noble Lord that there is no Legislature in Europe;

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question before the House is whether imprisonment should be ordered. The causes of the disorder last Tuesday cannot be gone into.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I have no desire to stray in the slightest degree from what is appropriate to this Amendment, but I thought I was entitled to answer the noble Lord and the references he made. I will pass from the subject by saying that there is not one of these legislatures which would have tolerated the closure which took place in this House. The noble Lord referred at length to the House of Lords. Some hon. Members seemed to think that that was not altogether relevant to this Amendment, but I should think that on a question of imprisonment a reference to the House of Lords would be always quite in order, for it is a proposal that might be more reasonably looked for from the House of Lords than from the democratic House of Commons of Great Britain. The noble Lord has not gone far enough, and I submit to him that instead of withdrawing this Amendment he should do what I have no doubt he would like to do, what I have no doubt many Members opposite would like to do, and what I know their forefathers did in days gone by with the Irish people's representatives, and that is to cut this matter short by making a rule that hon. Members who may disobey under any

circumstances shall be committed not to prison, but to the Tower of London and forthwith decapitated.

COLONEL NOLAN (Louth, S.) said that such an Amendment as they were now discussing should, he fancied, have come from those responsible for the conduct of the business of the House, and not from so close a connection of the head of the Government. The noble Lord who moved the Amendment was treading on somewhat dangerous ground. The hon. and gallant Member did not for a moment say that disobedience to the orders of the Chair was not a serious offence, but the punishment that had been proposed by the Government was political and it was very severe, for the suspension of a Member for possibly six months practically meant the disfranchisement of the constituency. But that was not a personal punishment. It was reserved for a near relative of the Prime Minister to propose for the first time in that House that a period of imprisonment should be given.

He hoped that most of the hon. Members, even on the other side of the House, would not try to push their opponents too hard. He hoped they would not thirst for, he would not say the blood, but for the imprisonment of offending Members.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Although the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich has asked leave to withdraw his Amendment, still he has presented an exceedingly grave issue to the House, and has done good service by proposing the Amendment. He is the only hon. Member who seems to appreciate in full the gravity of the situation. It is true that his view is different from that of his relative the First Lord of the Treasury. He proposes that the Member guilty of the offence should be punished; the Leader of the House proposes that the constituency should be punished. Of the two, I must say that I think the noble Lord the more logical. At the same time he has presented an exceedingly important issue, not merely to the House but to the country. The noble Lord says there is a decline in the influence and authority of the House of Commons. He might have gone further, and said that that decline was contemporaneous

with the two Unionist Governments which have been in power. This is really a very important matter. I think the House of Commons will pause even at this hour and consider really whether either the noble Lord or the First Lord of the Treasury has hit upon the real cause. The noble Lord says that certain disorderly Members must be punished. He says that the Amendment proposed by the First Lord of the Treasury is inadequate. I say it is not merely inadequate, but it is absolutely irrelevant to the cause of the whole disturbance. Let me take the three cases instanced by the noble Lord, and they are most singular cases. The first case was the Education Bill. Let us examine that for a moment, and the House of Commons can easily discover who is at the bottom of this decline in its authority. What was done in the case of the Voluntary Schools Bill? A Bill was introduced of a most important character, which created a perfect revolution in the educational machinery of this country. It proposed to hand over to the ecclesiastical authorities the management of half the schools of the Kingdom, and what did the First Lord of the Treasury do? He came down and said he would carry the Bill. He would listen to no Amendment, not a single comma was to be disturbed. The House of Commons was not allowed to deliberate and criticise. It had nothing to do but to register the decision of the First Lord, who himself

did not understand the Bill. All I can say is that this is reducing the business of this House to a farce.

*MR. SPEAKER: The noble Lord referred to two or three cases in which there was great feeling. That does not entitle the hon. Member to discuss the merits of the Bills.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I was simply going to point out that the Amendment of the noble Lord had nothing whatever to do with the cause of disorder. The cause of disorder is not to be found in anything he referred to. The same thing applies to the Agricultural Rating Bill, which is another of the cases he referred to.

*MR. SPEAKER said it would not be in order to discuss the merits of the Bill.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Then, I shall be in the position of not being allowed to substantiate what I have stated. As long as it is perfectly understood that I shall not be in order in pursuing that matter, I shall not carry that further. There is the last illustration, which I think will be absolutely relevant. The noble Lord said they had there the gravest constitutional question of modern times, but there was no conflict with the authority of the Chair. The noble Lord has not acquainted himself with the history of that particular transaction. I have just been consulting Hansard about it. An order was given to clear the House for a division, which is exactly analogous to the present case; the very thing that has precipitated this rule. I One Member; and I believe he is a Member who has to-night been denouncing the disorderly conduct of the Irish Members, who has been saying that they are not fit to be Members of the House, and should be expelled; turned round and said, "Do not let us go out," and stimulated his colleagues around him to acts of disorder. What happened in that case? After all, we are supposed to be here on a basis of equality, but I am not clear that it is anything beyond a mere supposition. There are hon. Members here from Ireland in a permanent minority, belonging to a different race, and with a different attitude towards the Imperial Parliament. They have not yet been reconciled to the Imperial Parliament. I think they represent a country which has suffered a good deal at the hands of the Imperial Parliament. That is acknowledged by both parties in the House. Nobody denies it, and both parties endeavour to effect a remedy, each in its own way. I say, in a case of that kind it is the business, and it ought to be the pleasure, of the Imperial Parliament to treat the Irish Members with even a greater amount of indulgence than Members belonging to other portions of the United Kingdom. But what happened in the case? am referring to, when English Tory Members of Parliament grossly and openly defied the Chair? No one got up and moved that Mr. So-and-So be named. The First Lord of the Treasury talks very solemnly to us about the dignity and honour of this House. Where was he then? He was present. Did he rebuke the Members? Did he get up and dissent;

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is entirely misrepresenting history. He is not stating the facts.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg the First Lord's pardon. I have been acquainting myself with the history within the last few minutes. I am simply giving a case which is strictly analogous;

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is mistaken. I was not in the House; he

says I was.

Mr. LLOYD-GEORGE: This case;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; There is an Amendment before the House, and this detailed discussion with regard to the Home Rule Bill is not in order.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I am sorry if in replying to the First Lord's observations I was disorderly, but I think I am entitled to reply to the challenge of the noble Lord to Members on this side of the House by that precedent. He says. "This is how we conducted ourselves."

LORD HUGH CECIL: My argument was that no one was suspended.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: That is exactly my point. The only difference between the two cases is that nobody interferes with English Tory Members; they are not punished; but the First Lord makes them Ministers at the first opportunity. More than that, there was not a single Irish Member sitting here on Tuesday night who offered violence to anybody. But in this other case the Member for Fulham did that.

A LORD OF THE TREASURY (MR. HAYES FISHER, Fulham): I hope the hon. Member will make some approach to accuracy. I altogether deny that I offered any violence to any Member; [An Hon. Member: We saw you.]; until the hon. Member for the Harborough Division came across the floor of the House and made an attack upon me.

*MR. SPEAKER: Anything that took place between the hon. Member for Fulham and the hon. Member for the Harborough Division is surely not germane to the point under discussion.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Of course I am sorry if I have travelled beyond the point of issue, but I have not travelled an inch beyond the precedent set me by the noble Lord, and, in justice to an absent man who is at present ill, I think I ought to be allowed to say that the hon. Member for the Harborough Division was not guilty of touching the hon. Member for Fulham.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; Whether the hon. Member for Fulham or the hon. Member for the Harborough Division was the more to blame in a transaction which took place in 1893 has nothing to do with the matter under discussion.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE: All I say is that I congratulate the First Lord of the Treasury, who moves this amended resolution and approves of the speech but not the Amendment of the noble Lord, that he has selected as one of those responsible for maintaining discipline in his party the hon. Member for Fulham. There is no reason why the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich should be ashamed of his Amendment; he has presented the case fairly between the two parties in the House; he resorts to the good old Tory principle that punitive measures are the only ones with which to deal with cases of this kind. We say that you ought to get at the root of the difficulty, and deal with that. The worst thing you can do is to peddle with these little Amendments of the Standing Orders instead of dealing with the real evil itself. The fact of the matter is this: You will effect nothing by this Amendment of the Standing Order. You have got to deal with the real difficulty, and that is that you are governing a nation against its will. The First Lord has referred to the precedents that occurred during the last five years. But he knows very well that during that time there was no real

Opposition, and the precedents that then occurred are of no use at all. We have now from Ireland

a resuscitation of the Nationalist movement, and what has disturbed the House is, if I may say so, the reappearance of the Irish banshee in its midst. We have here a motion for imprisoning the Irish Members for protesting against the mismanagement of the business of the House by the First Lord of the Treasury, and for standing up for the rights of their constituents. We are engaged in crushing out a nationality 6,000 miles away, and imagine that we are going to do it in a few weeks; but here we have a nation which has for 700 years protested against your rule.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): The speech of the noble Lord excited in me feelings of astonishment and of indignation. He and others have spoken of the degradation of this House and the gradual diminution of its authority. I accept the statement as accurately describing the feeling of the world outside this Assembly. This degradation was partly or largely caused, at least for the moment, by the action of some of my lion, friends the Members from Ireland, and the House has now for nearly an hour and a half, with the sanction and approval of the Leader of the House, as the guardian of its honour and dignity, been discussing the question whether or not the right of Members to exercise their duties in this House should subject them to imprisonment. Talk of the degradation of Parliament, when the son of the Prime Minister; not a young and untried man from Ireland, but a Member of this House for years; has the courage, I use the word "courage" because I wish to be polite, to come here and declare that a Member of this House because of his nationality should be subject to imprisonment because he protests against what he considers to be a wrong done to his country; I say because of his nationality, because some of those who are to night the loudest advocates of order and dignity did exactly the same thing as the Irish Members did on Tuesday night, with this difference, that they were rewarded by office, while the Irish Members were turned out of the House. Did I not see the hon. Member for Fulham sit in his seat for twenty or thirty minutes absolutely declining to leave the House or join in the division, shouting and howling at the then Chair-

man of Committees, and defying his authority? Yet he was never suspended I even for one hour. I am not saying this in any spirit of rancour or bitter recollection; the hon. Member was suffering from strong political excitement;

MR. HAYES FISHER: So also was the hon. Member himself; He shouted out "Judas Iscariot";

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea): But he did not get the thirty pieces of silver.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I should have thought that tenderness for the political reputation and susceptibilities of one of his most illustrious colleagues would have suggested to the hon. Member that it would be just as well not to remind the House of that. But I do not find fault with hon. Members because under violent political excitement they took strong action. I do not think the worse of any man who holds strong opinions and who, when he considers those opinions are not fairly treated, expresses his views in strong words. My complaint is that because they were Englishmen they were permitted to do these acts of

violence and grave political disorder without even rebuke from their own leaders or from the great and distinguished man who held the chair in the House. They escaped all blame whatever. The Speaker and that great Leader of the House (Mr. Gladstone) took what I believe was the right attitude, namely, they turned something of a deaf ear and a blind eye in that time of grave political excitement, instead of degrading the House as it never was degraded before, by the introduction of police within the walls of this Chamber.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member desires to blame my conduct he must do it by a substantive motion. The hon. Member is now attacking the Chair in the most unjustifiable manner.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: In obedience to your ruling, which in the interests of Ireland I think it always right to obey, I will not pursue that line of argument further; but I trust I may address the Leader of the House, and contrast him with the Leader of the House at the time to which I was referring. The then Leader of the House, who was always in his place, and in that way was always able to keep order and good repute, let the incident pass, and the result was the violence and high feeling were forgotten in a few days. Therefore I have justified my statement which I made in the case of the noble Lord that his Amendment is for the purpose of imprisoning Members of this House because of their nationality, and not for any other purpose.

The Leader of the House made a speech in reply to the speech of the noble Lord. I do not wish to suggest to the First Lord of the Treasury the manner in which he should discharge his duties on an occasion like this, but to treat seriously this monstrous proposition, this gross outrage upon the dignity and honour of this House, as if it were a serious proposition; to discuss for twenty-five minutes a proposal that Members should be imprisoned because they are Irishmen; to treat a speech and an Amendment like that seriously, is a reflection upon the dignity and the honour of the House. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich makes his speeches in good taste as a rule, but to-night he has made an almost impudent motion. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House has spoken of the cheap martyrdom of imprisonment, but I will tell the House what I think of this proposal. The noble Lord

AYES.;Nil.

NOES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Balfour, Rt. Hon.G. W. (Leeds
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Acland- Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Balfour, Maj.KR(Christchurch
Brown, Alexander H.(Shropsh.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Banbury, Frederick George
Brown, George M.(Edinburgh)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bartley, George C. T.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Aird, Sir John
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Bull, William James
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Ambrose, Robert
Beckett, Ernest William
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Bell, Richard
Burke, E. Haviland-
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Burns, John
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bigwood, James
Butcher, John George
Arrol, Sir William
Bill, Charles
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Black, Alexander William
Caine, William Sproston
Ashton, Thomas (Iair)
Blake, Edward
Caldwell, James
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert II.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Atherley, Jones L.
Boland, John
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Bond, Edward
Carew, James Laurence
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitz Roy
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Carlile, William Walter
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Bain, Colonel James Robert

Boyles, James
Causton, Richard Knight
Baird, John George A.
Brand, Hon. Arthur (J.
Cautley, Henry Strother
balcarres, Lord
Brigg, John
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Broadhurst, Henry
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)

says that one of the reasons why the authority of the House is going down is because the power is passing from the House to the Cabinet, and that is one of the reasons why the authority of the House is going down. I quite acknowledge that the repute of this House is going down in the eyes of the country. It will go down further if it is to be the duty of the House simply to register the decrees of Ministers without debate; to neglect and forego the greatest of all its duties, namely, the careful scrutiny and criticism of the expenditure of the country and its various departments. The noble Lord says the power is passing into the hands of the Cabinet. That is a very serious statement considering the composition of the Cabinet. What does it mean? The Cabinet consists practically of members of one family, and everybody knows that every family in the history of the world is governed by the Benjamin of the family. And therefore, as the House will plainly see, what the noble Lord, this young Cromwell, really has in his mind is that the one true remedy for the salvation of the House, for the restoration of its repute, its honour, and its dignity, is to entrust the liberties of the Irish Members to the youngest son of the noble house of Cecil. Question put.

The House divided:; Ayes, nil; Noes, 426. (Division List No. 44.)

Cawley, Frederick
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Labouchere, Henry
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Lambert, George
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Couliding, Edward Alfred
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Graham, Henry Robert
Law, Andrew Bonar
Channing, Francis Allston
Grant, Corrie
Lawrence, William F.
Chapman, Edward
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)

Lawson, John Grant
Charrington, Spencer
Green, Walford D. (Wed'sbury)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Greene, Sir E. W. (BrySEdm'nds)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William Edw. H.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Grenfell, William Henry
Lee, Capt. A. H. (Hants. Fareham)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Gretton, John
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Cogan, Denis J.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Griffith, Ellis J.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Groves, James Grimble
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Leng, Sir John
Colville, John
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Lloyd-George, David
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Hall, Edward Marshall
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G. (Mid'x)
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S)
Cranborne, Viscount
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nderry)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Hammond, John
Lough, Thomas
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
Lowe, Francis William
Cust, Henry John C.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Dalziel, James Henry
Harrington, Timothy
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Davies, Sir Horario D (Chatham)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemouth)
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Macartney, Rt Hon W.G. Ellison
Delany, William
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Macdona, John Cumming
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Dimsdale; Sir Joseph Cockfield
Hayden, John Patrick
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Hayne. Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Maconochie, A. W.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fd. Dixon
Hayter, Rt Hon. Sir Arthur D.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Heaton, John Henniker
M'Crae, George
Duffy, William J.
Helder, Augustus
M'Dermott, Patrick
Duke, Henry Edward
Helme, Norval Watson
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb., W.
Duncan, James H.
Henderson, Alexander
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Majendie, James A. H.
Edwards, Frank
Hoare, Edw. Brodie(Hampstd.
Malcolm, Ian
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Hobhouse,C. E. H.(Bristol,E.)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Elibank, Master of
Hobhouse, Henry(Somerset, E.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Elliot, Hon. A. RalphDouglas
Hope,J.F.(Sheffield,Brightside
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Ellis, John Edward
Horniman, Frederick John
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W. F
Emmott, Alfred
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Mather, William
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Hoult, Joseph
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir HE (Wigt'n
Faber George Denison
Howard,Cpt. J. (Kent,Faversh.
Maxwell, W. J. H(Dumfreissh.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Farrell, James Patrick
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil

Middlemore, John Throgm'rt'n.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Milton, Viscount
Ferguson, B. C. Munro(Leith)
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Milward, Colonel Victor
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Fisher, William Hayes
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Mooney, John J.
Fison, Frederick William
Jessel, Captian Herbert Merton
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Johnston, William (Belfast)
More, Robert Jasper (Shropsh.)
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst.
Flower, Ernest
Joicey, Sir James
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Flynn, James Christopher
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'nsea)
Morrell, George Herbert
Forster, Henry William
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Morrison, James Archibald
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptf'd)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Joyce, Michael
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport
Gartit, William
Kearley, Hudson E.
Moulton, John Fletcher

Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary(St. Albans)
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Muntz, Philip A.
Gladstone. Rt. Hn HerbertJohn
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Murphy, J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Kenyon-Slanev, Col. W. (Salop.
Murray, Rt Hn A.Graham(Bute
Godson,SirAugustusFrederick
Keswick, William
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
Kimber, Henry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Kitson, Sir James
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Gordon,Maj Evans-(T'rH'mlts
Knowles, Lees
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Nicholson, William Graham
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Rentoul, James Alexander
Tennant, Harold John
Nolan, Col. John F.(Galway, N.
Renwick, George
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Rickett, J. Compton
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Ridley,Hn M. W.(Stalybridge)
Thomas,F.Freeman(Hastings
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Ritchie, Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Thornton, Percy M.
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipp'r'ry, Mid

Roche, John
Tollemache, Henry James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Tomkinson, James
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.
Ropner, Col. Robert
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Round, James
Trevelvan, Charles Philips
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Tufnell, Col. Edward
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Russell, T. W.
Valentia, Viscount
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan
O'Malley, William
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
O'Mara, James
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Webb, Col. William George
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Saunderson, Rt. Hon.Col. E. J.
Weir, James Galloway
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Welby, Lt.-Col.A.C.E.(T'nton
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
White, George (Norfolk)
Parker, Gilbert
Seton-Karr, Henry
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Sharpe, William Edward T.

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Partington, Oswald
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Paulton, James Meflor
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Simeon, Sir Harrington
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Williams, Rt. Hn. J. Powell- (Bir.
Percy, Earl
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Perks, Robert William
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Pilkington, Richard
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Pirie, Duncan V.
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.
Plummer, Walter R.
Soares, Ernest J.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (North'nts
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Purvis, Robert
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Wrightson, Sir, Thomas

Randles, John S.
Stock, James Henry
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Stroyan, John
Young, Commander (Berks, E.
Reckitt, Harold James
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Reddy, M.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Yoxall, James Henry
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Sullivan, Donal
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Redmond, William (Clare)
Talbot, Lord E. (Colchester)
Sir William Walrond and
Reid, James (Greenock)
Talbot, Rt.Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Uni.
Mr. Anstruther.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I really wonder that the right hon. Gentleman, with his intelligence, should have wasted so much of the time of the House. As a matter of fact, the right hon. Gentleman brought on this change in the Standing Order because certain of our hon. friends resented the action of the Government, and under circumstances of great irritation insisted on remaining in the House after you, Sir, had ordered them to divide. But has it not occurred to the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury that there is no earthly reason why Members should not sit here while a division is going forward? Does the First Lord of the Treasury think that the rule to oblige Members to clear out of the House into the lobby is of ancient order? It was only by a decision of Mr. Speaker Brand that it commenced; there is no Standing Order to that effect, and all that Mr. Speaker Brand's decision has done has been to keep us from coming into the House. Sometimes we find ourselves in the House, and we have to decide whether we shall vote aye or no, and, for my part, on one occasion I had the privilege of voting with my right hon. friend, although I had the very strongest objection to going into the Conservative lobby.

My suggestion is that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury should now follow the example of his noble relative, and so far from anyone opposing such a proceeding, we shall all accept it with pleasure. If he were to do that, and bring in later a resolution that Members who happened to be in the House when a division is called may remain in the House, then that matter might be discussed. Why,

Sir, I remember an occasion in the time of Mr. Speaker Peel when the Colonial Secretary remained in the House. At the time of the division the Colonial

Secretary had disappeared, nobody could find him, and he did not take part in the division; but directly after the division he appeared again. As a matter of fact, the right hon. Gentleman was in the precincts of the House when the doors were locked, and was in the same illegal position as certain hon. Members upon the benches behind me were on Tuesday night. He was behind your chair, and in the same way, on Tuesday, hon. Members would very likely have disappeared if they had known where to go. I suggest that the right hon. Gentleman should put an end to this difficulty, and put an end to the clearing of the House when a division is going on. If the right hon. Gentleman does not take that course we ought to look upon this matter as one in which the offence which was committed by the Irish Members has been committed by English Members over and over again. This is making a racial question of it. I do not for a moment wish to minimise their dereliction from the rules of the House, and I do not wish to excuse it. Hon. Gentlemen opposite, no doubt, find themselves in a difficulty in this matter. We as Members here owe allegiance to the House, and as Members we are bound to obey you. Sir; but we owe allegiance also to our constituencies, and when one allegiance conflicts with the other we are in a difficult position. We must recollect that on Tuesday night those hon. Members who violated the rules of the House, at the same time considered they were unjustly treated and were not given the full opportunity, which they claimed and had a right to as representatives of large constituencies in Ireland, to discuss the Vote. I do not defend their action. What I do say is, that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury does not understand the true cause of this crisis. If you sit day after day upon the safety valve of a machine the machine will finally explode, and that is exactly what the right hon. Gentleman has done here. Day by day he takes privilege after privilege. Only last week he took away a great privilege in connection with ways and Means, so that after a few hours discussion on education all these Votes were passed without any discussion whatever. Had the right hon. Gentleman wished to consult our views he would have got up shortly after dinner and said that we had had an interesting discussion on education, but there were other Votes to be disposed of, and suggested that the discussion upon education should have been brought to an end. Had he done that, no doubt hon. Members would have assisted him, but the closure was moved upon this matter after all the time had been consumed by the Education Vote, and no discussion whatever had taken place on the many other matters included in the Estimate. I was shut out, as a matter of fact. I had gone home in the belief that the sitting would be adjourned; otherwise I should have remained here, for I had intended to move an Amendment that the Vote should be reduced by half. I gather that the right hon. Gentleman is not going to take my advice, and therefore I beg leave to move the Amendment to leave out the words, "during the remainder of the session," and insert in their place, "for two months." The right hon. Gentleman does not appear to quite realise what a session may be. A session may extend over a year, and it does seem a very hard thing that because an hon. Gentleman violates the rules of the House his constituents are to be disfranchised for over a year. It is a monstrous proposition. You have at the

present time a punishment. If a Member of this House does not obey your ruling he may be suspended for one week, or two weeks, or a month. I was suspended myself, curiously enough, on one occasion for a short period; but if I had been suspended for two years it would have been a very different thing. See how it would operate. Supposing the hon. Member for Westminster, one of whose constituents I happen to be, comes up and refuses to obey your ruling and gets suspended for two years, why should I, as his constituent, be disfranchised? because, after all, he may be a useful Member. I give that as an instance, and I suggest that the suspension should be for two months, which I think is far more reasonable than the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman. We have in all these matters borne very patiently the alterations in, and Amendments to, Rule 27, The first step was taken some time ago. We are now asked to go a step further, but if we are to have such a resolution as that which the House is now discussing, let us have it by degrees. Let us have the two months suspension first. Why do you take the entire session? I cannot understand your doing so. Look at the position of the Irish Members here. Do you suppose if all the Irish Members refused tomorrow to go out of the House into the division lobbies anything would be gained by such a resolution as this? There could be nothing more dangerous or more serious or far reaching in its consequences than Ireland being practically unrepresented in this House; her Members suspended going over and agitating in Ireland, holding conventions, and saying "We cannot represent you in England for they suspend us and will not let us speak." Having regard to the peculiar relations existing between this country and Ireland, I urge the Government, I urge hon. Gentlemen opposite, to support me in this Amendment to reduce the suspension for two months instead of the rest of the session.

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment, as amended;

"In line 7, to leave out the words 'during the remainder of the session,' in order to add the words 'for two months.'"; (Mr. Labouchere).

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment, as amended."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think the Amendment of the hon. Member has been supported by his arguments, and I cannot accept it.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said the important point to look at in the subject under discussion was upon whom the punishment fell. In this case the punishment fell not upon the Member, but upon the constituents he represented in the House, because if a Member of the House disobeyed the order and was suspended his constituents would be without a representative in the House. Now a constituency had a right to a representative in this House, and to take away that representative for an unlimited period by the suspension of the Member whom they had sent to Parliament, would be a very flagrant scandal. No doubt many Members on the Government side of the House were foolish enough to believe that it would be better to have no Irish constituency represented, but if this rule were carried he might point out that there would be this danger. If an hon. Member was suspended for such a period as the rest of the session it would be his duty not to allow his constituents to be unrepresented, and he would take

such steps by applying for the Stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds so as to ensure that his constituency should be represented, if not by him by somebody else. He thought, under the circumstances, it would be very unwise for the right hon. Gentleman to press for the rule.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) did not desire at this late hour of the night to take up the time of the House, but at the same time thought that the subject under discussion was sufficient to justify all the attention that could be given to it. What hon. Members felt who supported the Amendment was that the proposal of the Government was too severe to deal with such offences as had given rise to its being brought forward. He would be the very last person to defend what had occurred on the previous Tuesday. The ruling of the Chair must be obeyed, but at the same time he could see that in that case there were many extenuating circumstances. One of the greatest dangers that the House had to face at the present moment was the constant misrepresentations which were made in the Press and, incidentally, the mischief it did in the country by engendering false ideas of what was done in the House. In order to point out how the proposals of the Government were too severe on this occasion he would deal with what he considered the extenuating circumstances, and show why the Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton was quite sufficient to meet the justice of the case. He attributed the outbreak which took place on Tuesday night, not so much to what actually occurred on that evening to bring it about, as to a system which was calcu-

lated to bring about such a lamentable occurrence at any time. The opinion held by hon. Members sitting around him was that two months suspension would be quite sufficient to meet the necessities of the case. They looked with dismay on the possibility of a penalty which would disfranchise constituencies for a whole session. They considered that the policy which should be adopted in a case of this sort should be one more of conciliation than of severe treatment and punishment. If there was a revolt or a revolution against a system of Government, it was clear that injustice must have been originally at the bottom of it. He warmly supported the Amendment of his hon. friend the Member for Northampton, he would not vote against the Amendment of the Government, but would abstain from voting on the main question, because he did not wish it to be imagined that he impugned the authority of the Chair.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): It appears to me that it would be wise for the Leader of the House to accept the Amendment, especially if he wants to impose an effective punishment. I am quite certain that under the Amendment proposed by the Leader of the House the punishment would be very small indeed. We all know quite well the hon. Members at whom it is aimed. They come from constituencies where there were not contested elections. What would be the result of this new Standing Order? We will suppose that some scene occurs similar to that which took place the other night, and that a dozen Members come under the rule. They are suspended for the remainder of the session. They would accept the Chiltern Hundreds, they would go back to their constituencies, and they would be immediately re-elected. What would be the position of the hon. Members when they came back? Would they be allowed to take their seats? I do not believe anyone

would venture to contest their election. The punishment, therefore, would be extremely slight. I sincerely trust that we may now adjourn the debate in order to give reasonable time for the consideration of the rule. I cannot vote at all on this Amendment, and yet I would like to vote upon it. There is nothing I dislike more than to leave the House without voting. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made and Question proposed, "That the debate be now adjourned."; (Mr. Caine.)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We have had very ample discussion of the motion. I hope the hon. Gentleman will not persist in his motion for the adjournment.

MR. CAINE: The reason why I moved the adjournment was that we may have time to consider the Amendment as amended.

MR. LOUGH: The right hon. Gentleman will admit that we on this side have addressed ourselves to the debate in a, very praiseworthy and industrious spirit. I would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that two hours have been wasted in a perfectly futile and meaningless Amendment moved on the other side of the House. It was a shocking proceeding; I might almost say, I have never seen it equalled in the House. The noble Lord who moved it had not the courage to vote for his own Amendment. ["Oh, oh!"] I am afraid I am introducing a little heat, and I do not want to do that. I wish to make a reasonable appeal to the right hon. Gentleman. I think we might have another day to discuss the subject. There is no urgency about the matter at all. By accepting this proposal the right hon. Gentleman will, on the whole, lose no time, and he will do something to allay the bad temper which has been aroused.

MR. BROADHURST: May I join in the appeal to the First Lord of the Treasury? He dismissed the question as to whether the suspension should be for two or six months in the most airy manner. We have sat here now for something like eleven hours continuously, and that is more than any hon. Member ought to be called upon to do. I do say that it is most unseemly that at this hour of the morning [2.10] the House should be called upon to continue the consideration of a subject of this importance. We have certainly not had time to realise the importance of the Amendments that have been introduced. I support the motion for the adjournment of the debate, and I hope the First Lord of the Treasury will see how reasonable it is both in the interest of himself and Members who are exhausted.

MR. DILLON: I agree with the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich that the matter which the House has been discussing to-night is of infinitely greater importance than hon. Members have any idea of. It occurs to me that the noble Lord, although not very successful with his Amendment, was the first Member who really placed this question in its true light before the House as regards its importance, because up to the time he spoke the subject had been treated in a light and airy fashion as if it were only a matter, if I may use the expression, of hammering the Irish Members. It is a very large question. I think this question affects the very essence of the power and prestige of this House, and it is of vastly greater importance than hon. Members appear to understand, because it is only a step on the road. You are only taking the first step to-

night. Whatever other qualification I may have I can speak of this. I do not suppose there is a man in the House who has greater experience of this than I have, and I warn the First Lord of the Treasury and the Members of the House that this rule will do no good. It will be ineffective, and you will be called upon to take another step. The question has been discussed by us reasonably and with application to the point. The only time that has been wasted was that taken by the noble Lord in moving a bogus Amendment and by the First Lord in delivering a prolonged eulogium on the noble Lord's speech, whereas those of us who are defending our rights have addressed ourselves strictly to the matter under discussion throughout the evening. I myself have a further very important and eminently reasonable Amendment to propose later on, and it is not fair to ask us to go on with this discussion at two o'clock in the morning.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): As one who was concerned in and associated myself with the protest made the other night against the use of the closure, I wish to urge the House to vote for the adjournment. This matter has been altogether too hurried. Before the passions which were aroused on Tuesday night have been given an opportunity

to cool, this matter has been, brought before the House and is being forced through without adequate discussion. I am an entirely new Member, but I must say that the way the procedure of the House and the closure are used to force matters through has surprised me. I did not come here to do penance for the occurrences of Tuesday night, but in the heat of the moment;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; I must remind the hon. Member that the only question before the House is the motion for adjournment.

MR. O'MARA: I am merely explaining how this method of forcing business through the House strikes a new Member. We have a right to discuss these matters fully and entirely, and we are going to avail ourselves of that right, but I protest against having to discuss them at two o'clock in the morning. My past life has not fitted me to be here considering such questions at this hour. These coercive measures are the only measures we get from the Treasury Bench, and I rise merely to suggest that time should be given us to collect our thoughts and to allow the angry passions aroused by Tuesday night's proceedings to cool down.

MR. TULLY: I think one of the reasons why the adjournment should be granted is that so few Irish Members have spoken in the course of the debate. This is a measure aimed directly at the Irish representatives, and those whose rights are imperilled ought certainly to have an opportunity to discuss the matter thoroughly. We want to know how this rule would apply in the case of an hon. Member who, if he were expelled from the House for the remainder of the session, resigned his seat. That point ought to be considered by the right hon. Gentleman.

*MR. SPEAKER: That point does not arise on the adjournment.

MR. TULLY: I am only giving reasons for the adjournment.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member might claim to argue every Amendment and every line of the Amendment upon that ground.

MR. TULLY: Well, Sir, I think we on these benches have not been treated fairly as so very few of us have spoken, and the First Lord ought to accept this

motion.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): It seems to me, personally, that this motion is a reasonable one under the circumstances. I shall vote for the Amendment of the Government when it is finally put, but I think the House ought to recollect that this Notice appeared on the Paper only this morning. It is a very important motion, affecting every Member of the House. We have considered it, as I think the right hon. Gentleman will admit, with good temper and without any attempt at obstruction or improper discussion, and the speeches have not, at all events, been confined to this side of the House. Seeing that we had not seen the rule in print until this morning, and that in the course of the debate certain Amendments have been accepted, so that it is now in a different form from that in which we have it on the Paper, I think a reasonable compromise, and one which I venture to suggest, would be that we should dispose of the Amendments to-night, and then have the motion reprinted for some future occasion. We should then be able to judge more properly whether the rule as amended required any further alteration, or whether it could be accepted as it then stood.

MR. DALZIEL: In consequence of this motion appearing on the Paper only this morning, we have been unable to put down any Amendments, and consequently we have had to move Amendments without notice, which have been very difficult to understand. This is a very important alteration in the rules governing the procedure of the House, and we ought certainly to see the resolution in print as it is proposed to be adopted before we give our final vote upon it. That surely is a very moderate demand to make. At the same time I would point out that by suspending the Twelve o'clock Rule the House did not necessarily commit itself to an all-night sitting. The interpretation of such a suspension has always been that about half-past one or two o'clock the House should review the situation according to the circumstances of the case. Suppose we agree to divide upon the Amendment which has been moved and then adjourn.

To-morrow the Army statement is the first Order. In the ordinary course of things that would be over before dinner. This motion could be put down as second Order, and we should then have an opportunity of calmly reviewing the whole question. Another course would be to dispose of the Amendment now before the House, and put the motion down as first Order to-morrow, with the understanding that it shall be disposed of before dinner. I imagine the former would be the better alternative for the right hon. Gentleman, and without delaying the House further, I hope he will see that there is at any rate a strong case for full consideration before this alteration is finally adopted.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I think the suggestion is a reasonable one, and I would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman that he should favourably consider it. I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman can seriously desire to force this rule through at one sitting by the use of the closure. When this rule was originally proposed in its modified form in the year 1880 it took several days to pass. In the year 1882, when it was extended not nearly so much as it is now proposed, it took several days discussion. If the right hon. Gentleman desires that any real moral weight should attach to the decision of the House he would be wise, I

think, to accede to the proposal which has been made by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy. What is that proposal? It is not that he should give us a complete Parliamentary day for the purpose of this discussion, but it is that after the Secretary of State for War has made his statement and unfolded his scheme to-morrow, and after the debate upon that subject is adjourned the remainder of the day should be voted to finishing the discussion on this matter. That is not a large claim to make, and as it affects the business of the House so little, I suggest that it would be a wise thing for him to accept that suggestion and agree now to the adjournment of the debate on the understanding that it can be taken up to-morrow after the Army debate has been adjourned.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): I hope the right hon. Gentleman will accede to this appeal which has been made to him, and I think he ought to do so when he reflects that the original piece of work which he put before the House is now almost unrecognisable. I have some further criticisms to offer to the House on the Amendment as it stands now, and I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that my criticisms will not be directed towards defeating the object of this Amendment, but will be in favour of making the new Standing Order a better piece of workmanship, and I would recommend the right hon. Gentleman in the interval to consult with his friendly opponents on this side of the House in order that we may come to some friendly understanding. I think I may promise the right hon. Gentleman that my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition will be willing to take part in a friendly discussion, and if this course is adopted we may arrive at an improvement upon the Amendment as it now stands. I do desire that this Standing Order shall reflect the care and wise thought of this House, and that no Order shall be put upon our books in haste.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: A large number of hon. Members have appealed to me to adjourn this debate, but I think that in one respect they have treated me rather ungratefully. I have accepted their Amendments, and now they are using that as a reason for adjourning the debate by saying that they wish to see the rule printed. It is perfectly true that Amendments have been accepted, but I think it is impossible to consider this rule in isolation from the general condition of business before the House. If I could consider it in isolation I should be glad to meet the wishes of hon. Members, whether they agree with me or not. The hon. Member for Kirkcaldy threw out a suggestion that we should take it after the statement of the Secretary for War to-morrow. I suppose that my right hon. friend's statement will be opened early in the evening, and if the House can come to some arrangement by which we can be assured of a substantial amount of Supply to-morrow I shall be willing to make the sacrifice. I see that the hon. Member for Waterford smiles at that.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: My smile means that if the right hon. Gentleman desires to facilitate the business of Supply the best way to do it would be to try and conciliate hon. Members by making a reasonable concession such as we ask.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am always desirous of being as conciliatory as possible, but Supply must be got through. I believe there are eighteen Votes to be got

through, and unless I can get a satisfactory assurance that substantial progress will be made with the Estimates I am afraid we must proceed with the debate. I hope hon. Gentlemen will not think that I have approached this question in any tyrannical spirit, but the reason is that we have to absolutely get through the Estimates by a certain day.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Unfortunately the Civil Service Estimates, to which, the First Lord of the Treasury referred, are of considerable importance, and I should say that it is very difficult to enter into any sort of arrangement regarding them.

They include such subjects as Uganda, Ashanti, business in South Africa, and other matters of very considerable importance, and I do not think it will be a good thing to enter into an arrangement to burke discussion on South Africa. It would be an exceedingly bad arrangement, and there has been really too much of that sort of thing. I think the First Lord of the Treasury should consider this on its merits. Here we are discussing an Amendment of our procedure of the most vital importance. We have only got to interpret it with what has happened this week in order to see its importance. If this rule had been in operation last Tuesday twelve constituencies would now have been disfranchised for the rest of the session, and such a proposal is to be rushed through after only twenty-four hours notice, before there is a full opportunity to discuss it. This is perfectly unprecedented. I should have thought that two sittings of the House would not have been too much for a matter of this kind, and I do ask the right hon. Gentleman to consider this matter on its merits. We have still one Amendment not disposed of, and some other Amendments have to be moved.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It would be very difficult for anyone to give a pledge as to what would take place to-morrow. I think we all recognise in the right hon. Gentleman's last observations a most reasonable spirit, and, before speaking of what may happen on other days, I would venture to press very strongly upon him that whatever we may say of this now Order I do not think anyone who is interested in, and who has the good feeling of the House at heart, can contemplate very pleasantly the hurrying through of this proposal in an all-night sitting. I do not think that any time has been wasted upon it except a certain waste of time for which those on this side of the House have not been responsible. I never knew a more unnecessary expenditure of time than that which was devoted to the Amendment of the noble Lord the Member for Greenwich. I think the whole of that episode was so much lost time. Therefore, I think we have a strong claim upon the Government for a postponement of this debate. As to-morrow is a nondescript day, with nothing definitely announced for it after the statement by the Secretary of State for War, I should have thought that the remainder of the day might be taken up by resuming the debate upon this rule. I do hope that the right hon. Gentleman will be able to come to an arrangement of that sort, and I can assure him that I shall use every influence I possess, if he agrees to this course, to keep the discussion of the various topics within reasonable limits, and I do not think I can do any more.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I quite admit that it is a disagreeable thing to have to do business in these hours of the morning, but business must be done even in these hours in order that the necessary financial business may be finished before 31st

March. Of course if hon. Members will consent to make some arrangement of a definite character in regard to the business to-morrow I would be disposed to adjourn the debate.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The only arrangement that can be made is that suggested by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy; and that is that after the Secretary for War makes his statement tomorrow the debate should be adjourned, and the rest of the sitting should be devoted to the discussion of this rule. It is absurd to imagine that half an

hour would suffice. If the Government do not agree to this suggestion, let them closure the whole discussion now and take upon themselves the discredit of passing a penal law of this kind without fair and proper discussion.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): A most reasonable proposal has been placed before the House by those who have moved the adjournment of the debate. We have been at this discussion for eleven hours, and if it concerns anybody in this House in particular, it concerns the Members from Ireland. The rule is directly aimed at their liberty, and at the liberty of their constituents; and we maintain that it is only just and right that those whom it most affects should have a proper opportunity of studying the rule and seeing its bearing in every aspect. It only appeared on the notice Paper this morning, and most of us have not had the opportunity of carefully studying the rule. If we had we possibly might be ready with some Amendments. I maintain that the House is at a disadvantage in not having these Amendments in print before us. For that reason alone I think the motion for adjournment is essentially a reasonable one. The right hon. Gentleman seems to think that the time has been wasted on these benches; but I venture to say that very few of us have up to this time taken part in the discussions, although some of us are bound to express our views in regard to the new rule. If there has been any unreasonable consumption of time it has not been on these benches. The Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for East Mayo was most germane to the subject, and that was even recognised by the action of the Government. The waste of time has taken place on the other side of the House in connection with the motion of the noble Lord who had not the courage to vote for it. It was a bogus motion, and the First Lord delivered a speech in reference to it which I think was unworthy of him in his position. I think I may say that the conduct of the business of this House does not depend upon rules, but on the tact and courtesy of those who lead it. And certainly we have reason to complain on all grounds of the manner in which the business has been conducted. The right hon.

Gentleman would meet the convenience of all the Irish Members if he would accede to the motion for adjournment, and give us an opportunity of considering carefully this punitive motion, and not pass it in a hurry or panic. This is a far-reaching rule and Amendments of far less moment have taken weeks of discussion before they were passed. Our desire is therefore most reasonable.

*MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I rise to support the motion for adjournment. There is too much hurry about this motion. What is all the hurry for? Has not this House existed for 800 or 900 years without this regulation? Why, then, should you hurry this rule after only eight or nine hours debate? The First Lord of the

Treasury has made the urgency of Supply a reason for special expedition, but he has given no reason why this alteration in the Standing Orders should be carried before Supply is got through. I venture therefore to suggest that the debate on the rule should be adjourned until after Easter or Whit-Sunday, and then taken up with the coolness which the importance of the subject requires.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House has been the prime mover and cause of all this trouble. I read in The Times of this morning that this was deliberately planned to prejudice the Irish Members. I had not the honour of being named the other night, but I consider that when the First Lord of the Treasury came into the House and moved the closure;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question before the House is that of adjournment.

DR. AMBROSE: I was going to say that we have a good many Amendments to move yet. In fact, I have an Amendment to propose, namely, to suspend the Leader of the House for two months on the ground that the right hon. Gentleman has caused the whole of the trouble. It seems to me, from the attitude of hon. Gentlemen opposite, that they have made up their minds to rush the rule through to-night; but I appeal to them to give us an opportunity of impeaching their conduct to-morrow.

MR. FLYNN: I do not agree with hon. Gentlemen opposite. We can sit here till sunrise to-morrow while they pursue a policy which is of no good to the Ministry and is no credit to the House. I have had several years experience of this House, and my opinion is that no practical progress is made with public business at these hours unless the Ministry give way. Members get exasperated on both sides and enter into foolish competition to show most endurance, like the man who fasted for forty hours. The Parliament is comparatively young, and when there is a long life before us, the conduct of public business should not be permitted to get into this impasse. It is somewhat tyrannical on the part of the Government to force the pace at present. No doubt as the Parliamentary year rolls on and we get into the summer months, when the sun rises earlier than now, we shall be treated to this kind of thing at greater length. This is a most important motion. If it had been a Sessional Order a short debate might have done. But a few Irish Members have taken part in the debate yet. If the right hon. Gentleman had had more regard for the convenience of the House he would not have made an academic speech on an unsubstantial motion which had nothing behind it, as the division showed. The waste of time has come not from these benches, but from the Government benches, and that at an hour when we should have been at our rest. I speak on behalf of the officials of the House, and of the policemen, who have had a most trying experience during the last few days, particularly the members of the A Division. The Government will gain nothing by continuing to oppose the motion for the adjournment. Some consideration should be had for private Members who are interested in private Bills. I am myself very anxious to come down here early to-morrow to get a draft of a Bill, but if we are kept sitting so late I will not be able to give my mind to the work. If the discussion is prolonged it certainly will not conduce in the smallest degree to the despatch of business, and I trust the First Lord of the Treasury, who is not

insensible to

reason, will recognise the plain and obvious facts of the situation.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): There is perhaps one argument which may appeal to right hon. Gentlemen, on the Treasury Bench, and especially to the right hon.

Gentleman the Leader of the House. It is that there are a great number of junior Members in the House who are not accustomed to rules of procedure, and to whom it is extremely necessary that they should have an opportunity of seeing the healing of this new rule. I consider further, not only in the case of junior Members but also in the case of senior Members, that some period should lie allowed to elapse during which hon. Members might have an opportunity of considering carefully what would be the effect of this new rule. All Members from Ireland have special reason to demand that such a period should elapse before an important motion of this kind is carried, and therefore in our opinion the present is essentially an occasion on which the adjournment of the debate should be agreed to. A proposal has been made that as regards to-morrow the Army statement should be taken first and this motion, afterwards. I am perfectly convinced if that course is pursued the House will have no occasion to regret it. To-morrow we will be able to discuss the matter carefully and without undue haste, and in a manner which will redound to the credit of the House of Commons and make a favourable impression on the new Members of the House. Unless you treat new Members with consideration and allow them time to master carefully new proposals of this kind, I do not for my part see how you can expect us in the future to look upon measures that may be introduced with that care, and thought which are naturally expected from all Members of the House.

*MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): The Leader of the House must know, as every hon. Member who has been in the House a few years knows, that no good is done by going on with a discussion of this kind at three o'clock in the morning. It is perfectly useless to continue keeping us here in this way. If I wanted another argument for the adjournment it would be the appearance of right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench, many of whom appear to be physically in a state approaching collapse.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I desire to support the motion for the adjournment. If the House will consider the matter dispassionately I am sure hon. Members will see that the claim now put forward is reasonable and moderate, especially when they consider that the right hon. Gentleman's motion is directed against the Irish Members. As a new Member of the House, knowing nothing of its rules, but anxious to conform to them as far as an Irish Member can, I rise to ask English Members honestly to say to us Irish Members whether they are prepared to treat us justly, and not disregard or treat with contempt our appeals for fair play. If hon. Members will consider the seriousness of the question before the House; that it is proposed to introduce into the rules of this House an innovation which I cannot characterise as otherwise than unheard of, and that the First Lord of the Treasury is trying to repress freedom of speech and to deprive Irish Members by the closure and his huge majority of their only opportunity to express their views; then it will be seen that the appeal for the adjournment of the debate at this late hour is reasonable. I was

present at the scene which occurred on Tuesday, but we Irish Members are not ashamed of our action on that occasion. We felt that it was our duty to our constituents;

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must speak on the adjournment of the debate.

MR. THOMAS O'DOXNELL: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I have departed from the rules of debate, but I would appeal that this new rule should be thoroughly discussed. If you persist in discussing this subject at this hour you will not be affording Irishmen a specimen of that broad-minded toleration expected from you, nor will you impress us with your sense of justice and fair play. We saw the time of the House wasted to-night by an Amendment which I cannot characterise, but when we went to a division on it the noble Lord who proposed it had not the courage to support it.

MR. NANNETTE (Dublin, College Green) said he rose to protest against the passing of the rule, which would inflict penalties not upon himself, but upon the constituency which he represented. He joined in the appeal of the hon. Member who moved the adjournment of the debate, not because of the pains and penalties which might be inflicted on himself; for both he and his hon. friends around him, who on Tuesday night felt constrained to make the protest that they did, would do again what they had done before if occasion arose. When they found hon. Members endeavouring to force through a Vote without adequate discussion;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question before the House is the question of adjournment. The hon. Member must confine himself to that.

MR. NANNETTI said that his only desire was to treat the House with due decorum, and he bowed to the ruling of the Chair. He desired to enter his protest against the Government endeavouring to enforce at that hour of the morning a new rule which would have a very far-reaching effect. It was neither worthy of the House nor of the First Lord of the Treasury, and so far from having a good effect it would have quite the contrary. It was not calculated to allay the feeling raised upon the Irish benches, because if it was the intention of the Government to rule Ireland at all, they must rule it with conciliation and with tact. His reason for supporting the adjournment was that many hon. Members had been in attendance at the House since the previous noon, and it was not fair that they should be kept longer, but if the right hon. Gentleman would not give way and grant so reasonable a request, perhaps the vitality of those who advocated the adjournment might be as great as that of hon. Gentlemen opposite, and they might be able to keep up the discussion so long that in the endeavour to enforce their arguments the House might get more than it bargained for. He strongly protested against the debate being continued, but, nevertheless, if it were to be he would not be coerced or frightened out of doing his duty to his constituents. He would much rather be at home looking

after his own business, but so long as his country sent him to the House and the House would hear him, he would protest against being kept at the House to such a late hour when appeals had been made from all sides that the debate should be adjourned.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): With my usual modesty, I was prepared to give way to an old and valued Member of the House, but as I have been called upon I desire to

add my voice to those which have been lifted up in the appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury to adjourn the debate Speaking as a new Member, I know you will grant me the usual courtesy that you extend to new Members. I look upon you, Sir, as the grand pilot of this House, and I know that if I stray from the channels of debate there is no fear of my getting wrecked upon the shoals which are known as breaking the rules of procedure in this House, for I am sure, Sir, with your usual courtesy you will kindly put me right. I am glad that the First Lord of the Treasury has returned to his place to listen to the dulcet tones of my voice, and I am in great hopes that what he would not do for the Leader of the Opposition and the other gentlemen who have appealed to him he may be inclined to do for the Member for Limerick City. So far as I am concerned the length of this debate is absolutely immaterial to me. I am used to long spells of fatigue and to long hours on my feet, and it is only the personal consideration which I have for the hon. Gentlemen on the Government benches that induces me to intervene and ask the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury to meet the hon. Members of this House and comply with their request for an adjournment of the debate on such an important question. The importance of this question must commend itself to every hon. Gentleman in the House. There is no Member of this honourable House who has more respect for your ruling, Sir, or the history of your House than I. I do not believe there is a Member of this House who for the short time that I have been a Member of it has given more time to listening with interest and, I may say, with pleasure to the debates that have arisen in this House, and I think on such an important question as this; and I could have wished that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury had remained in his place while I gave my reasons; I think on such an important question as this hon. Members opposite would do much better to listen to me with patience, because if they do not the chances are that I shall occupy their attention a little more than I otherwise should, because where-ever I have gone and stood up to speak I have always insisted on being heard, though I never have made what I call a speech, having always been too pleased to listen to good speeches made by others. But, Sir, on this occasion, when there is such an important question before the House, I think it is right that every hon. Member representing an Irish constituency should voice his own feelings and the feelings of his constituency in this House. I hope I am not delaying unnecessarily the time of this honourable House, but I certainly think after the reasons; fair and just reasons; put forward by hon. Members from all parts of the House for an adjournment, the First Lord of the Treasury would be doing a wise and a gracious thing if he met those hon. Members in the same conciliatory spirit as they have endeavoured to meet him.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I rise to support those who have already spoken, and to ask that the further consideration of this most important subject may be adjourned to another sitting. May I point out that what we are now discussing is a question affecting the future conduct of the Members of the House. Not only that, but the Amendment under discussion provides an automatic punishment that is to be applied without further consideration in the event of

certain offences being committed. I respectfully submit that that is not the kind of Amendment that should be rushed through the House now. If there was an Amendment proposed on the criminal law of the country affecting the foulest outcasts of the nation, the House would insist upon proper time being given to the consideration of it; and surely the House ought to claim for itself, in spite of anything the Government might say or desire, as much respect as regards its own laws

as it would insist upon in cases without its jurisdiction. There is one illustration which must be present to the minds of most members of the House of the danger of accepting Amendments the full bearings of which have not been considered. It stands to the credit of this Government that it attempted to pass an excellent Workmen's Compensation Bill. [Cries of "Order."] I hope that hon. Gentlemen will restrain their hilarity until I am finished. I was about to observe that we had in that Bill an illustration of the mischief that comes from hurriedly accepting Amendments the full bearing of which has not been considered. The intention of the Government in introducing the Bill was excellent.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member cannot discuss another Bill by way of illustration.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I will not, Sir, and I did not intend to, attempt to discuss the Bill, but I hope it is within the scope of a speaker to draw an illustration, without discussing the merits of the Bill, from something that has already been done in the House. My point is this, that the Bill as introduced was excellent.

*MR. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member that that Bill could not be discussed.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I ask the House to agree to the adjournment. If these Amendments which have been accepted or are still to be accepted have the same effect as the Amendments accepted in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Bill, the Government will live to regret not having acceded to the request for further time for the consideration of the subject. We have no right at this hour of the morning [3.20], when Members are not in a fit state to discuss serious business, to make a pretence of legislating in the direction of amending the Standing Orders which govern this House. The Amendment marks a new departure in the procedure of this House. It subjects Members of the House to a possible indignity from which hitherto Members of Parliament have been supposed to be exempt, and because of the importance of the Amendment, and its far-reaching consequences upon the

future conduct of this House, I join in the appeal of those who have spoken that the further consideration of this matter may be adjourned until tomorrow, until the Amendments on the Paper have been considered, and until those which have been accepted may be seen in their true and full bearing. It may suit hon.

Gentlemen opposite to rush this thing through, but I would remind them that the root-cause of all the trouble, the reason why we are having a discussion now, is because of the foolish attempt to rush through another question without adequate discussion. Surely one lesson of that kind ought to be enough for one session. I trust, therefore, that the House will agree to the motion for the adjournment,

and will allow this most important matter to be considered in a manner worthy of its importance.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I associate myself with my hon. friends on this side of the House in appealing to the Government to adjourn the discussion of this matter until to-morrow. We have been told, Mr. Speaker, in Ireland; I have learned it from my infancy; that in coming to this House and appealing to its Members for justice, it never would be denied to us. Yet what is the state of things that presents itself to us here to-night? You have, nine-tenths of the representatives of Ireland making a request to the House of Commons in a unanimous and practical spirit, and you have another portion of the House refusing that request. It simply brings home to our minds the lesson that there is no possibility whatsoever of turning our eyes towards Westminster for justice, that if any good is to be done the people of Ireland must turn their attention in some other direction, that they must resort to other means and to other methods besides those;

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member can only speak to the question of the adjournment.

MR. DUFFY: I am emphasising some of the reasons which, in my opinion, should weight with the House to defer this most important matter until tomorrow. Some short time ago the question was asked by an hon. Member above the gangway as to what was the

intention of the Government in regard to those Irish Members who have been ejected from the House. It was asked if they might go back to their constituents and seek re-election.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not confining himself to the question of the adjournment.

MR. DUFFY: I am sorry that I should come in conflict with the Chair. It certainly was not my intention when I stood up. I will always endeavour as far as I possibly can while a Member of the House to conform to your ruling. But I consider this a very serious and vital matter. There is no man in this House to-night who can deny for an instant that this question is aimed, and aimed exclusively, at the suppression of speech and of liberty as far as the Irish Members are concerned. It is not aimed or directed against any party in this House outside the Irish Members, and as an exponent of Irish thought and feeling I enter an emphatic protest against the action sought to be forced on those Members. [Cries of "Order."] Gentlemen on the other side may shout "Order" and cry me down. I have had experience of this kind of thing in Ireland before, and I am not going to be put down.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The only question before the House is whether it should now adjourn.

MR. DUFFY: In my opinion, Sir, the heat that has been introduced into this debate to-night would in itself be sufficient justification for hon. Members calling upon the Government to adjourn the matter until to-morrow. By doing so, I believe the House would bring to the consideration of the matter an impartiality and freedom from passion they are not able to bring to-night. We will be able amongst ourselves to discuss the matter, and the House will be able to arrive at a better and more reasonable conclusion.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): As a young Member of the House I desire also to join in the protest made from these benches in reference to this rule which has been introduced by the First Lord of the Treasury. It is a matter of difficulty for us to try to understand the proceedings of the House, and to try to act in accordance with its rules, when we are kept here to such an early hour in the morning for the purpose of discussing a question which is new to us, and which we are not in a position to understand, by reason of our inexperience, but on which we desire to bring our best judgment to bear. Hon. Members need have no fear that we are making this request because we are unable to stand the strain. We are quite able and prepared to carry the debate on until to-morrow morning and the morning after that if necessary. But we want to have this matter considered in a dispassionate manner. Passionate feelings have been aroused, and while Members are possessed with those feelings we are asked to pass a rule which may have the effect of disfranchising several Irish constituencies for a lengthy period. I therefore support this just and reasonable motion for adjournment.

The hon. Member was proceeding to discuss the proceedings of Tuesday night, when *MR. SPEAKER reminded him that the only question before the House was that of the adjournment.

MR. MURPHY: I strongly approve of the motion for adjournment, because it will enable us to consider the matter in a calmer and more dignified manner than is possible this evening.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: It is almost a monstrous thing that in the second or third week of the session we should be called upon to sit here all night to carry new rules of this kind. If we were at the close of a long session, and it was necessary that Members should be able to get away to attend to their businesses, it would be a different matter, but there is no urgency whatever in the matter now under discussion. There are half-a-dozen ways in which the difficulty might have been met without resorting to the barbarous and miserable method of sitting to this hour of the morning. Here we have the First Lord determinedly refusing this motion for adjournment and at once leaving the House, and you will probably find him at this moment fast asleep in one of the lobbies. I do not grudge him his nap, but I do say that the spectacle of the House sitting till this hour in order to carry such a rule as the one before us is not creditable, nor will it be admired by the general public. If, however, there is a determination among new Members on the other side of the House to have an all-night sitting, I can assure them that whatever inferiority the Irish Members may exhibit on any other question they at any rate can hold their own in regard to a matter of that kind.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.): I approach the discussion of this question under rather peculiar conditions. I should like to give my own reasons for what I have done, and with patience I should be able generally to state them. The first reason why the First Lord of the Treasury should consent to an adjournment of this debate is the hour of the clock. It is now on the point of four o'clock, and many hon. Members have been in this House since twelve o'clock, or at any rate since between two o'clock and three o'clock.

An Hon. MEMBER: When did you get in?

MR. JORDAN: I had the honour to get in myself at about six o'clock. These long sittings lead to extreme weariness of mind and body, especially when we are compelled to remain in this House discussing such a question as this at four o'clock in the morning. Another reason for the adjournment is that the public do not know at this hour of the morning what is being done in the House. Everybody knows there is no reporting going on now, especially at this hour of the morning, for the English papers will not report anything, and I suppose all the morning papers have gone to press. Therefore the public do not know what is being done in the House of Commons. Then there is another reason; somebody said that the First Lord of the Treasury had gone out to have a nap. I am sure no one begrudges him a nap. I do think, however, that it is cruel on the part of the First Lord of the Treasury to keep this House open up to this hour of the morning. It is cruel to keep the attendants here to this hour, because all the servants of the House, both female and male, will be required here to-morrow again at twelve o'clock to attend to their duties. I have nothing to say against the policemen of the place; from what I have heard, I believe that the policemen in the discharge of their duty the other night did it in as tender a manner as they possibly could. Therefore I think, out of consideration for the policemen of the place, this House ought to adjourn. Then there are the higher officials. There are the gentlemen at the Table, and I should not wonder if their minds are becoming a little clouded, and I should not be surprised if they made mistakes like other fallible and sleepy creatures. Then, I have often wondered since I came into this House at the endurance of Mr. Speaker in the Chair. I have said over and over again about the present occupant of that position, as I said about the late occupant, how they can endure to sit in that Chair from three o'clock in the afternoon to twelve at night I cannot understand. Here you are, Mr. Speaker, sitting in that Chair at four o'clock this morning, and the First Lord of the Treasury has no sympathy with you, and no compassion for the position in which you are placed. I will not use any harsh phrase about the right hon. Gentleman, but if he takes all these things into consideration I think he ought to adjourn this debate in order to allow the officials of the House and the hon. Members of this House to go home and try to get a few hours sleep before they come back here again in the morning. I would make a further appeal to him on these grounds. There are several old men in this House, and we old men are expected to remain here to discharge our duties as long as the House sits. I do not think it is fair for men of my age to have to do this, and I do appeal to him to adjourn the consideration of this question for the sake of the old men in this House who are trying to discharge their duty to the country. I press these considerations upon him, and I cannot understand how it is that he remains so obdurate. The right hon. Gentleman is not going to make much out of the course he is taking, for it will tend to irritate and not conciliate us, and it will act in such a way that we shall take every opportunity to retard business if we are not dealt with in a spirit of compromise and conciliation instead of in a spirit of irritation. I have always entertained a high opinion of the First Lord of the Treasury for his kindly

sympathy, but I am amazed that his usually gentlemanly bearing and sympathy seem to have been suppressed to night, and he is probably showing his rougher human nature in compelling the Members and the officers of this House to remain here simply to gratify his determination to have his will and his way. He sets up his will and way against the wishes of a large section of this House of Commons. He says, in fact, "You must give way to me, and I must have my way."

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNEKMAN: I think this is one of the most protracted discussions on a mere question of adjournment of the debate that I have ever listened to, and the reason it has been so protracted has been that we are anxious to give the Government time to make up their mind what they will do. A number of Irish Members have already shown a great faculty of addressing the House at length upon subjects very limited in their scope, and I have been delighted to listen to my hon. friend who has just sat down, and who has been almost the hero of the recent episode in this House. ["Oh."] All I can say is, that if the hon. Gentleman who thinks it right to say "Oh"; and who knows nothing about the hon. Member of whom I am speaking; if he who says "Oh"; in that manner; if by the tune he has been as long in the House as my hon.

friend, and has attracted to himself something like the degree of respect which my hon. friend has, then he will be entitled to congratulation. We have been watching with interest, which is very unusual, the process which has kept us to-night. It is like that sort of peep-shows where you can see through a glass a colony of ants or bees engaged in their work. We have seen an endeavour being made to come to some sort of arrangement of business which will enable us not only to get home, but to escape anything like hurry or pressure in passing this most important motion, and also of providing adequately for the fulfilment of our duties on another day. I hope the right hon. Gentlemen have been able to arrive at some sort of conclusion. There has been a considerable disposition on this side of the House to meet the right hon. Gentleman. [HON. MEMBER:

Oh]; Again, the hon. Gentlemen who say

"Oh"; do not know what has been done. I certainly hope that it has not been without effect, but if it has not, I think the best course to pursue would be for the House to take a division on the motion for adjournment, and then let us go on with the debate on the main question.

*MR. LAMBTON (Durham, S.E.): We used the word "Oh"; over here; and if the right hon. Gentleman wishes to know why I said "Oh"; I will tell him. It was because the right hon. Gentleman seemed to uphold the hon. Members who the other night disobeyed the Chair and created the scene.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I never said anything of the sort.

*MR. LAMBTON: The right hon. Gentleman said that the last speaker was a hero. By that he meant to infer that the other Gentlemen with whom the hon. Member acted were also heroes.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I said he was the hero of an episode. He was the Member who was wrongfully punished by the House, and to whom the House had to apologise.

*MR. LAMBTON: If the right hon. Gentleman regards the episode as in any way heroic I am sorry for his idea of heroism. I appeal to the First Lord of the

Treasury to put an end to this unseemly debate; he has the power, and for the honour of the House, I hope he will use it.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I would not have intervened in this debate were it not that I realise so fully how important it is. I feel that the most careful consideration should be given to the Amendment now before the House. It seems to me that there is no necessity for the rush with which

AYES

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Balearres, Lord

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

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

Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Balfour, RtHnGeraldW(Leeds

Bull, William James

Alllusen, Augustus Henry E.

Balfour, Maj. KR(Christchurch

Bullard, Sir Harry

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Bartley, George C. T.

Carlile, William Walter

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.

Cautley, Henry Strother

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Beach, Rt. Hn. SirM.H.(Bristol)

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

Arrol, Sir William

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.

Cavendish, V.C W(Derbyshire)

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Beckett, Ernest William

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Bagot, Capt. JoscelineFitzRoy

Bigwood, James

Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Bill, Charles

Chamberlain, J Austen(Worc'r

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Chapman, Edward

Baird, John George Alex.

Bond, Edward

Charrington, Spencer

the right hon. Gentleman seems desirous of planting this new rule on the House. It is very easy in times of excitement, when Members' minds are impressionable, and in times of panic, to propose legislation because hon. Members fear that if that is not accepted other consequences will ensue. But the time may come when hon. Gentlemen may find themselves in the position in which we on this side of the House are at present. I think it is not in any sense of the word an unreasonable thing that more time should be given for the consideration of this great constitutional change, and that the House should be allowed to adjourn. For my part, I confess I cannot take any lengthy part in the debate. I was travelling all night, and I have not been in bed since the night before last. But I think I should avail myself of the ordinary privilege of the man in the street and get to bed in good time. I was not present at the incident the other night, and consequently I am all the more free to express my opinion as to the course which should be adopted in regard to that important event. I cannot but feel that the right hon. Gentleman has been badly advised in pressing on this rule at this very early hour of a new day. It is an attempt to gag us in this House under the thin guise of a new rule.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Gentleman is travelling from the subject before the House.

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, 233; Noes, 117. (Division List No. 45.)

Churchill, Winston Spencer

Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil

Peace, Herbert Pike (Darlington)

Clare, Octavius Leigh

Hudson, George Bickersteth

Pemberton, John S. G.

Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.

Hughes, Colonel Edwin

Percy, Earl

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)

Pilkington, Richard

Colomb, Sir John Charles R.

Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)

Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton

Plummer, Walter R.

Cranborne, Viscount

Johnston, (William (Belfast))

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Cust, Henry John C.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Pryce-Jones, Lt. -Col. Edward
Dalkeith, Earl of
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop.
Purvis, Robert
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Keswick, William
Randies, John S.
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Knowles, Lees
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Law, Andrew Bonar
Rentoul, James Alexander
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lawrence, William F.
Renwick, George
Doxford, Sir William T.
Lawson, John Grant
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Duke, Henry Edward
Lee, Capt AH. (Hants, Fareham)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Faber, George Denison
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Russell, T. W.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn E.
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Finch, George H.
Long, RtHnWalter(Bristol, S.)
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Fisher, William Hayes
Lowe, Francis William
Saunderson, RtHn. Col. Edw. J.
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Seely, Charles Hilton(Lincoln)
Forster, Henry William
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)
Sharpe, William Edward E.
Garfit, William
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Gibbs, Hn. A.G.H.(City of Lon.
Macartney, RtHnW. G. Ellison
Simeon, Sir Harrington
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St.Albans)
Maedona, John Cumming
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Smith, Rt. Hn. W. F. D(Strand)
Gordon, Hn. J.E. (Elgin&Nairn
Maconochie, A. W.
Stanley,Hn.Arthur(Ormskirk
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'rH'ml'ts
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
M'Iver, SirL. (Edinburgh,W.)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Goschen, Hon. George J.
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Stock, James Henry
Graham, Henry Robert

Majendie, James A. H.
Stroyan, John
Green, WalfordD(Wedneshury
Malcolm, Ian
Sturt, Hn. Humphry Napier
Greene, SirEW(B'rySEdm'nd's
Manners, Lord Cecil
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Grenfell, William Henry
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.
Thornton, Percy M.
Gretton, John
Maxwell, RtHnSirHE(Wigton
Tollemache, Henry James
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Maxwell, WJH(Dumfriesshire
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Groves, James Grimble
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
MilnerRt.Hn.Sir Frederick G.
Valentia, Viscount
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Milton, Viscount
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Milward, Col. Victor
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Webb, Col. William George
Hambro, Charles Eric
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Hamilton, Rt. Hn LordG(Mid'x
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Welby, Sir Chas.G.E.(Notts.)
Hamilton, Marq. of(Lond'deny
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Hardy, Laureuce(Kent, Ashf'rd
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)

Williams, RtHnJ. Powell-(Bir.
Harris, FLeverton(Tynemouth
Morrell, George Herbert
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Morrison, James Archibald
Wills, Sir Frederick
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morton, ArthurH.A.(Deptford
Wilson, A. Stanley(York, E. R.)
Heath, ArthurHoward(Hanley
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Heaton, George Henniker
Muntz, Philip A.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcester. N.)
Helder, Augustus
Murray, RtHnA.Graham(Bute
Wortley,Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Henderson, Alexander
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Young, Commander(Berks, E.)
Hope, J. F(Sheffield, Brightside
Nicholson, William Graham
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Nichol, Donald Ninian
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Hoult, Joseph
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Howard, Capt. J (Kent, Faversham
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
NOES.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Boyle, James
Caine, William Sproston
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Brigg, John
Caldwell, James
Ambrose, Robert
Broadhurst, Henry
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)

Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Bell, Richard
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Carew, James Laurence
Black, Alexander William
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Carvill, PatrickGeo. Hamilton
Blake, Edward
Burns, John
Causton, Richard Knight
Boland, John
Buxton, Syndey Charles
Channing, Francis Allston
Cogan, Denis J.
Jordan, Jeremiah
Partington, Oswald
Colville, John
Joyce, Michael
Paulton, James Mellor
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Kennedy, Patrick James
Pirie, Duncan V.
Dalziel, James Henry
Kitson, Sir James
Power, Patrick Joseph
Delany, William
Labouchere, Henry
Reckitt, Harold James
Dillon, John
Lambert, George
Reddy, M.
Duffy, William, J.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Duncan, James H.
Leese, SirJoseghF.(Accrington
Redmond, William (Clare)
Edwards, Frank
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Rickett, J. Compton
Elibank, Master of
Lloyd-George, David
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Ellis, John Edward
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Roche, John

Emmott, Alfred
M'Arthur, William(Cornwall)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Evan, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
M'Crae, George
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Farrell, James Patrick
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sinclair, Capt John(Forfarshire
Flynn, James Christopher
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Spencer,RtHn.C.R(Northants
Fuller, J. M. F.
Mansfield, Horace Kendall
Sullivan, Donal
Gladstone,Rt.HnHerbert John
Mooney, John J.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Morton, Edw. J. C.(Devonport)
Tennant, Harold John
Grant, Corrie
Murphy, J.
Thomas,Alfred (Glamorgan,E.
Griffith, Ellis J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Thomas, F.Freeman-(Hastings
Hammond, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthvrTydvil
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Tomkinson, James
Harrington, Timothy
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid.)
Tully, Jasper
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, James(Wicklowl, W
Weir, James Galloway
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
White, George (Norfolk)
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Hobhouse, C. E. H.(Bristol, E.)

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Williams, Osmond(Merioneth)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O' Kelly, James(Roscommon, N
Woodhouse, SirJT(Huddersf'd
Joicey, Sir James
O'Malley, William
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Haviland Burke.
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
O'Mara, James
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Question put accordingly, "That the Debate be now adjourned."
AYES.
Abraham, Wm. (Rhondda)
Edwards, Frank
Lloyd-George, David
Allen. C. P. (Glouce, Stroud)
Elibank, Master of
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Ambrose, Robert
Ellis, John Edward
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Emmott, Alfred
M'Crae, George
Beaumont, Wenworth C. B.
Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)
M'Dermott, Patrick
Bell, Richard
Farrell, James Patrick
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Black, Alexander William
Flynn, James Christopher
Mansfield, Horace Kendall
Blake. Edward
Fuller, J. M. F.
Mooney, John J.
Boland, John
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Boyle, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford

Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Brigg, John
Grant, Corrie
Murphy, J.
Broadhurst, Henry
Griffith, Ellis, J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)
Hammond, John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Hardie, J.Keir Merthyr Tydvil
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Harrington, Timothy
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Burns, John
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Caldwell, James
Hobhouse, C. E. H.(Bristol, E.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo. S.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Carew, James Laurence
Joicey, Sir James
O'Kelly, Jas.(Roscommon, N.)
Carvill, Patrick George H.
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
O'Malley, William
Causton, Richard Knight
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Mara, James
Channing, Francis Allston
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Cogan, Denis J.
Joyce, Michael
Partington, Oswald
Colville, John
Kennedy, Patrick James
Paulton, James Mellor
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Kitson, Sir James
Pirie, Duncan V.
Dalziel, James Henry
Labouchere, Henry
Power, Patrick Joseph
Delany, William
Lambert, George
Reckitt, Harold James
Dillon, John
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Reddy, M.
Duffy, William J.
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Duncan, James H.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Redmond, William (Clare)
The House divided::Ayes, 119; Noes, 231. (Division List No. 46.)
Rickett, J. Compton
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Woodhouse, Sir JT(Hudd'rsfi'd
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Tennant, Harold John
Weir, James Galloway
Roche, John
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
White, George (Norfolk)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan,Gower
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Tomkinson, James
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Speneer,RtHnC.R.(Northants
Tully, Jasper
Mr. Caine and Mr. Henry Wilson.
Sullivan, Donal

Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Faber, George Denison
Lawrence, William F.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Lawson, John Grant
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lee, Capt. A H (Hants. Fareham
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Finch, George H.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Fisher, William Hayes
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Arrol, Sir William
Forster, Henry William
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Garfit, William
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Lowe, Francis William
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Gordon, Hon. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Baird, John George Alexander
Gordon, J (Londonderry, South
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Balcarres, Lord
Gordon, Maj Evans - (T'r H'mlts

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Core, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Balfour, Rt. Hon. Gerald W. (Leeds
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Balfour, Mjr. K. R. (Christchurch
Graham, Henry Robert
Macdonald, John Cumming
Bartley, George C. T.
Green, Walford D. (Windsor)
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Greene, Sir E. W. (Bristol)
Maconochie, A. W.
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Grenfell, William Henry
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Beckett, Ernest William
Gretton, John
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
M'Ilver, Sir Lewis (Edinb., W.)
Bigwood, James
Groves, James Grimble
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Bill, Charles
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Majendie, James A. H.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Malcolm, Ian
Bond, Edward
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Manners, Lord Cecil
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon. W. F.
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Hambro, Charles Eric
Maxwell, Rt. Hon. Sir H. E. (Wigt'n
Bull, William James
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G. (Mid'x
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire
Billiard, Sir Harry

Hamilton, Marq.of(L'donderry
Middlemore, John Throgm'rt'n
Carlile, William Walter
Hardy, Laurence(Kent, Ashf d)
Milner, Rt. Hn. SirFrederickG.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Milton, Viscount
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Harris, F. Leverton(Tynem'uth
Milward, Colonel Victor
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.)
Heaton, John Henniker
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Chamberlain, J. Austen(Worc.
Helder, Augustus
Morgan, DavidJ(Walthamst.)
Chapman, Edward
Henderson, Alexander
Morrell, George Herbert
Charrington, Spencer
Hermon Hodge, Robert T.
Morrison, James Archibald
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hope,J. F. (Shef'ld, Brightside
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Houldsworth, Sir William H.
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hoult, Joseph
Muntz, Philip A.
Collings, Rt. Hn. Jesse
Howard, Capt J (Kent,Faversh.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Colomb,SirJohnCharlesReady
Hozier, Hon. James H. Cecil

Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Cranborne, Viscount
Hughes. Colonel Edwin
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hutton; John (Yorks, N.R.)
Nicholson, William Graham
Cust, Henry John C.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Dalkeith, Earl of
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Pemberton, John S. G.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Percy, Earl
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Keswick, William
Pilkington, Richard
Duke, Henry Edward
Knowles, Lees
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edw.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Plummer, Walter R.
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Law, Andrew Bonar
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Pretymann, Ernest George
Shaw-Stewart, M.H. (Renfrew)
Welby, Lt-Col. A.C.E. (Tauntn
Pryce-Jones, Lt-Col. Edward
Simeon, Sir Harrington
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)

Purvis, Robert
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Randles, John S.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk)
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell (Birm
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald
Reid, James (Greenock)
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Rentoul, James Alexander
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Renwick, Georee
Stock, James Henry
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Stroyan, John
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Russell, T. W.
Thornton, Percy M.
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Tollemache, Henry James
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Valentia, Viscount
Sir William Walrond and
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Mr. Anstruther.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)

Wanklyn, James Leslie
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Webb, Col. William George

Amendment again proposed;

"In line 7, to leave out the words 'during the remainder of the Session,' and add the words 'for two months.'"

Question again proposed, "That the words 'during the remainder of the Session' stand part of the proposed Amendment, as amended."

MR. J. P. FAERELL said that it was absolutely necessary that the scope of the resolution should be limited if there was in the future to be any chance whatever that private Members would get an opportunity of expressing their views; therefore he had much pleasure in supporting the Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton. He regretted exceedingly that the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury had shown no desire to accept any of the various Amendments or suggestions that had been made with the object of rendering this resolution not so hard and fast in character. The hon. Member for East Mayo and other hon. Gentlemen representing Irish constituencies had endeavoured to get the right hon. Gentleman to agree to more elastic proposals, but he had refused to allow any Amendment of the drastic resolution which was before the House. In the first place it was particularly unfortunate that the right hon. Gentleman should have proposed such a resolution, and in the second to wish to carry this struggle on in order to force it upon the House. It was not a good thing to legislate in a, time of panic, but that was practically what the proposal of the Government amounted to. They had become alarmed at this ebullition of feeling, and in their panic they had come down with this drastic resolution and insisted that it should be carried right away. When an English Member of Parliament of the eminence of the hon. Member for Northampton came forward with a moderate proposal limiting the scope of this drastic, change it ought to receive very careful consideration before it was rejected. The operation of this new rule was intended solely for the Irish Members, and as an Irish Member he protested against it being passed. Irish Members came to that House to do their duty, clothed with as much authority as any Members of the House, and they would not be prevented from doing so. He appealed to the Members of the House to consider what they were doing before they gave the unlimited power conferred by the resolution. He urged them to re-fleet upon what it would mean to disfranchise a constituency for six months of the session. If the Irish Members were suspended and removed from the House by main force, unless some further rule was made to prevent them from applying for the Chiltern Hundreds, they would apply and resign their positions in the House and go back to their constituencies, with the absolute certain knowledge that, in spite of the resolution by which they were suspended, they would be sent back again. The result would be that the resolution would become practically inoperative. Under the Standing Orders a Member now could be suspended for a week, a fortnight, or

a month. The hon. Member for Northampton made a moderate proposal that the long limit of one month should be extended to two; surely that was drastic enough. There had not been a case for many years where the suspension had been for a month; even in 1881 and 1893 the longest suspensions were one week. He suggested that the rule should be left as it stood, with the extreme limit for suspensions one month, but granting that special cases required special treatment, and that it might be necessary to provide against similar outbreaks to that which occurred on the previous Tuesday, it was not fair to the public who elect the Member to say, on a motion from the Chair, that that man should be suspended for the rest of the session. The Amendment of the hon. Member for Northampton was a moderate one, and should commend itself to the earnest attention of the House. It seemed to him that a good deal of the freedom which they had been trying to confer upon other peoples of the world they were willing to take from the Members of their own House. He most strongly and earnestly supported the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Northampton. He assured the Government that he felt that in this matter a very vital principle, and, in fact, the cardinal principle, of liberty was at stake. Whether or not the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House saw his way to accede to the Amendment the Irish Members would take every opportunity open to them within the rides of debate to press on the attention of this unwilling Parliament the claims of the country which they come here to represent. Whether as the result of new rules or old rules they endeavour to stifle the Nationalist representatives of Ireland, they would find each and every one of them perfectly willing to undergo any punishment.

MR. TULLY: I think the question of the penalty is one to which the House should give a good deal more attention than can be given at this hour of the morning [4.50]. We have to choose between two courses; whether the penalties are to be the heavy ones proposed by the Government, or the much milder penalties proposed by the hon. Member for Northampton. It was one of the monarchs of England, the unfortunate Charles I., who first used the expression that the punishment could be greater than the offence. I say that under this new rule it is quite possible that the punishment can be greater than the offence. A Member on these benches might in the excitement of the moment be drawn into the whirlpool of passion, as was the case the other night, by the action taken by the Government of the day, and that Member, who in other respects and at other times may be an observer of law and order, giving his best attention to the promotion of the business of the House, might be subjected to the same punishment as a Member who had plotted an organised resistance. I say that in a case like that there should be some differentiation between the Members. The Member who is drawn into the affair as the result of a mere outburst of passion should not be treated with the same severity as a Member who entered it as a matter of calculation.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not addressing himself to the Amendment. There is no question of differential treatment before the House.

MR. TULLY: I was trying to explain the reason why I thought two months would be a more equitable punishment for any offence that might be committed than the vague punishment put down here of suspension for the entire session. Another

point that is not covered by the new rule is the question whether, in the event of a Member being suspended for the entire session, he can go home to his constituency and resign his seat. There is nothing in the Standing Orders on that question, and I do not see that the punishment provided by the new rule proposed by the First Lord of the Treasury would prevent the resignation of Members. I think the proposal of the hon. Member for Northampton would get rid of any difficulty, and would not be so likely to provoke the resignation of Members. If the severer punishment should be adopted you will force Members to apply for the Chiltern Hundreds. How are you to prevent that except by some illegal action directed towards the Chancellor of the Exchequer? Are we to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer muzzled by the First Lord of the Treasury, just as the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs is muzzled in the matter of supplementary questions? If the new rule is carried the First Lord of the Treasury will have to arrange by some illicit means to prevent the Chancellor of the Exchequer from accepting the resignation of particular Members. I think that will not contribute to the dignity of the House, and to the winning of public respect for the acts of the House. We have in this case to decide whether a heavy or a moderate penalty is the more effective weapon. In my opinion, if you have a heavy penalty it will inevitably defeat itself. If you suspend a Member in the first week of the session for the entire session you will by that means arouse, not only among his own constituency, but among the larger public of Ireland, sympathy for that Member. We have heard the First Lord of the Treasury denouncing cheap martyrdom. Is he not providing cheap martyrdom by this rule, which has no elasticity about it, and which in the case of suspending a Member at the opening of the session is bound by the very violence of the rule to excite sympathy for the Member? I think in a case like that the right hon. Gentleman is not proceeding on the lines of prudence or wisdom. I think that a moderate penalty is always more effective than a drastic measure. A penalty of two months is one that would not excite very great sympathy for the Member who would commit himself in the manner that these new rules profess to deal with. In the speeches delivered here to-night by hon. Members on the other side we have heard drastic remedies called for. One hon. Member seemed to be thirsting for the scalps and for the blood of the Irish Members. Some of them seemed to wish for our perpetual imprisonment or imprisonment during the session. Certainly some of us have been in prison before, and would not bother about any further imprisonment inflicted upon us. I suppose the next drastic remedy called for will be one of burning our houses. That will be the next remedy applied to Irish Members who do not submit with sufficient dignity to whatever motions the Government of the day seek to bring into operation. I think this rule will have a much wider application than is intended now; to the Irish Members. In the Parliament of 1892 hon. Members who are now on the Government benches were guilty of conduct which merited very much more drastic remedies than the First Lord of the Treasury is proposing now. I think hon. Members on the other side of the House would be well advised if they would look a little ahead. They are not likely to be always in a majority and to sit on the Government side of the House. The time may come when they will sit on

this Opposition side of the House, when probably they will try to resist the measures of popular reform, and when probably the very weapon they are forging to-night will be used against themselves. We have heard an hon. Gentleman, who spoke in his South African manner, calling for our heads. Probably when the hon. Members on the Government benches are over on this side of the House, some gentleman, speaking with the same spirit as that hon. Member, will be calling for the heads of the Tories just as that are calling now for the heads of the Irish Members. Hon. Gentlemen will probably regret that they ever forged this instrument, which will be used against themselves later on. Liberal and Radical Members have to complain a great deal of the obstruction of the Tory party when Liberals and Radicals are in power.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; I must ask the hon. Gentleman to confine himself to the Amendment before the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'rh'ml'ts

Maxwell, Rt. Hon. Sir H. E. (Wigton

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte F.

Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-

Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim

Middlemore, J. Throgmorton

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.

Graham, Henry Robert

Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fred. G.

Arohdale, Edward Mervyn

Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury

Milward, Col. Victor

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Greene, Sir E. W. (B'ry S. E. dm'nds

Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Arrol, Sir William

Grenfell, William Henry

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Gretton, John

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Groves, James Grimble

More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill

Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow

Bailey, James (Walworth)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Morrell, George Herbert
Barn, Colonel James Robert
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Morrison, James Archibald
Baird, John George Alexander
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Balcarres, Lord
Hambro, Charles Eric
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manchester)
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G. (Midlothian)
Muntz, Philip A.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. Gerald W. (Leeds)
Hamilton, Marquess of (Londonderry)
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Balfour, Major K. R. (Christchurch)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Hartley, George C. T.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemouth)
Nicholson, William Graham
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Beckett, Ernest William
Hay, Hon. Claude George
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Bigwood, James
Heaton, John Henniker
Paulton, James Mellor
Bill, Charles
Helder, Augustus
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Pemberton, John S. G.
Bond, Edward

Hope, J. F.(Shef'ld,Brightside
Percy, Earl
Boseawen, Arthur Griffith-
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Pilkington, Richard
Brown, AlexanderH.(Shropsh.
Hoult, Joseph
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Bull, William James
Howard,Capt J(Kent,Faversh.
Plummer, Walter R.
Ballard, Sir Harry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Carlile, William Walter
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Pretymann, Ernest George
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Purvis, Robert
Cavendish,V.C.W((Derbyshire
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Randies, John S.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Katcliffe, R. F.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Chamberlain,Rt.Hon.J.(Birm.
Kenyon,Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r.)
Kenyon-Slaney,Col.W.(Salop.
Renwick, George
Chapman, Edward
Keswick, William
Ridley,Hn.M. W. (Stalybridge
Charrington, Spencer
Knowles, Lees
Ritchie,Rt.Hn.Chas.Thomson
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Lambton, Hon.Frederick Wm.

Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A.E.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Lawrence, William F.
Russell, T. W.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Lawson, John Grant
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Lee, Capt AH (Hants, Fareham)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Cranborne, Viscount
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos Myles
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Dalkeith, Earl of
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham)
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lowe, Francis William
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Faber, George Denison
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Smith, Hon. AV. F. D. (Strand)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)

Finch, George H.
 Lucas, Reginald J. (Fortsmeuth)
 Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
 Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
 Macdonald, John Dimming
 Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
 Fisher, William Hayes
 MacIver, David (Liverpool)
 Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. M.
 Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
 Maconochie, A. W.
 Stock, James Henry
 Fletcher, Sir Henry
 M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
 Stroyan, John
 Forster, Henry William
 M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
 Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
 Garfit, William
 M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
 Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
 Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.)
 M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
 Thornton, Percy M.
 Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
 Majendie, James A. H.
 Tollemache, Henry James
 Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
 Malcolm, Ian
 Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray
 Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
 Manners, Lord Cecil
 Tufnell, Col. Edward
 Gordon, J. (Londonderry, South)
 Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W. F.
 Valentia, Viscount
 Question put, "That the Question be now put."
 The House divided: Ayes, 219; Noes, 105. (Division List No. 47.)
 Wanklyn, James Leslie
 Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
 Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
 Wason, John C. (Orkney)
 Williams, Rt Hn. J. Powell (Bir.)
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Webb, Col. William George
 Willox, Sir John Archibald

Young, Commander (Berks, E.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. CE (Taunton
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Sir William Walrond and
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Grant, Corrie
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ambrose, Robert
Hammond, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Harrington, Timothy
O'Malley, William
Black, Alexander William
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Mara, James
Blake, Edward
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Boland, John
Helme, Nerval Watson
Partington, Oswald
Boyle, James
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Pirie, Duncan V.
Brigg, John
Horniman, Frederick John
Power, Patrick Joseph
Broadhurst, Henry
Hulton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Reckitt, Harold James
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Joicey, Sir James

Reddy, M.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans' a
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Caldwell, James
Jones, William (Caruarvonsh.)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Pickett, J. Compton
Carew, James Laurence
Joyce, Michael
Roche, John
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Kenndy, Patrick James
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Channing, Francis Allston
Lambert, George
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Cogan, Denis J.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Sinclair, Capt Jotm (Forfarshire
Colville, John
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Spencer, Rt. Hn. CR (Northants
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Sullivan, Donal
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Arthur, Wm. (Cornwall)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Delany, William
M'Crae, George
Tennant, Harold John
Dillon, John
M'Dermott, Patrick
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Duffy, William J.
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Duncan, James H.
Mansfield, Horace Kendall
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Edwards, Frank
Mooney, John J.
Tomkinson, James

Elibank, Master of
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Tully, Jasper
Ellis, John Edward
Murphy, J.
Weir, James Galloway
Emmott, Alfred
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, George (Norfolk)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Farrell, James Patrick
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Flvnn, James Christopher
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Fuller, J. M. F.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Labouchero and Mr. E. J. C. Morton.
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Question put accordingly, "That the words 'during the remainder of the Session,'
stand part of the proposed Amendment, as amended."
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Bigwood, James
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Bill, Charles
Dalkeith, Earl of
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Bond, Edward
Davies, Sir Horatio (Chatham)
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Arrol, Sir William
Bull, William James
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Carlile, William Walter
Durning, Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cautley, Henry Strother
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Faber, George Denison
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbysh.)
Fellowes, Hon. A. Edward
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Baird, John George Alexander
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Finch, George H.
Balcarres, Lord
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm)
Finlay, Sir Robert Baunatyne
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manch'r)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Fisher, William Hayes
Balfour, Rt. Hon. Gerald W. (Leeds)
Chapman, Edward
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch.)
Charrington, Spencer
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Bartley, George C. T.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Forster, Henry William
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Ceilings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Garfit, William
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Gibbs, Hon. A.G.H. (City of Lond.)
Beckett, Ernest William
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Cranborne, Viscount
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
The House divided:;Ayes, 224; Noes, 97. (Division List No. 48.)
Gordon,Hn.J.E(Elgin&Nairn
Lowe, Francis William
Rentoul, James Alexander
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Renwick, George
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r Haml'ts)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Ridley,Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge)
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Lucas,Col.Francis(Lowestoft)
Ritchie,Rt.Hon.ChasThomson
Goschen,Hon.George Joachim
Lucas, ReginaldJ. (Portsmouth
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Graham, Henry Robert
Macdona, John Cumming
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Green, WalfordD(Wednesbury
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Russell, T. W.
Greene,SirEW(B'rySEdm'nds
Maconochie, A. W.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Grenfell, William Henry
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Sadler, Col. SamuelAlexander
Gretton, John
M'Calmont,Col.J.(Antrim, E.)
Sandys,Lieut.-Col. ThosMyles
Groves, James Grimble
M'Iver, SirLewis(EdinburghW
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
M'Killop,James(Stirlingshire
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E.J.
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Majendie, James A. H.
Scott, Sir S.(Marylebone, W.)
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Malcolm, Ian

Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Hambro, Charles Eric
Manners, Lord Cecil
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord (Middlesex)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hon. W. F.
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Hamilton, Marquess of (London and Warr)
Maxwell, Rt. Hon. Sir H. E. (Wigtown)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashford)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarkshire)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemouth)
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Heaton, John Henniker
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Stock, James Henry
Helder, Augustus
More, Robert Jasper (Shropshire)
Stroyan, John
Hermon Hodge, Robert T.
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Hope J. F. (Sheffield Brightside)
Morley, Charles (Breckshire)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Houldsworth, Sir William H.
Morrell, George Herbert
Tennant, Harold John
Hoult, Joseph
Morrison, James Archibald
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings)

Howard, Capt J. (Kent, Faversham)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Thornton, Percy M.
Hosier, Hon. James Henry C.
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Tollemache, Henry James
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Muntz, Philip A.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Hutton, John (Yorks, N.R.)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Valentia, Viscount
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Nicholson, William Graham
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Webb, Colonel William George
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.)
Keswick, William
Paulton, James Mellor
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Knowles, Lees
Pease, Herbert Pike Darlington
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Pemberton, John S. G.
Williams, Rt. Hon. J. Powell-Brym
Law, Andrew Bonar
Percy, Earl
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Lawrence, William F.
Pilkington, Richard
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)
Lawson, John Grant

Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Lee, Capt. AH (Hants, Fareham)
Plummer, Walter R.
Wilson, J.W. (Worcestersh, N.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Purvis, Robert
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham)
Randies, John S.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Sir William Walrond and
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Reid, James (Greenock)
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Dillon, John
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Duffy, William J.
Horniman, Frederick J.
Ambrose, Robert
Duncan, James H.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Motley)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Edwards, Frank
Joicey, Sir James
Bell, Richard
Elbank, Master of
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
Black, Alexander William
Ellis, John Edward
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Blake, Edward
Emmott, Alfred

Jordan, Jeremiah
Boland, John
Evans, Samuel T.(Glamorgan)
Joyce, Michael
Boyle, James
Kennedy, Patrick James
Brigg, John
Farrell James Patrick
Lambert, George
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Flynn, James Christopher
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Burke, E. Haviland-
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Caldwell, James
Grant, Corrie
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
M'Crae, George
Carew, James Laurence
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
M'Dermott, Patrick
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Hammond, John
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Channing, Francis Allston
Hardie,JKeir(MerthyrTydvil)
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Cogan, Denis J.
Harrington, Timothy
Mooney, John J.
Colville, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Murphy, J.
Delany, William
Helme, Norval Watson
Nannetti,Joseph P.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Pantington, Oswald
Thomas,Alfred(Glamorgan,E.
Nussey, Thomas Willans

Pirie, Duncan V.
Thomson, F. W. (York,W.R.)
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipper'ry Mid
Power. Patrick Joseph
Tomkinson, James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Reckitt, Harold James
Tully, Jasper
O'Connor, James(Wicklow,W.
Reddy, M.
Weir, James Galloway
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Redmond, John K. (Waterford
White, George (Norfolk)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Redmond, William (Clare)
While, Luke (York, E.R.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Rickett, J. Compton
Williams,Osmond(Merioneth)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Roche, John
Wilson, HenryJ.(Yorks,W.R.
O'Kelly, Jas (Roscommon, N.)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
O'Malley, William
Shaw. Thomas (Hawick B.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
O'Mara, James
Sullivan, Donal
Mr. Labouchere and Mr. Broadhurst.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
MR. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That the main Question be now put."
Main Question put accordingly, "That
AYES.
Acland-Hood,Capt.SirAlex.F.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Hayne,Rt.Hon.Charles Seale.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Heath,ArthurHoward(Hanley
Agnev, Sir Andrew Noel
Dalziel, James Henry
Heaton, John Henniker
Allen, Chas. P.(Glone.,Strond)

Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Helder, Augustus
Althnsen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Helme, Norval Watson
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Hobhouse, C.'E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Arrol, Sir William
Duncan, James H.
Hope, J.F. (Sheff'ld, Brightside
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Horniman, Frederick John
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Edwards, Frank
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Baget, Capt. Joceline FitzRoy
Elibank, Master of
Hoult, Joseph
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversham.
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Faber, George Denison
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Baird, John George Alexander
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Balcarres, Lord
Fielden, Edw. Brocklehurst
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A.J. (Manchester)
Pinch, George H.
Mutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Finlay, Sir Rbt. Bannatyne
Hutton, John (Yorks., N.R.)
Balfour, Maj. K.R. (Christchurch)
Fisher, William Hayes
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Hartley, George C. T.
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon

Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Beach, Rt Hon. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Forster, Henry William
Joicy, Sir James
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans' a
Beckett, Ernest William
Garlil, William
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Bell, Richard
Gibbs, Hn. A. GH. (City of Lond.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans
Keswick, William
Bigwood, James
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. John
knowles, Lees
Bill, Charles
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Bhundell, Colonel Henry
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Bond, Edward
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Lawrence, William p.
Boseawen, Arthur Grillith-
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, Si
Lawson, John Grant
Brigg, John
Gordon, Maj Evans - (Tril' ml'ts
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Brown, Alex) H. (Shropsh.)
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Lee, Capt AH (Hants. Fareham
Bull, William James
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim-
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Bullard, Sir Harry
Graham, Henry Robert
Leigh, Sir Joseph

Caldwell, James
Grant, Corrie
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Carlile, William Walter
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S
Cautley, Henry Strother
Greene, Sir EW (Bry S. Edm'nds
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Greniell, William Henry
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derhysh.
Gretton, John
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Grillith, Ellis J.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Groves, James Grimble
Lowe, Francis William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)
Chamberlain, J. A. (Wore'r
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Chapman, Edward
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Charrington Spencer
Halsey Thomas Frederick
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Churehill, Winston Spencer
Hambro, Charles Eric
Maedona, John Cumming
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Maclver, David (Liverpool)
Collings, Rt. Hon Jesse
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
Maconochie, A. W.
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
Colville, John

Hare, Thomas Leigh
M'Arthur, Wm. (Cornwall)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemouth)
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Crauborne, Viscount
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
M'Crae, George
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W)
the Amendment, as amended, be there inserted in Standing Order No, 21."
The House divided;; Noes, 51. (Division List No. 49.)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Majendie, James A. H.
Plummer, Walter R.
Stock, James Henry
Malcolm, Ian
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Stroyan, John
Manners, Lord Cecil
Pretymann, Ernest George
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.,
Purvis, Robert
Tennant, Harold John
Maxwell, Rt Hon Sir HE. (Wigt'n
Randies, John S.
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Maxwell, WJH (Dumfriesshire
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Cower)
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Rickitt, Harold James
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fredk. G.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Thornton, Percy M.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Rentoul, James Alexander
Tollemache, Henry James

Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Berwick, George
Tomkiuson, James
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Rickett, J. Compton
Tomlinson, Wm.Edw. Murray
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Ridley, Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge
Tufnell, Col. Edward
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Valentia, Viscount
Morgan, Dav. J.(Walthamstow
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Wason, JohnCathcart(Orkney
Morrell, George Herbert
Russell, T. W.
Webb, Col. William George
Morrison, James Archibald
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Weir, James Galloway
Morton, Arthur HA(Deptford)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Welby, Lt.-Col.ACE(Taunton)
Morton,Edw.J. C.(Devonport)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Welby, Sir Chas. E. (Notts.)
Mowbray, Sir Robert (Gray C.
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Muntz, Philip A.
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Whitmore, Chas. Algernon
Murray, Rt Hn AGraham (Bute
Saunderson, Rt. Hn Col. Edw. J.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell-(Bir.
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Seely, Charles Hilton(Lincoln)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Nicholson, William Graham

Sharpe, William Edward T.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York,E.R.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Shaw-Stewart,M. H. (Renfrew)
Wilson, JW.(Worcestersh.N)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Simeon, Sir Harrington
Wortley,Rt.Hon.C.B.Stuart-
Partington, Oswald
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Paulton, James Mellor
Smith, Hon. W.F. D.(Strand)
Young, Commander (Berks,E.
Pease,Herb. Pike (Darlington
Stanley. Rt Hn. CR. (Northants
Pemberton, John S. G.
Stanley,Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Percy, Farl
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Sir William Walrond and
Pilkington, Richard
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Hardie, J Keir(Merthyr Tydvil
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ambrose, Robert
Harrington, Timothy
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.
Blake, Edward
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Malley, William
Boland, John
Joyce, Michael
O'Mara, James
Boyle, James
Kennedy, Patrick James

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Broadhurst, Henry
Labouchere, Henry
Power, Patrick Joseph
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Roddy, M.
Carew, James Laurence
M'Dermott, Patrick
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Channing, Francis Allston
Mooney, John J.
Roche, John
Cogan, Denis J.
Murphy, J.
Sullivan, Donal
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Tully, Jasper
Delany, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
White, George (Norfolk)
Dillon, John
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Duffy, William J.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Farrell, James Patrick
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Mr. Patrick O'Brien and
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Mr. Haviland-Burke.

Ordered, That if any Member, or Members acting jointly, who have been suspended under this Order from the service of the House, shall refuse to obey the direction of the Speaker, when severally summoned under the Speaker's orders by the Serjeant-at-Arms to obey such direction, the Speaker shall call the attention of the House to the fact that recourse to force is necessary in order to compel obedience to his direction, and the Member or Members named by him as having refused to obey his direction shall thereupon, and without further Question put, be suspended from the service of the House during the remainder of the Session.

COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE TO CROPS, ETC., BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Wednesday, 19th June.

Adjourned at twenty minutes before Six of the clock, a.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 8th March. 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 Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.:

West Surrey Water Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

BRITISH GAS LIGHT COMPANY BILL.

TAKE VALE RAILWAY BILL.

TENDRING HUNDRED WATER BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That, in pursuance of the provisions of the Private Legislature Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899, they had selected the following Fifteen Members to form the Parliamentary Panel of Members of this House to act as Commissioners:;Mr. Channing. Mr. Colville, Sir Charles Dalrymple, Mr. J. E. Gordon, Mr. Charles Hobhouse, Mr. Alfred Hutton, Mr. Brynmor Jones, Sir John Kinloch, Mr. A. K. Loyd, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Pym, Mr. Renshaw, Mr. A. H. Smith, Sir Walter Thorburn, and Mr. Eugene Wason.

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Basset-law; Bewdley; and Welbeck; to lie upon the Table.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

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

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Swansea; Blackpool; and Glusburn; to lie upon the Table.

PARLIAMENT (KING'S DECLARATION).

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

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1890.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Macclesfield; and Sheerness and Minster; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Reigate; and Bideford; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Aberdeen (three); York (two); Largs; Carlisle, (four); Plymouth; Stepney Green; Brixton; Durham; Bridlington; Bide-ford; and Greenock;

to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Greenock; Gourock (five); Ashton; and Johnstone; to lie upon the Table.

BRITISH MUSEUM.

Petition of the Trustees of the British Museum (King's Recommendation signified), for grant in aid; referred to the Committee of Supply.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNFUNDED DEBT.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 5th March; Sir Edgar Vincent]; to lie upon the Table.

BOARD OF AGRICULTURE.

Copy presented, of Annual Report of Proceedings under the Tithe Acts, Copyhold Act, 1894, Inclosure Acts, and other Acts for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES.)

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2559 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (WATER-TUBE BOILERS) (COMMITTEE).

Copy presented, of Interim Report of the Committee appointed by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to consider certain questions respecting modern Boilers for Naval purposes [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

REVENUE (COLLECTION OF TAXES).

Return ordered, "showing for each of the three Kingdoms (1) the amount charged for Income Tax, Land Tax, and Inhabited House Duty for the financial years 1898, 1899, and 1900; and (2) the amounts and percentage of same collected in each country by the 31st day of January and the 28th day of February, respectively, in each of the said years.";(Mr. M'Crae.)

BRITISH MUSEUM.

Return ordered, "of Account of the Income and Expenditure of the British Museum (Special Trust Funds) for the year ending the 31st day of March, 1901; and Return of the number of Persons admitted to visit the Museum and the British Museum (Natural History) in each year from 1895 to 1900, both years inclusive; together with a Statement of the Progress made in the arrangement and description of the Collections, and an Account of Objects added to them in the year 1900.";(Mr. John Morley.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;NUMBER OF BOER PRISONERS.

CAPTAIN BAGOT (Westmoreland, Kendal): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state how many of the enemy have been taken prisoners since the commencement of the war in South Africa, how many have been released on parole or otherwise, and how many are now in our hands as prisoners of war.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Up to the 9th February the total number of the enemy taken prisoners was 16,082; of these 447 are on parole, and 293 have died.

CAMPS OK CONCENTRATION.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now inform the House as to the number and situation of the camps of concentration in South Africa, both in the Colonies and the two late Republics, the number of the men, women, and children in each camp, and the actual nature of the shelter provided; whether medical attendance is provided, particularly for the women and children; and whether relatives and others desiring to mitigate the situation of those confined in these camps are allowed reasonable access to them.

MR. BRODRICK: I am afraid I have no information to add to that which I have already given to the hon. Member. I do not think the hon. Member need be under any anxiety about these people. [Mr. ELLIS rose, but resumed his seat amid Ministerial cries of "Order."] Lord Kitohener telegraphed to me that he himself has gone into the question and finds that the people in the laagers are all contented and comfortable, and we must rely on his assurance.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I am much obliged to the right hon. Gentleman. I meant no discourtesy by my interruption, but allow me to say I asked him for facts, not for opinions.

AN HON. MEMBER: "A stream of facts."

CIVIL APPOINTMENTS IN THE TRANSVAAL.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what were the specific appointments made by Lord Roberts to posts of a civil nature in the Transvaal, and what were the terms of such appointments in respect of duration and remuneration; whether the persons in question have either discharged any of the duties of their posts or received any remuneration; and, in the latter case, against whom it has been charged.

MR. BRODRICK: There is no information at the War Office which would enable me to give the hon. Member a list of the civil appointments in question. Any such appointments made by Lord Roberts were temporary and terminable when the military administration gives place to civil government. The persons so appointed have, I believe, discharged their duties and received their remuneration. Any expenses of administration which cannot be defrayed from local revenues are provisionally borne by Army funds.

ST. JOHN AMBULANCE BRIGADE; WAR GRATUITIES.

SIR FREDERICK MILNER (Nottinghamshire, Bassetlaw): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it has been officially decided that members of the St.

John Ambulance Brigade who have served in South Africa are not entitled to the war gratuity that was by

a recent Order awarded to all classes of troops engaged in the war; and whether, seeing that the members of the St. John Ambulance Brigade have been working with the Royal Army Medical Corps, doing the same duties and bearing the same risks and hardships, and also seeing that fifty out of the 1,900 members of the St. John Ambulance Brigade serving in South Africa have died in the execution of their duty, he will reconsider this decision.

MR. BRODRICK: The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative. The war gratuity is a military gratuity, originally intended as a

substitute for prize-money, and is not applicable to civilians employed on specific terms during the war. I may remind the hon. Member that members of the St. John Ambulance Brigade are paid at considerably higher rates than the corresponding ranks of the Royal Army Medical Corps.

SOLDIERS' UNCLAIMED BALANCES.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg I to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the amount of soldiers unclaimed balances for the past year, and what portion of these has been: handed over to the Patriotic Fund Commissioners.

*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Unclaimed balances are advertised for six years before they are transferred to the Patriotic Fund. As the balances of any one year are kept in hand for two years I before the account is closed, and the balance is invested, it is not possible to state the amount of unclaimed balances for the past year.

SOLDIERS' KITS;LOSSES ON ACTIVE SERVICE,

*MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the case of wounded soldiers whoso small kit has been lost in the field or left behind at Cape Town according to instructions, on their reporting themselves fit for duty a new set of small kit is supplied to them but is deducted from their pay; if so, I can he state whether the deduction is made in accordance with an Army Order, and will lie consider the advisability of cancelling such order.

*LORD STANLEY: Attention was called to this matter. I have had the regulations amended so that a soldier's necessities lost, prematurely worn out, or damaged, on active service are replaced at public expense. Instructions were issued to this effect some little time ago.

PROVISION FOR INVALIDED SOLDIERS.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that Private Woolley, a Reserve man, formerly of the Royal Horse Artillery, now resident at Leicester, who was invalided home from South Africa, and is certified by the military medical authorities to be practically blind, very helpless, mentally dull, subject to fits, and needing constant care and attention, has been granted a temporary pension of 1s. per day for twelve months; and whether that is in accordance with the practice of the War Office in such cases.

*LORD STANLEY: Woolley has been awarded a pension of 1s. a day for twelve, months in the first instance by the Chelsea Commissioners. At the end of that period he will be re-examined and his case reconsidered. His character while with the Colours was indifferent. He is stated to have been addicted to drink, and was frequently reported for other offences. While in the Reserve he was three times convicted by the Civil power for drunkenness and assault. As there is no evidence that Woolley's disability is the result of military service, the pension in question is the highest that can be awarded.

WAR OFFICE MESSENGERS.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it has been brought to his notice that a certain number of Crimean and Indian Mutiny veterans serving as messengers in the War Office were recently

retired at sixty instead of sixty-five years of age, the Treasury age limit, limit still applicable to messengers in their Government offices; and whether, seeing that these men are now reduced to their Army pension of a few pence a day, he will consider the advisability of granting them some small increase of pension to keep them from penury in their declining years.

*LORD STANLEY: The case of these men has been explained to the House on a previous occasion. In the War Office it is essential that the messengers should be active and able-bodied. It was accordingly found necessary to fix the age for retirement of temporary messengers at sixty. All such men who have fifteen years service as such receive a gratuity on discharge in addition to the Army pension of which they may be in receipt. I am afraid that it is not possible to do anything more for them as suggested.

CHINA EXPEDITION; PAY OF OFFICERS.

MR. AGG-GARDNER (Cheltenham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will explain why certain officers, who have been lent to the Home Government for service in the China Expedition, should draw less pay and allowances when in China than they did while on service in India.

*MR. BRODRICK: Officers of the Indian Staff Corps continue to draw Indian rates of pay while serving in China, Officers of the British Army leaving India would naturally revert to British rates of pay and China allowances, and these might be less than Indian rates.

ILLEGAL TRAWLING; REPORTS BY COASTGUARDMEN.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if there are any objections to coast guardmen reporting illegal trawling to the nearest fishery officer.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The coastguards are directed by their instructions to report to the nearest fishery officer any breach of the Fishery Laws which may come under their notice in the ordinary course of their duty.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGES AND STATE GRANTS.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he intends, in accordance with the precedent of 1896, to appoint Commissioners to visit and report upon the University Colleges receiving grants from the State before any fresh allocations of the grants in 1902; and, if so, whether he can say when and by whom such visitations will be made.

THE CHANCELLOR, OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Yes, Sir. Dr. H. G. Woods, formerly President of Trinity College, Oxford, and Dr. Alexander Hill, Master of Downing College, Cambridge, have consented to serve as Commissioners. Arrangements for the visitation are now being made, and it will begin at an early date.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL: I presume the officials and those interested in the conduct of the colleges will have an opportunity of stating their case.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Certainly.

MR. PALMER (Salisbury): Will the visitations be extended to other colleges of a similar nature, which have not yet received the grants?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH said that any college doing what was properly university work

would be included in the inquiry. If any college which had not received any grant sent in an application from which it appeared that it came within the rule he would consider it.

THE NEW COINAGE.

*MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the widespread condemnation of the portrait of Queen Victoria on the coinage first used in 1887, he has satisfied himself that the designing of the new coinage has been entrusted to the best possible artistic workmanship; and, if not, whether he will order designs from such a source, or else consider the advisability of retaining the present designs on the reverse side of the new coins.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The task of designing the effigy of His Majesty on the new coinage has been entrusted to Mr. De Saulles, the engraver to the Mint. I think the coinage of 1887 is a warning against entrusting this work to an artist unaccustomed to coinage and engraving. The whole question of the designs for the new coinage is receiving my careful attention. I do not, as at present advised, think that it will be found desirable to introduce many changes in the present designs on the reverses.

FACTORIES AND WORKSHOPS; INSPECTOR'S ANNUAL REPORT.

"SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether he can say at what date he expects to be able to circulate the Annual Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories and Workshops.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I am afraid I cannot fix a date; but the Chief Inspector assures me that he is making every effort to get his Report out as early as possible.

FATALITY AT HOOTON'S FACTORY, NOTTINGHAM.

*MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the death of George Benton, which took place on 1st February at Messrs. Hooton's factory, Nottingham; and will he inquire whether this factory was erected before or after 1st January, 1896, and whether, in view of the nature of the accident, he will consider the advisability of applying the provisions of Section 9 of the Factory and Workshop Act, 1895, to all factories containing self-acting machines irrespective, of the date of the erection of such factories.

*MR. RITCHIE: I have made inquiries about this accident, and find that the factory and the machine that caused the accident were erected long before 1896. The suggestion of the hon. Member was considered and found to be impracticable in 1895; and I do not think that the House would be likely to accept it now. Moreover, it would not, so far as I can see, have prevented the accident in question. Fencing will, however, be erected which should prevent the possibility of a similar accident in future from this particular machine.

METROPOLITAN POLICE AT DEVONPORT DOCKYARD.

MR. KEARLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the extra allowance recently conceded to married constables of the Metropolitan police to meet the high rent payable in the Metropolis will be extended to the

Metropolitan police serving in the Government establishments at Devonport, where house rent is as high, and the men are obliged by the regulations to live within ten minutes walk of their place of duty.

*MR. RITCHIE: No, Sir; the case of the Metropolitan police in the dockyards at Devonport was considered when the whole matter was before me, but the conditions under which they serve there are very different from those prevailing in London. There is no regulation requiring them to live within ten minutes walk of their place of duty.

PURE BEER.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the unanimous resolution passed by the Carmarthenshire Chamber of Agriculture as to the necessity of a Bill being passed to secure purity in beer, by laying down therein the ingredients of which beer may be composed, and the compelling of brewers at regular intervals to make a return of beer brewed and ingredients used; and, if so, whether he can assure the House of his intention to introduce promptly a Bill carrying out the purport of this resolution.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I have seen a copy of the resolution referred to, but the matter is not one which concerns the Board of Trade.

EVENING SCHOOL CODE LIMIT.

MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education if he will confer with the Treasury as to the possibility of removing the 17s. 6d. limit from the Evening Schools Code, and also as to providing a specific grant for physical instruction in evening continuation schools.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The Board of Education cannot undertake to make an application to the Treasury for the removal of the 17s. 6d. limit from the Evening Schools Code. A grant is already made for physical instruction.

VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM;DUKE OF SAXE-COBURG'S COLLECTION.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAG-GREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the Oriental collection of His Royal Highness the late Duke of Saxe-Coburg has been lent to the Victoria and Albert Museum; and, if so, what is proposed to be done with it, and whether it is intended to lend it for a time to the Bethnal Green Museum for exhibition.

SIR J. GORST: The Oriental collection of the late Duke of Saxe-Coburg, consisting of Indian arms, Chinese porcelain, and other objects of art, has been lent to the Victoria and Albert Museum. It will be exhibited during the summer in the Indian Section of the Museum, and afterwards in the Bethnal Green Museum.

LLANELLY CROWN LANDS;BELGIAN ENTERPRISE.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a Belgian company has secured a lease of a large area of Crown land at Llanelly noted for containing coal of a highly bituminous nature which is indispensable for the manufacture of steel, a staple industry of that district, the company intending

to employ Belgian workmen and to ship the coal to Belgium; and, if so, whether he can inform the House if the covenants of the lease have been broken so as to enable him to cancel it, even if it be a sub-let, or if he can adopt some action which will prevent the steel manufacturers of Llanelly from being deprived of coal necessary for their manufacturing purposes, and British colliers from losing employment; and, in the event of the Crown Commissioner for Woods and Forests not being able to cancel the lease, whether, in the interests of British traders and British workmen, he can assure the House that in the future no Crown land will be sub-let or let to any foreign company.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire E.): The bulk of this area of Crown coal was let to some gentlemen at Llanelly in 1896 for a term of twenty-one years. They never succeeded in raising sufficient capital in Wales or England to work it properly, although they made great efforts to do so, and it consequently remained unworked. Recently an arrangement was come to by them with a Belgian gentleman who was willing to provide the necessary capital, and he has taken an assignment of the lease. The Commissioner of Woods has agreed to grant him a new lease for an extended term when he shall have sunk certain deep shafts. This agreement cannot be cancelled by the Commissioner. I cannot give an absolute promise of the nature suggested in the last paragraph, but such cases are not, I hope, likely to recur, and British subjects will, other things being equal, always be accepted as tenants in preference to foreigners or foreign companies.

LONDON AND PARIS MAIL.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, having regard to the negotiations now proceeding between the French and English postal authorities for improving the London and Paris mail services, the Postmaster General will direct the attention of the French postal authorities to the practical advantages business firms and correspondents generally in France and Great Britain; more especially in the provinces; would derive if the morning mail were started from London and Paris at 7.30 or 8 a.m. instead of at 9 a.m.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The question of an earlier departure of the day mail between London and Paris in both directions has already been fully discussed between the British and French

Post Offices; and it is found that the change would in each case be attended by drawbacks of a serious nature. The hon. Member may, however, like to know that, as a result of a recent conference, the French authorities have, at the instance of the Postmaster General, made special arrangements for accelerating the arrival in Paris of letters sent from London by the day service in order that they may be distributed by an earlier delivery than heretofore.

IRELAND; CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL (Mayo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of acres of land purchased by the Congested Districts Board in Ireland since the 1st April, 1900; the aggregate sum of purchase money paid; the average number of years purchase given; and the counties within which the transfer of property took place.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (MR. WYNDHAM, Dover): Since the date mentioned, the Board has purchased 5,711 acres in the counties of Donegal, Mayo, and Galway for the sum of £13,480, including landlords' and tenants' interests. In some cases the lands purchased were untenanted, in some tenanted, and in others partly tenanted; the number of years purchase cannot, therefore, be computed. In some cases the lands were subject to head rents, quit rents, and tithe rent charges, and in others they were free of all rents or charges whatsoever; and the latter, of course, commanded a higher price than the former. The Board is negotiating for the purchase of other estates comprising 13,390 acres.

POLICE MALPRACTICES AT MULLOUGH.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Police-sergeant Sheridan and Constable Mahony, of Mullough police station, have been dismissed the service for placing boycotting notices in the pocket of a man named Ryan and subsequently arresting him; and what steps do His Majesty's Government propose to take

to safeguard the public against such practices on the part of the police.

MR. WYNDHAM: Sergeant Sheridan and Constable Mahony arrested on the 1st January, at Mullough, county Clare, a man named John Ryan, alleging that they had observed him in the act of posting a threatening notice, and that subsequently they had discovered two other threatening notices in his pockets. He was brought before the resident magistrate at Miltown Malbay on the following morning and remanded from time to time until the 26th January, when he was discharged from custody on the ground that the evidence would not have secured a conviction. No other course could properly have been taken when the evidence brought forward was, in the opinion of the Crown, untrustworthy. These police officers were not discharged for placing the notices in the man's pocket. They were discharged for supporting a charge by evidence of a character so unsatisfactory and conflicting as to render their further retention in the force undesirable in the interests of the public.

TRACTION ENGINE TRAFFIC ON BALLYMKNA ROAD.

MR. SAMUEL YOUNG (Cavan, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the Local Government Act for Ireland there is no provision to compel the users of traction engines to pay for excessive wear of public roads; and that the use of these engines has made the iron ore road, 650 perches in length, between Glenarm and Ballymena, almost impassable, and has increased the cost to the ratepayers by over £800 per annum for maintenance above the sum required before the mineral traffic began in 1870; and whether he will take steps to relieve the inhabitants of the districts of this tax by assimilating the law in this respect with that of England; namely, the Act of 1878; so that damages may be recovered in Ireland by the local authorities in regard to excessive wear on highways.

MR. WYNDHAM: Under Section 23 of the Highways and Locomotives Act, 1878, as amended by Section 12 of the Locomotives Act, 1898, damages can be recovered by the local authority in England in respect of excessive wear on highways by reason of extraordinary traffic. These enactments do not apply to

Ireland but I will consider the question of assimilating the law in this respect in both countries. I may add that, without further inquiry than I have been able to give to the matter, I cannot say how far the words "extraordinary traffic" apply to traffic conducted otherwise than by traction engines.

WICKLOW COUNTY COUNCIL FINANCE.

*MR. COGAN (Wicklow, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that, at the quarterly meeting of the Wicklow County Council on 25th February, the secretary reported that, although he had his calculations ready as far as possible for the estimates for the ensuing financial year, he was unable to complete them owing to the failure of the Valuation Office to forward him the revised valuations of the urban districts, and the total for the county, and informing him they would not be ready before the 1st March, although the Order in Council requires the estimate to be adopted by the county council by the 1st March; that he then communicated with the Local Government Board, and did not receive a reply until the 25th ultimo, stating that he could act on last year's valuation, but that the secretary reported this would be a dangerous experiment owing to the opposition, of some urban councils to the demands of the county council, and that in any case the letter from the Local Government Board was received too late to enable him to complete his estimate; and that the county council adjourned without adopting the estimate for the ensuing year; whether the Local Government Board will take the necessary steps to legalise the action of the county council when they adopt their estimate after 1st March, as they have been precluded from doing so within the time limited by the Order in Council owing to the failure of the Valuation Office in furnishing the necessary report in time; and whether the Government will take steps to increase the staff of the Valuation Office, so as to enable it to supply to county councils in Ireland information required by them in sufficient time to enable them to proceed with their business in a regular manner.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are substantially as stated in the first paragraph of the question, but the county council received the revised valuation lists for all the rural districts on the 1st of February. There are two urban districts in the county, and the charge in the valuation of these only amounted to a sum of £;220, so that there was really no valid reason why the estimate should not have been completed in Wicklow, as in other counties, with all necessary accuracy. The Local Government Board are not in any way in default, but as there has been some misunderstanding it will be prepared to extend the time for making the estimate in county Wicklow, so as to get over the difficulty. No increase is necessary in the staff of the Valuation Office.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN CASHEL UNION.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state on what grounds the application for a cottage by a labourer, named Dwyer, of Rosheg, East Division of Kilpatrick, Cashel Union, county of Tipperary, was twice rejected by the Local Government Board, the house of applicant having been certified by the Medical Sanitary Officer as being unfit to shelter cattle; whether he is aware that a petition

signed by the Roman Catholic and Protestant clergymen of the parish, and all the ratepayers, was forwarded to the Local Government Board to reconsider the rejection, and its prayer refused; and whether he will now take steps to have this application reconsidered.

MR. WYNDHAM: The proposal was rejected in 1893 because Mary Dywer acknowledged that she was not an agricultural labourer. It was again rejected in 1899 because two cottages, erected in the vicinity for agricultural labourers, were occupied by a shoemaker and a blacksmith, contrary to the provisions of the Labourers Act of 1883. If this state of things still exists it does not appear that a different decision could now be arrived at.

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOL REQUISITES.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the requisites for the new programme in Irish national schools are yet ready; will the Education Office make a free grant of those requisites to all schools; are the requisites manufactured in Ireland; and has any one person or company a monopoly in supplying those requisites.

MR. WYNDHAM: All the requisites needed in connection with the revised programme can be ordered by managers of schools through the Commissioners' stores in Dublin. It is the intention of the Commissioners to make equipment grants of the requisites required for hand and eye training and elementary science instruction to the most necessitous of the national schools. Some of the requisites are manufactured in Ireland, and some are not. The answer to the second paragraph is in the negative.

IRISH EMIGRATION.

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state the number of emigrants who left Ireland from the 1st January, 1901, to the 31st December of the same year, and how many of the total left the province of Connaught.

MR. WYNDHAM: The year 1901 is clearly a misprint for 1900. The number of emigrants from Ireland in the past year was 45,288, of whom 14,060 were from the province of Connaught.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I ask whether that total is larger than the total for 1899, and the total for the year 1899 larger than that for the year 1898?

MR. WYNDHAM: I believe the hon. Member is correct. The total for the past year is higher than the total for the previous four years, and lower than for several years prior to 1896.

SHILLELAGH UNION; CHARGES AGAINST NURSE JOYCE.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that charges made by Dr. Bolster, Tinahely, against Nurse Joyce, an employee of the Shillelagh Union, were investigated by the guardians of that union, and dismissed as unfounded; will he explain why the Local Government Board, overriding the decision of the guardians, ordered a new inquiry to be held by their own inspector, Dr. Flinn; also, why the latter, after making arrangements to hold the inquiry in the

Tinahely Courthouse, subsequently, without explanation to witnesses and other persons concerned, held the inquiry in Shillelagh; whether Dr. Flinn called for a list of witnesses on behalf of the accuser and accused, and also summoned Dr. Bolster's witnesses; and, if so, why did he not summon Nurse Joyce's witnesses; and whether he is aware that notwithstanding Dr. Flinn's statement to some of the guardians that there was nothing in Dr. Bolster's charges, he (Dr. Flinn) has given judgment against Nurse Joyce; and whether in view of Dr. Flinn's procedure towards Mrs. Joyce, he will order Dr. Flinn's decision to be reconsidered, and direct a new inquiry to be held.

MR. WYNDHAM: The charges preferred by Dr. Bolster against Nurse Joyce were investigated and dismissed by the guardians. In view of the gravity of the charges the Local Government Board ordered a sworn inquiry to be held by its inspector, Dr. Flinn. The inquiry was held at Shillelagh, the usual and most convenient place. All the witnesses on both sides whose evidence was likely to be material were summoned, and attended. Dr. Flinn did not state that there was nothing in the charges against the nurse. The decision was arrived at by the Board, not by Dr. Flinn, whose duty was simply to obtain evidence. It does not appear that any further inquiry is called for.

CHARGES AGAINST DR. BOLSTER.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, having regard to the fact that the Shillelagh Guardians have investigated charges against Dr. Bolster of neglect and indifference towards patients holding union tickets for his attendance on them, and have declared the charges sufficiently established to demand inquiry, will he see that the inquiry into Dr. Bolster's conduct is held as soon as convenient.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board has called upon Dr. Bolster for his observations on the charges preferred against him; upon receipt of his reply the question of holding a sworn inquiry will be considered.

GORTIN MAGISTERIAL BENCH.

*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the constitution of the petty sessions bench at Gortin, in North Tyrone, which consists almost exclusively of Protestant magistrates, though the majority of the population of the district are Roman Catholics; and is he aware of the dissatisfaction existing in consequence among the Roman Catholic population; and, if so, would he be pleased to call the attention of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, in whom lies the sole power of appointing to the Irish magistracy, to this state of affairs, with a view to redressing the grievance.

MR. WYNDHAM: My attention has not been directed to the religious composition of the Justices in attendance at Gortin Petty Sessions; but I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the statements. In answer to the second paragraph, the right hon. Gentleman must be aware that recommendations for appointments to the Commission of the Peace in this, as in other districts, should be made to the Lieutenant of the County, who will submit them, if suitable, for the consideration of the Lord Chancellor. It is not within my province to intervene in the matter of these appointments as suggested, but I will forward to the Lord

Chancellor, for his information, a copy of the question and of my answer to it.

*MR. HEMPHILL: May I ask, is the right hon. Gentleman aware that Lord Chancellors have conferred the commission of the peace quite irrespective of any recommendations from the Lieutenant of the County, and that it was done in many cases by the late Lord Chancellor Walker?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not aware of that. It is not the practice which is being followed.

HORSE BREEDING IN COUNTY CORK.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the refusal of the Congested Districts Board to an application from the Ballydehob district (county Cork) for one of the board's stallions suitable to the district, he will now take steps for the favourable reconsideration of this request.

MR. WYNDHAM: The allocation of the Boards stallions has been made after full and careful consideration of the circumstances of each district, and the Board regrets that it is unable to send a stallion to Ballydehob this season.

CLOGHERHEAD POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that letters for Clogherhead, county Louth, are despatched from the Drogheda Post Office a short time before the arrival of the limited mail; that, consequently, all letters from England, Scotland, and abroad for Clogherhead lie in Drogheda or Termonfeckin for twenty-three hours before reaching their destination, which causes inconvenience to the families of Clogherhead fishermen, many of whom are absent from home at the Scotch fisheries during the season and send home part of their earnings for their families, and deprives the farmers there of the means of prompt information as to the sales of their cattle and sheep consigned to Liverpool and Salford; and whether this delay could be obviated by causing the postal messenger from Termonfeckin, who delivers letters within a half mile of Clogherhead, to go direct and deposit letters for that office, and make the few house to house deliveries required on his way back to Termonfeckin.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General will consider whether a second post can be provided in the way suggested by the hon. Member, who shall be informed of the result.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) RETURNS.

MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Return, Local Government Act (Ireland) Electoral Areas, moved for on 2nd August last, and ordered to be printed on 15th February, will be soon ready for distribution.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Return, which is a very voluminous one, will, I hope, be ready for distribution in the course of the next fortnight.

MEATH COUNTY COUNCIL; CREDIT BALANCES.

*MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): I bag to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that an assessment of income tax has been made on interest received by the Meath County Council on credit balances in the hands of its county treasurer, pursuant to Section 2 of the County Treasurers Act, 1867; and

that this income is applied by the county council to the relief of the destitute poor in lieu of poor rates; and whether he will direct the Commissioners of Income Tax to cancel this assessment.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Inquiry is being made into the circumstances of this case. Assuming, however, that the facts are as stated, the proper course for the Meath County Council to adopt, if they were dissatisfied with the assessment, was to appeal against it to the Commissioners for Special Purposes, from whose decision a further appeal lies to the county court judge. If the county council have failed to give notice of appeal within the time prescribed by law, it will not now be possible to alter the assessment for the current year. But it is not in my power to give the directions suggested in this question.

*MR. KENNEDY: The question is, are they liable to pay income tax on this interest which they receive on their credit balances, and which, is applied to the relief of the poor? Is money applied to the relief of the poor liable to income tax?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I should be rather surprised if it is so, but it is a legal question, and it is impossible for me to reply to it.

*MR. KENNEDY: I can assure the right hon. Gentleman, as chairman of the county council, that it is so.

CLONES POST OFFICE;STAFF ACCOMMODATION.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if his attention has been directed to the office accommodation at Clones, where, with a mixed staff, there is an entire absence of sanitary arrangements and no provision for heating; and will he undertake to give the matter consideration, with a view to improved arrangements for the public and the staff.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The post office at Clones is located at present, as it has been for many years past, in a shop, half of which is used for the purposes of a private business. The accommodation is admittedly inadequate, but it is the best that could be obtained. A site for a new Crown post office is in course of acquisition, and plans are being prepared for a new building, which it is hoped will be commenced during the present year.

MEDICAL ATTENDANCE FOR THE CLONES MEDICAL STAFF.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that a sorting clerk and telegraphist at Clones, who is only in receipt of 18s. per week, was recently refused payment of medical expenses incurred by him during illness, on the ground that the Department did not at that office provide gratuitous medical attention; whether inquiry will be made with a view to the sum claimed being paid; and if he will state what are the conditions requisite to claim free medical attention.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is the case that a sorting clerk and telegraphist at Clones who was absent on sick leave was informed that his medical expenses could not be paid by the Department. It is only at offices to which a medical officer is attached that Post Office servants, whose pay does not exceed £150 a year, are entitled to free medical attendance; and Clones is not one of these offices.

IRISH LANGUAGE IN THE POST OFFICE.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, as Irish is taught in national and intermediate schools in Ireland, spoken and written by a portion of the population, the Post Office authorities in Ireland will take steps, by the appointment of competent officials, for the delivery of letters addressed in Irish.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No inconvenience has been found to arise from ignorance of the Irish language on the part of officers of the Post Office employed in Ireland, and it is not thought necessary to take any special steps to ensure that such knowledge shall be possessed by them.

LONDON BILLS IN PARLIAMENT; OPPOSITION BY METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCILS.

MR. BOULNOIS (Marylebone, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he proposes to take action with reference to the powers of Metropolitan borough councils to oppose Bills in Parliament, having regard to the fact that Section 6, subsection 6, of the London Government Act, 1899, is practically inoperative in the Metropolis in consequence of the provisions of the Borough Funds Act, 1872, having to be observed.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WATER LONG, Bristol, S.): The sub-section referred to in the question places the councils of metropolitan boroughs in the same position with regard to opposing Bills in Parliament as the councils of boroughs outside London. Some amendment of the Borough Funds Act generally is, I think, desirable. I could not undertake to propose legislation for this purpose at the present time; but my hon. friend the Member for South Islington has now before the House a Bill on the subject, and I should hope that he may be able to make progress with it.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE; ARMY AND NAVY VOTES.

GENERAL LAURIE (Pembroke and Haverfordwest): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, in view of the rule that general questions connected with the Army and Navy can only be discussed on Vote A or Vote 1, and that there is a necessity that these Votes must be taken before 31st March, and in view that His Majesty, in his Speech at the opening of the session, announced that measures would be submitted to the judgment of Parliament for increasing the efficiency of the military forces of the country, whether any arrangement can be made by which the law may be complied with, and the number of men and provision for pay may be voted before the commencement of the financial year, and an opportunity afforded to consider in fuller detail the proposals of the Government.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): It is true, of course, that these Votes must be got before 31st March. I hope there will be an opportunity before that date of having a good discussion upon the large issues involved. It would be also possible, of course, on later Votes to deal with some of the important questions to be raised this afternoon by my right hon. friend. If those opportunities prove really insufficient we shall have to consider what course to pursue.

VOTE ON ACCOUNT.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can say when he proposes to take the Report stage of the Vote on Account, and whether he will put it down as the first Order of the Day on which

it is taken; and whether he will allow ample time for its discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR replied that he was not in a position as yet to say when the Report stage would be taken.

DIVISION REGULATIONS.

MR. PLUMMER (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will undertake to consider the desirability of so amending the Rules and Orders or custom of the House as to provide that the House need not necessarily be cleared for a division, and that the votes of Members who remain in their places shall not be accounted in the division, which will proceed to be taken notwithstanding their absence from the lobbies.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The present method of working divisions seems to me in the main convenient. It is founded upon practice and not upon Standing Order, and I presume that under those circumstances it could be changed without an alteration of our Standing Orders.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether a resolution of the House would be necessary to bring about an alteration of the practice in question.

*MR. SPEAKER: I should not like to say, as I have had no notice of this question, and, as far as I know, there is no resolution which would be considered binding on the House on the subject. But I have not made any research. I understand that, as the First Lord of the Treasury says, it is a matter of practice, and the practice as to the mode of taking divisions has been altered in my own time in some small details.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Does not the question of clearing the House depend upon the Standing Order?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think so, but I should not like to answer the question dogmatically without notice.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid): If there is no Standing Order requiring that Members should proceed to a division, on what ground is it that they are suspended for not going to a division?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order; The hon. Member is entering into an argument.

POINT OF PRACTICE; CAPTAIN DONELAN'S SUSPENSION (5th MARCH); EFFECT OF SUSPENSION ON MEMBERS' PRIORITY FOR MOTIONS AND BILLS.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): In connection, Sir, with the revision of the Order Paper, the hon. Gentleman the Member for South-East Cork had first place at the ballot for a notice of motion on your leaving the chair and going into Committee of Supply on the Army Estimates. That notice of motion is removed from the Paper. I want to know whether there is anything in the Standing Order directing that the notice standing in the name of the hon. Member for South-East Cork, who has been suspended for a week, should be removed from the Paper.

*MR. SPEAKER: What has been done in this case was done in pursuance of the order that the hon. Member would be suspended from the service of the House for one week.

MR. DILLON: Does that order mean that all notices of motion in his name must, as a consequence of his suspension, be removed from the Paper?

*MR. SPEAKER: No. As each day comes on and the Notice Paper is made out, if that is one of the days during which he is suspended any notice in his name is erased.

MR. DILLON: This is a matter of the greatest importance. Do I understand you to say, Sir, that, in the event of the business to which his notice applied being postponed to a date subsequent to the expiration of his suspension, his right of priority will revive?

*MR. SPEAKER: No; I did not give you to understand that that would be the rule if his name was erased, but I will see if any case has arisen before similar to this. My impression at the moment is that he loses his right of priority if another Member gets in front of him on the Order Paper.

MR. DILLON: Hon. Members must see that this is a matter of great importance. To suit your convenience, Sir, I was thinking of putting a question on Monday next in reference to this point, asking you in the meantime to consider how the hon. Member's position stands as regards this notice. It affects not only questions of priority for a notice of motion, but also Bills.

*MR. SPEAKER: I must deprecate the practice of putting questions of this kind to the Speaker. It is the Speaker's duty merely to answer questions of order and procedure as they arise.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: May I ask one additional question? I quite understand your ruling, Sir, that the hon. Member will lose his right of procedure if another Member below him on the Paper has brought on his motion. But in this case the question of your leaving the chair may be adjourned to-night before any Amendment is moved by any other Member, and I want to know, if at a date subsequent to the hon. Member's suspension for a week the question is again put on the Paper, whether his right would not then revive?

*MR. SPEAKER: I would not like to give an unconsidered answer to the question. It may depend on precedents. If the hon. Member comes to the chair during the evening, I will endeavour to give him what information I can. My present opinion is, as I stated before, that his right does not revive.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had, nominated the following Members to serve on the Standing Committee for the consideration of all Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufacture:;Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Baird, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Gerald Balfour, Mr. Beckett, Mr. Boland, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. John Burns, Mr. Burt, Sir Charles Cayzer, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Charming, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir John Colomb, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Crombie, Sir Charles Dalrymple, Mr. Daly, Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland, Mr. Doughty, Mr. J. P. Farrell, Sir Robert Penrose-FitzGerald, Sir Fortescue Flannery, Sir Henry Fowler, Mr. Galloway, Mr. Harrington, Sir Alfred Hickman, Mr. Brodie Hoare, Sir William Hornby, Sir William Houldsworth, Major Jameson, Mr. Jeffreys, Sir James Joicey, Mr. Kemp, Mr. Lambert, Sir Elliott Lees, Mr. Lloyd-George, Colonel Long, Mr. Walter Long, Dr. MacDonnell, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Mather, Mr. Charles Morley, Mr. Oldroyd, Mr. Parkes, Mr. Pike Pease, Colonel Pilkington, Sir James Rankin, Mr. Renshaw, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Round, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Stuart Samuel, Mr.

Seton-Karr, Mr. Thomas Shaw, Sir Barrington Simeon, Mr. Samuel Smith, Mr. Strachey, Mr. Tennant, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Tully, Mr. George Whiteley, Sir Frederick Wills, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), Mr. John Wilson (Falkirk), Mr. Wolff, and Mr. Samuel Young.

Mr. HALSEY further reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had nominated the following Members to serve on the Standing Committee for the consideration of all Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure which may, by Order of the House, be committed to such Standing Committee:;The Lord Advocate, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Atherley-Jones, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Barlow, Mr. Bartley, Mr. Beach, Mr. Butcher, Mr. Carew, Lord Hugh Cecil, Mr. Clancy, Mr. Coghill, Mr. Cripps, Sir Savile Crossley, Mr. Bromley-Davenport, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Dillon. Mr. Tatton Egerton, Mr. Arthur Elliot. Mr. Samuel Evans, Mr. Faber, Sir George Fardell, Mr. Flynn, Mr. Vicary Gibbs, Sir Frederick Godson, Mr. Goulding, Mr. Graham, Mr. H. D. Greene, Mr. Haldane, Mr. Harwood, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. James Heath, Mr. Helder, Mr. Hemphill, Mr. Henry Hob-house, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Brynmor Jones, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Lees Knowles, Mr. W. F. Lawrence, Sir Joseph Leese, Mr. Loder, Mr. A. K. Loyd, Mr. Lyttelton, Dr. Macnamara, Mr. MacNeill, Sir Henry Meysey-Thompson, Colonel Milward, Mr. Arthur Morton, Mr. Lloyd Morgan, Captain Norton, Sir Francis Powell. Colonel Pryce-Jones, Sir Robert Reid, Mr. Rentoul, Mr. Secretary Ritchie, Mr. Bryn Roberts, Mr. Parker Smith, Mr. Soames, Mr. Solicitor General, Mr. Ernest Spencer, Mr. Stevenson, Sir Benjamin Stone, Mr. Ure, Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Robert Wallace, Mr. Warr, and Sir James Woodhouse.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

NEW BILL.

BURIAL PLACES (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) (SCOTLAND).

Bill to amend the Rating Exemptions (Scotland) Act, 1874, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Shaw-Stewart, Sir John Stirling-Maxwell, Mr. Colville, Sir Lewis M'Iver, and Mr. Eugene Wason.

BURIAL PLACES (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To amend the Rating Exemptions (Scotland) Act, 1874," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday next, and to be printed. [Bill 92.]

SUPPLY (ARMY ESTIMATES).

Order for Committee read.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I rise to make a motion which has never before been made by a Minister in this House, and I trust will never require to be made again; namely, that you, Mr. Speaker, do now leave the chair in order to consider Army Estimates amounting to close upon eighty-eight millions of money. It is just five years since I rose from this bench and in some degree apologised to the House for introducing Estimates to the extent of £;18,000,000 in a time of profound peace. The progress of events has singularly dwarfed the Estimates which were presented in 1896. In 1898 it was my duty to ask for £;19,250,000, with a further liability, which appeared on the Estimates of 1899, that brought them up to £;20,500,000. In 1900 my right hon. friend the present Chief Secretary for Ireland moved for Estimates which,

at the then rate and with the addition as to men, raised the £;20,500,000 to £;25,500,000. I have now to submit to the House Estimates for the year, apart from the war in South Africa, but including provision for reserves of stores which will not accrue for the next three or four years, amounting for the normal Estimates alone to £;29,685,000. I propose to-night to devote myself mainly to a consideration of the normal Estimates. As regards these larger figures the House of Commons has almost become inured to them. They would have been regarded some years ago with perturbation; they are now accepted almost, I think, with relief, because they tend to show that we are taking steps which must lead to nearing the termination of the war. And even in respect of these large figures the House of Commons has been, in my judgment, corrupted and debauched by the graceful oratory of

my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary, for he succeeded in so veiling his proposals last year that, although he was making such great demands, he managed to preserve an appearance of moderation, and even of abstemiousness, which caused many Members as they left the House, when they heard him move for £;50,000,000, to express their regret that he had not gone as far as £;75,000,000. To-night I believe I shall best be consulting the interests of the House by dropping, except for a very few words, allusion to the War Estimates. We have had long discussions upon them, and I do not propose either to vindicate the policy of the war or to prophesy as to its duration. All I would say is that what we, have taken as the cost of the war is what we regard as being the full sum that we are likely to have to ask from the House of Commons. In taking so large a figure it is an earnest of our intention to pursue the war at all costs to a conclusion. We are sending out the reinforcements which we believe are necessary to that end. We have stinted the generals on the spot in nothing. On the other hand, though our demands are so large, and though our intention is absolutely determined as to the pursuance of the war, there are no Members of the House who will be as glad as the Members on this bench when it is possible to relieve the country of the cost of the war, and of all the Members on this bench there is none who will more gladly than the Minister who is now addressing the House welcome its termination.

If I may take it that the House agrees with me that we may devote ourselves more to the large and, I admit, increasing cost of our normal military establishment, I propose to leave altogether aside the stale controversies with regard to the war; as to its conduct, as to who began it; and to go to the root of the matter with regard to the future organisation of our Army. I want to ask the House to consider what our Army is organised for. Is it in strength and character capable of fulfilling its proper functions? Are we to pull down the existing system and build it up anew, or can we found on the existing system what is necessary to secure our home defence and our foreign obligations?

We can do that to-night calmly and without any degree of panic. But I would like to remind the House that this is not the first time that this House has been invited to consider the system of its Army. During the last century there were three occasions on which the whole Army system of the country was brought under consideration. The first was after the Great War, in which it took us

years to provide the Duke of Wellington in the Peninsula with the force which was necessary even to hold his own in a defensive position against the great force which was arrayed against him; and ultimately, I think, the extreme amount of the efforts of many years and of immense expenditure was that we were able to find him 65,000 men. But after that experience, when a partial disarmament began in 1814, we had profited by our experience so badly that in 1815, although there were something like 210,000 troops voted for that year, with the most supreme effort we were not able to provide the Duke of Wellington with more than 40,000 men in Flanders. As every one knows, this country, like other countries, went to sleep for forty years afterwards in military matters, and our organisation became so rusty in the later years of the Duke of Wellington that in the Crimea we were found deficient in everything that was needed to make an army except the bravery of our troops. We had not enough men; we had not enough horses; we had no commissariat and supplies; our officers were untrained, and our generals were inexperienced. Even after that experience, we took so little heed of our position that there was no time during the last century in which the British Army was weaker than between 1860 and 1870. It was not only the army in this country that was insufficient, but the army which, after the Indian Mutiny, and after the great awakening in India, should have been maintained in that country was constantly short by hundreds and thousands of men, and, as is well known, with absolutely no reserve at home to draw upon.

The third and last awakening came, in 1870, the period of the Franco-German war. We then had a real reorganisation of the Army. We had then great changes, the effects of which, I venture

to say, have never been appreciated until the war which is now going on. But it is a most remarkable fact that so unpopular is Army reform, so wedded are the people of this country to past associations and prejudices which may be considered antiquated, that, whether it was some fault in the presentation of the subject, whether it was the personality of the man, or whether it was the general unpopularity of touching things to which men had long been accustomed, I have never in my experience heard a single cheer in this House when the name of the man who abolished purchase and who first started short service in the British Army has been mentioned. The unpopularity of Mr. Cardwell in respect of these matters was great at the time.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Not in this House.

*MR. BRODRICK: The right hon. Gentleman has the advantage of me. He was in the House at the time. I am glad to hear his statement. I am thinking more of the country than of the House. I cannot help feeling that we owe something to Lord Cardwell's memory in view of the use to which we have put his great reforms in the course of the last few months. Surely the proudest inheritance of a statesman is not in the immediate cheers with which his fellow-countrymen may greet a popular but perhaps not altogether successful movement, but in the fact that after thirty years that system, with but small modifications, gave us 80,000 reservists, of whom 96 or 97 per cent. were found efficient, which has enabled us to keep, apart from Volunteers and Colonials, an army of 150,000 Regulars in the field for fifteen months, and which gave us those

manœuvres which were too long dropped by successive Governments, and which are in the opinion of all our military leaders absolutely necessary in order to get an acquaintance with the practice of war. Now we have another great awakening, or rather a discovery, that there are many flaws and imperfections even in those portions of our Army system which were deemed to be best. I should like to state that, though I am here to state the views of the Government as to the changes that are necessary,

I should like that it should be felt that the greatest change which has taken place with regard to our war policy is not in the Government but in the House of Commons and the people. I have over and over again endeavoured to persuade the House of Commons that it was necessary for us to organise our forces on the principle of being able to send two army corps abroad. I have had the scantiest attendance and backing of the House for these proposals. For home defence everybody was willing to act; but home defence in the minds of a great many Members represents not an organised army, not even with regard to our auxiliary forces, no compulsion with regard to drill, but simply the acceptance from every man of that amount of service which he desires to give; various proposals that are very pleasant and which can be reeled off easily; but which really mean the organisation of your Army on the system of the Boxers, an idea of a military system that every man should shoulder a rifle and stand in front of his own door. Not only have there been failings in regard to organisation, but there have been many doubts as regards the numbers. When, in 1898, I asked for 25,000 additional men I remember a question from that Bench and a great deal being said as to whether these numbers were necessary.

What has been our experience in regard to organisation and numbers has also been our experience in regard to manœuvres. I have extracted from the House, with the greatest reluctance, compulsory powers in regard to manœuvres. They may be an imperfect preparation for war, but, in my opinion, they are better than no preparation at all. All our proposals in regard to manœuvres have been cut down largely by the House. With regard to ranges, we had need to fight a battle upstairs before Committee before we obtained power to close the smallest footpath, just as we have now, if we want to take property by compulsion, to run the gauntlet of judges and others, under whose auspices we pay, I say without hesitation and without fear of contradiction, on the average 50 per cent. more than the land is worth. I could give instances to prove it; and, as I see that hon. Members for Ireland take some interest in this question, I may say that in Ireland it is still worse, for there you have to deal not only with the landlord, but with the tenant. The result of all that is that up till now there have been the greatest possible difficulties placed in the way of the Government; not theoretically, because I admit this House has never refused demands for men or for money; but in all the accessories, in all that goes in the way of spending the money well and making the men efficient, this House has been reluctant to trespass on private rights or the feelings of individuals. I often hear hon. Members boast that we are by nature a fighting race. I can only say that we may be a fighting race, but it is only by accident that we are a military nation. Now we have to consider how we

can turn that accident into a permanent opportunity.

I should like to detain the House for a moment on the lessons which this war has taught us. In the first place, I think the House will agree with me that we can no longer lay to our souls the flattering unction that we have not got to be prepared to send two army corps abroad. I think the events of the last fifteen months have proved, first of all, that we must be prepared to send more than two army corps abroad; secondly, that these army corps must be better organised; and, thirdly, that, when you have parted with the force which it is necessary to send out of the kingdom, you must have a sufficient organisation at home for our own protection. In addition to that, it has been made obvious that our artillery is insufficient, and that our field artillery requires to be supplemented by heavier field artillery. Sir, it is also perfectly clear that the exigencies of modern warfare, the greatly extended positions which are held, and the necessity of rapid movement make it necessary that we should be provided with a much larger body of mounted troops. There is, as I have already admitted, a reform also needed in our Army Medical Service, and in our transport service. But there is another question, not so much of money and of men; we want a reform of our drill and training. We want less barrack square drill. We, want more scouting, we want more independence, more individuality amongst the men. All these things will give us plenty of food for thought, and will give Lord Roberts a wide arena in which to exercise his great talents. But, having said so much as to the defects which have been brought to light by the war, let us, before passing, congratulate ourselves that, in the war, we, have still found the spirit of our troops as excellent as it has ever been. If our officers have not been trained to the highest professional pitch, no man in the world, whether he be our friend or our foe, can deny that they have shown the greatest bravery and gallantry on all occasions. In addition to that, we may also congratulate ourselves that both our gun and rifle practice has been good; and I think we may say this for our system: that, whether it was prepared or not prepared for all emergencies, it has shown marvellous adaptability in hastily providing a home defence which gave us more men in barracks in the course of last year than we had at any time of profound peace. I think that those who administer the Service may well be grateful to the country at large for having borne the very unexpected reverses with a patience and calmness and self-possession worthy of the greatest praise.

In approaching the subject of reform, I would ask the House to allow me to mention two points on which we differ from any other nation in regard to the problems we have to face. In the first place, we have got to keep an enormous force abroad, quite apart from war, in a time of peace. We have got to provide, to equip, 115,000 men in India and the Colonies, mostly in tropical stations, and we have to attempt to do that, which no other Power attempts, relying entirely upon voluntary enlistment. If we arrive finally at a decision that we can build up on the present system, it will not be for want of consideration of what other systems can do. The right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean has impressed on the attention of the House more than once the desirability of having a separate Indian army.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): That is putting it too strongly. A separate system of enlistment rather than a separate Indian army.

*MR. BRODRICK: I have always thought that the right hon. Gentleman rather favoured that view, and have felt that the fact of my never having been able to find any way to accept it was the key of a good deal of his want of confidence in my fitness for the post I now occupy. At all events, I might explain to the House why we cannot accept the idea of a separate Indian army. In the first place, we have 75,000 men in India. If you are to have a separate Indian army, you must train the recruits before they leave this country. You must also have them at a certain age, because we never send men to India between eighteen and twenty years of age. The recruits require to train two years at home in order to fit them to go to India. That means you must keep two years drafts; and experience shows that if you want to keep a regiment of 1,000 men in India you must keep as drafts between 400 and 500 men in England who belong to no regiment, who are enlisted solely for the Indian Army, who are only partially trained before they leave, and who form a force accountable to nobody, and form no part of a unit at home. If, instead of these 400 or 500, you raise them to 800, and form them into a battalion at home, you will have the nucleus of battalions which with Reservists added makes up regiments. Reservists have given satisfaction to every general under whom they have served in South Africa. If you were to attempt a separate Indian army, you would not only have a much greater cost on your active list, but you would have men serving nine or ten years in India, and you would incur a greater expense for pensions. You would have a no more effective army in India and a less effective one at home. We therefore reject the idea of a separate Indian army. The next question is, Is our Army in future for home defence to be a voluntary Army, or is it to be recruited by compulsion? I am perfectly aware of the delicate ground on which I am treading in respect to the question of voluntary or compulsory service. I know very well how easy it is in this House to win cheap cheers by a proud declaration about adhesion to the voluntary system. I think the voluntary system for home defence is not a thing to be proud of, unless you get an efficient defence. I do not doubt that man for man a voluntary army is better than a, conscription army, but mass for mass a trained army of conscripts is better than an incompletely trained army of volunteers, and especially if it happens to outnumber them. Therefore my adhesion to the voluntary system is strictly limited by our ability to obtain under it a force with which our military authorities can satisfy the Government that they have sufficient force to resist invasion and can maintain it to their satisfaction. At the same time the Government fully recognise that, while the country is willing to pay heavily to escape invasion, it is incumbent on the Government to exhaust every means before coming forward with any such proposals, and especially under the circumstances of the present time.

We have never had such recruiting as we had last year under the influence of the warlike spirit that pervaded the country and the conviction that the war was just and necessary. That war spirit has brought us the largest number of recruits to the Army in any year in any period of our history. The recruits for

the Army were 46,000, and for the Militia, deducting those who went into the Army, 30,000. Ten thousand Yeomanry enlisted last year on the cavalry rate of pay, and 57,000 additional Volunteers joined during the year, making a total of 140,000 men who came forward voluntarily for service during 1900. Be it remembered that a large majority of these were recruited for service in the war, to which those who joined the Army were liable. Thirty-five Militia battalions offered for foreign service, and were at disposal for South Africa; 10,000 Yeomanry went and 10,000 Volunteers, and we can have another 10,000 when we want them. I think, then, that any proposal that did not proceed on voluntary lines would be, as it were, applying spurs to a willing horse; although I fully realise what the difficulty may still be in keeping up the required force with the advantage which is possessed by nearly every other nation in the world. I think the first thing to remember is that our Army must be a national Army, and any step in a direction which is contrary to our previous policy should not be taken until it receives the support, at all events, of the vast majority of the country. To take a step of that kind, which a future Government might feel it to be their duty to go back upon, would be, I think, disastrous to the Army and the country. On the other hand, perhaps I may be allowed to address one word of warning to the House with regard to that. I do not believe that this great spirit of recruiting will continue with the same intensity after the war is over. I am not at all certain that the ease with which money is obtained now will be borne out by the pleasure with which the taxation necessary for it will be paid. I never come down to the House of Commons without being subjected in the lobby to the demand that we should increase the pay, or that we should add to the expenditure in some direction in regard to the war or at home. I hardly ever get a letter from a Member that does not invite consideration of some great and, to his mind, undoubted hardship suffered by somebody or some class of individuals. There is no section of the various component parts of our national defence which has not been the subject of representation to me in some form or another in the last few weeks with a view to a great addition of expenditure. But I know also that if at this moment I am attacked for parsimony, I think the day is not far distant when I shall be attacked for extravagance: and I can well realise that among those who are loudest in calling for expenditure there may be many who would feel the pinch very heavily in years to come, and I even think, as I pass the lamp-post in Palace Yard, there will be plenty of people who would be glad to hold on to one end of a rope if they could only be persuaded that I myself or the Chancellor of the Exchequer was attached to the other end. Our proposal, therefore, is to lay down what is necessary for the country to obtain. We know that we can equip any force that is necessary, and let us see if we cannot train them. If we lack recruits, if the war fever is followed by a peace collapse, I think we shall be very pusillanimous if we do not make further proposals to the House. Remember that what we ask the House to do is to ensure us a system of defence for which not only our own forefathers made great sacrifices but for which our neighbours, whether they live under a democratic or despotic government, consider that at this moment no sacrifice is too great. I am, therefore, not going to accommodate the

organisation I propose to our existing resources. I am going to consider how we can find proper resources for the organisation that is necessary. If I may trouble the House for a few minutes longer on this subject, I shall endeavour to lay down what it is for which we ought to prepare. In the first place, when we talk of home defence, let us not confuse our minds by considering the position and action of the Navy. The Navy is obviously our first line of defence, and if all naval matters were matters of certainty, we might dispense with an army for home defence altogether. I quite agree that invasion may be an off-chance, but you cannot run an Empire of this size on off-chances. We are bound, with Army and Navy acting together, to provide a proper system of home defence. I must also lay this down; we must have proper provision for foreign war. If five years ago I had tried to persuade anybody in this House that we should be sending three army corps to South Africa I should have been the object of ridicule to those who belittle our power of sending troops abroad, and I think I should have been the object of contempt to those who belittle the power of our opponents, especially in South Africa. Well, we have not only had to send three army corps but six army corps to South Africa; I mean the equivalent of six army corps. I trust we shall never have to send that number of troops abroad again; but we must remember that Africa is not the only continent on which we have great commitments. On two other continents we have commitments, and we must realise that we have interests there we are bound to defend. It may be contended; I do not deny it; that a wise foreign policy may go far to keep us out of enterprises and entanglements. [Opposition cheers.] Yes, but we have to recollect that we have great possessions, and great wealth, and that those possessions and this wealth, however peaceful our own inclinations may be, must at times be objects of enterprise to our neighbours. Let us lay to heart what was said to

Crœsus in old

days, "Remember that if any man come who hath better iron than you he will be master of all your gold." Do not let us build up our military policy on such a quicksand as the goodwill and forbearance of foreign Powers. I will not entertain the question of a European war, but I think no man in the House will be so bold as to say that under all circumstances we shall be able to keep ourselves free from European entanglements. The Government of 1880, which came in with probably the greatest peace policy of any Government, found themselves not merely at war in Egypt, but in 1885 on the verge of war with Russia. We cannot shut out the possibility of having to send a large force to defend our own possessions, nor can we suppose that if ever we should become unhappily entangled in a European war we can limit our enterprise solely to the defence of our possessions, and to the action of our fleet. It stands to reason if we have allies that none of them would be prepared to turn out every man they could muster and allow ours to rest at home. Therefore my proposition is that besides home defence we ought to be ready at any moment to send abroad three army corps with the proper cavalry divisions, in fact a force of one hundred and twenty thousand men; and the proposal which I submit to the House to-night contemplates that we should hold such a force in readiness with a proper admixture of reservists, and still provide ourselves with the power to defend ourselves at

home when that force is gone.

The proposals I have to make to the House are as follows: I propose to reorganise the Army on a new system, of which the bedrock will be that the whole country will be divided into six army corps by districts, that each district in time of peace will have the same relative proportions to the various arms that are necessary to make up the corps, and that they will be under the commanders who will lead them in time of war. This will be a great change on our existing somewhat haphazard system. It will be a great measure of organisation. But there will also be a great measure of decentralisation. My object is to centralise responsibility, but to decentralise administration. The army corps will no longer be a paper force. The British army corps of the past, as has been often pointed out, is got together in a moment of emergency. Commanders have been summoned and hastily appointed. Their staffs have often never seen their commanders. The brigade has been made up by taking a regiment from Malta, another from Edinburgh, a third from Dublin, and a fourth from Shorncliffe. These four have been dumped down together in South Africa or elsewhere, the colonels not knowing each other, and perhaps none of them knowing their brigadier. That is an organisation which cannot be considered an organisation at all. If you want to make troops work together, they must have some knowledge of each other and of their commanding officers. We propose that in these army corps districts troops shall be within reach of each other, that the different arms shall be complete, that the officers, as far as peace duties justify it, shall be appointed, and that we shall have a full staff as far as peace duties justify it. The stores will be massed with each army corps in the army corps district; the troops will not be immediately adjoining, but will meet for manœuvres. The transport will be arranged and will be under the commander of the army corps; each army corps will be complete in artillery and mounted troops. We hope by these means to obtain not merely greater efficiency, but some esprit de corps in these army corps.

But the two cardinal points to which we look for the greatest advantage are the appointment for peace command; only of those officers who are certified by the military authorities to be fit to command in war. [Cheers.] I am glad to hear that expression of opinion by the House, because of all the proposals I have to submit there is not one which will call for so much support of Ministers by the House. All the forces of good nature, all the forces of prejudice, all the pressure which can be exerted will be exerted to induce us very often, I fear, by question or by motion in this House, to reappoint to positions for which they are not fitted, officers against whom no actual failure can be proved. I will not come down to this House and ask for these large Estimates in order to raise and equip troops who can be made efficient and then be made a party, for the sake of peace and quietness, to putting them under the command of inefficient officers. I feel most strongly on this subject, and the Commander-in-Chief, Lord Roberts, has decided that in future appointments will be made, not for five years but for three years, with power of extension, so that it may be possible for him at the end of that time to review the action of these officers and, if necessary, to replace them by others. That is the more necessary, because the

second great advantage which we expect from this system is that we intend to delegate to the commanders of the army corps a very large amount of the authority which is now exercised in Pall Mall. I believe that the desirability of doing that, if it can be carried out, as I believe it can, is so patent to everybody that I need not labour it. But I do say this, with all the confidence of some experience, that these two steps, the appointing of men in peace, even if they are younger and more active, and even if it ends in our having to exclude men whom we should like to employ on other grounds; I believe that this is the only way by which we can secure the proper leading of our troops in war, and I believe that the proper delegation of authority is the only means by which we can redeem our military system and our officers from the paralysing effects of relying for every detail of their task in time of peace on a central establishment in Pall Mall.

Perhaps the House would like to know where these army corps will be planted. The first three army corps are intended for foreign service, or, of course, for home defence in the first instance. The first army corps will be at Aldershot. It will be complete in every particular, except Reservists. It will include among the infantry a brigade of four battalions of the Guards. The system by which the Guards have acted as part of the garrison at Gibraltar will not be further followed. Arguments which had great force four years ago have, in one respect, less force now. I think I am right in saying that four years ago skirmishers were hardly divided from each other by a distance the breadth of this table; skirmishers in South Africa under

modern conditions have been divided from each other by the length of this House, and the training of troops in a limited space has become infinitely more difficult now under the new conditions than it was when we first considered the garrison at Gibraltar. Under any circumstances, I think that it would be both useful for the Army and useful for the brigade of Guards that a brigade of Guards should be permanently stationed at Aldershot. The second army corps will have its headquarters at Salisbury Plain. We are building large barracks on Salisbury Plain, and the land acquired there is of inestimable value for the training of troops for musketry and for other purposes. By planting these two army corps at these particular centres we shall have them not merely in the best possible positions for the defence of the country, but also at the easiest points for embarkation and in the most facile position for manœuvring.

Therefore those two are ideal centres for our first two army corps. The third army corps, which will also consist almost entirely of Regulars, will be quartered in Ireland. The barracks there have always been kept up on a considerable scale, and with a certain readjustment will completely house the troops necessary for that army corps, with the exception of three Militia battalions. The three Militia battalions, should the army corps go on foreign service, will, of course, be replaced by other troops.

When I come to the fourth army corps I come to a subject which I think will be of great interest to the House. That army corps will have its headquarters at Colchester. With the full concurrence, I might almost say on the initiative, of the Commander-in-Chief, admitting for the first time that picked Militia and

Volunteer battalions can be ranged with Regular troops in the first line, we propose to employ altogether in the last three army corps sixty battalions of Volunteers and Militia, which have been carefully selected. The Volunteer battalions will have special training, they will be invited on special terms to undertake special training liability each year, and if they cannot come up to those conditions, and if on the inspection each year, which will be by no means a formal inspection, any particular battalion is not found equal to its work, it will lapse from the army corps, and another battalion will replace it. We go further, we propose for the first time to give the Militia and Volunteers, within limits, a certain number of field guns. I have lived through, and so has the right hon. Gentleman opposite, three sets of opinion at the War Office. The first was that it was very desirable to have Volunteer artillery; Volunteers liked to join; but that it was not necessary to find them in guns. I think the right hon. Gentleman was at the War Office when it was decided that they might be entrusted with the handling of heavy garrison guns. I know that I was at the War Office when we persuaded the military authorities to go a step further and allow them to take heavy guns of position into the field. But that system halted there for twelve years. Lord Roberts is willing to make a great and final step in advance, and to agree that with certain training he will rely, from the experience of this war, on Volunteer batteries, a certain proportion in each of the last three army corps. The admirable practice made by the C.I.V. batteries in the Transvaal satisfied Lord Roberts that that step could be taken without danger. Therefore, in each of the last three army corps, while there will be a considerable proportion of Regular troops, and in each fourteen batteries of Regular artillery, one-third of the army corps, that is seven batteries, will be found in each of the last three army corps by the Volunteers and Militia. The army corps with its headquarters at Colchester will have attached to it some of the best London Militia and Volunteers. The fifth army corps, which will be stationed at York, will draw on the best Volunteer and Militia battalions of Lancashire and Yorkshire. We propose to house the sixth, and last, army corps in Scotland. I feel that the War Office owes so much to Scotland that Scotland ought to obtain a special place. Our Scottish regiments, even in comparison with others, and notably our Irish regiments, have done magnificent work in this war. As we all know, there is a great national feeling in Scotland, and I think that both by their patriotism and by their contribution to the national finances they are entitled to some consideration at our hands. Some part of our barracks loan will be spent in building necessary barracks in Scotland. The headquarters of this army corps will be placed in Edinburgh. The House will see, I think, that we have not adapted our organisation to our existing resources. I shall have to call on the House to produce the necessary result by giving us the necessary troops. The first difficulty in which I am placed is whether or not I am to ask the House to add to our Regular forces. I am reluctant to do so. In the last three or four years we have added between 40,000 and 50,000 men to our Regular forces, and I am not at all sure that we have not reached the limit of our recruiting power under present circumstances.

In any case I should like to see the regiments already proposed to be raised, and the larger number of batteries that we added last year, and which are now to a considerable extent manned by Reservists; I should like to see their fate assured after the Reservists return to their homes before I ask the House in any respect to add to the Regular Army. But that does not prevent our needing more Regular troops; and I propose, therefore, that we should obtain those troops, not by raising fresh ones, but by freeing some of our Regular troops who are shut up in garrisons from the duties in which they are at present engaged. We propose to take three steps in that direction. The House may have seen; because it was necessary to put out an Army Order a few days ago; that in the first place we propose to raise eight garrison battalions. If we are to use to the full extent the military power of the country, we have got to take military opinion as to the longest period for which the men can properly serve and utilise the services of those who are willing to continue in the Army. There is nothing in the least degree repugnant to the spirit of short service if, having obtained the services of the man with the colours and in the Reserve, we proceed to utilise any further services he is willing to give to the country. We propose to form these garrison battalions of men of more than fourteen years service, and in some cases of twelve years, limiting their services, except in rare cases, up to twenty-one years, when in the great majority of cases they are still under forty years of age. I think the House will see the common sense of this proposal. When you are placing men at stations like Gibraltar and Malta, where at the outside they can only be a few miles away from their own barracks, it is not necessary to have so rigid a standard of the extremest physical competency as you require from men who may have for many weeks to undergo the hardships of a campaign. I think men between thirty and forty, and some perhaps even a little later, would be admirably qualified for that service. Lord Roberts has gladly consented to select from the large available force of men who leave the colours and Reserve every year enough men to make up eight garrison battalions. The terms we offer will, I hope, prove sufficiently attractive. I will mention one point of special interest to the House: we give them the hope of a pension. That pension I wish to place on a wholly different footing from the pensions which have been given hitherto. Up to the present a man has got 10d. or 1s. a day on leaving the colours, and has got that amount until he dies. That is too much. It is not needed by a man when he is in full vigour of health and earning full wages, but it is too little when he gets to old age. To give a larger sum would be an enormous charge on the Exchequer. After all, many men will have earned it in the very prime of life, when they have still a long time in which they may hope to labour. We propose to give a pension which will be equivalent to what a man would have earned if he had been in the Reserve; namely, 6d. a day from the time of his leaving the garrison battalion; and to make that 6d. up to 1s. 6d. when he has attained the age of sixty-five, thereby, I hope, establishing a system of old-age pensions.

SIR H CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: May I ask whether these will be men who have completed their Reserve service?

*MR. BRODRICK: Certainly; we do not mean to impinge upon the Reserve in any way.

Some men serve twelve years with the colours, and those men will not go into the Reserve afterwards, but may be possibly allowed to go into the garrison regiments if they desire it. But, incidentally, let me remind the House that this will meet a want that has often been spoken of in this House, that with the limited number of men who do want to give long service, we shall provide a man who enters the Army, subject to good conduct, with the certainty of a future career.

That will give eight Line battalions for field service. I get five more by substituting at certain fortresses five Indian battalions, who in the tropics are equally efficient for the work and would save us sending five battalions of young soldiers into a tropical climate. We pay India for raising these five battalions. Already two or three of them have taken up their duties. We propose to raise those to five in the present year. By that means we gain thirteen battalions.

I come now to a subject upon which I have a very strong feeling myself, but on which I cannot give an absolute decision or pronouncement to the House. The War Office view is that the time has come for the smaller coaling stations to be taken over by the Admiralty. I do not mean fortresses like Malta and Gibraltar, but the smaller stations, like Singapore and Colombo and others, which are not attackable from the land, and in regard to which, therefore, you would have this gain, that you would not have two authorities in the island, but one. You would have the Admiralty supreme in their own domain and you would not lock up our infantry, and, with a constant change of ships, you would give the Admiralty a chance of relieving some of those men and providing others as the exigencies of the service might demand. But that subject requires a great deal of examination, and the First Lord of the Admiralty has not yet seen his way to give a final decision. But if I am able to prevail, and I trust I may, we shall then have five more battalions, making eighteen in all available to be added for home service. The distribution will now be in the future; allowing twelve battalions permanently in South Africa and making provision for the coaling stations; seventy-nine battalions of the Line at home and seventy-seven abroad.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): Will that include the Guards?

*MR. BRODRICK: No; the ten battalions of the Guards are separate.

I come now to the Militia. The Militia is a great problem. It is the old constitutional force. It has not only been a great stand-by in days gone by, but in this war it has practically helped us at moments of very great difficulty. Thirty-five battalions have gone abroad voluntarily, and by embodying others we shall of course have to start a nucleus for our reorganisation at home. The Militia should be 150,000 strong, but it is only 100,000 strong. There is something worse than that. We take in Militia recruits every year from 35,000 to 40,000 men. Deducting those who go to the Line, we have still left nearly 30,000 Militia recruits. They are engaged for six years, and by a very simple computation the House will arrive at this fact, that at the very least these 30,000 men, engaged for six years, ought to give us a force of from 150,000 to 180,000 men. As a matter of fact we have to take and train about 30,000 each year, and we only produce 100,000 of a total force on the six years engagement.

The reason is very simple. The inducements we offer the men are not sufficient to keep them. The Militia service has always been on the principle of making it very easy for a man to come in and go out. By a very cheap system of purchase he can find his way out when he is tired of serving. We mean to make things better for the Militia. It is perfectly true that some men are lost by desertion, who probably come in to drill when they cannot find work; but there are others, and Militia officers tell me by far the larger number, who honestly think the Militia service is not good enough, and, especially when they marry, they decide to leave. Martial ardour and marital ardour do not seem to run together in the Militia, and we want to give them an inducement to get over that critical moment until, after two or three years of matrimony, they may be willing to contemplate a little war in order to get a little peace. With the object of getting them at the critical moment, we propose to make a special arrangement for them. In the first place we shall give the Militia in future the Army ration, the extra 3d. a day for rations which was given to the Army three years ago. In addition to that I propose to reconstruct the old conditions of bounties. At present the trained Militiaman gets a bounty of £;1 10s. when he leaves; we propose to give him a sovereign at three other times in the year ; £;4 10s. in all; so that the net gain to the Militia will be 3d. extra a day during training and 3d. extra a day after training and in the intervals. We therefore hope we shall make our service more attractive in that respect.

But we have another and much larger scheme. I propose also to establish a Reserve for the Militia. I propose to abolish the present Militia Reserve for the Army. I do so on two grounds. In the first place these men who have taken a pound a year hitherto and never expected to be called out to join the Army have given their services in South Africa in the most uncomplaining fashion. I doubt whether there are many of them who will take a pound a year for the liability of such service again. Therefore I propose to abolish the Militia Reserve; the more so as I think it most unfair to the Militia that they should themselves be forced to go into action after they have been denuded of a good many of their best men. In substitution of the Militia Reserve I propose to have a genuine Reserve of Militia, to be composed of two classes of men; Militiamen who have done ten years service in the Militia, and Line men who have done fourteen years service with the line colour and Reserve. A man after he has done fourteen years' service will have an opportunity of going into a garrison regiment or going into the reserve of the Militia. The Militiaman is to have two periods of service; that is to say, ten years, and an opportunity of enrolling his name as a reserve for the Militia. He will be obliged only to be called on for shooting training on such occasions as may be necessary. We propose to give this Reserve 4d. a day. We anticipate that their liability being only to serve inside the country; Great Britain and Ireland; the opportunity will be largely availed of. I have every reason to believe that, having fixed this, figure, we shall be able to get 50,000 men

for the Reserve of the Militia, who will be available in case of the Militia being embodied for the defence of the country. That will make up the Militia from 100,000 to 150,000, without adding a man to those who are at present

serving or calling upon the country for a single additional recruit. I believe that to be not only an inexpensive course, but that it will bring the Militia up to strength and fit it for the duty we propose to assign to it.

Although I fear these proposals are very lengthy, I am afraid I must trouble the House at some little length further about the Yeomanry. The Yeomanry is our sole mounted force. Up to now it has accompanied the Volunteer reserve of this country. It has been drilled as cavalry in shock tactics. It has remained at its present figure of 10,000 to a large extent owing to the difficulties as regards expense, also to the fact that while our national wealth has so greatly increased, the agricultural classes from which the force is drawn have not kept pace with that increase of wealth. We mean to have in the Yeomanry a nucleus of that much larger body of mounted troops which is now required by the exigencies of modern warfare. You have now greater distances to cover, and flanking movements must be carried out by mounted troops, and scouting has to be done on a wider plan. Our artillery has also to be protected to a much larger extent. We believe that it is not only absolutely necessary to obtain more mounted troops, but that, under more favourable conditions, there are very large numbers of men in the country who would rather serve the King mounted than on foot. Our experience during the last few weeks, during which we have been able to raise 15,000 mounted men for duties in South Africa, shows there is no disinclination for that form of service. May I say one word in recognition of what the Yeomanry have done in past years in equipping and bringing together the Yeomanry force which has gone to South Africa, and which, without exception;except, perhaps, the colonial troops;have been of the greatest service to Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener? I feel so strongly the value of the services they have rendered, and the desirability of re-

leasing them as early as may be possible, that I have asked Lord Kitchener, in view of the large number of mounted men who are now on their way out, to consider the hard cases amongst them, men who really have lost or may lose their employment, and he has undertaken as quickly as he can to deal with such cases, and release such men as soon as possible.

Now, we intend to put our money on the Yeomanry, and we expect great results. I am glad to say we shall have some support for the changes we propose to make from the ranks of the Yeomanry themselves. I asked a number of Yeomanry officers to form a committee, which gave us a most excellent report in January last. They propose changes in drill, changes in uniform, and changes in the organisation of the force. They went at their work in a broad and enlightened spirit, and, as befitting men who ride horses, they took an extremely cheerful view of everything, even including the character and disposition towards them of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I cannot honestly say that I shall be able to follow them in all the recommendations for expenditure which they made. But Lord Roberts, who has carefully considered their report, has come to the conclusion that we ought largely to increase them, and the title under which we propose to do it is the Imperial Yeomanry, now consecrated to us by excellent service in South Africa. Their uniform will be khaki, giving them a proper interval in which to change the present uniform at a minimum of loss. I say nothing of the

officers, who may, perhaps, require to keep their mess uniform. We do not want to interfere with these old arrangements, but there must be a change of arms. It is impossible for us to contemplate training, the Yeomanry for sword practice, and Lord Roberts is strongly of opinion that the sword must be given up. He wishes them to be armed with a shortened rifle and bayonet. The officer will probably retain the sword, and in the further arming of the Yeomanry it is a question whether we should substitute the revolver for the sword. There is a great difference of opinion on that subject, but I will not detain the House by discussing it to-night. When I suggested to a friend, a Member of this House, that a revolver was more than an equivalent at close quarters to a sword, he said, "If you had to try it you would not think so." I invited him to bring his sword into Hyde Park the following morning, and I would come there mounted and with a revolver, and we would see who was the better man. I am bound to say that, although my friend did not accept the combat, he turned my flank, for he said, "It is all very well when one is pitted against one, but it is a very serious thing to go into a charge with a lot of men with revolvers in their hands," and he instanced the case of an officer in the charge at Omdurman who succeeded in putting a bullet into one of his own troopers and another into his colonel's horse. Consequently I do not propose to solve the great question whether Yeomanry should be given revolvers or a sword. The reorganisation will be on these lines. We shall train them for eighteen days, of which fourteen days will be obligatory. They will be trained in camp. The pay will be 5s. a day, with ration allowance and forage. The officers will receive cavalry Army rates and a consolidated pay of 10s. for rations and forage. But the greatest change we make, and which we think will bring in a large number of men, is the giving to each Yeoman who brings a horse of his own £;5 a year. In the case of those who have not got horses of their own, we propose to provide them with a Government horse, which we believe we can do by developing that excellent system of registration by which for 10s. a year we obtained 14,000 of the very best horses on the very day we required them. We propose to extend that system by paying £;5 a year to obtain a month's use of a horse as well as the registration. That will enable us to find mounts for these Yeomen who are unable to find horses for themselves. We propose that each regiment shall be of four squadrons making 500 men, and we propose to keep up all the county associations, to retain distinctive titles, and we shall try through the lord lieutenants of counties to form fresh regiments in other counties. We propose to bring the force up to a total strength of 35,000. Before I leave this subject I wish to say that I trust the day is not far distant when some of our colonial brethren who have given us mounted assistance during this war will be willing, subject to the consent of their own Government, to keep up mounted contingents, also under the title of Imperial Yeomanry, who, when occasion demands, will be available to join our own Yeomanry should they ever volunteer to go abroad.

Now we come to the Volunteers. I am not going to speak at any great length about them. Everybody knows what their past has been; and do not let it be supposed that I am wanting in appreciation of the Volunteers when I say that what we

desire in the Volunteer force is not so much numbers as efficiency. Those Volunteers who are to be members of the army corps must be efficient, or they will be absolutely worthless. You cannot brigade men with regular troops unless you get a certain training from them. What we are going to do with the Volunteers is this. We shall offer that each of these special twenty-five battalions of infantry shall attend camp for thirteen days, exclusive of their coming and going, and we shall give each man a daily grant of 5s., paid to the corps, and to each officer a daily grant of 11s. 6d. We shall require that every man shall have attended ten drills before he comes into camp that year, thirty, of course, if he is a recruit. We shall also require that every man shall have done his musketry for the year. We propose to give them such training in manœuvring and reconnaissance as will make them really valuable members of the corps. We propose to give a special training to the fifteen batteries of field artillery which will form part of the army corps, and we have ordered, and I hope shall be in a position to place in the hands of the Volunteers before very long, in substitution for their present heavy guns, which are not of sufficient range, 4½ guns, which will be placed in the positions selected for the defence of London. The remainder of the Volunteers will have the opportunity of going to camps as heretofore, but under rather more stringent conditions. We shall also require of them to have done a certain number of drills before they go into camp, and in future, not this year, we shall require; instead of thirty drills in the first year, thirty in the second year, and twelve in the third ; thirty in the first year, thirty in the second year, and twenty in the third year. If Volunteers cannot fulfil these conditions, then we think we are better with a rather smaller force in camp, but a more efficient one. There is one other remark which I must make. There are at present a certain number of Volunteer companies of mounted infantry. They are very useful in their way, but we cannot have two forces of dissimilar description grouped together. After this year we shall have to ask these Volunteer mounted infantry either to make themselves a nucleus of the Imperial Yeomanry or attach themselves to one of the regiments.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Are you doing anything to improve the training of Volunteer officers?

*MR. BRODRICK: We shall take steps by means of schools, but this is one of the numerous questions which have been before us. We fully realise that officers in both, the Militia and Volunteers will require further opportunities for training. When they are being trained all their expenses are to be paid.

*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): What is the proportion between the Line regiments and the Volunteers in the last three army corps?

*MR. BRODRICK: I think there will be one division of the Line and two divisions of Volunteers.

*MR. M'CRAE (Edinburgh, E.): Is there any proposal to pay Volunteers going into ordinary camps? That is very important.

*MR. BRODRICK: They will get a rather larger sum, 2s. 6d. instead of 2s., and the officers will get 8s. instead of 4s., but we shall put them under rather more stringent regulations as to the time they stay in camp.

Therefore the net result of our proposals is this. We free a very considerable body of Regulars from garrison service for field service; we make up our Militia to war strength; we provide adequate artillery and mounted troops for all our army corps; we train better the Volunteers, who are to be given special grants. We shall have an additional number of Regulars ; namely, 11,500; we shall have 50,000 more Militia in the new Militia Reserve; we shall have 25,000 more Yeomanry; and we shall have 40,000 more trained Volunteers. The net addition, therefore, under my scheme will be 126,500 men, and that, even allowing £60,000 for the staff of the new army corps, will be achieved by an expenditure of a little under £2,000,000. Before I say a word on central organisation I should like to clear away some mistakes which have entered into people's minds with regard to the efficacy of our present arms. Questions as to the number of men are for politicians to decide on the advice of experts; but when you come to the range and power of artillery and the efficacy of rifles, obviously we have reached a point at which experts must be our sole guides. I have asked Lord Roberts to give me his opinion on the efficacy of our artillery in South Africa. His views are as follows;

"The testimony of generals in command and of our artillery officers, in which opinion I coincide, is that our field artillery gun is on the whole a good and effective weapon. It has powerful shrapnel; it has accuracy; it has moderate weight behind the teams, all of which are important elements in artillery guns. It is entirely satisfactory in these respects. The open country and clear atmosphere of South Africa have shown that, as regards range and power, an improvement is necessary. This has, to a certain extent, been effected during the war by the provision of slow-burning fuses. As regards rapidity of fire, some improvement is certainly necessary, and the matter is now under consideration. Our horse artillery gun needs improvement in several respects, and a Committee is now sitting to consider how its shortcomings can best be remedied."

I may here say, with regard to these matters, that I have put some £50,000 into the Estimates with a view to meeting any immediate provision which the Committee may suggest.

"A want which has been brought to light by the war in South Africa is the necessity of having a proportion of heavy guns to accompany the Army in the field, to be worked not as guns of position, but as a more deliberate and slowly-moving field gun. A good deal has been said about the impediment of such guns on the march. No doubt they do take up room, but they have the compensating advantage of a heavy shell at long range, and that outweighs the disadvantages."

We have already put on order 200 of the 4.7 guns, which are. I believe, of the precise calibre which it is desired to use as heavy field artillery. I hope they will be coming in very shortly. The House will see that Lord Roberts's opinion, subject to that modernising which all artillery is undergoing at the present time, is that we have no reason to be dissatisfied with the artillery gun, which I remember was accounted by our experts about three or four years ago still to be the best field gun in Europe. Then I have asked Lord Roberts to give me a Report as regards our rifle. We have

heard a great deal about the Mauser rifle and its advantages as compared with our own Lee-Metford. I believe that these ideas have received no confirmation by the war. Lord Roberts says;

"Our rifles have stood the test of the campaign admirably as regards range, accuracy, mechanism, solidity, and thoroughness of their manufacture. But they would be still more suitable for Army purposes if they were a little shorter and a little lighter, because they could then be used by cavalry as well as infantry. These changes can, it is believed, be made without in any way affecting their range and accuracy. Experiments have been tried with an improved sight on a shortened and lightened rifle."

I have read these opinions verbatim, because I believe they will be very reassuring to the House.

But I realise that, even if we provide the Army with a proper number of men and efficient weapons and good officers, it would be absolutely useless unless we can to some extent meet the defects which have been shown to exist in the drill and training of our troops. I said just now that we hoped to get less barrack square drill, and I should like to add that, if possible, I hope we may get less sentry-go. I believe that sentry-go is the most paralysing effort of the soldier's life. It is certainly not good for health, and not of any advantage to the young soldier. With regard to drill, in which I am somewhat out of my depth, I believe the German manual exercise has got three positions and that our manual exercise has ten positions. I cannot help thinking that the fewer positions and more musketry training you can give to our soldiers the better. And I think this bears also on the question of getting recruits. There is no doubt that this increased training of the soldier does to a great extent make his life during the time he has to be trained

a harder one. I do not propose to deal again, as we did three years ago, with the question of the soldier's pay. I have myself the gravest doubts whether any increased pay we could give, unless we gave something like double, would really bring in a different stamp of recruit. It has often been said how recruits are attracted to the Army, but a great deal of it is due to locality and to association. It may interest the House to know that I have received from a high quarter a Return of the benefactions made by her late Majesty last year to those families who have got the largest number of sons serving in the Army. I find that of three sons in the Army in one family there were no less than 100 cases; four sons, 176 cases; five sons, 142 cases, six sons, 74; seven sons, 20; eight sons two; nine sons, one case; and one instance of ten sons serving in the Army. I think that shows that there is a considerable military feeling in certain families and in certain localities. What we are doing for the soldier this year is that we hope to make his life easier; we hope to give, by means of Garrison Battalions and Militia Reserves, something like a career for those soldiers who wish to go back to the Army.

Lord Roberts is very anxious; and I entirely agree with him; that we should also try in some of our new barracks the experiment of cubicles, and in other respects see whether we can give more comfort in barracks. We also propose to change the dress of the Army this year, leaving the full-dress, which is

absolutely necessary for the attraction of recruits, but having the same dress for fighting as for other work in this country. That will give the great advantage that when a regiment is ordered abroad it has in its possession, except its full-dress, the exact dress required for fighting in all circumstances, instead of having to be completely re-equipped. In doing this we have considerably improved the material and have added some underclothing as well.

But if the difficulty of training the men is great, the difficulty of training the officers is much greater. I am not altogether satisfied that Woolwich and Sandhurst provide us with all the training we ought to expect in an officer. My hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn

put to me a question of a very pregnant description when I was answering questions one day last June on behalf of the Under Secretary to the War Office, in which he wanted to know the precise dates on which Lord Roberts, Lord Kitchener, General French, and three or four other generals had left the Staff College. I was not able to oblige him. The dates had escaped my memory at the time, and Lord Roberts has not been able to refresh it. I am afraid there is no doubt, without saying a word against the Staff College, that it has been proved that men without a Staff College training have made a very fair hand at military affairs. Although I do not in the least degree prejudge what should be done, I do feel that the time has come to ask a small Educational Committee to report to us on the education given at Woolwich and Sandhurst and to consider whether or not any change in the system of admitting candidates to the Army should now take place. This is not an immediately pressing matter, for this reason; we must give commissions to a large number of men this year, and I hold, and I believe the House will hold, that the first claim on our attention for commissions in the Army are the men who in various capacities have gone out with the Militia and Regular troops to serve in South Africa, and have given satisfaction to their commanding officers. I propose to put at the disposal of Lord Kitchener a very considerable number of commissions this year, to be allotted on the reports of the commanding officers; and I beg here to make this statement, because I know a deluge of letters will reach me otherwise, that I have no influence whatever with Lord Kitchener. In all probability it would rather go against the man if I were to interfere on his behalf. When we come to the drill and training of officers I do not want to be misunderstood. We say most distinctly that we shall require from officers in the future a larger share of professional spirit in the Army. I do not want to say a word against the accomplishments on which young Englishmen pride themselves and which add to their courage and endurance; whether it be polo, or hunting, or steeplechasing or cricket or any other manual acquirement. I clearly realise what the advantages of those acquirements are to the Army. But it is not enough that our officers, when they get into action, should be brave or should be willing to volunteer to rush to the front. We must make it clear that professional requirements are to come first. While we will do our very best to get the cream of the youth of Great Britain into our Army, we must get out of the Army those who do not mean to enter it in a professional spirit. Before I leave this

question of the training of officers, let me say that I must come to the House and ask for facilities for the carrying on of manœuvres; facilities which are in the interest of the country, even if at the expense of private individuals; in order to make things more easy than they are at present. We must at least give the officer a chance of learning his trade.

There is one subject which is of interest to the House on which I must say a word. That is, the restricted field we have for obtaining officers by reason of the enormous expenses to which they are put. Nothing could be more difficult to deal with than this subject. I do not myself believe in sumptuary laws. They have been tried by many monarchs, but they have never succeeded; and to lay down that no mess is to charge more than 3s. for dinner, or that no one is to drink champagne is absurd. But there are some things that you can do. There is, first, the ridiculous expense of dress in the Army. If the House will pardon me I will give the chief prices of our uniforms and of those in the German army. I take prices of uniforms in the German army, in the stores of this country, and at a fashionable tailor's. Trousers in the German army cost 25s., in the stores in this country 66s., and at the tailor's from 55s. to 105s. The highest price of tunics in the German army is 54s., the lowest store price here is 125s., and at the tailor's 108s. The great-coat of the German officer costs 70s. Our store price is 118s., and at the tailor's 168s. The forage cap in Germany is 5s., and £1 here. The items which approach each other are dog-skin gloves, which are 4s. in Germany and 4s. 3d. here, the difference perhaps being accounted for by the tax on dogs. The result is, that the cost to a second lieutenant entering the German army is £18 12s. 6d.; here at the stores the cost is £48 12s., and at the tailor's £86. I propose to establish a system of getting good cutters and makers, by which officers will be able to get from our Government establishments uniforms at cost price. The difficulty about that, again, is the same difficulty as besets us about the expenses of chargers. In a smart regiment I do not think that a Government tunic would be looked at. In the same way a Government horse is never taken in some regiments. We have supported the excellent arrangement by which an officer bound to provide himself with a horse is entitled to take one or two chargers by paying £10 to the Government for each horse; an excellent bargain to the officer. I think what we aim to do in these matters cannot be done by legislation or by Army Orders, but it can be done, we think, by influence. I think that Lord Roberts is prepared to call together the colonels of cavalry regiments when they return to England and put before them the difficulty which we are under of getting cavalry officers, owing to the enormous expense. I think we shall find that expensive corps do not always mean efficient colonels. In cases in which we find that young officers are unable to enlist because of the extravagance on the part of the corps, we may have to revise the arrangements as a whole, leaving aside the fact that a very rich man must always be allowed to spend his money as he likes if he does not infect others.

Now we come to the next and, to many Members, the most interesting part of Army reform, and that is the reform of the War Office. I am not in a position tonight to enter into that engrossing topic the Order in Council. A good deal has

been said about it lately in another place, but I am not able to go into it at length for two reasons. In the first place, Lord Roberts, who communicated with me on this subject before returning to England, entirely concurred with the Government in believing that at this moment, with all we have upon us, it is more important that we should carry on the business of bringing the war to a conclusion, preparing the Estimates, and getting ready our scheme for this year rather

than in occupying our minds in mending the machinery by which the scheme is to be carried out. In the second place, Lord Roberts, not having before been at the War Office, was willing and anxious to have the experience of the War Office before he made up his mind as to whether any and what change was necessary. I will ask the House, therefore, to defer the subject for a short time. I have myself no strong preconceived opinions in regard to some of the points at issue. In the first place, I cannot contemplate any sort of struggle between the Commander-in-Chief and the Secretary of State for predominance. As far as Lord Roberts is concerned, when I was at the War Office before and he was not, I think that on almost every occasion of any difficulty I asked for his advice. I asked for it when he was in command in Ireland. My own feeling is that outside the charmed circle of the War Office there is almost as good advice to be got as is to be got inside, and I think the Secretary of State has not merely a right, but a duty, to make himself personally acquainted with a large number of officers. I myself have always endeavoured to see, without distinction, any officers returning from South Africa from high commands there. The position at this moment as regards the supervisory control of the various military officers is one which must be considered as time enables us to consider it, and we shall not unduly put it off.

But to my mind, far beyond all regulations, and all laws, and all arrangements for division of duty, is the consideration that there should be hearty co-operation and mutual understanding between the Secretary of State and the Commander-in-Chief; and I, of course, am specially fortunate as Secretary of State in having to deal with a Commander-in-Chief fresh from the command of 220,000 men in the field, who has got at his fingers' ends every detail of the military problems and has seen the work in the field of every officer he may have to appoint. Happy is the Minister who finds himself in such a case; and I have no fear that, in respect to reform of the War Office, anything will suffer from deferring for a short time the solution of these problems. But, Sir, let the House of Commons understand that the predominance of the Secretary of State in War Office matters is not nearly so much a predominance which he may desire himself as that which is forced upon him by the House of Commons. Take the last day or two. I could not come down here and say even that I have left to Lord Kitchener the arrangements with regard to prisoners and refugees without myself being urged to interfere with Lord Kitchener. I had to argue a week ago the question of courts-martial and other important questions of that kind. There was a general desire on the part of the House that the power of the civil Government should make itself responsible for the action taken by the chiefs of the Army. The main amount of

interference with military affairs is caused by civilians in the House of Commons itself, who desire the personal influence of the Secretary of State in all departments.

Before I leave the War Office let me say that I have myself asked for a Committee to advise us as to the changes that are necessary. I believe great changes are necessary. I am prepared to make them. At the same time I do ask that different and divergent questions may not be mixed up with any mistakes of the system there may be in the War Office. I hear nothing and read nothing but these unmitigated indictments of all that has been done by that Department; ascribing to the War Office all the failures that have occurred during the war.

I believe that to be a grave injustice. This House and the Government and various Governments have told the War Office to organise with a view to a certain state of things. They have had to provide for sending double or treble the men abroad contemplated under their organisation. During the last fifteen months I believe the supplies for our Army have not been equalled in our history or in that of any nation in any war that ever took place. Lord Roberts himself states that the supplies sent to South Africa were ample in all respects for men as well as animals. Lord Roberts states;

"My wishes were always forestalled with regard to them. It is true that men did not always receive full rations, but that was caused by the length of the lines of communication and the difficulties of distribution."

I think that is a very considerable testimony. I think the fact that, without breakdown, the organisation, against great difficulties, has dealt with this war during the last eighteen months requires some consideration from the House, and I think it would be very hard if the House does not associate with this result the services of the Adjutant General, Sir Evelyn Wood, who has managed to find men as fast as they could be shipped; the Quartermaster General, Sir C. Mansfield Clarke, whose department has never been found wanting: and, last but not least, the Director General of Ordnance. Sir H. Brackenbury, who has had to meet demands never dreamt of in the supply of military stores and has never yet fallen short. It would be hard on them if they were not associated in the commendation of the House with those civilians who had worked not only from morning to night, but until advanced hours of the morning, to see that the War Office was not found wanting.

But I entirely concur with those who think that the system of the War Office should be remodelled. I believe the great unpopularity of the Department is due to the fact that it is dilatory and too much tied up by regulations. It may be that the War Office system of dealing with letters is a dilatory system. The number of letters delivered at the War Office is 3,500 a day, which requires to be dealt with; a correspondence which is on a scale unexampled in any other Department, and, I believe, in most private businesses. It needs an admirable system to work operations of that kind. I have, however, laid down a variety of reforms which I trust may have some effect. In the first place, I have laid it down that all letters that do not involve reference to other Departments must be answered on the day. Secondly, I have largely stopped the Minutes from one person to another, holding, as I do, that if people cannot agree by writing a

Minute on either side, they had better meet and settle the question. But I am sorry to say we have yet to teach officers at a distance that business habits are as essential as good military discipline. Perhaps the House will allow me to give one or two illustrative instances of what I mean. Shortly after I took office I received a letter from a Reservist who had made application to join the South African Constabulary, and who for two months had waited without receiving an answer. I made inquiry, and I was told that the man ought not to write to the Secretary of State, and I quite agree with that; but it is difficult to debar a man from taking some means to get an answer. But I wished to know whether the man was to be allowed to go or not, and I waited a considerable time for an answer. I waited a fortnight, and, hearing nothing, I wrote again, requesting a prompt reply, for which I waited another week. Then I sent a telegram saying that I must know, and still nothing came. At the end of the fourth week I thought the time had come to exercise my authority. I indicated to the authorities that if I did not receive an answer on the following morning somebody would go on half-pay. I got an answer the next morning. The application had gone about among military officers, but meanwhile the man's case was not settled, as it should have been. In consequence of the multiplication of such cases as this it became necessary that the Adjutant General should lay down a regulation that all officers should open their own letters. I do not mean that they should not employ clerks, but that each officer should be responsible for seeing the work done. I certainly think that the interest of the public service demands that a man under discipline who makes such an application should have a prompt reply. Here is another case. A paper came before me last November, and that paper was in relation to the question whether a particular cottage should be shut up, or pulled down, or repaired at an expenditure of £130. Then I ascertained the history of that paper. It started in 1896, and came to me in November, 1900. In the interval it had been touring about between three military officers. In the second year it reached the War Office, and the Assistant Under Secretary sent it to the Commander-in-Chief, who gave certain orders. Then, as officers had been changed meanwhile, it went again on its peregrinations, and the result was that, after four years, the matter still remained unsettled. I sent it to Lord Wolseley, requesting him to see that whatever orders he gave were executed. Making a little more inquiry, I learned the result, which reminds me of the trial of the pig in "Alice," for deserting his sty, the pig being found when sentence was pronounced to have been dead for some years. So, in this case, I found that the cottage over which all this had taken place had been shut up three years ago by order of the sanitary authority. Dealing with such cases, I cannot but remember that we have got to teach a body of men to whom we delegate large powers, which some of them use admirably, that business habits must be enforced.

But I realise fully that neither rewards or penalties will carry us as far as we should go in this matter. You will not secure loyal service unless you retain the confidence of those who serve you. Too long there has been supposed to be a distinction between the civil and military departments at the War Office. There seems to be an assumption in the Army that duty to the Commander-in-Chief does

not include the service of the War Office as such, and that the saving of money was not the saving of the country's money but the War Office money. Now, I wish to do everything in my power to remove this feeling. Lord Roberts is working with me in every respect, and I with him, to make the Army feel that loyalty to the Commander-in-Chief means loyalty to the War Office also. We cannot get rid of the civilian element, and I do not wish in any way to reflect on the admirable service of the eminent men who have served the War Office. Among the younger men, especially with high attainments, there is an ambition to render the best service in their power; still I think that the hard and fast line between the civil and military elements at the War Office should, so far as is consistent with the interests of the public service, be broken down. For many years it has been the custom of the Secretary of State to be, as it were, in laager encircled by civilians, with a civilian Under Secretary, a civilian Parliamentary Secretary, a civilian Financial Secretary, and a civilian private secretary; and through this hedge it was difficult for a military officer to approach him. Now, I have done what I can to break down this division. In the recently appointed permanent Under Secretary; Colonel Ward; we have a man of recent brilliant military experience, and recommended by Lord Roberts as the best military organiser for the post that he knew. I think myself most fortunate in having secured him. In the Parliamentary Under Secretary we are so fortunate as to have an officer who has served in the Guards and is one of the best Militia colonels, and who has ever taken the greatest interest in the service. Then, as the House well knows, as Financial Secretary we have my noble friend, whose services we are happy in securing after his recent South African experience, and who brings a fresh breezy atmosphere into the War Office. My private secretary is an officer of South African experience, and renders me the greatest possible assistance. We wish to carry this principle as far as we can; and I think there are many posts that can be most usefully filled by officers who can no longer go on active service, and more especially among those who have suffered in the war. I hope to take further steps in this direction, but for any general change in business I must wait to hear the conclusions arrived at by the Committee which has given so much time and attention to the subject.

To pull together what the House has allowed me to say, our object is to re-organise the Army, giving full equipment and stores, by strengthening the Regular military force, by bringing the Auxiliary forces up to strength and improving their training, by changes in drill and uniform, by training, by reform of War Office administration, the Medical service and the Transport service. On some points I cannot undertake that we will move in the present year. I have any number of cases brought before me every day involving what I may call immediately unproductive expenditure; the maintenance of schools, of cadet corps, the establishment of Volunteer reserves, the encouragement of rifle clubs; all these involve expenditure of large sums of money, and which, however ultimately desirable, do not conduce to immediate efficiency of the Army, and I must be content for the present to do as I have said. We shall ask the House to main-

tain an Army of about 155,000 at home, a Reserve of 90,000, Militia 150,000, Yeomanry 35,000, and 250,000 Volunteers at least, allowing for some deductions under the more stringent conditions of service. We ask the House to take on the Estimates 680,000 men, the Field Army absorbing 260,000, the garrisons at home 190,000, the Volunteers for London defence 100,000, and the various staffs 4,000, so that in all we have 560,000 men allotted to various positions, giving a margin of 120,000 for recruits not trained, the sick, and other deductions in time of war. It is an organisation that may well tax the best energies of the War Office.

I know there are many gaps in the details of my statement and much that I have omitted. What I have aimed to do is to establish a standard up to which we can work and by which we can know what remains to be done. I must ask the House to look with favour on what I have attempted. I have been but four months in office, and I have had the advantage of Lord Roberts's advice for only half that time. During this time we have had to maintain 200,000 troops in South Africa and to equip and despatch 30,000 additional troops and to keep up the stores and supplies. The various reforms I have sketched out have involved an enormous amount of work at the War Office and a prodigious amount of correspondence. Added to this there have been more questions in the House and more debates in the House than ever War Minister had to engage in within such a period of time. The claims on my time have been great, and I mention this in no tone of complaint, but rather to secure the indulgence of the House towards any imperfections they may find in the scheme I have placed before them. Moreover, there is at all times to be dealt with the current business of a great Department, which I have seldom been able to take up before the evening. Complaint would be out of place, for no man feels more than I do how much every effort which we can make is due, and how small that effort is compared with the efforts which we have required of our troops in South Africa in the last fifteen months. And when I think of the

10,000 or 12,000 men whose lives have been given for the country in this war, and the much larger number of men who have come home suffering from wounds and disease, I cannot help feeling that by far the highest monument which we can raise, and the best recognition which we can give to their heroism is by founding on their experience an army system adequate to defend their countrymen at home, and to fulfil the demands necessarily made upon us for our colonies abroad. It is because I have been fortified by this feeling that I have felt that we should shrink from no labour, that we should shirk no difficulty, and fear no criticism, and I have a profound conviction that it is possible to build up an army that will be adequate to our needs. And I cannot but hope that, long after the discussions which divide us with regard to the war and to other political topics have been forgotten, it may be written in the history of this Government; yes, and of this Parliament; that they have unflinchingly set their hands to the great national work of the reform of the Army, and thereby gained both for the Government and for Parliament the abiding gratitude of their fellow-countrymen.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.";

(Mr. Brodrick.)

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I propose to ask leave of the House to withdraw the motion in order to carry out the pledge I gave yesterday to the right hon. Gentleman opposite.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That will be in accordance with the understanding.

May I say that I should ill express the feeling of the House if I did not congratulate the right hon. Gentleman not only on the substance, but on the manner of the statement he has made.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Resolved, That this House will immediately resolve itself into the of Supply.:(Mr. Balfour.)

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

1. Motion posed, "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;3,000,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for additional expenditure, due to the War in South Africa, in respect of the following Army Services, viz.: Vote 6. Transport and Remounts, £;2,000,000; Vote 7. Provisions, Forage, and other Supplies, £;1,000,000;Total, £;3,000,000."

*SIR ARTHUR HAYTER (Walsall) congratulated the Secretary of State for War on the magnificent speech to which they had listened with appreciation and advantage.

Dealing with the Estimates, the hon. Member called attention to the enormous loss of horses in connection with the South African campaign. That was a matter of which the Committee should take notice. Since the original Estimates were presented the total sum voted for remounts was no less than £;8,100,000. While he recognised that this war had been carried on under exceptional circumstances, and in a climate which was very trying, he must call attention to the

exceedingly bad arrangements which were made for the supply of horses. Our strongest cavalry regiments had 609 rank and file, but they had only 465 horses, or a permanent deficiency of 144. In the Household Cavalry regiments there were 404 rank and file, but only 275 horses, being a deficiency of 129. The result was that we had to go all over the world when the war broke out to find horses.

We went to the Argentine Republic and to the London General Omnibus Company. The Argentine horses had been excessively bad. What we did in South Africa was to establish at a place called Maitland camp, a depot for horses, and the animals, imported from all over the world, were taken to that place. He had received a letter from one of the officers employed

there, and referring to the way the horses were treated the letter contained the following;

"In October, 1899, war was declared, and I maintain that England at that moment was absolutely unprepared so far as remounts and horses generally were concerned. They therefore sent officers and veterinary surgeons to all parts of the globe and bought horses of every kind. This took time. The various regiments arrived at Maitland camp near Cape Town and waited there for their horses. The

horses arrived in time, were at once seized on and sent up country. After four or live days in a truck they were detrained and marched with heavy men and much kit on their backs twenty or thirty miles, and so on day after day. The result was that they died in thousands, which was both cruel and costly. I therefore think some other system must be employed in the future."

The hon. Member agreed that some other method must be employed. Everyone acquainted with horses knew that after a voyage of 6,000 miles horses required alterative diet, gentle exercise, and good treatment. But our horses were hurried up country at once. If after the first two battles there had been sufficient cavalry we could have cut off the Boers in their retreat. He should like very much to know why Basuto ponies had not been employed. In a previous war there was a whole regiment who were mounted on Basuto ponies. The son of a popular Whip in that House, who had been out there, told him that he rode a Cape pony which carried him through the whole campaign. The gentleman was fifteen stone, and the pony which carried him, with full accoutrements, was perfectly well and fit now. We ought to have bought up every possible Cape pony. Besides their power of endurance, they were accustomed to the climate, and would have stayed the campaign better. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give attention to having a better registration of horses. He hoped also that the cavalry regiments would, in point of horses, be brought up to the number of men. In Ireland if stallions were lent to various counties the Government ought to have right of pre-emption in the produce. One of the greatest blots in connection with the war was the deficiency in horses. He urged that some provision should be made whereby we would not be subjected to the same experience in future.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said he did not know anything about the Cape horses. The best horses for cavalry were Irish horses. That market had been altogether neglected by the Government for the last fifteen or twenty years, and the consequence was that there was a comparatively bad supply of horses in Ireland when the war broke out. He wished to know if that was exclusively the fault of the Government. The House of Commons voted plenty of money to pay for horses. They voted £;40 a horse. It paid the farmer to produce a good cavalry horse for that sum. But the farmer did not get £;40. He had tried to get the figures from the War Office, and he had put question after question in the House, but he had got very little information. The Army authorities were ruining their last breeding ground for horses; Ireland; by the practice of buying through dealers. Last year about 6,000 horses were purchased from dealers and 209 from non-dealers. The dealer got £;40 per horse and paid only £;28 to the farmer: and when the cavalry officer purchased direct from the farmer he paid only the same amount; £;28; in order not to spoil the dealers' market. The consequence was, that for the last ten years farmers in Ireland had found that it did not pay to produce horses for the Army. While he believed that Irish horses were best for cavalry purposes, he did not mean to say that they were best for artillery. As a general rule the Irish horse had not sufficient weight for the artillery. There were many inconveniences from having to buy horses through dealers. The remedy for this was to make the cavalry colonel buy his horses direct from the farmer,

giving him the price which was now paid to the dealer. He hoped the Secretary of State for War would turn over a new leaf in this matter.

*Mr. FULLER (Wiltshire, Westbury) said he wished to support the hon. and gallant Member for North Galway in urging that remounts should be brought from farmers direct, not only in Ireland but also in this country. He had had some experience in the Yeomanry in the buying of remounts, and knew how easy it was to deal direct with the farmers in the west of England. It was the custom in the west of England for dealers to receive from £40 to £50 each for horses which they purchase in

anticipation of a visit by an Army officer at half the money. He thought there ought to be a different system of purchase. The horses should be brought to certain centres for the inspection of Army officers and purchased direct from the breeders. The question was one of very considerable importance to breeders of horses in the west of England, and he earnestly pressed the right hon.

Gentleman to turn over in his mind the possibility of meeting in some such way as he had suggested the wishes of the breeders of horses.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said he wished to ask a question with regard to the fittings on board the South African transports, and the enormous loss of horses in consequence of their being faulty. On one of the transports, he believed it was the "Weimar," going from Bombay to Durban, the horses were swept overboard wholesale, simply because the fittings were of a faulty character. Some of the transports, on the other hand, had iron fittings of the very best character. He suggested that the Government should lay down specific regulations as to the sort of fittings to be used on board the transports, and that in the event of there being a loss of horseflesh caused by fittings of a non-regulation character the owners of the vessel should bear the cost. The suffering involved ought in itself to be sufficient to attract the attention of the War Office to the matter, and the Committee were entitled to some assurance that the question should be looked into, so that a repetition of the scandals which were far too prevalent at the early stages of the war would be avoided.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said that he happened to be at Durban when the particular ship referred to by the last speaker came in. It was true that the few horses remaining were cut about in all directions, but it was hardly fair to put it down to the bad fittings. The real cause was that the captain of the vessel was not familiar with that part of the coast; he put out too far to sea, and there was a tremendous storm raging. There might possibly have been faults in the fittings, but that was not the main reason.

Mr. KEARLEY said that as a matter of fact he was aware that a great deal of the loss of horseflesh on that ship was occasioned down below by a tank getting loose.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (LORD STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton) suggested that the hon. Member might be confusing two cases.

MR. KEARLEY was certain he was not mistaken, as it was only recently he was discussing the matter with a man on the ship. It was the case of the 9th Hussars. The fittings were wooden and faulty. But he did not rest his complaint upon one case. It was a matter of public notoriety that in the earlier stages of

the war the fittings passed by the Army officials in London and Liverpool proved to be altogether inadequate.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) agreed that as a general rule Argentine horses were very unsatisfactory, it would have been much better if more horses could have been purchased from Ireland. His experience of Irish horses was limited to one, for which he paid, as he thought, a very high price. But although he worked that horse very hard in South Africa, he had no difficulty in selling it out there for £10 more than he originally gave for it. That might be a good tip for the Government, because, if they did not want to bring the horses back, the people out there would buy them, as they were very glad to get hold of good horses. Another point to which he wished to refer was the burden borne by the cavalry and mounted infantry in the field. The weight was perfectly inconceivable. The saddles were loaded with forage, a lance, a sword, and a carbine, with perhaps five or six stone weight tacked on, so that it was almost impossible to keep the saddle in the middle. The consequence was that the horses suffered severely from sore back, and were then absolutely useless for all practical purposes in the field. He saw no reason why the mounted troops should not have a certain number of light squadron carts, with, say, four horses apiece, which should follow at a distance and come up to the camp at night. These carts could carry the forage, tools, rugs, blankets, and so on, that were not imme-

diately required by the men. The advantage of such a scheme would be that immediately a horse began to get a sore back it could be changed for one of the leaders in the cart, and, by being relieved of the saddle, it would be able to keep up with the regiment, so that the necessity of leaving it on the veldt, as so many hundreds and thousands had had to be left, would be avoided. The hon. Member was proceeding to refer to the proposed extension of the system of registration, when

*THE CHAIRMAN ruled that that question did not come within the Vote under discussion.

MR. COCHRANE said that on the proper occasion he would refer in a friendly manner to that subject.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) looked upon the question of the proper supply of horses as one of the greatest importance. The registration system was one of the very best methods that could be adopted, and if a system could be devised by which the British Government might have a claim upon colonial horses;

*THE CHAIRMAN reminded the hon. Member that the Committee were discussing a Supplementary Estimate for horses in respect of the war in South Africa. The general question of horses, registration, and so forth, was not open for discussion.

COLONEL NOLAN pointed out that Vote 6. Item D, included the registration of horses. Would not the discussion of the question therefore be in order?

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the Minister in charge of the Vote said that any of this money has been paid in respect of registration of horses the hon. Member would be right. But I understand that that is not so. The money is asked for in respect of the purchase of horses which have been or will be sent to South Africa before

the end of the financial year.

CAPTAIN NORTON, passing from the registration to the transport of horses, said that the case of the 9th Hussars was but one isolated instance. There were at least half-a-dozen ships which sailed from various ports taking horses to South Africa in regard to which the same point arose. In many cases the enormous loss of horseflesh was due almost entirely to bad fittings. The ships had been fitted under the supervision of officers who were not experts in reference to that particular duty. In some cases ships sailed without veterinary surgeons of experience on board, and horses bought abroad were brought down to the ship-side absolutely raw and unprepared for the voyage. Where duly qualified veterinary surgeons were on board they were practically under the orders of officers ;some of them Militia, and most of them infantry officers;who had no knowledge whatever as regarded the shipping of horses. The Army Veterinary Department had never received fair treatment at the hands of the authorities. At the time when the war broke out there were twelve vacancies, but only one member of the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons presented himself for examination. The main reason for that state of things was that, as in the case of the Army Medical Department, the views of the profession had not been attended to. The Army was consequently tabooed by the schools, and the best men were not forthcoming. The department was so framed and constituted that there was no arrangement for extension in the case of war. As nine-tenths of the British campaigns were carried on in countries more or less uncivilised, where if there was railway transport at all it was very limited, there was no army in the world which needed to be better provided for an extension of its veterinary department than the British. The difficulties of supplying an army in the field with only one line of railway were prodigious, as to a great extent, wheeled transport and pack animals had to be relied upon. The horses, mules, and oxen necessary for that purpose, of course, required veterinary treatment just as much as the cavalry and artillery horses. A large number of veterinary surgeons had to be employed; but was it to be supposed for one moment, seeing the great rise which had taken place in the social status and position of veterinary surgeons to-day as compared with a few years ago, that men would leave good practices to enter the Army for temporary employment under the conditions obtaining at present? Of course they would not. Large numbers of the men who were employed had proved absolute failures, as they had no knowledge whatever of the duties they were supposed to perform. Considerable responsibility rested upon the War Office authorities for not having established prior to the war some system whereby they could lay their hands upon, at any rate, a limited number of properly qualified veterinary surgeons of a certain standing.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I must remind the hon. Member that there is no money asked for in regard to veterinary surgeons.

CAPTAIN NORTON pointed out that he was endeavouring to show that the loss of horseflesh was mainly due to the fact that the horses had not been properly taken care of. When they arrived in South Africa, instead of being prepared for transport by rail, they were sent under incompetent persons to the various

depots up-country. They were put in charge of men from various cavalry regiments whose commanding officers had found them to be practically useless, as it stood to reason that no colonel commanding a mounted corps would send his best men to the depots to take care of horses. There was a sort of dual responsibility between the military and the veterinary officers in charge of the depot. Such a system was bound to do badly, and as a result at two crises of the war operations were delayed in consequence of the dearth of horses. Had a proper supply of horses been forthcoming many men who had lost their lives in South Africa would have been alive to-day. After the battles of Graspan, Modder River, and others, the general officer in command was unable to take military advantage of the success he had gained, because he had no cavalry either to turn the flanks of the enemy or to pursue the foe when they were in retreat. Another point in connection with this matter was the effect which the large number of horses, mules, and oxen dying on the march or in crossing the various rivers had upon the health of the troops. Probably a great deal of the enteric fever was caused by the contamination of the water supplies by the bodies of these animals. With regard to the large number of Argentine horses which had been purchased, it was known that hardened horses were not to be found in the Argentine Republic. They were bought there in a green state, and surely that was not the field to which the War Office should have gone. Others were bought in Hungary, where it was understood £7 or £8 per head was paid by the dealers through whom they were bought, but the British Government had to pay something nearer £40. He admitted there were great difficulties in buying horses in a foreign country, but surely a great and wealthy country like England could lay its hands upon a certain number of men with the necessary qualifications to buy horses in Hungary. The question of the weight carried by the horses was one of considerable importance. Members who were old cavalry officers had called attention to this matter over and over again. It was said that the British cavalry as mounted men were equally as good as the Boers, and yet the Boers with smaller horses were able to walk round the British troops. It stood to reason that the tremendous weight carried by the horse must tell in a long march. Moreover, the average British cavalry soldier took practically no interest in his horse in the matter of sore back, and a horse after two or three days sore back became absolutely useless. In South Africa no depots were provided for these horses with sore backs, and they were ridden until they were practically useless, and then they had to be despatched. Had those horses been sent to proper depots they would have, in four or five weeks time, been not only equally good but far better than the new arrivals. His belief was that at the root of all these evils lay the want of proper organisation of the Army Veterinary Department. It was impossible all at once to extend a department to do ten times the work expected of it under ordinary circumstances, and he hoped that under the scheme foreshadowed in the able speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War; upon which he heartily congratulated him; he would not forget this great necessity in the Army Veterinary Department. MR. RATCLIFF (Staffordshire, Burton) said that something had been stated about buying horses in the Argentine and in Ireland. He thought it was wise to

buy horses at the present time on the other side of the equator. Horses had to change their coats at certain times of the year according to the season, and it stood to reason that horses bought in Ireland and taken over to the other side of the equator would have to undergo a change of climate which would be very trying to them. Therefore, he thought the Government were wise in purchasing horses on the other side of the equator. He was not arguing in favour of Argentine horses, but he thought horses could be bought, probably in Australia or elsewhere, which would serve the Army better than the horses bought in Ireland.

*SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston) said he had been induced to make one or two observations in consequence of what he had been told went on in South Africa by an old friend of his who had been out there, and had witnessed the excessive waste of horseflesh which had occurred during the campaign. That waste meant a terrible loss of money to the taxpayers, and he could not help thinking that in this respect the forces had suffered from a want of organisation just as they had suffered from this cause in reference to the spread of disease in the Army. At a late period of the war, horses were shipped in large numbers under great difficulties, and with some defects in the transport arrangements. Those who were not military men or veterinary surgeons knew that horses brought over a long sea voyage always required a certain amount of rest before they were put to work. He was assured on good authority that when the horses came to be landed at Cape Town no preparations were made for giving them a short period of rest, and although they were suffering from all the ills of the voyage, made very often in ships inadequately fitted, they were entrained at once and sent up country to the depot. Even when they arrived there they did not receive that period of rest which was absolutely necessary in order to fit them for the hard service of the campaign. Horses required proper and considerate treatment, but they never received such

treatment, and they were put to carry those enormous weights referred to in the debate in that bad condition. How could such horses, carrying from twenty to twenty-one stone, be expected to compete with the Boers, who were mounted on hardy ponies, carrying perhaps from 20 to 25 per cent, less weight. In all those matters of rapid movement on horseback no one knew better than the noble Lord that weight told more than anything else. They could not get pace if they did not look after the weight, and a weight-carrying horse, however good he might be, had no chance against an inferior horse if he had two stone more to carry. Not only had they been carrying on a wasteful and almost indefensible policy in regard to the treatment of horses, but they had not been giving the men such a number of remounts as would enable them effectively to bring the war to an end. On the ground of humanity alone, and out of regard for the dumb creation, better care ought to have been taken of those unfortunate horses. Hundreds of horses had dropped down on the roadside in consequence of the labour put upon them when they were not in a condition to do it. The horses had died in thousands, and he should like to hear from the noble Lord the exact mortality among the horses. Those horses which had died on the roadside had been a source of great danger to the troops themselves. Their carcasses had been left there rotting in the sun,

and often polluting the water supply, and if this had not produced enteric fever, it had contributed largely to that other disease known as dysentery, which had affected their troops in South Africa, and which had done so much to swell the list of deaths from disease. On these grounds he thought they ought to press this matter upon the attention of the noble Lord and the right hon. Gentleman his colleague opposite, in order that the great waste of horseflesh might be avoided in the future.

LORD STANLEY: Perhaps I may be allowed to intervene at this stage in order to answer a few of the questions which have been raised. I can assure this Committee that the War Office authorities have not the slightest intention of covering up any shortcomings. One question put to me had reference to the purchase of Basuto and Cape ponies. I may say that we got every Basuto pony that it was possible to get, but our Commissioner found that there was not a great disposition to sell. I should like to point out that a large portion of this Tote which we are taking to-night is for horses and Cape ponies purchased in those districts which have come under martial law, and in consequence we have been able to obtain them. We sent out buyers to purchase not only Basuto ponies, but also Cape ponies, and they had obtained as many as they possibly could. Two or three hon. Members have spoken with reference to the future purchasing of horses for the Army, and I confess that I am entirely in accord with those who would wish us as far as possible to buy from our own breeders, and thus give them an inducement to produce a class of horse that will be useful to us in the future. I am not sure that I should confine this to trying to produce cavalry horses in this country, but I should try and extend it by having large stud farms in Canada and South Africa.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: And Australia.

LORD STANLEY: Australia is slightly different, because that is a country from which we draw upon so much for horses for the Indian Army, and we do not wish to interfere with that supply which must be kept up for India. Cape Colony and Canada seem to me to be suitable places where we might be able to establish some system of breeding horses. As far as Canada is concerned, I know it is open to the objection that in the winter it is impossible to send horses produced there into the warmer climates. I think, however, in South Africa it would be perfectly possible to do something in this direction very successfully, and I hope when the war ceases we shall be able to start some system of this kind. There is another system which has been mentioned, which personally I am very much in favour of, and that is whether we could not, by providing for the tenant farmers in this country and in Ireland a good class of mare and using sound stallions, obtain a lien on the produce. I know there are a great many difficulties in the way of carrying this out, but they might possibly be overcome. Upon the question of the general buying of horses there have been endless difficulties. I do not think that there is a single Englishman or Irishman who does not, in the first place, think he is the only man who knows how to buy a horse, and he thinks he can readily convince anybody else who is selling you a horse that he is really doing you, and that he could get you a better horse for the same money. I do not think that we can say a word against

those persons who have been sent to buy our horses, for they have done their best. They have had very hard work to do, and, although they have had some failures, I cannot help thinking that the majority of horses they have purchased have not been of such a very bad class as some hon. Members would have us believe.

With regard to the purchasing of horses at the present moment, my hon. and gallant friend may be pleased to hear that orders have been given for the purchase of 1,000 horses and cobs in Ireland, and we have also given directions that our dealers in Ireland and in England shall put themselves more in touch with the breeders of those horses than with the dealers. If gentlemen of influence in the various localities would assist our buyers in any way it would lead to better results. I think hon. Members who understand anything about buying horses will certainly bear me out when I say that the amount of rubbish brought forward for artillery and cavalry purposes is extraordinary, and disapproval of these animals is very often expressed in very strong language. Two or three hon. Members have referred to the question of the weight carried by our horses in South Africa. I do not think anybody could have been out there without being impressed with the enormous amount of weight that we have to put on the backs of our horses and men to send them out in an efficient state even for a three days march. That, of course, is one of the questions which will have to be dealt with, but it is hardly my place to express an opinion upon such a subject. I think it is one of those questions which can safely be left to those officers who

have had the most experience in those matters, and it must be left entirely in the hands of the military authorities to make suggestions.

My hon. friend the Member for West Newington spoke about the Veterinary Department, and I think that is one of the very few omissions which one can point to in the statement of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War to-day. But though he omitted it in his speech, I may say he has not omitted it in his consideration, and an attempt is being made to put the Army Veterinary Department on a much more substantial basis than it has ever been before, and by the better terms which we propose to offer I think we shall be able to get a better class of veterinary surgeons than we have had during the present war. At the same time, it is obvious that it is perfectly impossible to have in permanent employment in the Army the number of veterinary surgeons required in time of war, and if we can come to some arrangement in regard to veterinary officers similar to that which we have arranged in regard to the horses, I hope that will be a step in the direction in any future war of saving our horses. The hon. and gallant Member was wrong when he said that we had no sick establishments for the horses. I know there was one at Bloemfontein, at Fisher's Farm, and there must have been something like 300 or 400 horses under treatment there. There was another such establishment at Pretoria, and there was also another in Natal.

AN HON. MEMBER: There was also one on the Orange River.

LORD STANLEY: I was not aware of that. It is very easy for hon. Members to talk about collecting sick horses and placing them in the depot. When a regiment was

on the march there may have been cases where perhaps horses might have been saved by sending them to these; depots, but owing sometimes to the circumstances of the case and the distance you are from the main line, you are obliged to put the finishing touch to the horse by riding him on an extra day. Hon. Members must not judge in this respect simply by what they hear, and I would suggest that they might accept the verdict of some of those officers who saw these things and who are convinced that as much was done in that direction as is possible. With regard to giving the horses on their arrival at Cape Town a period of rest, there were many difficulties in the way. In the first place it was difficult to get a good camp for them, and it must also be remembered that what we wanted was a horse fit to take the field at the point of distribution. If you brought a horse to Cape Town and got him fit there, if you had then to put him in a truck for eight days, where he would not be regularly fed owing to the great difficulties in the way of carrying this out, when you came to take him out you can readily imagine that a great deal of the condition put on at Cape Town must go off before you get him to the district where he was wanted. The ideal treatment would have been to have taken all the horses to the distributing place and got them into condition there. That would have meant, however, an enormous expenditure of forage, which it was altogether impossible to give. It was as much as could be done to feed the few horses that we had got there, without having to supply some thousands of them while they were getting fit. With regard to the horses we are sending out now, it should be remembered that part of this vote is for a large number of the mounted troops which we are now sending out as reinforcements. In addition to this the Vote includes payment for all the horses and ponies that we have taken in South Africa, and, in addition, we are at the present moment providing a reserve stock to endeavour to see if we can get some condition on them at Cape Town before they are sent out to the front. I think we shall be able now to send out three thousand a month over and above the demand that has been made.

With regard to the fitting up of the ships, I have not provided myself with the figures as to how many horses have died owing to the defective fitting up of the ships. Of course it would be rather difficult to give those figures, because you must also take into account the sort of weather you had on the voyage. There are other circumstances besides defective fittings to account for the great loss of horses. When the "Suffolk" went down all the horses on board, belonging to the 10th Hussars, were lost, but when that regiment got to Cape Town the men were provided with Argentine horses, and I believe they outclassed any of the horses in the other two squadrons, so that all Argentine horses are evidently not of the same sort. All these ships are carefully examined by naval experts before the horses are sent out. There is a great difference of opinion as to how you should ship horses, but I believe that every possible care has been taken, and if this war has brought out defects, I am perfectly certain that if it requires any expenditure of money to put these matters right in the future my right hon. friend will be the last man to stand in the way of the money being spent. I do not think it will be found that these fittings have been as defective as has been made out, and I believe that the

mortality on board has been more due to weather and to change of climate than to any defect in the fittings.

I think I have now dealt with all the questions put to me, and I would like to say that we are endeavouring as far as possible to carry out the promises that we made in this House with regard to the future purchase of horses. We have written to Lord Strathcona, and we are arranging for buyers to go out to Canada. We are not purchasing any more Hungarian horses, but we are purchasing another class which we are told is very useful in South Africa. With regard to England and Ireland, more buyers are being sent out, and experienced officers are visiting various districts, and we hope that in this way we shall be able to come in touch with local breeders without purchasing so exclusively from dealers as we had to do in the past.

SIR WALTER FOSTER asked whether the noble Lord could say what the mortality had been.

LORD STANLEY: I do not think I can, and I am afraid that it is impossible for anybody to say what it has been.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said there was no doubt that the mortality amongst the horses in South Africa had been greater than in any war in history. The loss of horses after landing had been absolutely gigantic and beyond all precedent, and there had been no breakdown and no failure in the war more serious than that connected with the supply of horses, and it had had a most disastrous effect on the course of the war. Generally speaking, he found that the horses which came out with the cavalry regiments were in fairly good condition, for they had been properly looked after. The greatest loss took place in the case of the horses bought in Argentina, Australia, the United States and Canada, and in some of the Yeomanry horses purchased in England. They were landed in a very unsatisfactory manner at some of the ports, and then were put into various remount camps which were short-handed all along, though there was plenty of forage. There was not only a deficiency in the number of the men, but they were unsatisfactory. The deficiency was made up by the employment of raw Kaffirs without experience of horse tending. Then the horses were sent up to the front in that bad condition. The noble Lord had described the great difficulty that took place in their transport. In one case the horses had been no fewer than eight days in the train. The boxes became slippery; they were not very good boxes in the first place; and the horses got knocked about in every possible way. At Craddock, and perhaps at Bloemfontein, the horses were fed out of the train and proper arrangements were made by the officer commanding there. That was the one bright spot in the life of the horses. Then the trains were sent up in charge of a very short number of men. There were often 200 horses in a train, and commonly 150, and there was only one officer, one non-commissioned officer, and six soldiers; although there were a few more at the last, and some Kaffirs. As all the horses had to be fed in the train the conditions of the journey were disastrous. Then the horses were immediately sent on marches of considerable length. In one case the horses, immediately after a three or four days journey in the train, were sent a march of thirty miles, and most of them died. The loss was gigantic, and that had a most disastrous effect on the course of the war. We

had had good luck in that the enemy had no cavalry. One general officer who had commanded a cavalry brigade under General French had stated publicly that the army never could have reached the Portuguese frontier if the enemy had had any cavalry. Several speakers had referred to the weight required to be carried by the horses, as though that was an explanation for the losses. Of course everybody knew that if a horse had less weight to carry he could do better; but they must remember that the success they had met with in keeping horses alive had been much less in South Africa than in the Peninsula, where very few cavalry horses had been lost. There was the great march from Salamanca to Ciudad Rodrigo, where only the artillery horses were killed and the cavalry horses were saved, although the weight carried by them was much greater than that carried now by our cavalry. In the French War of 1870 both the German and French cavalry carried more weight, and they were able to keep their horses alive, which the Germans did, but who carried by one stone the heavier weight, In the march to Russia by the Grand Army the cavalry horses carried a heavier weight than ours did in South Africa. Our loss in horseflesh in South Africa had been greater than in any previous war. It was evident that the noble Lord had given his mind to this matter, and he had shown the Committee that the lessons of the war had not been lost upon him, and that everything would be done in the future to prevent a repetition of the horrible loss of horses. He was inclined to think that if at the beginning of the war precautions had been taken, a great deal of the expenditure might have been saved. He could not but fear that the great destruction in horseflesh was due to the want of training on the part of the men in horse-mastership and in generally looking after horses.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) congratulated the Secretary of State on the extremely lucid and clever speech which he had made. He regretted he was not an expert on this question, for he had not been to the front, although that was not entirely his fault. The regiment with which he had served, however, had been at the front, and he had collected from his old comrades some information which might be of

some use. In the first place, they had to deplore a waste of horseflesh from bad treatment. Some of the horses were hunters which had been used to careful attention in warm stables, and yet they had been put on board cattle trucks, and sent down to Southampton for shipment without a rag of clothing. Consequently they contracted the seeds of pneumonia, which was developed during the rough passage to the Cape. Then they were put in charge of Militia officers who had never seen a horse before. It was due to the Member for North Aberdeen that so many horses arrived alive. Even after arrival they were kept three days without food. When a Cape millionaire imported horses he reckoned on their taking a year to acclimatise, but these horses were sent up to the front without even waiting forty-eight hours, and the natural consequence was that they died like flies. In one particular regiment seven times the number of horses which the regulations required passed through the ranks. The question of horse-breeding had been mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman, who could not do better than look at a letter by Sir Walter Gilbey, which appeared in The Times of 27th December last.

In that letter allusion was made to the stud farms established in Austria in 1876. The noble Lord had said that the plan would be to get a lien on the horses in these stud farms. What was the system adopted in Austria? The farmers sent their mares to the stud farms to be served without payment, and the produce was afterwards bought at £28 for cavalry horses and £26 for draught horses. There was another interesting letter, which appeared in The Times on 25th December last, signed by a cavalry officer. That writer alluded particularly to the question of Hungarian horses. It seemed to him that Hungarian horses were absolutely useless. They had straight shoulders, staring coats, and the only hard thing about them was their mouths. They failed when any weight was put on them. He did not always agree with the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean, but he did so in regard to the weight which cavalry horses had to carry. The saddles were enormous; more like the equipment of an elephant. The stirrups were

as thick as two of a man's fingers, and wherever there was a bare bit of horseflesh the authorities insisted on covering it with a buckle or something. The total weight the horses were supposed to carry was nineteen stone and a half, and he had been told by some friends of his that the only way in which they could keep their horses in condition was to ride on a stripped saddle and without any weight. Of course, it was absurd to ask an eleven-stone hunter to carry nineteen stone and a half. His hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn suggested that the campaign should be carried on by cavalry only, as had been done by Alexander 2,000 years ago, each man with three spare horses. That was how it had been carried on by the Boers. If we had had more remounts we should probably have done better in the war.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) said he had listened with considerable interest to the speeches made, from the statement of the Secretary for War to that of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down; but as an Irish Member he must say that there had been a remarkable desire exhibited to ignore the claims of Ireland to a fair share of the purchases of remounts for the cavalry in South Africa. One hon. Gentleman had gone so far as to say that Ireland as a horse-breeding country should be ignored, that no money should be spent in Ireland, but that it all should be spent in the Argentine and other countries beyond the Equator. He would like to know how much of the taxation of this country was to be borne by the people of Argentine or of Hungary, where the horses were being bought at present. The noble Lord the Financial Secretary to the War Office had outlined some plan by which the Government were going to establish stud-farms; one in Canada and one in South Africa. But the noble Lord did not outline any scheme by which the horse-breeders in this country and Ireland would receive some benefit from such a plan. Now, it was generally admitted that Ireland, of all countries in the world, was the best for the production of useful horses; and why should Ireland be given the go-by in this respect? The right hon. Gentleman had said that something like 1,000

horses or cobs were to be purchased in Ireland; but from 150,000 to 160,000 horses had been sent to South Africa, and nearly 100,000 of these had died. From time to time the gaps caused by that terrible mortality had to be filled, and he

would most respectfully submit that 1,000 was not a fair proportion to obtain from Ireland. The people of Ireland were, as a whole, opposed to the war, on the grounds of policy and humanity, and so far as they were concerned it would be to their advantage, from a political point of view, if Government did not trouble them with any orders. But the unfortunate part of the arrangement between the two countries was that they were still compelled to pay a proportion of the cost of the war; and therefore as long as they had to pay this large tribute, it was but fair and just that a proportion of the horses required should be purchased in Ireland. If the whole Irish market was only to supply 1,000 horses they were not receiving that fair proportion that was their due.

LORD STANLEY: I said that there was one order for 1,000 horses, but it does not follow that that is to be the only order.

MR. J. B. FARRELL said he accepted the statement of the noble Lord, but he wanted to allude to the way in which these particular purchases were carried out. The horse fairs in his neighbourhood were very largely supplied with serviceable and useful animals, but no representative of the War Department had ever gone over to these large horse fairs, so far as he had been able to ascertain. A military officer might attend them for the purpose of buying remounts. He thought it would be right to give encouragement to the official dealers to go to these fairs. Better still, notice might be given by advertisement that on a certain day so many horses would be examined with a view to purchase. Another question he wished to raise on this Vote of three millions was the supply of provisions, forage and transport in Ireland. Complaints had been made in House already about the boycotting of Irish contractors to the Army. He would like to know what contracts for provisions, forage, clothing and other supplies had been given to Irish contractors. Very much feeling had been generated in Ireland on account of the great loss that accrued to the country by giving contracts to syndicates who had mainly their headquarters in London. It was not a pleasure to Irishmen to raise these points, but since England insisted on making them pay their proportion of the cost of the war, it was but fair and right that the Irish taxpayers should receive a fair share of the contracts.

*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said he should like to add his congratulations to the unanimous tribute which had already been offered to the Secretary of State for War upon the admirable address which he had delivered that night.

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

*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said it had never been his good fortune to listen to a statement more broadminded and statesmanlike than that of the Secretary for War that evening. The question of remounts was one of the most important that had arisen during the course of the present war. He was not sure whether the deficiency in the supply of horses ought not to rank as one of the foremost causes of the length, expense, and disasters of the war. In his opinion it was entitled to rank as equal to others which he would only refer to; namely, the insufficient supply of troops in South Africa before the war began, and the bad generalship which was displayed at the earlier stages of the campaign. Both of

these sources of blunder were responsible for an amount of from £50,000,000 to £70,000,000. Many thousands of lives might have been saved if there had been prevision at the War Office or on the part of the military authorities as regards the quantity and quality of horses requisite for the war. It was absolutely deplorable when they thought of the waste of horses that had occurred, and what an enormous expenditure there had been in consequence of the want of prevision. He did not know what the total amount was, but taking the horses at £40 apiece, and that was probably the minimum cost, at least £6,000,000 had been spent upon horses, and if £500,000 had been spent judiciously before the war began upon the provision of a sufficient supply of horses and remounts the greater part of that money would have been saved. The country had a right to know who was responsible for this. There were three authorities that might be responsible. First of all there was the Cabinet. If the Cabinet as a whole decided that this money was not to be spent, then they were clearly responsible. On the other hand, it might be what was called the War Office that was responsible. The third authority that might be responsible were the military advisers of the Secretary of State for War and the Cabinet. He hoped that the Secretary of State for War would see that the responsibility for this frightful waste of horses and money was put on the right person. He thought the noble Lord the Member for the Westhoughton Division, who made a very interesting reply to the various criticisms which had been addressed to his Department on the subject, took rather an optimistic view of the efforts which had been made to obtain the necessary supply of horses in South Africa. Of course the noble Lord must be understood as referring to the middle stages of the war; about, say, the months of February and March last. Before the time when Lord Roberts's control came into full effect the efforts to obtain a supply of Cape horses were not exhausted. Whether they were exhausted after that date he greatly doubted, because the experience of the last few months showed that there was still a great reserve available in the north-western districts of Cape Colony, and even in some parts of the Orange River Colony, and also in Natal, and in parts of the Transvaal which were under our control. He thought something more might have been done earlier by sending some intelligent buyers into those parts. The noble Lord stated that English horses had done best during the campaign. The hon. Member supposed that was subject to the condition that they had a sufficient supply of food they could eat. The difficulty about horses foreign to South Africa was that the supply of food was so scant, so different from that to which they were accustomed at home, that they could not be nourished upon it. The advantage of having Cape horses and ponies was that they nourished themselves upon what appeared to be almost a barren country. They were placed out at night and they managed to get food where an English, Australian, or Canadian horse could not find a mouthful. Another advantage possessed by the native horses was their capacity for avoiding the numerous holes, obstacles, stones, and other troubles which, in that enormous open country, were met with in the course of the campaign. A native horse avoided a hole by instinct, whereas a foreign horse put his foot into it and broke his leg. This ought to have been perfectly well known to hundreds of

officers before the war, and yet very slight effort was made to obtain these horses, which were there in thousands. He thought the amount of money spent on horses out of South Africa had been unnecessarily large. A large number of experienced buyers should have been earlier in the field. In this way a great part of the expense would have been saved. It would be very interesting to know from the War Office the comparative cost of the horses purchased in various countries, and also the cost of the transport, which was a very heavy item indeed. He doubted if it would work out at much less than £50 apiece all round. This question of horses was a remarkable illustration of the truth of the old adage that "You may spoil the ship for a ha'p'orth of tar." If we ran similar risks, in case of war with a great European Power, we might find that we had spent not only £6,000,000, the greater part of which might have been saved, and £100,000,000 on a war which might easily have been managed for £30,000,000; but, in addition to the enormous expenditure, we might find that we had suffered great national and Imperial disaster. This above all was the lesson the late expenditure on foreign horseflesh taught. It was a crime and a blunder of the worst kind ever to sacrifice in questions of war the military position to the political, as had been done in South Africa. He hoped the mistake would be never again repeated.

*THE CHAIRMAN stated that the hon. Member was digressing from the Vote before the Committee.

*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (continuing) said he was trying to draw a general conclusion from the extraordinary expenditure on horses in this Vote, but he would not pursue that ject further. He hoped the Government would hear in mind that great facilities and encouragement should be given to breeders in England, Ireland, and Scotland wherever good horses could be reared. He admired the ingenuity of the hon. Member who made his conscientious objections to the war tally with his desire to have larger orders for Irish horses. He quite sympathised with the hon. Member's wish in that matter. While South African horses were by far the best in their native country, they would not be suitable for a European campaign. In a country not so and there was not the slightest doubt that English and Irish horses would be very much better. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean that too much stress was laid upon the question of the weight of our cavalry mounts. It was far more a question of nourishment. He saw General French's forces when they arrived at Kimberley, and afterwards at Paardeburg, and the condition of the horses was absolutely deplorable, not on account of the weight carried or the distance travelled, but on account of the want of food. The average Boer weighed one or two stones heavier than the British soldier, and he carried more ammunition than our soldiers. He hoped the Government would take every precaution to see that the Army did not suffer in future campaigns through want of provision in regard to the supply of horses.

*MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said the increase in the expenditure on horses during the past few years was startling. In the Estimates for 1899–1900 the total amount was £125,000; in 1900–1901 it was £2,100,000; and now, so far as he could make out, it was £5,500,000. There was an enormous difference

between the first and the last-mentioned figures. The noble Lord the Under Secretary for War seemed to feel amused at that, but it was not very amusing for the taxpayers. It struck the hon. Member that to make up the difference there must have been a good deal of blundering, and perhaps plundering. He did not think all that money could have been honestly applied. He agreed with the hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division that if £500,000 had been spent earlier they would not have been asked to vote so large an amount now. It occurred to him that they had not got the proper explanation as to why so much money had been wasted on horses. It was all very well to plead the stress of the war. The stress of the war had been used to cover a good many acts which could not be very well defended in public. He heard a Liberal Member state in the House that he was in the Argentine when the Government buyers were there purchasing horses, and that the Government buyers selected the most inferior class of horses, and did not buy the ordinary class of Argentine horses. They gave the full price he supposed that was stated in the Returns sent to the War Office. It occurred to him that one reason why the Government buyers were anxious to get to the Argentine was that they could very easily buy inferior horses there and pay a nominal high price, and that this would not be detected so readily as if the transaction had been done in Ireland or England. He thought the Committee were not satisfied as to the reason for sending buyers to the Argentine while famous horse-breeding districts in Ireland were entirely neglected, and no effort made to purchase the horses that could be got there. Very many of the Argentine horses, probably three-fourths of them, were unrideable, and they were almost as vicious as the most vicious mule. It appeared to him that most of the money here asked for had been wasted. Instead of a sufficient number of horses being purchased at the beginning of the war they were sent out in dribblets, with the result that they were continually being used up and more asked for. Ireland had ground for very serious complaint in the manner she had been passed over in the matter of the purchase of horses. The Government seemed to have the same animus towards Irish horses as towards Irish Members. It had been stated that one of the reasons more horses were not bought in Ireland was the attitude of the Irish people towards the policy of the Government. But the Germans were as great pro-Boers as the Irish, and yet the Government would go to Germany for bad guns, while they refused to go to Ireland for good horses. The Government buyers raked the ends of the earth for horses, but nobody went to the western parts of Ireland, where some of the best horses for this purpose were to be obtained. The destruction of a large number of horses was due to the careless handling by the mounted troops. The Boers had always been particularly careful in that respect. When the Irish Brigade arrived at Pretoria and were received by President Kruger, instead of delivering to them a speech clothed in sentimental language, the President surprised them by making a short practical speech on the necessity of taking care of their horses. If the British troops had had a homily of a similar kind probably a large portion of the waste would have been prevented.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich) said he had been asking for some time that an inquiry should be held regarding the horses bought in Austro-

Hungary in the spring of last year and the winter of 1899. From letters he had seen, it appeared that the agents sent from this country bought, right and left, horses of the very worst description, and made from £;10 to £;15 apiece on them. He was convinced that many of the disasters in the early part of the war were entirely due to the inferior animals that were sent out. With regard to future action, the demand made by the Government was for five-year-old horses at about £;25. That was an impossible price at which to rear horses in Ireland or England. The age also was much too high. Draught-horses were used by farmers when they were only two years old. If the Government intended to go in for breeding themselves, it was not necessary to have large studs all over the country. Farmers in all parts of the country could breed thoroughly good horses, but the Government must pay the price. He suggested that horses should be bought at three years of age, not to be put at once into hard, active military work, but for use in barracks, where they would walk and trot about and be well fed. They would very well carry soldiers on parade at that age, and the difference of a year or two would save nearly £;20 to the farmer. In Germany one and a quarter millions of money was spent every year by the Government in rearing and improving the breed of horses, and the same system could very well be adopted in England. As one who went in very largely for breeding both thoroughbreds and draught-horses, he would be very glad to give the authorities any information he could if they would make an inquiry into these matters.

*MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.) said that he had recently had an opportunity of conversing with a gentleman whose experience of Basuto ponies was very great, and from him he gathered that, while at the beginning of the war a certain quantity of the ponies had been bought in Basuto-land, the purchases ceased at a very early stage of the operations, and no renewed attempt had been made until quite lately, although during the whole time the Boers were taking over the frontier, without the knowledge of the authorities, large numbers of these ponies for their own use. That was an instance of a great horse supply being untapped by the British Government, while at the same time it was being largely drawn upon by the army to which they were opposed. With regard to the Cape horses, there had been a difficulty, whether well or ill founded he could not say, in procuring horses to remount the cavalry and for the purposes of transport. But that difficulty was not in consequence of there being no horses at the Cape, but because the authorities had not taken the means to procure such horses as there were. Very clear proof had been given that there were any quantity of horses in the Cape. Since the beginning of the year nearly 10,000 horses had been captured from the enemy; so far as the newspaper reports were correct; and in addition a very large number had been purchased at the Cape for the supply of the Army. Why was not that supply drawn upon but year and at the end of 1899? The Committee were told that the military authorities were not able to purchase the horses. But in a great many districts martial law had been in force, and under that martial law horses could have been obtained as they were being obtained at present. The policy of destroying farmhouses was adopted in order to reduce the enemy to submission. A very much better policy would have been to

commandeer their horses, as that would not only have deprived the enemy of their mobility but would have supplied the British Army with a possibility of movement which they did not then possess. Last year a number of regiments were returned to the House as being in a state of efficiency as cavalry regiments. At the time that statement was made there was in Ireland a cavalry regiment which had a complement of nearly 700 men, but only seventeen horses. To return such a body of men as efficient was absurd.

MR. BRODRICK: When was that?

*MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: The actual date was January, 1900, and the regiment was the King's Dragoon Guards.

MR. BRODRICK: At that moment they were being sent to South Africa.

*MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE said that his complaint was that the horses were being swept from this and other countries to the Cape, when at that very moment there were at the Cape thousands of horses now being utilised, and the interruption of the Secretary of State proved his case. It was very necessary that horses should be in a fit condition for work, but very often they were taken off the ship after a three weeks or a month's voyage and put straightaway into badly constructed horseboxes or open cattle-trucks, exposed to all the inclemencies of the weather, taken five or eight days journey up-country, and then turned out on the veldt. To put horses to work in that soft and unfed condition did not add to the efficiency of the Army. The horses relied upon for the movement and concentration of troops were not fit to do a day's work, and in many cases they died by the score straight off. The hon. Member instanced a case where 200 or 300 horses were detained on the way up and put into a kraal in charge of four Kaffir boys and a non-commissioned officer. It was practically impossible that under such

circumstances the horses could be looked after or even fed. What was the good of concentrating all those horses at one particular spot? It would have been much better to have taken a smaller number of the horses and had them properly looked after and attended to, and sent to the front in a fit condition, even though they were a week or a fortnight later. As an old soldier he welcomed the speech of the Secretary of State. It was necessary that the responsibility for mistakes should be placed on the right shoulders, not in order to inflict punishment upon particular officers, but to deter others from committing similar errors upon subsequent occasions. Another point in connection with the money asked for was that a large amount of it had been spent on the purchase of mules. According to a Consular Report, no less than 23,000 mules were shipped to South Africa from New Orleans alone. A scheme had been foreshadowed under which horse-farms were to be established either in Canada, Australia, or elsewhere, but no provision had been made for the breeding of mules. The mule, however, was the most useful of all transport animals, and he had had experience of its great value both for riding and draught purposes. He wished to enforce upon the notice of the Secretary of State for War, seeing the climatic conditions under which the troops were often called upon to serve, the necessity of providing as great a quantity of mules as was possible. In a great many places it was almost impossible to make use of horses with advantage where it was perfectly possible

to make use of mules. He hoped the Secretary of State for War would not lose sight of that matter. They had to thank him for the close attention he had given to administrative reform, and not the least of those reforms was the provision of remounts for the Army.

*MAJOR BAGOT (Westmorland, Kendal) said that probably in modern times there had never been such a great loss of horses as had occurred during the present campaign in South Africa. Undoubtedly it would have been a great advantage if they had had a large supply of horses in the country when the war began, but that was not the case. They had been compelled to buy an enormous amount of horses during an emergency.

It had been suggested that the Government ought to have bought up all the horses available in Cape Colony immediately before the war, but no doubt there would have been many objections raised to the collecting of a large number of horses which the Boers would have seen could only have been got together for one particular purpose. Undoubtedly under the circumstances which occurred in the summer of 1899, whilst most delicate negotiations were going on, it would have been exceedingly difficult for the Government at that time to have set to work buying horses in South Africa. He held the opinion that the chief opposition to such a course would have come from hon. Members opposite. Horses had to be collected from all parts of the world and sent out to South Africa, and great losses had occurred. The Member for the Forest of Dean, who had given great attention to this subject, had stated that the transport arrangements were very bad, but from personal observation he was able to say that the transport arrangements were not so bad as had been alleged. They were sending out 6,000 horses a week at one time, and the arrangements for landing them were certainly not bad. Horses which had been on the sea for three weeks could not be expected to be in good condition, but it was remarkable in what good condition the horses were landed under the circumstances. He did not think there was that scarcity of men to look after them as had been complained of, for a very few men could look after a large number of horses in the enclosed camps in South Africa. The hon. Baronet opposite had mentioned Kaffirs as rather superfluous for this work, but the Kaffir who took charge of horses was, as a rule, a first-rate man, and was very often as good as half a dozen of some others. He did not think blame could be attached to the transport arrangements or to the condition of the horses before they were sent up country, but as they had to get this large number of horses at an emergency, whether fit or not, and send them straight up into the country, that undoubtedly was the cause of this extraordinary loss. The horses were in a poor condition, and it is admitted that the English horses undoubtedly stood the strain better than those horses from the the Argentine and other places. The great mortality among the horses undoubtedly arose from the scarcity of food and the fact that it was absolutely necessary to send them up country in trains by a single line of railway before the animals had a chance of getting into condition after their voyage. As it was not possible before the war to secure the horses in South Africa, it was not fair to attribute mismanagement to the War Office or to the people who had charge of affairs in South Africa. He agreed that they ought to have bought the horses in

South Africa before the war began, but, as he had stated before, there were a great many difficulties in the way, and it was not fair to attribute blame to the War Office in this respect.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) thought the House ought to have a better explanation as to why they should be called upon at the close of the financial year to vote £;2,000,000 for remounts. There was a widespread feeling in the country that there was something unpleasant about the large purchases of horses in the Argentine, and that there had been an abuse in regard to the contracts for the purpose of horses in that country. The sum required now was enormous for this one Vote, which covered transport and remounts, the net total for the present year being £;19,800,000. That was an appalling sum. He noticed the other day when a question was put to the Financial Secretary to the War Office as to the price paid for horses in the Argentine, the Financial Secretary declared that it was not consistent with the interest of the public service to state the price.

That was a most extraordinary thing, because the price paid there was a matter of public knowledge in the Argentine, and it could not be denied by the noble Lord that hundreds of people in the Argentine Republic knew the price paid for these horses by the British Government. Surely those who had sold the horses must know, and in the Argentine Republic the man in the street would be able to tell them what price the British Government had paid for the horses. It was a significant fact that the British House of Commons, which had to pay for these horses, were refused information as to the price. He could understand the Government taking up

that position if it were possible for a moment to argue that this matter could be kept secret. It was perfectly ludicrous, for they must have bought from a large number of horse-dealers, and therefore, it was an extraordinary position for the noble Lord to take up to decline to inform the British House of Commons what price had been paid. He was not a "horsey" man, but the hon. Member for South Fermanagh, who was a "horsey" man, and was one of the oldest members of the Fermanagh Hunt, had just informed him that he had a horse to dispose of, which he could confidently recommend to any officer in the British Army.

Personally, he could not distinguish a horse worth £;10 from one which was worth £;100, and he was speaking on this subject simply from the point of view of the man in the street. The sum of £;19,800,000 was an appalling sum for transport and remounts. The taxpayers of the country were entitled to examine the use to which this money was put, and insist upon such information being given as would assure them that the money had been well spent. They required some better assurance that the money had not gone corruptly into the pockets of the contractors and other men who were making millions of money by transport arrangements and the purchase of stores and horses.

With regard to the question of Argentine horses, the information he had gathered from the public press had made a strong impression upon his mind that, practically speaking, the enormous number of horses brought from the Argentine Republic had been a disastrous failure, for not one in ten of those horses had been of any value whatever, and the enormous sums of money spent upon them had been absolutely thrown away. He had been reading an account of the formation of

the Colenbrander Scouts Corps known as Kitchener's Fighting Scouts. What did John Colenbrander say about the horse supply a month ago? He said that he attributed the efficiency of his scouts to the fact that they were not treated like a British regiment, and that out of every twenty horses offered them they rejected nineteen. They were allowed to have the pick of the horses. If that was true, it showed a very bad state of things, and would give grounds for the belief that millions of money had been wasted in the purchase of remounts. There was one extraordinary thing which puzzled him more than anything else in this war. According to the Estimates, they had spent millions of pounds in addition to all the resources of the British Empire before the war broke out. He would very much like to find out how much the Boers had spent in remounts. He would venture to say that the Boers had not spent £200,000 during the whole course of the war in remounts, and yet they had outdistanced us all the time. The British Army had an enormous stock of horses to begin with, and they afterwards spent £8,000,000 on remounts, and now they were asked to vote £2,000,000 more. He did not suppose the Boers had spent £1,000,000 on the whole war, as against the £130,000,000 spent by us. He thought they were entitled to inquire how this had occurred. He was reading the other day with very great interest a Blue-book containing a number of despatches from British generals in South Africa which had been for a long time withheld. A portion of that Blue-book contained a lecture on geography from Lord Roberts, in which he explained certain facts which were already known to the school children in Ireland in regard to the area of the Transvaal and Cape Colony. That information was to be found in a 1s. 6d. geography, and it did not need any Blue-books to explain it. This information was set forth by Lord Roberts to account for the extraordinary difficulties that he had to encounter in endeavouring to conquer the Boer territories. Their difficulty was to find out where the Boers were. Their object was to catch the Boers if they could, and if they were on the track of De Wet, surely the largeness of the country would not allow him to get away if their horses were as good as his. He had followed the war with great interest, for he had never read of a case before where 30,000 farmers had been able to fight 200,000 soldiers. His reading of the case was that it had taken one and a half years for the British generals on the spot to learn the interesting fact that ten English soldiers were only as good as one Boer. This fact was beginning to be realised now.

He had listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War with interest, but he doubted whether he would be able to carry out all the reforms to which he had referred. Lately an attempt had been made to kick all the Irish Members out of the House of Commons, and it seemed to be thought necessary that they should all be locked up in the Clock Tower. They evidently forget that the present Commander-in-Chief and the late Commander-in-Chief were both Irishmen. [An Hon MEMBER: He is an Ulster man.] That was the hen. Member's idea of geography, but Lord Wolseley came from the county of Cork and Lord Roberts from the county of Waterford. The hon. Member's geography seemed to be rather at fault. The speech of the Secretary of State for War was a very able one, but judging from his study as an ignorant man in the street it

appeared to him that the real moral of that speech was that they wanted more brain power. He had spoken of many things that were required, but what they really wanted was more brains. A system which required a man to possess an income of £500 a year before he could be a British officer was certainly not a satisfactory state of things. The real trouble seemed to him to be that they did not realise that brains were necessary in order to provide the horses. If they had had the brains at the head of affairs in South Africa they would have got the horses in time. The real trouble was that it took them a whole year before it dawned upon the minds of their British generals that they wanted two or three horses to each man in order to deal with the Boers. What astonished him throughout the whole of this discussion was that they appeared to think they had done the most extraordinary feat of arms by holding their own in South Africa for one and a half years, although their numbers were ten to one as compared with the Boers. They had sent out 270,000 men, and they thought that they had done something extraordinary. He had never been a fool to understand why it was that an equal force of British troops ought not to be more than a match for an equal number of Boers. It had been said that they were fighting in a large and a strange country, but that was not a very satisfying excuse. He entirely dissociated himself from those of his colleagues who had found fault with the Government for not buying Irish horses for this war. As an Irish Nationalist Member he felt no grievance that Irish horses were not bought. He hated this war and everything connected with it, and he had no desire to sell Irish horses or anything else in order to make a profit out of it, because he believed all such profit would bring with it a curse. So strong was his objection to the war that he would rather not see an Irish horse, or Irish soldier, used in it. But he objected to the taxpayers' money being used to defray "the cost of provisions and allowances in lieu of provisions," which was one of the items in the Vote. It was notorious that the Boer army had for a whole year lived almost entirely off these provisions. What explanation was going to be offered for the strategy of British generals which resulted in provisioning the Boer army at the expense of the taxpayers of this country? As an individual taxpayer he did not profess that this was a very great grievance. He honestly confessed that he would not object to the tax if it was going to provision the Boers rather than the British Army. But the ordinary taxpayer ought to know the reason why enormous convoys and provision trains were captured every week by the Boers. Why, a quarter of this Vote was for provisioning Botha, Delarey, and De Wet. The Secretary for War ought to give some explanation of this. No doubt Lord Kitchener had been evacuating a large part of the Transvaal territory and concentrating his troops along the railway line. But why should not Lord Kitchener retire from Bloemfontein and Pretoria and come back to the Cape? [An Hon. Member: Question.] That was the question, and he supported it by moving that the Vote be reduced by £1,000,000. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a reduced sum, not exceeding £2,000,000, be granted for the said Service." (Mr. Dillon.) LORD STANLEY said he did not intend to follow the hon. Member for East Mayo as to what Lord Kitchener should do. As to the question before the Committee, the

money embraced in the Vote was required to pay for horses that had been taken in South Africa and which were mounted by the local levies there, and also for the mounted troops they were sending out as reinforcements, and, in addition, to provide extra horses over those required for the moment, in order to have a reserve to fall back upon. The hon. Member talked of the Argentine horses, and asked that the price paid for them should be given to the Committee. He declined to state the prices paid for Argentine horses, because so long as purchases were going on it was not in the public interest that the prices they were paying should be mentioned. Some horses had been got in Cape Colony lately from the districts where martial law had been proclaimed. There had been no attempt in any way to conceal the prices, of hon. Members who alleged that the Government had been deliberately swindled in the purchase of horses would bring forward specific instances he should be glad to go into them. He could assure the Committee that there was not the slightest wish or intention on the part of his right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War or himself to conceal any deficiencies that had arisen in this matter, and there was not one of them that would not be turned to good account, he hoped, in any future war in which they might unfortunately be engaged. An hon. Member said that they ought to encourage the breeding of English horses, and not establish stud farms in Canada and South Africa. His own idea was to distribute well-bred mares to the farmers and for the Government to get the produce for the purposes of the Army. [An IRISH MEMBER: And Ireland?] Certainly, Ireland too. He bad, he hoped, answered all the questions put to him, and he could assure the Committee once more that he had no desire to conceal anything.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): Except the prices. How many horses were there in this purchase of remounts to the amount of two millions?

LORD STANLEY: I am not going to tell the hon. Member anything from which he can find out the prices. The remounts include, besides horses, mules and trek oxen.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that what they wanted was an assurance that the system under which the horses were landed at Port Elizabeth, the want of care when they were landed, and the way in which they had been sent up to the front, so that 90 per cent. of them died, would be put a stop to. It had been said that the horses had been well landed at Cape Town, but they had sure information that it was very different at Port Elizabeth; that there horses had been landed with broken legs, and that many had been put into trucks and sent up country at once, some of them remaining in the trucks for eight days without food or water.

MR. BRODRICK: I can easily give the right hon. Gentleman the assurance asked for. The whole question has been gone into most carefully, and the practice hitherto prevailing has been stopped. The horses are now being most carefully looked after.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER said that was what they had been asking for. At Cape Town, he believed, there was an immense collection of provisions and stores. Now there was a danger of the plague being carried by the stores, and that was a very serious question. He would like to have some assurance that these stores were being kept purified and not sent to the troops all over South Africa in a

contaminated state. [Laughter.] It was not exactly a laughing matter; that was exactly the way in which the plague was spread.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that when he was putting his question to the hon. Gentleman in regard to the number of horses which were wanted he was not speaking without book. He had a letter on the subject from a gallant officer at the front, which perhaps the Committee would allow him to read. It was dated 6th January, 1901, and the officer recited a most dismal story in regard to the state of the Army, which would not be relevant to the present discussion. But in regard to the horses he used language consistent with that employed by the hon. Member below the gangway. He said;

"We want at least another 100,000 horses, not skin or hair trunks, but horses, Up to date the consumption of horseflesh has reached the enormous total of 250,000. This includes horses presently in use. The remounts have been bad, very, and in each case wherever the War Office buys horses they buy them £10 under market price, getting a bad driving animal instead of a useful riding animal."

That letter was not addressed to him, but had been put into his hands.

LORD STANLEY said he could not give the actual number of horses required at the front at the present moment. As to price, he had always said that every one thought he could buy horses better and cheaper than the War Office. In providing horses for South Africa the War Office was not guided by private letters from one individual to another, but by the requisitions of Lord Kitchener, and every requisition Lord Kitchener made would be met to the full and, if possible, reserve kept over.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said there was more than met the eye in regard to this matter. Perhaps if it were left to the noble Lord he might tell them all about these horses and what they cost. But the War Office sent out people to buy horses, and these people bought horses and sold them to the Government at a higher price, and thus made plenty of money. Why did not the noble Lord tell the Committee how it was that these horses, which the hon. Member declared were wretched animals, cost two millions? The other day he met a very impecunious friend of his, who came up and shook him so warmly by the hand that he was naturally under the impression his friend was going to borrow money. But he appeared to be doing well. "What are you doing," he asked his friend, who replied, smiling, "Oh, selling horses to the Government." It was very necessary that they should look into these Votes. He had heard the late Secretary for War say, in another place, that the late Commander-in-Chief was not a man of business, and the next speaker said that the late Secretary for War was not a man of business. If that was the way things were carried on why should they, in appeals to patriotism, vote two millions? He should be prepared to vote against the Government, because he had not received sufficient information from the noble Lord to enable him to say that they had only been reasonably "done" in the matter.

*MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE asked if it was true that 24,000 mules and 43,000 horses had been shipped to South Africa from New Orleans, as stated in the British Consul's Report, at an average cost of £20 apiece?

Lord STANLEY: I am not aware of it.

MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said he hoped the noble Lord would pay more attention to the stores which were being returned from South Africa. Several sanitary authorities in Great Britain and Ireland had recently had cause to suspect a number of ships from South Africa in connection with the plague, and at this moment he believed the Local Government Board was arranging a conference between the Metropolitan Asylums Board and the Loudon County Council, in order to spend a large sum of money to meet any emergency. But apart from the Army, if they got even a suspicion of plague in the Port of London; if there were only four or five cases well established; the damage that that would do to English trade in a month or two might amount to four or five millions of money in solid cash. He appealed, therefore, to the noble Lord to pay every attention to the stopping of the importation of infected stores which, after having been

AYES.

Ambrose, Robert

Jordan, Jeremiah

O'Malley, William

Boland, John

Joyce, Michael

O'Mara, James

Burns, John

Kennedy, Patrick James

O'Shanghnessy, P. J. Power, Patrick Joseph

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Labouchere, Henry

Power, Patrick Joseph

Cogan, Denis J.

M'Dermott, Patrick

Reddy, M.

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Murphy, J.

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Delany, William

Nannetti, Joseph P.

Redmond, William (Clare)

Dillon, John

Nolan, Col. Jn. P. (Galway, N.)

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Duffy, William J.

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Roche, John

Farrell, James Patrick

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid)

Sullivan, Donal

Flynn, James Christopher

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

Tully, Jasper
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Hayden. John Patrick
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Haviland-Burke.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Cranborne, Viscount
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Carlile, William Walter
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Causton, Richard Knight
Dalkeith, Earl of
Allen, C. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Cautley, Henry Strother
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Cavendish, VCW (Derbyshire)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Cecil) Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Akinson, Rt. Hon. John
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Dowar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets, SGeo.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitz Roy
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Dickinson, Hubert Edmund
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Chapman, Edward
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Charrington, Spencer
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)

Clare, Octavius Leigh
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Cochrane, Hon. Thus. H. A. E.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Bigwood, James
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Edwards, Frank
Black, Alexander William
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Bond, Edward
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Colville, John
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Bullard, Sir Harry
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Finch, George H.
Butcher, John George
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Caldwell, James
Craig, Robert Hunter
Fisher, William Hayes

condemned at the Cape, were brought back to this country to be sold again and redistributed in this country. If he would do this he would not only save the Army a good deal of trouble, but he would also prevent a panic in London.

LORD STANLEY: I quite sympathise with what has been said by the hon. Member for Battersea, and anything that I can possibly do in the matter shall be done. I believe the sanitary authorities at Cape Town are taking every step in their power to prevent any means of contagion; but if it is wished, I am sure my right hon. friend will wire special instructions to the military authorities to take every precaution in conjunction with the sanitary authorities.

MR. JOHN BURNS: returned stores?

LORD STANLEY: Yes, to that question as well.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 41; Noes, 185. (Division List No. 50.)

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N S.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Forster, Henry William
Levy, Maurice
Roe, Sir Thomas
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol,S)

Ropner, Colonel Robert
Fuller, J. M. F.
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Garfit, William
Lowther, C. (Cumbr, Eskdale)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Gibbs. Hn. Vicary (St.Albans)
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Seton-Karr, Henry
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Lucas, Reginald J. (Port-mouth
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Macdona, John Cumming
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
M'Crae, George
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Majendie, James A. H.
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Malcolm, Ian
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nds
Manners, Lord Cecil
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Griffith, Ellis J.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Soares, Ernest J.
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Milner, Rt Hon. Sir Fred. G.
Stanley. Lord (Lanes.)
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Stroyan, John
Iamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Sturt. Hon. Humphry Napier

Hardy, Laurence (K'nt, Ashford
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Valentia, Viscount
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Dept'ford
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir A. D.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)
Mount. William Arthur
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T
Heath, James (Stafford, N.W.)
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Helder, Augustus
Nicholson, William Graham
Webb, Col. William George
Helme, Norval Watson
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Weir, James Calloway
Henderson, Alexander
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Higginbottom, S. W.
Paulton, James Mellor
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Peel, Hn. Wm Rohert Wellesley
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Pemberton, John S. G.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Howard, Capt. J (Kent, Faversham)

Pretymann, Ernest George
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Purvis, Robert
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Randles, John S
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Lawson, John Grant
Remnant, James Farquharson
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rentoul, James Alexander
Lee, Capt. A H (Hants. Fareham)
Renwick, George
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Richards, Henry Charles
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Ridley, Hn M. W. (Staley bridge)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas Thomson
Original Question again proposed.
Mr. DILLON said it appeared to him that this Vote had been fully and fairly
discussed, and he did not wish to prolong the discussion any further. He had,
however, made up his mind that he would allow no Vote in support
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Butcher, John George
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Caldwell, James
Craig, Robert Hunter
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc, Stroud)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir II.
Cranborne, Viscount
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Carline, William Walter
Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
 Causton, Richard Knight
 Dalkeith, Earl of
 Ashton, Thomas Gair
 Cautley, Henry Strother
 Dalrymple, Sir Charles
 Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
 Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
 Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
 Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitz Roy
 Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
 Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
 Bain, Colonel James Robert
 Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
 Dewar, John A. Inverness-sh
 Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
 Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
 Dewar, T R (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo.
 Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
 Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
 Dickinson, Robert Edmond
 Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
 Chapman, Edward
 Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
 Bell, Richard
 Charrington, Spencer
 Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
 Bigwood, James
 Clare, Octavius Leigh
 Disraeli, Coningsbv Ralph
 Black, Alexander, William
 Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
 Dorington, Sir John Edward
 Bond, Edward
 Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
 Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
 Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
 Colomlb, Sir John Charles Ready
 Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
 Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
 Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
 Edwards, Frank

of this war to pass without a challenge. He thought, therefore, that they might
 now proceed to the division on the whole Vote.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 184; Noes, 38. (Division List No. 51.)

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Lee, Cap. A. H. (Hants. Fareh'm
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Staly bridge
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Leose, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Finch, George H.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Carrie
Roe, Sir Thomas
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Fisher, William Hayes
Levy, Maurice
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Forster, Henry William
Loug, Rt Hn. Walter Bristol, S)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.
Fuller, J. M. F.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Garfit, William
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Gibbs. Hn. Vicary (St. Albans
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Macdona, John Camming
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
MCalmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

M'Crae, George
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Majendie, James A. H.
Stroyan, John
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry
Malcolm, Ian
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Greene, Sir E. W. (B'ySEdm'ds.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Griffith, Ellis J.
Maxwell. W J H (Dumfriesshire
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Tabot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'dUniv.
Hamilton, Rt Hon Ld. G (Midd'x
Moore, William (Antrim, X.)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Valentia, Viscount
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Morgan. J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Webb, Colonel Wm. George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanl'y
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Weir, James Galloway
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
Nicholson, William Graham
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Helder, Augustus
Nicol, Donald Ninian

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Helme, Norval Watson
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Henderson, Alexander
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
Paulton, James Mellor
Wilson', A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Higginbottom, S. W.
Peel, Hn Wm Robert Wellesley
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Hope, J. F. (Shef'ld, Brightside
Pemberton, John S. G.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wilson, J. W. (Worcester, N.)
Howard, Capt. J (Kent, Faversham)
Purvis, Robert
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Randles, John S.
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Remnant, James Farquharson
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Lawrence, William F.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Lawson, John Grant
Renwick, George
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Richards, Henry Charles
NOES.
Ambrose, Robert
Jordan, Jeremiah
O Mara, James
Boland, John
Joyce, Michael
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Burns, John
Kennedy, Patrick James

Power, Patrick Joseph
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
M'Dermott, Patrick
Reddy, M.
Cogan, Denis J.
Murphy, J.
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Delany, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Dillon, John
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'y, Mid)
Roche, John
Duffy, William J.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Sullivan, Donal
Farrell, James Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Tully, Jasper
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Hammond, John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Haviland-Burke.
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Malley, William

2. £;100, Supplementary, Ordnance Factories.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it would be extremely convenient if the House would at once grant us this Vote, and if this course is agreed to I will then move the adjournment of the House. Some of us, at all events, have earned a good night's rest.

Resolution agreed to.

Resolutions to be reported upon Monday next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn";(Mr. Balfour);put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at half after Eleven of the clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 11th March, 1901.

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

SWANSEA HARBEUR BILL. [BY ORDER.]

Order for Second Reading read.

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

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange), who had given notice of a motion for the rejection of the measure, said he had no desire to place obstacles in the way of the construction of the new dock and other improvements at Swansea which were contemplated by the Bill, nor did he and those who were acting with him intend to interfere with the discretion of the Swansea Harbour trustees to charge what rates they thought fit on shipping entering that port; but what they did say was that those rates ought to be charged on the legal tonnage of the ships, and not upon the arbitrary tonnage basis proposed in the Bill. This endeavour to substitute an arbitrary tonnage basis for the tonnage basis laid down by the Merchant Shipping Act was an endeavour to interfere with a public Act by means of a private Bill, and was opposed to public policy. Every British ship had to be measured under the Merchant Shipping Act, and her tonnage had to be ascertained in accordance with a system of measurement laid down by that Act. When the tonnage of the ship had been thus ascertained it was cut into the ship's beam, and that then became for all purposes the tonnage of the ship. That tonnage was the tonnage on which rates had to be charged, and in point of fact this system was uniform all through the country with one or two exceptions. In all ports, with one or two exceptions, where the tonnage dues were charged they were charged on the legal tonnage of the ship. This Bill proposed to establish a new system of tonnage. It proposed that in the case of steam vessels other than steam tugs the net registered tonnage on which dues should be charged should in no case be less than 50 per cent. of the gross tonnage, and that in the case of tugs the net registered tonnage should in no case be less than 18 per cent. of the gross tonnage. If Swansea were to have this power of making her own tonnage basis the same liberty would have to be conceded to other ports, and the uniformity established by the Merchant Shipping Act would be destroyed, and a state of chaos would be brought about. There was an additional advantage of the present system, inasmuch as when the British system of measurement was adopted by foreign countries the tonnage of the ship ascertained in the foreign country was her tonnage for all purposes in Great Britain, He did not see why a provision of that kind should be overridden by the proposals of a private Bill. He thought the reason on the part of the Swansea trustees for asking for this power was that there were some vessels which were so constructed that they obtained a net registered tonnage much less than they ought to have, and on that account it was desired to correct the anomaly by means of this proposal. But if it was desired to correct an anomaly arising out of the general law it should be done by an amendment of the general law, or by an alteration in the instructions given by the Board of Trade to their surveyors. He understood that the Board of Trade had this very matter under their consideration at the present time, and it that were so, surely it was a very inopportune time for any particular port to rectify the matter by means of a private Bill. He would

remind the House that in 1899 a Bill was brought, before the House of Lords in which this proposal was contained in reference to Bristol and other ports, and when the matter was brought under the notice of Lord Morley, as Chairman of Committees, he said it was not one that ought to be proposed in a private Bill, and the Bill was withdrawn. He did not wish that this Bill should be withdrawn, for it contained many very useful and beneficial matters, but he hoped the promoters would give an undertaking that this particular clause would not be pressed. If it were not pressed he would withdraw his opposition to the Bill. If, on the other hand, the clause came down from the Committee in the shape in which it now stood, the opposition to the Bill would be renewed, and he should press it to a division.

SIR GEORGE NEWNES (Swansea) remarked that this Bill proposed an expenditure of £2,000,000 for the benefit of a. densely-populated district and of the commerce of the country, and the clause to which objection had been taken by the hon. Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool was, after all, only a subsidiary matter. He should have pleasure in accepting the offer of the hon. Member and in acceding to his terms.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR said that in these circumstances he would not oppose the Second Reading.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

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.:

Cambrian Railways Bill.

Llandrindod Wells Water Bill.

Richmond Gas Bill.

Stroud Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

BEXLEY TRAMWAYS BILL.

BURGESS HILL WATER BILL.

DEVONPORT GAS AND COKE BILL.

GLASGOW AND RENFREW DISTRICT RAILWAY TRANSFER BILL.

NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY BILL.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER.

Bill to confirm a Provisional Order under the Drainage and Improvement of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863, and the Acts amending the same, relating to the Triogue Drainage District, in Queen's Comity, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Austen Chamberlain and Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

"To confirm a Provisional Order under the Drainage and Improvements of Lands (Ireland) Act, 1863, and the Acts amending the same, relating to the Triogue Drainage District, in Queen's County," presented accordingly, and read the first

time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 93.]

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

Petition from Isle of Wight, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

BOROUGH FUNDS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Falkirk, against; to lie upon the Table.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Meopham; and Bideford; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Ryde; Aston; and Royton; to lie upon the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.

Petition from Bristol, for extension to Women; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1890.

Petition for alteration of Law, from Whitby; and Strood; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Glasgow (four); Govan; Manchester; Aberdeen (two); Dumbarton; Burnley; Carlisle (two); West Kent; Cumwinton; Largs; Poulton; Malton; Hawick; London; Southampton; Llandillo (four); Selkirk; Lander (two); and York; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Larkhall; Perth; Aberchirder; Buckie; Peebles; Charlestown of Aberlour; Tillicoultry; Ardrossan; Arbroath; Port Glasgow (three); and Glasgow (two); to lie upon the Table.

WORKMEN'S HOUSES TENURE BILL.

Petition from Falkirk, against; to lie upon the Table

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

UNFUNDED DEBT.

Return [presented 8th March] to be printed. [No. 79.]

EXPLOSIONS (MESSRS. CURTIS AND HARVEY'S FACTORY AT TRIMLEY MARSH, SUFFOLK).

Copy presented, of Report by Captain M. B. Lloyd, R.A., Her late Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending Explosions which occurred at the Mixing House and Store at the Factory of Messrs. Curtis and Harvey, Limited, at Trimley, Suffolk, on the 28th November, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY BOROUGH OF BRIGHTON).

Copies presented, of Orders made by the Council of the County Borough of Brighton on the 4th June, 1896, the 19th January, 1899, and the 21st February, 1901, altering certain Polling Districts in the Borough [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVAL WORKS ACTS, 1896, 1896, 1897, AND 1899.

Account presented, showing the amount of Money issued out of the Consolidated Fund; the amount and nature of the Securities created in respect thereof; the

amount of the surplus of Income over Expenditure for the financial year ended 31st March, 1896, and the amount of Money expended in pursuance of the Acts during the year ended the 31st March, 1900; together with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 80].

BIRTHS, DEATHS, MARRIAGES, AND VACCINATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of the Forty-sixth Annual Report on the Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Scotland for 1900, and Thirty-fifth Annual Report on Vaccination [by Command]: to lie upon the Table."

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) (CODE, 1901).

Copy presented, of Code of Regulations for Day Schools, 1901, with Appendices [by Command]: to lie upon the Table.

PATENT ACTS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed by the Board of Trade to inquire into the working of the

Patent Acts on certain specified suggestions [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, No. 2560 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

PHARMACY ACTS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Order in Council, dated 7th March, 1901, approving of a Regulation made by the Pharmaceutical Society of Ireland [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

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

Lunacy.;Copy of Return of all sums received by the Visitors of Lunatics for travelling expenses, or upon any other account, from 1st January to 31st December, 1900 [by Act].

COLONIAL LOANS ACT, 1899.

Copy ordered, "of Statement showing to what Colonies up to the present time sums have been advanced by the Treasury under the Colonial Loans Act, 1899, and for what purposes, to what amounts, and at what rates of interest; also the date on which each such Loan was sanctioned, and the date fixed for its repayment.";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

DEATHS FROM STARVATION, OR ACCELERATED BY PRIVATION (LONDON).

Address for "Return of the number of all deaths in the Administrative County of London, in the year 1900, upon which a coroner's jury has returned a verdict of death from starvation, or death accelerated by privation; together with any observations furnished to the Local Government Board by Boards of Guardians with reference to cases included in the Return (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No 345, of Session 1900).";(Mr. Talbot.)

ST. CROSS HOSPITAL, WINCHESTER.

Copy ordered, "of Correspondence with the Charity Commissioners with reference to the new scheme for the administration of St. Cross Hospital, Winchester.";(Sir Walter Foster.)

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Copy ordered, "of Handbook to the Reports from the Committee of Public Accounts, Vol. III (1893 to 1900), with Index comprehending the three Vols. (1857 to 1900).";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No.81.]
QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR; MONEY GRANT TO EARL ROBERTS.

MR: THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the intention of His Majesty's Government to propose a grant of money to Earl Roberts in respect of his services in South Africa; and, if so, on or about what date the Vote may be expected to be taken.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have nothing to say on the subject at the present time.

VALUE OF CHARTERED COMPANY'S LANDS.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any arrangements have been made by the Colonial Office to ascertain the value of property in land taken under the Chartered Company in South Africa before the breaking out of the war; and whether he can state how these allotments have been affected by the war; and, in case of death of grantees before the war, the property is now vested in any court or officer to whom inquiries as to particular estates can be addressed.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The Master of the High Court of Southern Rhodesia is the official who has charge of the estates of all persons deceased in Southern Rhodesia to whom inquiries should be addressed. I have no information as to the value of the land in question nor as to how it has been affected by the war.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: If particular cases are brought under the notice of the Colonial Office will inquiries be made?

Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Gentleman wishes for information as to any particular case and will communicate with me privately, I will endeavour to get it for him.

NEWSPAPER LIBELS ON BRITISH OFFICERS AND SOLDIERS.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General if his attention has been drawn to proceedings taken by the Attorney General of the Cape Colony against the editor of the South African News for publishing a defamatory and seditious libel; if he is aware that the matter in question originally appeared in the Freeman's Journal of 15th January, being reprinted in The Time 16th January; whether it is his intention to take similar proceedings against those papers; and, if not, if he can explain on what grounds does the action of those papers differ from that of the South African News; and whether he has considered the desirability of such a prosecution, so that by a discovery order being made the name of the writer of the original matter may be disclosed.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The propriety of proceedings for libel must depend upon the circumstances under which the publication has taken place. I may remind the hon. and gallant Member that such libels upon our officers and soldiers are in this country generally appreciated at their true value, while in the peculiar circumstances of South Africa their

circulation there may do infinite mischief. The procedure suggested in the last paragraph of the question is quite unknown to our criminal law, and the proposal that a criminal prosecution should be instituted merely to obtain information is not one which commends itself to my mind.

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT SERVING IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state when he will be prepared to grant the Return asked for as to the Members of both Houses of Parliament who volunteered for active service in South Africa.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The hon. Member's proposed Return will involve a reference on various points to South Africa. I hope the hon. Member will not press just now for such a Return, the preparation of which will involve a great deal of correspondence, to the detriment of work of a more pressing and important character.

MR. TULLY: I beg to give notice that I shall press for the Return.

RETURN OF VOLUNTEERS FROM THE FRONT.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is now in a position to state when the London Scottish and other Volunteers who have been on active service for upwards of a year in South Africa will be allowed to return to this country, so that they may no longer risk the loss of the situations which have been so long kept open for them.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (LORD STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton): As I have recently explained to the House, we are endeavouring to relieve as many as possible of the Volunteers, but it is not possible to say exactly when Lord Kitchener will be able to spare them.

COST OF ANIMAL TRANSPORT TO SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can give the total amount of money spent since October, 1899, on the transport of horses and mules to South Africa from Great Britain and elsewhere.

LORD STANLEY: I have already stated to the House on a previous occasion that the cost cannot be given.

SOLDIERS' UNCLAIMED BALANCES.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the amount of soldiers' unclaimed balances for the last year, and what portion of these ascertainable has been handed over to the Patriotic Fund Commissioners.

MR. BRODRICK: I have nothing to add to the reply which was given to the hon. Member on Friday last, the 8th instant.*

See page 1028.

DECEASED SOLDIERS' ESTATES.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War on what grounds the War Office withhold payment of the estate of the late Private James Meehan, 1st Battalion Royal Dublin Fusiliers, who was killed in action at Amerfoot on 29th June last, from his widowed mother; whether he is aware that she has taken out letters of administration so as to safeguard the War Department in case of any other claims; and whether, as this poor woman is living in destitution in Longford, the money will now be ordered to be paid to her.

LORD STANLEY: Instructions were given on the 6th instant to issue the estate, amounting to £;17 0s. 4d., to the man's mother. The delay arose through inability to obtain proof of the father's death, on whom, if alive, the estate devolved, as the soldier died intestate and unmarried.

PURCHASE OF FIELD GUNS FROM GERMANY.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state who is responsible for advising the purchase of eighteen batteries of field guns from Germany; were they delivered according to contract, and inspected previously to acceptance; did the manufacturers supply projectiles, and what percentage of premature bursts have occurred; and have any other points of weakness developed in the mountings beyond the axle-trees.

MR. BRODRICK: The Secretary of State, under the advice of the responsible officers, is responsible for the purchase of all artillery guns, and of these as well as others. They were delivered according to contract and inspected previously to acceptance. The manufacturers supplied projectiles and fuses. No premature bursts have occurred. Some defects have been discovered, which will be remedied.

DISCHARGES FROM THE ARMY.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the parents of a lad just over eighteen years of age, who enlisted in the Cameron Highlanders as recently as January last, have been unable to secure his discharge although they have offered to make the usual payment of £;10; and will he

consider the expediency of arranging for discharge by indulgence in cases such as this without awaiting the order for demobilisation.

LORD STANLEY: The rule against the grant of discharges during mobilisation has been strictly enforced, and an exception in an individual case could not be made without injustice to the many who have been refused their discharge.

AGE CERTIFICATES FOR RECRUITS.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, under the new reforms of our Army system, the regulations for enlistment will be so altered by the requirement from the proposed recruit of the production of actual proof of age by birth or baptismal certificate or otherwise so as to preclude for good the possibility of a recruit, whether for Regulars, Militia, or Volunteers, being enlisted under a false or apparent age, and so remaining all through his military career, and nullifying the true efficacy of any age regulations of time at which he may become available for increase of pay or pension.

LORD STANLEY: As the hon. and gallant Member is aware, an experiment was made a few years ago to test the possibility of introducing a system of verification of soldiers' ages. The results of the experiment were such as to show that it would be impracticable to require the production of a birth or baptismal certificate from every recruit.

PIMLICO CLOTHING DEPARTMENT; MASTER TAILOR CUTTERS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick's): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he can state the nature of the examinations for the position of the master tailor cutters at Pimlico Clothing Department; whether the

competition is open to young men; how many of them are Roman Catholics; what are their salaries; and whether a similar clothing department will be established in Ireland either at Dublin, Belfast, or Cork.

LORD STANLEY: There are no "master tailor cutters" at the Army Clothing Department. Cutters are accepted on the strength of testimonials and characters received from former employers. Subject to age limits, anyone may apply, and no inquiry is made as to the religion of those employed. It is not proposed to establish a clothing department in Ireland.

NEW NAVAL COLLEGE AT DEVONPORT.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can say when the new Naval College to replace H.M.S. "Britannia" will be ready for occupation, and whether in the meantime temporary accommodation for the Naval cadets could be secured elsewhere.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The contract for the completion of the sick quarters terminates on 12th May, 1902, and for the College Buildings on 12th November, 1904, and at present no reason is seen for supposing that the work will not be completed by the contract time. The question of temporary accommodation is being considered in case it may be found necessary to remove the cadets from H.M.S. "Britannia" before the completion of the new buildings.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS FOR THE NAVY.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty, in the case of single ships or squadrons of His Majesty's Navy at sea, if he can state what provision is made for the administration of the last sacraments which are of obligation to Roman Catholic sailors when dying.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: As stated in reply to previous questions, it is not possible to carry Roman Catholic chaplains on board His Majesty's ships. Full provision is made for ministering to the wants of Roman Catholic sailors on shore. The cruises are as a rule now of short duration, but during their continuance Roman Catholics on board His Majesty's ships are in the same position, as regards the administration of the sacraments, as sailors on other seagoing vessels during a voyage.

TIME-EXPIRED MEN-OF-WAR'S MEN ON THE CHINA STATION.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether a number of men-of-war's men now serving on the "Barfleur," the "Centurion," and other war ships stationed in the Chinese waters expired men; whether they detained against their will; they may be expected to be come home.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The King's Regulations direct that time-expired men are to be sent home in time to admit of their receiving their discharge when the term of their engagement expires, unless the exigencies of the Service are such as to render their detention for a time necessary. It is possible that owing to the recent troubles in China some men may have been detained, but the cases must be few and their detention would not be continued when the existence of the necessity was removed.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: Will the hon. Gentleman call the attention of the responsible authority to the desire of the men to be immediately released?

MR. ARNOLD-EORSTER: I have no doubt that the attention of the Commander-in-Chief has been called to the fact that the men are time-expired.

WOOLWICH ARSENAL; LABOURERS' WAGES.

MR. ARTHUR MORTON (Deptford): I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty if he will state how many labourers are employed in the Naval Ordnance Department of Woolwich Arsenal, and what rates of pay they receive, distinguishing the number of men employed and the rate of wages paid in each separate class.

*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): There are 365 labourers employed at rates of pay varying from 21s. to 27s. per week. I shall be glad to give the hon. Member further details if he will speak to me after Questions.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): How many are employed under 24s. a week?

*MR. PRETYMAN: About 325.

CHINA LOOTING AT PEKING AND TIENTSIN.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for foreign Affairs whether the

Government have any information to show that looting and pillage have been committed by British or other European troops in or near Peking or Tientsin, and that valuable property thus plundered has been publicly sold under the direction of British officers; whether such conduct is contrary to the modern usages of war as declared by the Hague Convention; and whether the Government intend to adopt any means for the restitution of the property so taken, and for the punishment of the offenders as their conduct may deserve.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): So far as I know there has not been any pillage or plunder by British troops in China in the sense implied by the question. General Gaselee reported in August last that "looting was openly tolerated among certain of the allied troops," and every effort was made by him to prevent our soldiers from participating in the indiscriminate plunder and wanton destruction of property which was prevalent elsewhere. In the areas assigned to British occupation there were a number of derelict houses. General Gaselee directed that the ownerless property so left should be taken charge of by authorised search parties, and where the legal owner could not be found sold by public auction for the benefit of all. There has not been any violation of the Hague Convention.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Would it be possible to have General Gaselee's report presented to the House?

MR. TULLY: Is it not a fact that at actually selling loot taken in China?

LORD G. HAMILTON: Possibly that may be so, but it does not necessarily follow that the things were looted by British troops. As to the question of the hon.

Member for Dundee, I am rather doubtful, as General Gaselee's report referred not only to British but to other troops.

CAPE-AUSTRALIAN CABLE.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the importance of the projected Cape-Australian cable as constituting a link in the All-British system, he would lay upon the Table of the

House a copy of the agreement with the contracting company; and whether permission has been granted for landing rights on each and all of the intervening mid-ocean stations, and what terms and conditions have been attached thereto in the protection of the public interests.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No formal agreement has been signed between His Majesty's Government and the Eastern and Eastern Extension Cable Companies in regard to the Cape-Australian cable, but I have informed the company that landing rights at Mauritius, Rodriguez, and Cocos Islands will be granted on condition that the sliding scale rates in regard to the traffic between England and South Africa are extended to these places. It is intended that the landing licences shall contain the same conditions and stipulations in favour of the Government and the public as the licence about to be issued by the Board of Trade to the same Company for the new cable from Madeira to Porth Curnow.

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT;ARRANGEMENTS FOR REBUILDING.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the delay in the rebuilding of the Central Criminal Court is due to the action of any Government Department; whether he is aware that the Corporation of the City of London have duly approved plans for the rebuilding but are unable to proceed owing to the difficulties placed in their way by the Government; and, seeing two judges have recently been indisposed in consequence of having to preside at trials under the present insanitary conditions of the Old Bailey, whether any steps can be taken to temporarily avoid such a state of affairs pending the erection of the new Courts.

The following question also appeared on the Paper::

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the attention of the Government has been directed to the insanitary condition of the Central Criminal Court, which has injuriously affected the health of the Lord Chief

Justice and other Judges who have had occasion to sit there; and whether they are in a position to do anything to remedy such a dangerous state of matters.

SIR JOSEPH DIMSDALE (London): I beg to ask the same right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that the Corporation of London have already paid £;25,000 to his Majesty's Commissioners of Prisons in part payment of the £;40,000 agreed upon between the Corporation and the Government for the purchase of the male wing of Newgate, and that the City Lands Committee, who have the matter in hand, are quite prepared to start the work of rebuilding the Central Criminal Court as soon as they gain possession of this land from the Government.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Berdesley): With regard to the question of my hon. friend the Member for the City of London, I have no doubt the facts are as he has stated them, but the City Corporation will allow the financial arrangements with the Government are very favourable to themselves, and they have made them on the express understanding that the prison would not be handed over until accommodation elsewhere was provided for the prisoners. With regard to the question of my hon. friend the Member for St. George's, I have to say that the City of London

authorities are responsible for the building in which the Central Criminal Court is held. In order to furnish them with a site on which to build a new court, His Majesty's Government have agreed to surrender Newgate Prison, but in order to make this possible extensive alterations have to be made in prison buildings elsewhere. This involves considerable delay, but it is not the case that His Majesty's Government are placing difficulties in the way. As a matter of fact, the Prison Commissioners are doing all they can to complete the arrangements which are a necessary preliminary to the discontinuance of Newgate Prison, and the transfer of its site to the Corporation.

HYDE PARK; RAILINGS AND LIGHTING.

*COLONEL LEGGE (St. George's, Hanover Square): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether it is proposed to remove the remaining iron railings inside Hyde Park; and whether he will consider the desirability of lighting the roadway between Victoria Gate and the Marble Arch.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): It is proposed ultimately to remove all the iron post and rail fence in Hyde Park except the portion round the ride. I have not at present sufficient funds to meet the heavy expense of lighting the roadway referred to by my hon. and gallant friend. Seeing that there is a public roadway running parallel to it, and within a few yards, it is not so pressing as other changes.

LONDON BOROUGH COUNCILS; TRIENNIAL ELECTIONS.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can now give an answer to the petitions of the City of Westminster and other borough councils of London in favour of triennial elections.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I am now in a position to deal with this matter. Subject to its being shown that the conditions prescribed by Subsection 8 of Section 2 of the Local Government Act have been complied with, I propose generally to assent to the applications made to me to direct that the Metropolitan borough councillors shall all retire together on the ordinary day of election in every third year. A few cases in which objections have been received will of course have to be specially considered.

VACCINATION STATISTICS.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state how many children were born in England and Wales in 1900, or the last year for which the statistics are known, and how many of these were vaccinated.

MR. WALTER LONG: The latest complete returns are those for the year 1898. The number of children born in that year was 923,059, and of these 562,737 were successfully vaccinated.

MR. BARTLEY: Are we to understand, then, that just half the population is now unvaccinated under the new law?

MR. WALTER LONG: I should not like my hon. friend to draw that deduction at present, because these figures are only for 1898.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether these figures are larger than those of preceding years?

MR. WALTER LONG: I could not really say, as I have not the figures before me.
BEER ADULTERATION.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if his attention has been called to the unanimous resolution passed by the Carmarthenshire Chamber of Agriculture as to the necessity of a Bill being passed to secure purity in beer, by laying down therein the ingredients of which beer may be composed, and the compelling of brewers at regular intervals to make a return of beer brewed and ingredients used; and, if so, whether he can assure the House of his intention to introduce promptly a Bill carrying out the purport of this resolution.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The President of the Local Government Board has asked me to answer this question, as the resolution aims, not only at the exclusion of deleterious ingredients from beer, but at limiting the freedom of brewers to use materials which, though wholesome, are not malt and hops. I can give no such assurance on behalf of the Government as is desired by the hon. Member.

EDUCATION;ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS CURRICULA.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he can give the House an assurance that in the future administration of the Higher Elementary Minute local authorities applying to have schools recognised under the Minute will be granted freedom in the preparation of proposed curricula for their schools, so that, as in the terms of the Minute, they may adapt the instruction to the circumstances of the scholars and the neighbourhood; and, further, whether he can hold out any prospect that the recognition of schools on whose account application for grants under the Minute is made will be on a more generous scale in the present year than in the past.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The Board of Education give full freedom to managers in all public elementary schools to submit their own courses of study. The only special conditions as to course of instruction attaching to higher elementary schools are (1) that a certain amount of science, proper to a course of general education, is taken; and (2) that technological subjects are not generally admissible. The recognition of higher elementary schools depends not on the generosity of the Board of Education, but upon the existence in the locality of the conditions specified in the Minute.

DR. MACNAMARA: Is it a fact that the Board of Education has declined to sanction business training as part of the curriculum for higher grade schools under the London Board?

SIR J. GORST: Yes, Sir. They regard business training as technological.

NEW DUSTON SCHOOL.

MR. ROBERT SPENCER (Northamptonshire, Mid): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been called to the want of school accommodation at New Duston, and whether he has received a

petition from the inhabitants respecting this lack of accommodation; and whether he can see his way to take the necessary steps to secure that the desired accommodation shall be provided.

SIR J. GORST: Yes; the hon. Member presented me with the petition a few days ago. The urban part of the United School District of Duston has been incorporated in the borough of Northampton, and there is, according to our information, ample school accommodation in the rural part left outside. New Duston as a separate parish is unknown to the Beard of Education.

EDUCATION CODE;RURAL SCHOOLS.

SIR W. HARTDYKE (Kent, Dartford): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Council when the new Education Code will be laid on the Table; and whether the new proposals with regard to education in rural schools will become effective under the operation of the Code this year.

SIR J. GORST: I hope to lay the Code on the Table before Easter. The Papers which have been recently issued represent the settled policy of education, and every effort will be made to introduce into the rural schools of this country the system of teaching embodied in those proposals.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask whether, having regard to the new curriculum, there will be a more generous system of finance under the new Code in dealing with rural schools.

SIR J. GORST: That is the second question the hon. Member has asked appealing to the generosity of the Beard of Education in this country. Public Departments are never generous. They have to act in accordance with settled rules of law which leave no place for such a sentiment as generosity.

CIVIL SERVICE;UNESTABLISHED WORK AND PENSIONS.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state how many persons, at one time employed in the Government service upon a temporary footing, have since 1884 been placed upon the permanent establishment, and of these in how many cases is the continuous temporary service rendered prior to establishment counted towards pension, as if the entire service had been upon the establishment.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): No, Sir I regret that I have no means of ascertaining the numbers.

CIVIL SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.

*COLONEL LEGGE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether it is in contemplation to reduce the age at which abstracters, sorters, and boy copyists in the Post Office may compete for higher civil service appointments: and, if so, whether those at present in the service will be exempted from the operation of the new rule.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It was decided last year in the interests of the public service to diminish the age deduction which may be made by civil servants competing for the second division and for assistantships of Customs and Excise. To prevent any possible hardship I have now arranged that the new Regulations shall only apply to persons who entered the service subsequent to its announcement in the spring of last year.

CHEAP TEAS.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if his attention has been drawn to the fact that quantities of inferior Ceylon and other teas alleged to contain microbial products dangerous to health are being sold in bond in London at prices ranging below 4d. per 1b.; if the Customs officers have taken and analysed any samples of such teas, and with what results; and what amount has been seized and destroyed during the past twelve months; and if, in the interests of public health, he is willing to consent to an inquiry into the best methods of checking the sale of such unwholesome teas by determining some minimum standard of purity, and by securing a proper analysis of such teas before they are blended with other teas.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Board of Customs have no knowledge of sales in bond of tea containing microbial products dangerous to health. They have power to forbid the introduction of tea that is found on analysis "to be mixed with other substances or exhausted tea," or is declared by the analyst to be "unfit for human food." During the past twelve months 2,055 packages were refused admission for home consumption or for use as ship stores. The second paragraph of the question should be addressed to the Local Government Board, which is the authority specially charged by statute with the protection of the public health.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE: Were the rejected packages destroyed?

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

ISSUE OF NEW POSTAGE STAMPS.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can state what steps are being taken to issue new postage stamps; will he take care that a clearly visible mark of the value; of the stamp, such as that on the 2d. stamp, be impressed on each new stamp; and will he give the public an opportunity of seeing the designs of the proposed stamps; and will he provide for the issue of the new penny stamp in royal scarlet, or red colour, in place of the present mauve colour.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The necessary steps are being taken for the issue of new postage stamps, but it is not expected that they will be ready for some months to come. The Postmaster General would point out to the hon. Member that, with the exception of the halfpenny, penny, and shilling stamps, all the adhesive stamps now in use do bear figures clearly indicating their value, and the same plan will probably be continued. In the case of the three stamps particularised they are of so distinctive a character that it was not thought necessary to print on them the value, in figures as well as in words, and the Postmaster General is not aware of any inconvenience having resulted. He does not think it desirable to submit the designs of the proposed stamps to the public. The Postmaster General is not satisfied that any sufficient reason exists for altering the colour of the penny stamp as suggested by the hon. Member.

POSTAL ORDER COUNTERFOILS.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will arrange; with the present contractors to issue the new postal orders with a counterfoil to be torn off by the senders; and whether, if the present contractors decline to do this without extra

charge, he will give an opportunity to other printers to print and supply the new postal orders at even a reduced price and with the counterfoil desired by the public.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has for some time past had the question of issuing postal orders with counterfoils under his consideration, but there are many practical difficulties in the way, and he has not yet been able to arrive at a conclusion.

EXAMINING OFFICERS OF CUSTOMS.

MR. O'MALLEY (Galway, Connemara): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether, in view of the fact that more than 100 examining officers of Customs will become redundant by the substitution of clerks for officers of this class in the Tea and Dry Goods Accounts Offices in the London Custom House, he will give an undertaking that the existing officers of the classes affected shall suffer no retardation of promotion as a result of the contemplated changes: and can he state what objection there is, if any, to inform the officers in advance of the exact measures which will be taken to safeguard their legitimate interests.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I regret that I am at present unable to add anything to the answer which I gave to the hon. Member on the 28th February.*The new arrangements will be communicated to the Customs Services as soon as they are finally settled.

LERWICK POST OFFICE.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Post master General, whether his official information shows that the post office building at Lerwick is in an insanitary condition, having little light and ventilation, and only lavatory accommodation consisting of an apartment about three feet square for the use of a mixed staff of persons; and, whether steps can be taken to make the necessary alterations.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The post office at Lerwick, which was provided in 1878 and enlarged in 1889, is now too small for the work, and as the building is not capable of adequate enlargement inquiries are being made for a suitable site for the erection of a new building. The Postmaster General is not aware that the present office is insanitary; but inquiry shall be made.

* See page 58.

CONVEYANCE OF STORNOWAY MAILS

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state what progress has been made with the negotiations with the North British Railway Company for the conveyance of the Stornoway mails via Mallaig; and will care be taken that tenders are invited for the steamer service between Mallaig and Stornoway.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The negotiations with the North British Railway Company for the use of the new railway to Mallaig have not yet been completed, and no decision has been arrived at in regard to the question of sending mails to Stornoway over this new line. As any steamer service from Mallaig must in the first instance be experimental in character, the Postmaster General thinks that it would not be expedient at present to invite tenders as the hon. Member

suggests.

ILLEGAL TRAWLING OFF ABERDEEN

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, having regard to the fact that the "Jackal" is the gunboat more directly charged with the duty of preventing illegal trawling in the close vicinity of Aberdeen, he can state how often during the months of December, January, and February, respectively, this boat has been berthed in Aberdeen harbour, and on how many of such occasions she has taken up her mooring inside the dock gates of the harbour; what is the number of officers on board her, and since when has the present officer in charge of her held the appointment; and where are the gunboats "Brenda" and "Niger" at the present moment.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Bute-shire): As regards the first part of the Member's question, I must refer him to the Admiralty, within whose jurisdiction the matter rests. As regards the second part, I presume, the hon. Member refers to the Fishery Board cruisers "Brenda" and "Nona," and, if so the answer is that the waters patrolled by the "Brenda" are Berwick-on-Tweed to Rattray Head, and by the "Nona" the Moray Firth.

SCOTTISH FISHERY RETURNS.

MR. WEIR: I beg, to ask the Lord Advocate if the Secretary for Scotland 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, the date of its construction, the area, the name of the proprietor or authority responsible for its upkeep, its present condition, and the funds derived from the harbour in dues or otherwise for each year since 1890.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: There are no materials at the disposal of the Secretary for Scotland to enable such a Return to be framed. There would have to be a special inquiry, and the Secretary for Scotland is unable to see any such public purpose to be served by the Return as to justify ordering such an inquiry to be made.

IRISH LAND COURT SALES.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what is the amount of purchase money paid for lands sold by the Judge of the Land Court since the Act of 1896 came into force, under Section 40 and under other powers.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The amount advanced under orders made pursuant to the 40th section of the Act of 1896 is £351,729, and the amount realised by sales to tenants pursuant to agreements sanctioned by the Land Judge is £628,385, making in all £980,114. Those figures are brought down to the end of October last, the latest date to which they are at present available.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say how many estates have been sold under Section 40 of the Act?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, the holdings are sold separately and the estates are not sold en bloc.

BANN DRAINAGE BILL.

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

Ireland whether, in consequence of the injury inflicted by the floods on the Bann, he will consider the expediency of reintroducing the Bann Drainage Bill or other remedial measures.

MR. WYNDHAM: As already stated, I am not prepared to introduce in the present session legislation in this matter.

ENNIS DISTRICT LUNATIC ASYLUM FINANCE.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Clare, I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been called to the fact that a sum of £934 16s. 2d. has been certified by the Government Auditor as due to the Ennis District Lunatic Asylum for the capitation grant towards the support of the asylum for the three months ending 21st March, 1899, and to the fact that this debt was acknowledged by the then Secretary to the Treasury, and whether this sum will now be paid immediately.

MR. WYNDHAM: At the request of my hon. friend, I will reply to this question. This matter has already formed the subject of correspondence between the Irish Government and the Committee of Management of the Ennis Asylum, and I have nothing to add to the views of the Government has already expressed. The hon. Member has not correctly interpreted the statement made by the late Secretary to the Treasury. For an accurate report of what he did say I would refer to The Parliamentary Debates of 30th April, 1900 [Fourth Series], vol. lxxxii., page 285.

SEA FISHING; MANUAL OF IRISH STATUTES.

MR PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will lay upon the Table a manual of the various Irish statutes and bye laws regarding sea fishing, similar to the volume issued last week to Members of the House regarding Scotland.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, this will be done.

KILFEE BURIAL GROUND, COUNTY WICKLOW.

MR. COGAN (Wicklow, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Kilfee burial ground, in the Ballycullen electoral Division of the Rathdrum rural district, county Wicklow, which is under the Rathdrum Rural

District Council, is at present unprotected by any fence, and is consequently over run with cattle and sheep, which injure the graves and memorials; and that this cemetery was originally twice its present size, but has been reduced by the owner of the land in which it is situate converting it into a cattle walk; and whether the Local Government Board will take steps to have this cemetery restored to its original size, and have it properly protected.

MR. WYNDHAM: The clerk of the rural council states that the fencing of this burial ground, which had been broken in places, has now been restored. It is possible that the cemetery was originally larger, but in regard to that matter the Local Government Board has no information and no jurisdiction.

CONGESTED DISTRICTS BOARD FISH CURING INDUSTRY.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, having regard to the fact that the Congested Districts Board, in connection with the fish curing industry, require a considerable number of

barrels, the Board will ask for tenders from Cork cooperage works, seeing that some coopering firms in that city have special facilities for turning out this class of work.

MR. WYNDHAM: Cooperages were opened by the Board for the purpose of imparting instruction in barrel making in congested districts, and until the industry has been firmly established I do not think it would be prudent for the Board to withdraw its support from these cooperages.

DOUGLAS (IRELAND) NATIONAL SCHOOL.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the teacher of Douglas National School, Roll No. 12,875, District 54, sent early in January an order for books to the Beard's stores, and has since got no reply; and that the manager of the school, who wrote more than three weeks since, complaining of the matter, has not yet got a reply; and whether, seeing that on 19th February, a second order was sent from the same and no reply has yet been sent, steps will be taken to place this department on a business-like footing.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have called for a Report on this question; but as I have not yet received it, I will ask the hon. Member to repeat the question to-morrow.

ROXBORO ROAD SCHOOL, LIMERICK.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his statement made recently in Dublin to the effect that only one case was left unfinished by the Educational Endowments Commission was accurate; and can he say what is the position of the Roxboro Road School at Limerick.

MR. WYNDHAM: I stated correctly that the Judicial Commissioners arrived at the unanimous decision imposed by the Educational Endowments Act of 1885 in all but one case. This is so. In answer to the second paragraph the House has on two separate occasions disapproved of the schemes approved of by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The powers of the Commissioners lapsed on the 31st December, 1897, and Mr. Gregg remains in occupation as a tenant from year to year. There is now no power to frame a new scheme.

MR. JOYCE: I shall put a further question on this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member will do better to raise it on the Estimates. The matter can hardly be debated by way of question and answer.

PARSONSTOWN AND PORTUMNA RAILWAY.

MR ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on 29th March, 1897, the then Chief Secretary for Ireland stated in the House of Commons that if a responsible railway-company, such as the Great Southern and Western Company, were got to restore the Parsonstown and Portumna Derelict Railway at a cost of £;24,000, and maintain it when restored, the Government would be prepared to advance one-half this sum, £;12,000, for that purpose: and that an offer has been made by the International Railway Corporation, Limited, to spend £;12,000 on restoring the line, and working and equipping it thereafter; and will he accordingly carry out the promise of his predecessor in office and accept the offer of the International Company.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am aware of the statement made by my predecessor on the date

mentioned. In answer to the second paragraph, I must refer the hon. Member to my replies to previous questions of the 4th and 7th instant on the same subject.*

MR. ROCHE: Am I to understand the Government refuse the offer of the International Railway Corporation?

MR. WYNDHAM: The Treasury do not see their way to accept the proposals of the Corporation.

UNITED IRISH LEAGUE MEETING AT BALLINALEE.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he explain by whose order County Inspector M'Dermott, with District Inspectors Rodwell and Millar, attended by 100 policemen armed with rifles, proceeded to Ballinalee on Sunday last to prevent the East Collumbkille fife and drum band from playing outside the League rooms in Ballinalee, in which the North Longford executive of the United Irish League was holding its monthly meeting; is he aware that these policemen kept following the band up and down the village of Ballinalee, and refused to allow them to stand for a moment at any house; can he explain what was the meaning of such conduct considering that the band had come a long distance merely to exercise; whether he is aware that no public meeting of any kind was intended or attempted, and no person or persons were boycotted or in any way interfered with in the neighbourhood; and whether the County Inspector ordered this display contrary to the advice and wish of his subordinate officers; and will an inquiry be made into all the circumstances of the case.

MR. WYNDHAM: Fifty, not 100, police were assembled at Ballinalee on the occasion referred to; none of these men were armed with rifles. No attempt was made to prevent the two bands present from playing outside the place of meeting or from parading the streets. A few police only accompanied the bands through

* See pages 392 and 824.

the village, which is the course adopted on all such occasions; the greater number of the police were confined to barracks. The force attended by the express order of Government in view of the fact that a large concourse of people was expected to be present and that proper precautions had to be taken.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Was any information sworn that would lead the Government to believe a breach of the peace was expected on that occasion?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir. No information was sworn. The precautions taken were proper police precautions, which would be taken anywhere in Ireland or elsewhere when a large crowd was expected to assemble.

MR. FARRELL: Will the cost of this police display fall on the county?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot say without notice, but I should say the mere concentration of police would not involve any charge.

DUBLIN CITY HOSPITAL FOR DISEASES OF THE SKIN.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.) I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that Dr. White, surgeon at the City Hospital for Diseases of the Skin, Beresford Place, Dublin, tried to induce Mrs. M'Ginley, a poor Roman Catholic widow, to enter the Protestant ward of the hospital of the South Dublin Union, which would have meant the registration as Protestants of herself and her four orphan children; whether

he will institute an inquiry into the case; and whether he will endeavour to ascertain whether there are in the Protestant ward of the South Dublin Union any Roman Catholics brought there by similar inducements.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hospital referred to is not subject in any way to the jurisdiction of the Local Government Board, and that Department has no authority to institute an inquiry as suggested. The Guardians of the South Dublin Union are perfectly competent to make the inquiry suggested in the last paragraph, if they think it expedient to do so.

NEWTOWNSTEWART (TYRONE) POLICE BARRACKS.

MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether complaints from Newtownstewart, North Tyrone, have reached him to the effect that the police barrack there is occupied exclusively by the head constable and his grown-up family, thereby necessitating the other members of the force to reside out of barracks; and whether it is against the regulations of the force that the grown-up families of constables should live in barracks; and, if so, will he be pleased to have such regulations put in force.

MR. WYNDHAM: The right hon. Gentleman has, I think, been misinformed. The head constable has six children residing with him in the barrack, and no breach of the regulations has been committed in this respect. The barrack is not exclusively occupied by the family of this officer, and no other members of the force are obliged to live outside the barrack for the reason stated.

MR. HEMPHILL: As a matter of fact, is not the head constable the only officer residing in the barracks?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not gather that from the information I have received. Anyway there has been no breach of the regulations and therefore there is no need for interference.

NEWTOWNSTEWART POLICE FORCE; CONSTITUTION.

*MR. HEMPHILL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the fact that the three senior officers of the Royal Irish Constabulary stationed at Newtownstewart; namely, the head constable, the senior sergeant, and one acting sergeant are Protestants, although Newtownstewart is a place where party disturbances are liable to occur; and whether he will take steps that one of the senior officers at least should be a Roman Catholic.

MR. WYNDHAM: The head constable and one of the two sergeants are Protestants; the other sergeant is a Roman Catholic. There has been no disturbance of a party nature at Newtownstewart for several years past.

SHILLELAGH UNION INQUIRIES.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether Dr. Flinn, Local Government Board Inspector, who recently investigated the charges made by Dr. Bolster against Nurse Joyce, received from the nurse the names of witnesses who could give evidence in her defence; and whether he summoned any of them to attend the Inquiry at Shillelagh; and, if so, how many, and were they examined by Dr. Flinn.

MR. WYNDHAM: The inspector received a list of thirty-four witnesses from Nurse Joyce and of sixteen witnesses from Dr. Bolster. In both instances Dr. Flinn

summoned only those witnesses whose evidence related directly to the subject matter of the Inquiry. Eight of the nurse's witnesses were summoned, of whom seven were examined; and nine of Dr. Bolster's witnesses were summoned, of whom six were examined. Those not examined left the Inquiry before it was concluded, and no desire was expressed that they should be recalled and examined.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Is Dr. Flinn a legal expert as to whether evidence is material?

MR. WYNDHAM: The others were only witnesses as to character.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): On the Estimate for the Irish Local Government Board I shall call attention to the conduct of Dr. Flinn.

SOUTH LEITRIM UNION.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board have received resolutions from the Leitrim County Council and Mohill District Council asking to have the unions in South Leitrim amalgamated with a view to using one of the workhouses used as an auxiliary asylum; and whether, in consequence of this proposal, the Lord Lieutenant will withhold his sanction from the proposed loan of £;40,000 for enlarging Sligo asylum, the chief cost of maintaining which falls on the ratepayer's of Leitrim and Sligo.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The county councils of Sligo and Leitrim, the two counties constituting the Asylum District, have not yet sanctioned the proposed loan of £;40,000 for the enlargement of the asylum, and until the proposal has been considered by them the question will not come before the Lord Lieutenant.

WORKMEN'S HOUSES AT BOYLE.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether any steps have been taken to expedite the issuing of a loan of £;1,800 to the Boyle Town Commissioners for the building of houses under the Housing of the Working Classes Acts, the Act for this purpose having been passed last August, and the loan sanctioned by the Local Government Board.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir; special steps were taken to expedite the preparation of the deed of mortgage which was forwarded on the 6th instant for execution by Boyle Town Commissioners. An issue on account of the loan will be made immediately after the due execution of the deed.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS IN IRELAND; FAIR WAGES CLAUSE.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has seen a resolution, passed by the United Trades Council and Labour League of Dublin, which stated that much difficulty is experienced in obtaining particulars relating to Government contracts in Ireland, and in identifying the persons entrusted therewith, and also that complaints have been made as regards the carrying out of the Fair Wages Resolution; and whether, in order to remove these difficulties, he would order that concise particulars of all Government contracts, together with the names of the persons whose tenders are accepted, be set out in the Labour Gazette; that a penalty of not less than five per cent, on the amount of the

tender be imposed on all contractors who fail to comply with the Fair Wages Resolution in executing the work; and that the names of all such contractors be published.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have received a copy of the resolution referred to. I am afraid it would be impossible to arrange for the publication of particulars of all Government contracts in the Labour Gazette. A clause providing for a fine of the nature suggested has been included in certain recent contracts, but before extending it further I think it desirable to have some experience of its working. Up to the present time no case has arisen for imposing penalties under it. When such cases arise, I shall have no objection to giving the particulars asked for.

MR. NANNETTI: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that many complaints have been brought before this House of the way in which the contractors carry out the Fair Wages resolution? Will the hon. Gentleman inquire further?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: If the hon. Member has a complaint to make about any particular contract, and will give me such details as will enable me to identify the case, I shall be happy to have it investigated, but I cannot set out on a roving commission on the general statement that there are complaints.

REGISTRATION OF PATENTS IN IRELAND.

MR. MOONEY (Dublin County, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the rules as to registration under the terms of the Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Acts, 1883–1888, can be purchased in Ireland; and, if so, will he state where they can be obtained.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The rules of 1890 are included in the volume of Statutory Rules for that year, which may be obtained of Messrs. Hodges, Figgis, and Company, of 104, Grafton Street, Dublin, the agents of His Majesty's Stationery Office for the sale of Statutory Rules. Since 1893 rules under the Patent, etc., Act have been treated as Statutory Rules, and as such may be purchased in separate form from Messrs. Hodges. The Patent Agents' Rules for 1899 were printed as a Parliamentary paper, and in that form may also be purchased in Dublin of Messrs. Hodges. When a reprint of the rules of 1890 is required they will be printed as Statutory Rules in separate form and put on sale in Ireland.

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL; HOUSING SCHEMES.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the refusal of the Local Government Board to accede to the plea of the London County Council that it may be permitted to spread the repayment of its housing schemes loans over 100 years, the said refusal being based on the fact that a previous Parliament has disagreed with the proposal, the Government will afford facilities for the present Parliament to express an opinion upon the matter.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot promise a day for the discussion which the hon. Member suggests.

SWISS MILITARY SYSTEM.

Mr. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government will appoint a Commission to inquire into and report upon the

military system of Switzerland, such inquiry to be directed not only to the character, efficiency, and cost of the system, but also to its effects upon the industry, physique, and morals of the population.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think much would be gained by the Commission desired by my hon. friend. There is a great deal of information on the subject in the possession of the War Office at the present time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. LOUGH (Islington, W.): May I ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he will not take Vote A of the Army Estimates before Thursday, considering the importance of the statement made by the Secretary for War?

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): Can the right hon. Gentleman state when he proposes to take the Report stage of the Vote on Account, and if any time will be permitted for its discussion?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to the hon. Member for West Islington, I must say that I do not quite follow the argument involved in his question. There has been an interval since Friday night which has enabled the House and the country to consider the important statement of my right hon. friend. I hope, therefore, we shall proceed with the discussion as rapidly as possible. As regards the question of the hon. Member for South Tyrone, there are Army and Navy subjects of the first importance requiring to be discussed, and I, therefore, do not, at present, see any opportunity of taking the Report stage of the Vote on Account.

Mr. T. W. RUSSELL: Then it will not be taken to-night?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): With regard to the discussion on the Army Estimates, will the right hon. Gentleman not agree to postpone getting the Speaker out of the Chair until to-morrow, at least, in order that we may have time for the full discussion of the statement? Let me point out; [Cries of "Order!";] well, perhaps I had better put it in an interrogative form in order to keep in order. Does the right hon. Gentleman appreciate the fact which is present to our minds that there are two aspects of this question, the aspect of general policy and that of detailed policy? Could we not have the general policy discussed before Mr. Speaker leaves the Chair, so as to leave us free for the consideration of details afterwards?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If that were the general understanding on both sides of the House. I am of opinion that it would be a very convenient arrangement to abstain altogether from discussing details at this stage, and to deal with nothing but details at the later stage. I do not propose, however, to try to get Mr. Speaker out of the Chair until to-morrow, in any case.

Sir JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street): May I ask whether, considering the importance of the statement made by the Secretary for War, the right hon. Gentleman will, for the convenience of the House, have the speech printed and circulated?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: That has never been done, and I hope it never will be.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I wish to prevent any possibility of mistake, but does not the right hon. Gentleman go a little too far when he says that at the

later stage we are to speak on nothing but details?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course, I mean as far as possible.

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I hope there will be no misunderstanding. The right hon. Gentleman has no objection, I take it, to our discussing the Army Estimates to-night with Mr. Speaker in the Chair, it being understood the debate is not to be concluded to-night?

Sir JAMES JOICEY: There is a precedent for what I asked the right hon. Gentleman. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has printed and circulated his statement before now?

Mr. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): What is the business for Thursday?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I thought the hon. Member for Chester-le-Street wanted the speech of my right hon. friend the Secretary for War laid as a Parliamentary paper in the same way as, I believe, in France, speeches which meet with the general favour in the French Chamber are printed and circulated. I do not think that that would be a happy precedent to set. With regard to the business for Thursday, that, of course, depends on the progress made with the Army Estimates. Personally, I anticipate that the discussion on those Estimates will continue on Thursday.

Sir JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): When are the Navy Estimates likely to be taken?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot tell my hon. and gallant friend.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): With reference to the course of business, I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman a question. He is probably aware that notice has been given of a motion of a very important character on the question that Mr. Speaker leave the Chair on going into Committee of Supply on the Civil Service Estimates. Can he give us any idea when he proposes to move the Speaker out of the Chair on those Estimates? It will be essential to the convenience of a large number of Members interested that we should have adequate notice. Last year in a similar case the right hon. Gentleman was good enough to give us a week's notice.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I will do my very best to give notice. But I do not anticipate that, in any case, we shall propose to move Mr. Speaker out of the Chair on the Civil Service Estimates before the 25th March.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Will it be before Easter?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: It will be more convenient to get it done before Easter, but I cannot promise.

Mr. TULLY: I have an Amendment on the Report of Supply closed last Tuesday. If it is not to be taken tonight, can the right hon. Gentleman say when it will be taken?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I can only say it will not be taken to-night.

Mr. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): Arising out of the discussion as to the way in which the Army Estimates are to be taken, is the right hon. Gentleman aware that, when a similar arrangement was made on a former occasion, the Chairman of Committees ruled out of order any debate on details, because some of them had been mentioned in the discussion with Mr. Speaker in the Chair? [No answer was given.]

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Cannot the right hon. Gentleman say-when he proposes to take the Civil Service Supplementary Estimates?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: As soon as I get an opportunity.

EAST INDIA LOAN (GREAT INDIAN PENINSULA RAILWAY DEBENTURES).

Committee to consider of authorising the Secretary of State in Council of India to raise money in the United Kingdom for paying off or redeeming Debentures of the Great Indian Peninsula Railway Company on the Security of the Revenues of India (King's Recommendation signified), To-morrow. (The Chairman of Ways and Means.)

CIVIL LIST.

Copy presented, of Accounts and Estimates relating to the Civil List [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Paragraph in the King's Speech respecting the Civil List at the opening of Parliament, and His Majesty's Message of the fifth day of this instant March, read as follows;

"Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

"The demise of the Crown renders it necessary that a renewed provision shall lie made for the Civil List. I place unreservedly at your disposal those hereditary revenues which were so placed by My predecessor: and I have commanded that the Papers necessary for a full consideration of tin subject shall be laid before you."

"Edward R.

"His Majesty being desirous of making competent provision for the honourable support and maintenance of His Son, the Duke of Cornwall and York. His Daughter-in-law, the Duchess of Cornwall and York, and His Daughters, the Princess Louise, Duchess of Fife, the Princess Victoria, and Princess Charles of Denmark, and being further desirous that similar provision should be made for Her Majesty the Queen in the event of Her surviving Him, and for the Duchess of Cornwall and York in the event of Her surviving the Duke of Cornwall and York, recommends the consideration thereof to His Majesty's faithful Commons, and relies on their attachment to adopt such measures as may be suitable to the occasion."

*The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): It will be unnecessary for me to take up the time of the House in explaining the reasons why it is incumbent on the House to take some action

on the gracious Message from the Throne which has just been read. I will simply quote the provisions of the Civil List of 1837, passed on the accession of Her late Majesty, by which it was declared, in precise conformity with similar Acts of previous reigns, that the several hereditary revenues of the Crown which had become payable to Her late Majesty on her accession should be carried to the Consolidated Fund for her life, and that in lieu thereof a fixed revenue should be paid to Her Majesty called the Civil List, but that on and after her decease this arrangement should end, and that the hereditary revenues should be payable to her heirs and successors;a period of six months, however, being allowed to elapse during which it would be possible for Parliament to make a fresh arrangement on this important matter.

As the House is aware, Sir, His Majesty the King has, in precise conformity with

the course adopted by Queen Victoria, placed unreservedly at our disposal the hereditary revenues so placed by her; and it is therefore necessary for us to consider afresh, as at the commencement of the previous reign, the provision of the Civil List for the Crown. The provision made by the Act of 1889 for the children of His Majesty, then the Prince of Wales, lapses at the end of six months after the decease of Queen Victoria; and therefore we are also invited to deal with the position of the son and daughters of the King, which, in conformity with past practice, will be dealt with outside the Civil List, as well as the possibility that Her Majesty the Queen may survive His Majesty and the Duchess of Cornwall and York may survive the Duke of Cornwall and York. It is clear, I think, that Parliament must take some action in the present condition of affairs, and the only question it is necessary for me to bring before the House is the method of procedure we should adopt with regard to it. We have a series of precedents, which, even if there were no reasons in its favour, I think sufficiently: dictate to us the course we should adopt. At the accession of William IV., and again at the accession of Her late Majesty, and lastly in 1889 on an analogous subject, the House of Commons decided to appoint a strong Select Committee to investigate the whole subject before any resolution was submitted to Parliament

It is not my intention this evening to state to the House the proposals which, on the responsibility of the Government, will be made with regard to the new Civil List. Those proposals will be made in the first instance to the Select Committee. The Committee will also have before it papers which I shall lay on the Table to-night, giving a full account in every detail of the amount of the expenditure of the Civil List during Her late Majesty's reign, and also of the net hereditary revenues received by the nation for the same time; and, further, the sums payable to the Sovereign and the Prince of Wales each year from the Duchy of Lancaster and the Duchy of Cornwall respectively. We shall produce to the Committee any further information bearing on this subject which they may desire; and, furnished with that information, they will be in a position to examine our proposals with the scrutiny which such proposals properly require and to report to the House. Their report will, of course, contain not merely their conclusions, but the information with which they have been supplied. On that report we shall base resolutions which will be submitted to the House and form the foundation of the Bill. I think it will be seen, therefore, that there will be full and ample opportunity for the discussion of the subject in the House of Commons as soon as the materials are placed before the House on which alone their conclusions can properly be based. I trust that when that time comes there will not be any wide difference of opinion among us.

Many subjects which in old times were matters of great controversy with regard to the Civil list have now disappeared. There were gross abuses on the Civil List in former days which have happily been removed; and now, I think, there is a universal agreement in this; that the Civil List shall not contain anything but that which is necessary for the proper maintenance of the dignity and state of the Crown, and also of the households of their Majesties. And, Sir, we also

stand in a favourable position in one other respect to which I must briefly allude. In former reigns great and frequent applications were made to Parliament, after the Civil List had been fixed, for the payment of the debts of the Sovereign or of members of the Royal Family. Her late Majesty's Civil List was fixed sixty-four years ago; and, Sir,, although it is a small matter among all that our nation owes to our late Queen, yet it will not be improper for me to remind the House on this occasion that during all these years;and in spite of the fact that during the later years of her reign her expenditure was greater than the revenue which Parliament had provided;not one application was made by our late Queen to Parliament for anything in addition to the Civil List provided by Parliament. If we may look back to the past with satisfaction; and it is a matter of no small importance as affecting the relations between the Crown, Parliament, and the people;I think we may also look to the future with confidence. His present Majesty has for many years occupied an exceptional position. For more than a generation he has, as Prince of Wales, from circumstances which will be fresh in our minds, had to perform to an exceptional extent the duties of Royalty, and that necessarily devolved upon him exceptional expenditure as compared with that which would be ordinarily required from the Heir-Apparent to the Crown. His annuity from Parliament was fixed more than thirty years ago; and that annuity, with the revenues of the Duchy, forming together an income not large when compared with the incomes of not a few private individuals among us, has proved sufficient for his present Majesty to perform all the exceptional duties to which I have referred in a manner for which he is entitled to the gratitude of the country, and to deal with all those who were in any way dependent upon him in a spirit of generous consideration for their comfort and welfare which has been an example, to the nation at large. Therefore, though when the time comes for us to settle the precise terms of the fresh bargain, so to speak, which we have now to make with the Crown, there may be differences of opinion as to the sum which has to be provided, yet we may all agree in this;that the liberality of Parliament will not be abused. There is another matter on which we may all agree, and that is the principle which should govern our action. The basis of our proposals will necessarily be the Civil List of her late Majesty, with such variations as the altered circumstances and the experience of more than sixty years may show to be necessary. Among these altered circumstances the most important is that his present Majesty is blessed with a Queen Consort who, ever since she first came among us from her northern home, has charmed the hearts of the people, and who is preeminently possessed of all those qualifications that can most adorn the social centre of the Empire. We shall remember, too, I think, with one accord that our King is not only King of the United Kingdom, but the head of a world-wide Empire. There may still be among us different theoretical opinions as to the best form of government; but surely none will deny that there never was a time when the constitutional monarchy was more universally popular in the Empire than the present, or that it is incumbent, as a matter of honour, upon the people to provide adequately for the dignity of the head of the State. And yet, Sir, I believe we shall all be agreed that this ought to be done without

extravagance; for there is something in the quiet temper of our people which, though all of them would desire a splendid Court, would yet be entirely out of harmony with extravagant waste and mere senseless or useless display. Sir, we shall endeavour to make our proposals in that spirit; in a spirit of justice to the Crown on the one side, and to the people on the other; and I believe that, if they are found to be so framed, the taxpayers of this country will not grudge in the smallest degree to provide adequately and properly for the dignity and the honour of a Monarch who has been always personally popular among us and who, by his every act and word since his accession has shown his desire and his capacity worthily to tread in the footsteps of the best and most beloved Queen that has ever reigned in this realm. I beg to move.

Motion made, and Question proposed. "That a Select Committee be appointed to consider so much of His Majesty's

Speech to both Houses at the opening of Parliament as relates to the Civil List and His Majesty's Most Gracious Message of the 5th March relating to Grants to Her Majesty the Queen and Members of His Majesty's Family."; (Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

Sir H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The course which the right hon. Gentleman suggests for the approval of the House is in accordance with the best recent precedents, and is recommended by a consideration for the dignity and convenience as well as for the interests of the House and of the country. I shall therefore say no more than that I beg to second the motion.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) who had the following Amendment on the Paper; "That this House declines to take any steps in connection with the Civil List until His Majesty's Government announce their intention of introducing legislation to alter the declaration made by the Sovereign on ascending the Throne, such declaration being grossly offensive to His Majesty's Catholic subjects,"

said: As the members of the Irish party in this House decline to appoint any of their number to serve on this Committee, contrary to the practice in reference to the appointment of Committees in this House. I think it would be well that I should have the opportunity of explaining shortly to the House why they take up that attitude. I confess, Sir, for my part, it is a matter of regret that upon an occasion such as this we have been forced by the rules of order to bring up the question which is in my mind, but we have had no other course open to us. It was utterly impossible for us to lie party to the appointment of this Committee, or to take any steps in connection with the Civil List, until we had some assurance that the declaration which was taken by the Sovereign on ascending the Throne, and which by, I think, universal admission is of a character grossly offensive to many millions of the subjects of this Empire, and to some hundreds of millions of Catholics throughout the world, was to be made the subject of review and amendment on the part of the Government.

*Mr. SPEAKER: The Amendment which the hon. and learned Gentleman has placed upon the Paper will not be in order; and it follows that any observations addressed to the question whether the declaration made by His Majesty under statute ought or ought not to be repealed by Parliament will also

be irrelevant and out of order.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: I bow at once to your ruling, but I am sure you will not think I am guilty of any disrespect to you when I say that I deeply regret that that ruling puts me in the position of having to offer opposition to the appointment of this Committee without being able to state the reasons. It may seem to some people a blind opposition. Of course, if the Government are in a position to announce any change of attitude on the question I have alluded to, the situation will be altered. I have seen a statement in the newspapers that such is the intention of His Majesty's Government. If they are in a position to make such an announcement, of course the difficulties with which I find myself faced will, to a very large extent, disappear, but failing the obtaining of a declaration of the character I have indicated from the Government, and as by the rules of order my mouth is shut from giving my reasons for the opposition, I can only fall back on opposition itself; and I beg to say that at every stage in regard to the appointment of the Committee, and every step taken in connection with the Civil List, I will offer a vigorous opposition, unless we obtain justice in this matter.

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I understand, Sir, from your ruling that it would be out of order to discuss the question of the Oath which has been taken by His Majesty according to statute, and which, of course, will not require to be taken again, even if the law remains unaltered, during the present reign. While it would be out of order to discuss that on the present motion, the hon. Gentleman has put to me a question as to the attitude of the Government. I do not know whether I am not going beyond, perhaps, what is usual in this House in referring to proceedings in the other House. But it is a fact, I understand, that the Prime Minister is to be asked in the other House whether the Government have any objection to appoint a Committee to inquire into the question of the Oath. So far as the Government are concerned no opposition to that Committee will be offered.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: What sort of Committee?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: A Committee on which, at all events. Peers of the hon. Gentleman's faith will be fully represented.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Does the right hon. Gentleman mean a Committee of Peers only?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: So far as I am concerned I see no objection to a joint Committee. We shall offer no opposition if that is the desire.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND: Then, Sir, in consequence of that statement I desire to say that while the Irish party will not take any part in serving on this Committee, and while we will not vote for it, under the circumstances we will abstain from voting against the appointment of the Committee, and reserve to ourselves the right, when the main question comes up for discussion on the Report of this Committee, to take what action we feel inclined to take, having, as we then will have, in our possession full information as to the proceedings of the Committee.

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in submitting this motion to the House, has justified it, among other reasons, on the ground that it is necessary to investigate the whole subject. The motion as

framed will not permit of the whole subject being investigated, and it will not enable the whole of the facts of the case to be placed before the country. I will move to add the following words to the resolution as printed on the Paper: "And to prepare a Report to be presented to this House showing in detail every item of expenditure, including salaries, paid from public funds towards the support and maintenance of the Royal Family." I submit that motion for this reason chiefly; the Civil List does not, and does not pretend to, exhaust the expenditure upon the maintenance and support of the Royal Family. Even so astute an investigator as the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean had to confess himself puzzled in seeking to trace all the items which might properly be placed under the head of Royal expenditure. It may be, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer said, that there are differences of opinion as to the form the Head of the State should assume, but I think there will be no difference of opinion as to the desirability of presenting to the nation an honest and straightforward statement of the cost of maintaining the Head of the State, under whatever name he may be. When the proper moment arrives I will have something to say concerning the Crown lands alleged to be given in exchange for the Civil List. I may at this stage point out, in reply to the statement frequently made, that the late Civil List was the lowest ever paid to any Sovereign in this country, that such is not the case. The first Civil List framed; for William III.; provided that £;700,000 should be set apart for the purposes of the Civil List; but Members, in comparing with that the £;385,000 of the late Civil List, must not overlook the fact that, with the exception of the expenditure upon the Army and Navy, the £;700,000 voted to William III, covered the entire cost of the civil government of the country. It was a sum voted not merely for the maintenance of Royalty, but, as its name implies, to cover the entire cost of the various departments of the civil administration. At the present time, anyone desirous of ascertaining the cost of the support and maintenance of the Royal Family has to search through the Civil List, annuities, pensions, salaries, expenditure upon yachts, and expenditure upon Royal trips, and various items which it is almost impossible to trace at all. For this reason I beg to submit the Amendment which I have read, its object being to secure a full and frank statement of account, which shall be presented to the nation, and without which his House is not in a position to settle the Civil List when the question comes before it. I beg to move.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare E.) formally seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed;

"At the end of the Question, to add the words 'and to prepare a Report for presentation to this House showing in detail every item of expenditure from public funds towards the support and maintenance of the Royal Family.'"; (Mr. Keir Hardie.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

*Sir M. HICKS BEACH: I am not sure that I entirely appreciate what the hon. Member desires by adding these words to the motion, but I can assure him of this, that it is our intention to afford the fullest information to the Committee which any Member of it may desire on this subject. I happen to know,

from a question asked by the hon. Member for Northampton of my right hon. friend near me, that his attention has been directed to what I understand to be the desire of the hon. Member. And as the hon. Member for Northampton is proposed to be a member of the Committee, I have no doubt he will request the information in Committee. I trust, therefore, it will not be necessary to press this Amendment.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I understand that the desire expressed in the motion is already covered by the terms of the resolution. I have no desire to put the House to the trouble of a division, and if I am to understand from the right hon. Gentleman that the terms of the resolution are already wide enough to cover the object I have expressed, I will withdraw my Amendment.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Of course. I cannot be absolutely certain that the hon. Member will be satisfied.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to consider so much of His Majesty's Speech to both Houses at the opening of Parliament as relates to the Civil List, and His Majesty's Most Gracious Message of the 5th March relating to Grants to Her Majesty the Queen and Members of His Majesty's Family.

Ordered, That the several Papers presented this day relating to the Civil List be referred to the Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee List of Twenty-one Members.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. A. J. Balfour be a member of the said Committee."

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Personally I have no objection whatever to the First Lord of the Treasury being a member of this Committee, as he probably is one of the persons most fitted to serve thereon, but I take this opportunity of saying that in my opinion the appointment of the right hon. Gentleman to serve on a Committee to deal with the expenditure of large sums of money every year is at the present time not appropriate, seeing that there are millions and millions of His Majesty's subjects dying of famine in India, and nothing is being done by the Government for them.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): I think we might have some sort of explanation from the Leader of the House as to the lines upon which he has proceeded in the composition of this Committee. It is usual in Select Committees; although this, of course, is not a party question; that the Government should have a majority of one. It seems to me that the Committee ought to represent, more than it does, the different countries. This is practically an English Committee. Ireland has one member, Wales has no member at all, and Scotland has two members, one of whom is the Leader of the Opposition. Scotland, at all events, ought to be better represented, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Stirling Burghs is on the Committee in his official capacity as Leader of the Opposition, so that we have only one unofficial member to represent the whole of Scotland. It seems to me that the Government should not be as well represented as they are, and I will even say that the Front Opposition Bench should not be so well represented. I do not

wish to divide against the right hon. Gentleman's name being included, but I do

desire to protest against the composition of the Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope the hon. Member will not go away with the impression that any unusual machinery has been used in the appointment of this Committee. We have followed the ordinary practice. The Government do not appoint the Committee. It is appointed by machinery with which the hon. Gentleman is thoroughly acquainted. The majority of Welsh Members sit on the other side of the House, and their interests should be looked after by light hon. Gentlemen opposite.

*Mr. TENNANT (Berwickshire): The right hon. Gentleman has said nothing about Scotland. I rose for the purpose of opposing my hon. friend on the ground that the right hon. Gentleman is a most admirable representative of Scotland, although he has the misfortune to be an English Member. But I do think Scotland has not been well treated in this matter, and that the Committee of Selection might have thought fit to propose some other Member from the country to which I have the honour to belong.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): As the First Lord of the Treasury has referred to the fact that the Welsh Members have made no complaint the composition of this Committee;

A. J. BALFOUR: I did not say so.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES: I think so.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What I said was that, as the House knows, we on this side of the House do not interfere with the selection of Members on the other side. The majority of Welsh Members are on that side of the House, and therefore their interests, if they have been neglected, which I do not at all admit, should have been looked after by gentlemen sitting on that side of the House, not on this.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES: That is exactly the fact I was leading up to. The Welsh Members are satisfied, because my right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouth and my hon. friend the Member for North Monmouth are to be Members of the Committee, and they look upon that as an admission that Monmouthshire is in future to be regarded as a part of Wales.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Will this be a private Committee, and will a record be kept?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The ordinary record will be kept, but the proceedings will, of course, be of a private nature.

Question put, and agreed to.

Motion made, and Question, "That Mr. Bartley, Sir John Brunner, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Frederick Dixon-Hartland, Sir William Hart-Dyke, Sir Henry Fowler, Sir William Harcourt be other Members of the said Committee," put and agreed to.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire

Cust, Henry John C.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Campbell-Banneman, Sir H.
Dewar, TR(T'rHmlets, St. Geo.
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Causton, Richard Knight
Dickson, Charles Scott
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Cavendish. R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Asquit J, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.
Bagot, Capt. Joceline FitzRoy
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Chamberlain. Rt. Hon J.(Birm.
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Baird, John Geo. Alexander
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Duke, Henry Edward
Baldwin, Alfred
Chapman. Edward
Duncan, James H.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Charrington, Spencer
Dunn, Sir William
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G.W. (Leeds)

Churchill, Winston Spencer
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart
Banbury, Frederick George
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Edwards, Frank
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Coddington, Sir William
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Bartley, George C. T.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Ellios, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Ellis, John Edward
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Emmott, Alfred
Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B (Hants)
Colomb, Sir J. Charles Ready
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Colston, Chas. E. H. Athole
Fardell, Sir T. George
Beckett, Ernest William
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Bigwood, James
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasg'w)
Fenwick, Charles
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Boulnois, Edmund
Craig, Robert Hunter
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Cranborne, Viscount
Fisher, William Hayes
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Cremer, William Randal
Fison, Frederick William
Brand, Hon. Arthur G
Cripps, Charles Alfred

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Flannery, Sir Fortescue

Motion made, and Question proposed. "That Sir Samuel Hoare be one other Member of the said Committee."

MR. DALZIEL: I need scarcely say that I have no personal objection to the hon. Gentleman whose name is now proposed. Under ordinary circumstances he would be a most excellent member of the Committee. The right hon. Gentleman represents an English constituency, and my sole object in opposing his selection is to move the insertion of the name of the hon. Member for Berwickshire as representing Scotland.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot move the insertion of a name. Names cannot be moved without notice.

MR. DALZIEL: Then I beg to move the omission.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member need not move the omission. He can negative the motion.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 300; Noes, 25. (Division List No. 52.)

Fletcher, Sir Henry
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Levy, Maurice
Rentoul, James Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Lock wood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Garfit, William
Long, Col. Chas. (Evesham)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Lowe, Francis William
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts)
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum.,. Penr
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Round, James
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsm'th)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Graham, Henry Robert
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison
Russell, T. W.
Grant, Corrie
Macdona, John Cumming
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Maconochie, A. W.
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Greene, Sir E. W.(BurySt. Ed.
M.Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Gretton, John
M 'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Greville, Hon. Ronald
M'Iver, SirLewis (Edinburgh W
Scott,Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Gunter, Colonel
M'Kenna, Reginald
Seely, Charles Hilton(Lincoln)
Hain, Edward
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Malcolm, Ian
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Markham, Arthur Basil
Simeon, Sir Harrington
Hamilton, Rt.Hn Lord G (Mid'x
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Mather, William
Smith. Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
Maxwell,RtHnSirHE(Wigton
Smith, JamesParker(Lanarks)
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil

Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Soares, Ernest J.
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Speneer, Rt. Hn. CR(Northants
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Stevenson, Francis S.
Heaton, John Henniker
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Strachey, Edward
Helme, Norval Watson
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Stroyan, John
Hoare, Ed. Brodie (Hampstead)
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Morrison, James Archibald
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Hogg, Lindsay
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Talbot, Rt. Hn J. G. (Oxf'd Univ
Holland, William Henry
Mount, William Arthur
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brig'htside
Muntz, Philip A.

Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower)
Horner, Frederick William
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Hy.
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Thornton, Percy M.
Hoult, Joseph
Myers, William Henry
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Nicholson, William Graham
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Valentin, Viscount
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Warner, Thos, Courtenay T.
Jones, David Brynmor (Sw'n's'a)
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Palmer, Geo. Wm. (Reading)
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney)
Kearley, Hudson E.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Welby, Lt-Col. ACE (Taunton)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.)
Pemberton, John S. G.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Kimber, Henry
Perks, Robert William
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Philipps, John Wynford
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)

Knowles, Lees
Pickard, Benjamin
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell-(B'm
Labouchere, Henry
Pilkington, Richard
Wills, Sir Frederick
Lambert, George
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wilson, Fred W (Norfolk, Mid)
Lambton, Hon. Fred. Wm.
Plummer, Walter R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Lawson, John Grant
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Ed. H.
Price, Robert John
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Lee, Capt. AH (Hants, Fareham
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Purvis, Robert
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Pym, C. Guy
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Leighton, Stanley
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Leng, Sir John
Reid, James (Greenock)
NOES.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Caldwell, James
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Black, Alexander William
Crombie, John William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Dike, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Caine, William Sproston

Elibank, Master of
Jacoby, James Alfred
Lewis, John Herbert
Sullivan, Donal
Yoxall, James Henry
Morton, Edw.J.C.(Devonport)
Tennant, Harold John
Pirie, Duncan V.
Wallace, Robert
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Weir, James Galloway
Mr. Dalziel and Mr. Eugene Wason.
Scott, Charles P. (Leigh)
Whiteley, G. (York, W. R.)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer

Ordered, That Mr. Jackson be one other Member of the Committee.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Sir James Kitson be one other Member of the Committee."; (Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

*Mr. KEIR HARDIE said he rose to move the omission of the name of Sir James Kitson. In the event of this name being omitted he wished to give notice that he would move to insert the name of the hon. Member for Battersea. He thought that it would be universally accepted by the House that there should be one direct representative of the work

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Dunn, Sir William
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Causton, Richard Knight
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Edwards, Frank
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatten
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Asher, Alexander
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)

Ellis, John Edward
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Chamberlain, J. Austen(Worc'r
Evans, Sir FrancisH.(Maidst.)
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Fardell, Sir T. George
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Chapmar, Edward
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Charrington, Spencer
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Fenwick, Charles
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.
Fergusson. Rt. Hn.Sir J (Manc'r
Baird, John George Alexander
Coddington, Sir William
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Baldwin, Alfred
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fisher, William Hayes
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J. Manch'r
Cohen, Benjamin L.
Fison, Frederick William
Balfour,RtHn.GeraldW(Leeds
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose
Banbury, Frederick George
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready
Fitzroy,Hn. Edward Algernon
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Colston, Chas. Edw H. Athole
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Bartley, George C. T.
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Corbett. A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry

Beach, Rt Hn.Sir M.H.(Bristol)
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Garfit, William
Beach, Rt. Hn.W.W.B.(Hants.
Craig, Robert Hunter
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Cranborne, Viscount
Gladstone, Rt.Hn. Herb. John
Beckett, Ernest William
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Bigwood, James
Crombie, John William
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Gordon, Maj. E. (T'r H'mlets)
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Gorst,Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Boulnois, Edmund
Cust, Henry John C.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Bowles, Capt. H.F. (Middlesex)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Graham, Henry Robert
Bowles, T.Gibson King's Lynn
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chathm
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh)
Green, WalfordD (Wednesbury
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. Sir John
Dewar, TR(T'r H'mlets,S.Geo.
Greene,Sir EW (B'ryS Edm'nds
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Dickson, Charles Scott
Gretton, John
Brown Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Dimsdale, Sir Jos. Cockfield
Gunter, Colonel
Bryce, Rt Hon. James

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
 Hain, Edward
 Burdett-Coutts, W.
 Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fd. Dixon
 Halsey, Thomas Frederick
 Burns, John
 Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
 Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Mid'x.
 Buxton, Sydney Charles
 Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
 Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
 Caine, William Sproston
 Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
 Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.

ing classes on the Committee, and he knew of no one who better represented the
 working classes than his lion, colleague and friend the Member for Battersea. He
 understood that Sir James Kitson had been nominated for the Committee by the
 Opposition. He was surprised that the Opposition in nominating Members of the
 Committee should have overlooked such representatives of labour as the hon.
 Member for Battersea and the hon. Member for Normanton, to whom they owed so
 much.

Question put.

The House divided:; Ayes. 307; Noes, 17. (Division List No. 53.)

Hardy, Laurence (K'nt, Ashf'rd
 M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
 Royds, Clement Molyneux
 Hare, Thomas Leigh
 Majendie, James A. H.
 Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
 Harmsworth, R. Leicester
 Malcolm, Ian
 Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
 Harris, F Leverton (Tynemouth
 Markham, Arthur Basil
 Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
 Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
 Martin, Richard Biddulph
 Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
 Haslett, Sir James Horner
 Mather, William
 Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
 Hay, Hon. Claude George
 Maxwell, Rt. Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n
 Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)
 Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
 Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh

Sharpe, William Edward T.
Heaton, John Henniker
Mellor, Rt. Hn. John Wm.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Helme, Norval Watson
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Sine lair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.
Hoare, Edw, Brodie (Hampstd.
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Milward, Colonel Victor
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Hogg, Lindsay
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Holland, William Henry
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightsd.
Moon, Edward Robert Racy
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Soares, Ernest J.
Horner, Frederick William
More, Robt, Jasper (Shropsh.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. CR (N'rthants.
Houldsworth, Sir William H.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Hoult, Joseph
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Howard, J. (Mid., Tottenham)
Morrison, James Archibald
Stevenson, Francis S.
Hozier, Hon. James H. Cecil
Morton, Arthur H.A. (Deptford
Stroyan, John
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Mount, William Arthur
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley

Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Muntz, Philip A.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Murray, RtHnA Grabam (Bute)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Joicey, Sir James
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Talbot, Rt.Hn. J.G. (Oxf'dUni.
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Myers, William Henry
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Kearley, Hudson E.
Nicholson, William Graham
Thornton, Percy M.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sri John H.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Valencia, Viscount
Kimber, Henry
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Wallace, Robert
Knowles, Lees
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Lambert, George
Palmer, George W. (Reading)
Wanklyn James Leslie
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Lawson, John Grant
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Pemberton, John S. G.
Wason, E. (Clackmannan)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. E. H.

Penn, John
Mason, John C. (Orkney)
Lee, Capt. A H (Hants,Fareham
Perks, Robert William
Welby,Lt.-Col. A C E(Taunton
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Philipps, John Wynford
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Pilkington, Richard
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Leighton, Stanley
Pirie, Duncan V.
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W.R.)
Leng, Sir John
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-n.-Lyne
Leveson-Gower, Fred N. S.
Plunmer, Walter R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Levy, Maurice
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Lewis, John Herbert
Pretymann, Ernest George
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Price, Robert John
Williams, Rt Hn J. Powell- (Bir.
Long, Col. Chas. W.(Evesham
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Wills, Sir Frederick
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Purvis, Robert
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pym, C. Guy
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Lowe, Francis William
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Wilson. J. W.(Worcestersh.N.
Lowther, Rt. Hon. Jas. (Kent
Reckitt, Harold James
Wodehouse,Hn.Armine(Essex
Lucas, Col Francis(Lowestoft)
Renshaw, Charles Bine

Wortley, Rt. Hon.C. B.Stuart-
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmonuth
Rentoul, James Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Macartney, Rt.Hn.WG Ellison
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Macdona, John Cumming
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Young, Commander(Berks,E.)
Maconochie, A. W.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
Ropner, Col. Robert
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
M'Iver, SirLewis(Edinb'h,W.)
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Round, James
NOES.

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouce., Stroud
Kinloch, Sir John GeorgeSmyth
Tennant, Harold John
Brown, GeorgeM. (Edinburgh)
Morton,Ed w. J. C. (Devonport)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgn, Gower
Caldwell, James
Murphy, J.
Yoxall, James Henry
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Pickard, Benjamin
Elibank, Master of
Russell, T. W.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Grant, Corrie

Shipman, Dr. John G.
Mr. Keir Hardie and Mr. Cremer.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Smith, Samuel (Flint)

Ordered, That Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Macartney, Mr. M'Kenna, Mr. Mildmay, Mr.
Renshaw, Mr. W. F. D. Smith, Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Warr, and Mr. Wharton be other
Members of the Committee.

Ordered, That Five be the quorum.:(Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (REPORTS OF MONEY COMMITTEES).

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I beg now to move the Sessional Order which stands in my name. This is a Sessional Order which has been in force for many years in the House, and for the last six years it has been immediately passed without discussion or division. It is a necessary rule in cases in which special arrangements have to be made. The effect of it will be, not to increase the twenty-three days allotted to Supply, including Report of Supply, but to extend the length of time that will be available for the discussions by exempting them from the operation of the Twelve o'clock Rule. It has worked well in the past under different Administrations and under different conditions.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Proceedings on the Reports of the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means and other Committees authorising the expenditure of public money may be entered upon at any hour though opposed, and shall not be interrupted under the provisions of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, except of Standing Order No. 5.";(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

*Mr. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe) said that this was another of the rather numerous interferences by the Leader of the House with the Standing Orders. The House had only been sitting some twenty days, and there had already been five motions by the right hon. Gentleman interfering with or suspending the Standing Orders. He appreciated all that the right hon. Gentleman had said in regard to the motion having been passed more or less without discussion during the last six years. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of the Twelve o'clock Rule, but really there was no such rule. He remembered very well when they were discussing the Standing Order that the right hon. the Member for Wolverhampton pointed out what would happen, namely, that the House would accept the Standing Order as meaning an adjournment at twelve o'clock, and that that would produce inconvenience so far as urgent business was concerned. The prediction of the right hon. Gentleman had been amply fulfilled. They had put into the hands of any one of the 670 Members the possibility and power of stopping all business after twelve o'clock. Of course the Government found that that was a state of things that they could not put up with for a moment; and the Amendment was to take away from the individual Member the power of stopping business at twelve o'clock. They could all understand that the right hon. Gentleman moved the Amendment in the interest of a certain class of business which must be got through by the 31st March. This was an altogether exceptional session. Everybody knew that finance would dominate this session, and possibly the next, to the exclusion of everything else. They would have to deal with the most extraordinary and unparalleled demands on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the purse of the taxpayer, and every other subject would practically be set aside. The Report of Supply was one of the opportunities of criticising the Administration.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: This motion, if I might interrupt the hon. Member, is to increase and not to diminish the amount of time given by the Government.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS said he had noticed there fell from the Chair the other afternoon at question time an intimation that certain matters ought to be dealt with in Supply rather than by question and answer. Now, by the motion it was

suggested that these discussions should go on through the small hours of the morning. The light hon. Gentleman said he was increasing the time for' discussion, but if so he was doing so after midnight, and there were other ways of doing it without such a course.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I did not make it quite clear when I spoke just now, but I think I can make it so. In the session there are only twenty-three days for Supply, including Report of Supply. Those twenty-three days, if you commence Supply at four o'clock, only contain eight hours each between that time and twelve o'clock. If you pass this rule the hours of those twenty-three days will be increased, which is a pure gain to the House for discussion and criticism of the Government.

*Mr. JOHN ELLIS said that when in Opposition the Leader of the House once declared this very motion to be a considerable interference with the ancient privileges of Supply, and so it was. He acknowledged the need of the resolution up to Easter, and with that object he moved an Amendment limiting the application of the motion "until Easter."

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) formally seconded the Amendment. Amendment proposed;

"After the first word 'That,' to insert the words 'until Easter.'"; (Mr. John Ellis.)

Question proposed, "That the words 'until Easter' be there inserted."

Mr. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet) said he viewed with some jealousy any attempt to override the letter and spirit of what was known as the Twelve o'clock Rule, and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, owing to the force of circumstances, had been a very great offender in this respect. The right hon. Gentleman said that by the House sitting until two or three in the morning it would derive two or three hours benefit for the discussion of financial business.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No, no; the House, in the one case, will have twenty-three days for the discussion of Supply. If you do not pass this rule you will have no more, but if the rule is passed the hours of those days will be increased.

Mr. JAMES LOWTHER said the right hon. Gentleman appeared to think he was conferring a benefit on the House by allowing it to sit up to the small hours of the morning. He did not think so. His main object, however, in rising was to ask the right hon. Gentleman to give an assurance similar to that which had been extracted from him on former occasions, that Supply, excluding the Report, should not be continued after twelve o'clock. What everyone desired was to make it clear that twelve o'clock was the hour when opposed business came to a conclusion in the House. Financial business ought not to be restricted, but at the same time it was not necessary that it should be contracted. Sitting to these late hours was contrary to the principles of conducting business in the House, and the constant suspension of the Twelve o'clock Rule was really becoming a crying evil, and one which every Member ought to vote against.

Mr. T. M. HEALY strongly supported the Amendment. He assumed that the Civil List Committee would be one of the "other Committees authorising the expenditure of

public money," and it would be an extraordinary thing if the House was to continue to discuss every matter arising out of that Committee after midnight. The Government ought to give an undertaking that all Civil List matters, which necessarily were of great importance, should not be brought under this rule. One reason which inclined him strongly to support the Amendment was that only three days was allowed for the discussion of Irish Supply, and, owing to the procedure last week, a great many Irish Estimates had not been discussed, and the only opportunity left was upon Report of Supply; but in the last two sessions not an Irish Member was allowed to open his mouth upon the subject. They were not allowed to discuss, for instance, the way in which the Royal Irish Constabulary was conducted. Let the House consider what it would mean if hon. Members were not allowed to discuss the Navy and the Army. Yet the Irish were not allowed to discuss the Royal Irish Constabulary, which was a sign of British rule in Ireland. In former times the Government always put down Report of Supply at a reasonable hour; the present resolution was an attempt on the part of the Government to commence discussion on Report of Supply after twelve o'clock. Members did not realise how many Irish items were undiscussed by this procedure. The result of the system was that owing to the way Irish Supply was put down, the whole twenty-three days was exhausted without any discussion taking place upon it, and the whole of Irish Supply upon Report stage was dealt with after twelve o'clock, which meant that Irish Members had no opportunity of criticising this expenditure. He complained of the way in which their opportunities were curtailed, and thought that if they were to be curtailed in the future as they had been in the past, and were being now, it would be cheaper and easier to exclude the Irish Members altogether. That was a motion he would heartily support, because it was a mockery to bring Members over from Ireland to discuss Irish matters, and give them no opportunity for doing so except at irregular times, in an irregular manner, which must give in the end irregular results. If the Government were not prepared to accept the Amendment, they should give some explanation for not doing so. In his opinion they had reached the limit of taxation, and the motion was to stifle discussion. The result was that the House was losing all control over money matters, and had to abide by the decision of Ministers. One occasionally noticed protests against monarchy, but monarchy was tolerable compared with oligarchy, and he did not know whether if there were a British Republic, with Lord Salisbury as its first President, the country would be much better off than under Edward VII.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis), said that the right hon. Gentleman had presented the resolution to the House as a perfectly harmless, innocuous, and, indeed, profitable resolution. So far as the House of Commons was concerned, he had pointed out that there were only twenty-three days for Supply, including the Report stage, and that whatever on the last of those twenty-three days had not been discussed would be guillotined and taken as reported. That might be true, but there were two other matters connected with the resolution which the right hon. Gentleman had not touched upon. The resolution proposed to give to Parliament hours for discussion which Parliament had excluded as being

improper. There was also a Committee authorising the expenditure of public money which had nothing to do with Supply; the Ways and Means Committee. The Civil List Committee was one of those which this session would be included in the term "other Committees authorising the expenditure of public money." Surely that was not a matter that should be treated in this way. He did not anticipate any difficulty in that matter, but, of course there were many stages to go through. First of all there was the Select Committee and then there was the Committee of the House. It was a matter of absolutely the first importance, and no opportunity ought to be lightly given away by the House of Commons for its discussion according to the ancient rules of the House. Not only had the Civil List to be fully and adequately discussed in the Committee of the whole House, but the Report should also be taken at an hour which would show proper respect for the Sovereign. The Government had already taken away the immemorial right of moving Amendments on going into Committee of Ways and Means. Last Monday, when they were entering upon the course of shutting down one after another the safety valves of the House, he warned them that they would have an explosion, and on Tuesday the explosion came. The Government were now proposing to shut another safety valve. The Report of the Committee on Ways and Means would this year have an importance which it had never had before in that House. It was in the Committee of Ways and Means that the Budget would be moved. If ever there was an occasion on which the House ought still to jealously preserve the right of discussing financial questions surely it was this year. He did not know what new taxes; perhaps protective taxes, which were favoured by his right hon. friend the Member for Isle of Thanet; were to be proposed. He really thought the Leader of the House ought not to ask them to give up the opportunity for discussing at proper hours the Report of the Committee on Ways and Means. As to the Amendment before the House, he did not care twopence about it. It was not a question of applying the motion before or after Easter. He looked at this matter as it affected the facilities afforded to private and unofficial Members to do their duty to their constituents. He deeply deplored the successive shutting down of all these safety valves, and he regretted that the Government had found it necessary to propose this motion.

MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.) said the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury had treated this motion as if it had nothing to do with anything but the Committee of Supply.

AYES.

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Grant, Corrie

O'Brien, Patrick (Ki kenny)

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)

Haldane, Richard Burdon

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

Ambrose, Robert

Hammond, John

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Barlow, John Emmott
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Dowd, John
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Black, Alexander William
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
O'Malley, William
Blake, Edward
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Mara, James
Boland, John
Holland, William Henry
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Jacoby, James Alfred
Palmer, Sir Charles M (Durham
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Joicey, Sir James
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Broadhurst, Henry
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Perks, Robert William
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Philipps, John Wynford
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Jordan, Jeremiah
Pickard, Benjamin
Burke, E. Haviland-
Joyce, Michael
Pirie, Duncan V.
Burns, John
Kearley, Hudson E.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Kennedy, Patrick James

Price, Robert John
Caine, William Sproston
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Caldwell, James
Labouchere, Henry
Reckitt, Harold James
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lambert, George
Reddy, M.
Carew, James Laurence
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Redmond, William (Clare)
Causton, Richard Knight
Leng, Sir John
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Cogan, Denis J.
Levy, Maurice
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Lloyd-George, David
Roche, John
Cremer, William Randal
Lowther, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Kent)
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Crombie, John William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Dalziel, James Henry
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Dermott, Patrick
Shipman, Dr John G.
Delany, William
M'Kenna, Reginald
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)

Markham, Arthur Basil
Soares, Ernest J.
Dully, William J.
Mather, William
Stevenson, Francis S.
Duncan, James H.
Mellor, Rt. Hn. John William
Strachey, Edward
Dunn, Sir William
Mooney, John J.
Sullivan, Donal
Edwards, Frank
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Tennant, Harold John
Elibank, Master of
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Thomas, A. (Carmarthen, E.)
Emmott, Alfred
Moulton, John Fletcher
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstn'e
Murphy, J.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Farrell, James Patrick
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Tally, Jasper
Fenwick, Charles
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Wallace, Robert
Flynn, James Christopher
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Furness, Sir Christopher
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)

*MR. SPEAKER said the Amendment before the House was limited entirely to the operation of the Twelve o'clock Rule before Easter.

MR. BLAKE said he was pursuing the course pursued by the hon. Members for North Louth and King's Lynn.

*MR. SPEAKER said the hon. Gentleman was now discussing the main question. Of

course it would be in order to discuss that afterwards, but he thought they had better dispose of the question before the House first.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 151; Noes, 254. (Division List No. 54.)

Weir, James Galloway

Wilson, John (Glasgow)

TELLERS FOR THE AYES;

White, Luke (York, E. R.)

Wodehouse, Hon. A. (Essex)

Mr. John Ellis and Dr. Farquharson.

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Williams, Osmond (Merioneth

Yoxall, James Henry

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Dickson, Charles Scott

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Dimsdale, Sir J. Cockfield

Kimber, Henry

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

King, Sir Henry Seymour

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred. D.

Knowles, Lees

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Dorington, Sir John Edward

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.

Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Lawson, John Grant

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Lee, Capt A H. (Hants. Fareham

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Darning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Carrie

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Leighton, Stanley
Baird, John Geo. Alexander
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Baldwin, Alfred
Fardell, Sir T. George
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch'h)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Lowe, Francis William
Banbury, Frederick George
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Fisher, William Haves
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Hartley, George C. T.
Fison, Frederick William
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Macdonald, John Cumming
Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B. (Hants
Elannery, Sir Fortescue
Maconochie, A. W.
Beckett, Ernest William
Fletcher, Sir Henry
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Forster, Henry William
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall
Bigwood, James
Garfit, William
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Blundell, Col. Henry
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.

Majendie, James A. H.
Bond, Edward
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)
Malcolm, Ian
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert J.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Boulnois, Edmund
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Gordon, Maj. E.-(T'r Hamlets)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Graham, Henry Robert
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury)
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Bull, William James
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Milward, Colonel Victor
Bullard, Sir Harry
Gretton, John
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Gunter, Colonel
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Hain, Edward
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hall, Edward Marshall
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Morrison, James Archibald
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Chapman, Edward
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nderry
Mount, William Arthur
Charrington, Spencer
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
Muntz, Philip A.
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Coddington, Sir William
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Myers, William Henry
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Nicholson, William Graham
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Colomb, Sir J. Charles Ready
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampsd.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Hogg, Lindsay
Parker, Gilbert
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Cranborne, Viscount
Horner, Frederick William
Pemberton, John S. G.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Penn, John
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Hoult, Joseph
Pilkington, Richard
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
Howard, J. (Mid., Tottenham)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Hy. Cecil
Plummer, Walter R.
Cast, Henry John C.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Jessel, Cap. Herbert Merton
Pretymann, Ernest George
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Pryce-Jones, Lt. Col. Edward
Dewar, T. R. (T'r H'mlets S. Geo.
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Purvis, Robert
Pym, C. Guy
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Valentia, Viscount
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Simeon, Sir Harrington
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)

Wason, John C. (Orkney)
 Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
 Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
 Webb, Colonel William George
 Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
 Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand
 Welby, Lt. -Col. ACE (Taunton
 Ropner, Colonel Robert
 Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
 Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
 Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
 Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich
 Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne
 Round, James
 Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
 Wills, Sir Frederick
 Royds, Clement Molyneux
 Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
 Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.
 Russell, T. W.
 Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
 Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
 Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
 Sturt, Hon. Humphrey Napier
 Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
 Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
 Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
 Yerburch, Robert Armstrong
 Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
 Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Uni.
 Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
 Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.
 Thorburn, Sir Walter
 Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
 Thornton, Percy M.
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
 Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
 Tritton, Charles Ernest
 Seton-Karr, Henry
 Tufnell, Col. Edward

MR. BLAKE said the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman was absolutely inadequate. It had been proved to demonstration that twenty-three days were absolutely inadequate for the orderly discussion of these matters, and as there was not time to discuss them in that period, they were told that they must find hours after midnight to carry on the business. They had to remember that the Votes in Supply this session would probably be of unexampled extent, and in many

respects would be special and peculiar. They had to remember that the discussion on the Report was of a very important character. It represented the sober second thought of the House. It was unfortunate in such a session that a motion should be proposed requiring that the discussion should take place at untimely and unseemly hours, for that was practically what it meant. It was a proposal that the discussion should take place at a time when it was practically impossible that it could be effective. The situation of the country with reference to Ways and Means was of the most serious character. They knew the extent of the expenditure, but they did not know in the slightest degree the methods by which it was to be met, and to say beforehand that the discussion on the Report of the Committee on Ways and Means was to be taken at two, three, or four in the morning, was much more serious this session than it would be when ordinary Budgets were presented.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton) said he was opposed entirely to the new rule. If it was to be pressed it was desir-

able that it should, to a certain extent be amended. In 1837, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the day moved the appointment of a Committee on the Civil List, he stated to the House what the proposals of the Government would be. He contended that the House would not have a full opportunity of discussing the Bill if they were obliged to take it at two or three o'clock in the morning, as business was done in a very perfunctory fashion at that hour. He therefore moved to omit the words "and of other Committees authorising the expenditure of public money."

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs) in seconding the Amendment considered that in a session which was to be practically a financial session, the opportunities of criticising the expenditure of public money, instead of being limited should be increased. There were to be a war bill of practically £90,000,000, an enormous increase in the normal expenditure upon the Army, a considerable increase of the expenditure upon the Navy, and a Budget Bill almost unparalleled in the financial history of the country. Two things characterised the management of public affairs by the present Government: firstly, the enormous increase in public expenditure; and, secondly, the greatly diminished opportunities for discussing that expenditure. Hardly a session had passed since their accession to office but the First Lord had set up some new precedent for limiting discussion; and no Leader had ever dared so much to crib, cabin, and confine the House of Commons in the exercise of its primary function and duty. It was absurd to say that matters could be discussed after 12 o'clock. Such discussion was really no discussion at all, as it was absolutely ineffective in calling public attention to the questions considered. The First Lord was nullifying the effect of his favourite weapon, as on the one hand he applied the closure, and on the other he advised the House to discuss questions after 12 o'clock. After midnight the House was not in full command of its temper or faculties, and to press important business after that hour was simply to provoke a repetition of the scenes recently experienced. The First Lord did not gain wisdom from experience, but was insisting on perpetuating that state of things which had been condemned by one of the most disgraceful scenes the House of Commons or any

other House had ever witnessed.

Amendment proposed;

"In line 3, to leave out the words 'and other Committees authorising the expenditure of public money.'" (Mr. Labouchere.)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member has ranged over a great variety of topics, and concluded with some observations with regard to the curtailment of discussion on expenditure. I do not know what discussion of expenditure the hon. Gentleman had in his mind when he used that argument. I have already pointed out to the House that so far as the ordinary opportunities of discussing expenditure are concerned the rule as it stands is in addition to those advantages, and not in limitation of them. The hon. Gentleman's observation therefore seemed to be singularly wide of the mark. But all that is apart from the criticism of the hon. Member for South Longford and that of the hon. Member who moved the Amendment. Those hon. Members were not dealing with criticism of Supply or on Report of Supply. The hon. Member for South Longford was concerned as to the Report stage generally of all Money Bills, and the hon. Member for Northampton was distinctly concerned, as I understood him, about the Civil List. What invasion of the privileges of Members does this rule carry with it? We are not discussing Committee of Supply; we are taking those Committees in which a Bill is introduced. Take the Civil List. What opportunities will the House have with or without this Amendment of discussing the Civil List? The Bill will have to be introduced in a Money Committee; that Committee will no doubt stand first Order of the Day, and will be open to the full discussion which such a position gives. The Report of that Money Committee may be taken after twelve o'clock, and my hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn appeared to think that that was an invasion of the ancient privileges and practice of this House. But under the old conditions everything could be discussed after twelve o'clock, and so far as this motion of mine has any effect at all on the procedure of the House it is reverting to the ancient practice of discussing the Report stage of these Committees after twelve o'clock.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: There was no closure then.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What relation has that to my argument? My argument is that this Amendment of mine, instead of diminishing opportunities of discussion, is restoring to the House the old opportunities of which I am accused of robbing them. The Budget has been referred to. The Budget will be introduced in Committee of Ways and Means. It will be discussed in Committee of Ways and Means, then on the Report of that Committee, then on the Second Reading of the Budget Bill, then in Committee, then, if there is any alteration, on Report, and finally on Third Reading. There are thus five stages upon which the Budget can be discussed, and all the present resolution does is to say that one of those stages may be taken after twelve o'clock. This is the invasion of ancient privileges which has provoked the philippics of the hon. Gentleman opposite; It appears to me that the course we are taking is one eminently for the convenience of the House, and I trust it will, without further

discussion, be agreed to.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) believed the practical effect of the resolution would be to repeal the Twelve o'clock Rule. Experience had proved that all work done after midnight was practically useless. The provincial, and especially the Irish press, could have no report of the proceedings, and millions of money might be voted without the public knowledge. If any encouragement were needed to resist the motion it was supplied by the Vote of £17,000,000 which was closed a few nights previously without anything like adequate discussion. In the present session, above all others, opportunities for full discussion were needed, but no Minister had ever done more to limit those opportunities or to curtail the liberties of debate than the right hon. Gentleman the present Leader of the House.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said he should always support the rights of private Members, but it was a pity to fight over a matter which was really in no way a deprivation. It was absurd to talk about the loss of ancient privileges. When he first entered the House the discussion on Supply and Report was practically all carried on after twelve o'clock, whereas now there were twenty-three days for Supply, and the Estimates had never been discussed so well as since the introduction of the present system. He thought it was a tactical mistake to close the Vote on Account on the preceding Tuesday, but the fact remained that if the Government had allowed another night to the discussion it would simply have meant a day less for the remaining Estimates, so that it was really to the advantage, rather than the reverse, of private Members. On occasions there was an advantage in being able to speak on Votes of Supply after twelve o'clock, and without doubt such a power as this did enable the Government to carry on its business in the face of determined opposition which sometimes existed.

MR. DALZIEL could not follow the argument that this resolution would confer extra time for discussing Supply. If the resolution was not passed the Report of Supply would have to be dealt with before twelve o'clock, and consequently in Government time.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It would be closed.

MR. DALZIEL would much rather have the closure and no discussion than the farce of a discussion after twelve o'clock. It was amazing to hear the First Lord talking as if he would like to go back to the ancient times before the Twelve o'clock Rule was passed. The very worst thing the House could do would be to encourage such a course in any but the most exceptional circumstances. If in such a session as the present this resolution was to be passed, why did not the right hon. Gentleman have the courage of what appeared to be his opinion, and suspend the Twelve o'clock Rule altogether? It was no good the House deluding itself with the idea that it was sitting under the Twelve o'clock Rule if day after day it had to look at its Order Paper to see whether there was any Report of Supply to be taken which might occupy several hours after midnight. Seeing that only one item of the Vote on Account closed a few nights before had been discussed, it was almost certain there would be a very late, if not an all-night, sitting on the Report stage of that Vote. The right hon. Gentleman was really working the House a little too far. A most important discussion with

regard to the Civil List might take place after midnight. There would be a Select Committee; the Select Committee would make a Report; in order to carry out that Report a Bill would be required; that Bill could only be brought before the House on a resolution in Committee of Ways and Means; and the Report on that would come after twelve o'clock. In view of the character of the business before the House this session, and the enormous demands already made, he considered a case had not been made out for the resolution.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) rather envied the light heart with which the Leader of the House calmly proposed that they should go back to the struggles and hours which obtained in the sessions between 1880 and 1887, but if those conditions were to be renewed he believed that many Members would before long find the

preservation of their health to be inconsistent with their remaining Members of the House. If this rule was passed, Members would begin seriously to discuss between midnight and two or three o'clock in the morning questions they had been unable to debate at other periods of the session, with the result that Ministers and officials of the House, and perhaps, under existing circumstances, the police also, would be compelled once more to return to the bad habits which he thought the House had given up for ever. It was impossible that complicated diplomacy and intricate negotiation could be satisfactorily carried on by Ministers who came to their offices jaded and weary after a late sitting in the House. The right hon. Gentleman was a strong supporter of the principles of the Monarchy, but could anything be more calculated to prejudice the repute of the Monarchy in this country than that a proposal with regard to the revenues of the Crown should be brought forward in the small hours of the morning, when there was no reasonable opportunity for discussing

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Dinning Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r)
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Chapman, Edward
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Charrington, Spencer
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Bain, Col. James Robert
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Fisher, William Hayes
Baird, John George Alexander
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Fison, Frederick William
Balcarres, Lord
Coghill, Douglas Harry
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Baldwin, Alfred
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J (Manch'r
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
F'lannery, Sir Fortescue
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christchch
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Forster, Henry William
Banbury, Frederick George
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Garfit, William
Bartley, George C. T.
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond-
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Beach, Rt. Hon. W W. B. (Hants
Cranborne, Viscount
Gordon, Maj. E.-(T'r Hamlets)
Beckett, Ernest William
Cripps, Charles Alfred

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
 Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
 Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
 Goulding, Edward Alfred
 Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
 Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
 Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
 Bigwood, James
 Cubitt, Hon. Henry
 Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury)
 Blundell, Col. Henry
 Cust, Henry John C.
 Greene, Sir E W (Bury St Edmunds)
 Bond, Edward
 Dalrymple, Sir Charles
 Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
 Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
 Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
 Gretton, John
 Boulnois, Edmund
 Dewar, T. R (Tremblets, St Geo.
 Greville, Hon. Ronald
 Bowles, Capt H. F. (Middlesex)
 Dickinson, Robert Edmond
 Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
 Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
 Dickson, Charles Scott
 Gunter, Colonel
 Brookfield, Col. Montagu
 Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
 Guthrie, Walter Murray
 Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
 Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.
 Hain, Edward
 Bull, William James
 Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
 Hall, Edward Marshall
 Bullard, Sir Harry
 Dixon-Hartland. Sir Fred. D.
 Halsey, Thomas Frederick
 Cavendish, R. E. (N. Lancs.)
 Dorington, Sir John Howard
 Hamilton, Rt Hon Lord G (Middx)

the question, or of having the debates reported in the press? The hon. Member strongly protested against the resolution, and warned the House that, if carried, it would mean a return to the bad old time when Members considered

themselves very lucky if they were able to get to bed between four and five o'clock in the morning.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.) said that the First Lord of the Treasury stated that his motion would give them additional time, but it would be illegitimate time, when their minds and bodies were jaded. He protested against being compelled to sit in the House up to such untimely hours of the morning. The ancient usage to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred was repealed on account of its oppressiveness, and now the First Lord of the Treasury wished to retain not only this ancient usage but the closure as well.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 253; Noes. 161. (Division List No. 55.)

Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfr'd

Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n

Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter

Hare, Thomas Leigh

Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire

Round, James

Harris, F Leverton (Tynemouth

Melville, Beresford Valentine

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Haslam, Sir Alfred S.

Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.

Russell, T. W.

Haslett, Sir James Horner

Middlemore, J'h'n Throgmorton

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Hay, Hon. Claude George

Milton, Viscount

Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)

Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotte

Milward, Colonel Victor

Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert

Higginbottom, S. W.

Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.

Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstd)

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.

Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E

Moon, Edward Robert Pacy

Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)

Hogg, Lindsay

Moore, William (Antrim. N.)

Seton-Karr, Henry

Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside

More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)

Sharpe, William Edward T.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Morrell, George Herbert
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Hoult, Joseph
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Morrison, James Archibald
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Win. Lawies
Mount, William Arthur
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Muntz, Philip A.
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. Graham (Bute
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Stroyan, John
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Myers, William Henry
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Nicholson, William Graham
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Thorburn, Sir Walter
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Thornton, Percy M.
Knowles, Lees
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Tritton, Charles Ernest

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Win.
Parker, Gilbert
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Law, Andrew Bonar
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington
Valentia, Viscount
Lawson, John Grant
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Lee, Capt. A H (Hants, Fareham
Pemberton, John S. G.
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Penn, John
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Pilkington, Richard
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham
Plummer, Walter R.
Webb, Colonel William George
Long, Rt Hon Walter (Bristol, S)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Welby, Lt. Col. A C E (Taunton
Lowe, Francis William
Pretymann, Ernest George
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Pryce-Jones, Lieut.-Col. Edw.
Whiteley, H (Asht'n und. Lyne
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Purvis, Robert
Wills, Sir Frederick
Lyttleton, Hon. Alfred
Pym, C. Guy
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Macartney, Rt Hon W.G. Ellison
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Macdonald, John dimming
Remnant, James Farquharson
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Maconochie, A. W.

Renshaw, Charles Bine
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Rentoul, James Alexander
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Majendie, James A. H.
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybridge
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Malcolm, Ian
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Sir William Walrond and
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Caine, William Sproston
Emmott, Alfred
Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Caldwell, James
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Ambrose, Robert
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Farrell, James Patrick
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herbert Henry
Carew, James Laurence
Fenwick, Charles
Atherley-Jones, L.
Causton, Richard Knight
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith
Barlow, John Emmott
Cogan, Denis J.
Ffrench, Peter
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Flynn, James Christopher
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.

Cremer, William Randal
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
Bell, Richard
Crombie, John William
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Black, Alexander William
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Furness, Sir Christopher
Blake, Edward
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert Jn.
Boland, John
Delany, William
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Dewar John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Grant, Corrie
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Dilke, lit. Hon. Sir Charles
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Broadhurst, Henry
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Hammond, John
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Duffy, William J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Sir William
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Duncan, James H.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Dunn, Sir William
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Burke, E. Haviland-
Edwards, Frank
Hayden, John Patrick
Burns, John
Elibank, Master of
Healy, Timothy Michael
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Ellis, John Edward
Helme, Norval Watson
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.

Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Holland, William Henry
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Norman, Henry
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Joicey, Sir James
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Soares, Ernest J.
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northn'ts.
Joyce, Michael
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Kearley, Hudson E.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Strachey, Edward
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Sullivan, Donal
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Tennant, Harold John
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Dowd, John
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Leng, Sir John
O' Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r
Levy, Maurice
O'Malley, William
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Lewis, John Herbert
O'Mara, James
Tully, Jasper

Lloyd-George, David
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Wallace, Robert
Lough, Thomas
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Lowther, Rt. Hn. Jas. (Kent)
Perks, Robert William
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Philipps, John Wynford
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Pickford, Benjamin
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
M'Arthur, Wm. (Cornwall)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Weir, James Galloway
M'Dermott, Patrick
Power, Patrick Joseph
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Price, Robert John
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Reckitt, Harold James
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Mather, William
Reddy, M.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth
Mellor, Kt. Hon. John Wm.
Redmond, John E (Waterford)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Mooney, John J.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Yoxall, James Henry
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfr.
Morton, Ed. J. C. (Devonport)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Moulton, John Fletcher
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Mr. Labouchere and Mr. Dalziel.
Murphy, J.
Roche, John

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) moved an Amendment to leave out the Report of Supply of 5th March from the operation of the motion before the House. He believed he was correct in stating that there was no precedent for the moving of the closure upon a Vote amounting to £17,000,000 after one night's debate.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member cannot discuss at this point the application of the closure.

MR. TULLY said he was striving to give his reasons, and one was that this Vote of £17,000,000;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is not entitled to go into that question.

MR. TULLY said they wished to discuss the Report of Supply of the 5th of March at a reasonable hour, so that they could have a full and frank discussion upon all the different items. He thought that under the circumstances the First Lord of the Treasury might agree to exempt this particular Vote. He thought it was entirely unprecedented

to closure a Vote on Account of £17,000,000;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member must not enter upon that subject.

MR. T. M. HEALY: We cannot hear your words, Mr. Speaker, owing to the disorder on the other side.

Amendment proposed;

"In line 3, to insert, after the word 'Money,' the words 'excepting the Report of Supply of 5th March.'"(Mr. Tully.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I have generally voted with the Government on this rule in reference to Report of Supply and Report of Ways and Means. I voted against them on the last motion. That was a separate matter, and it was only used in the year 1896. I thought there was a great deal of force in the objection taken to the Civil List. I think what the hon. Member has just asked for might reasonably be granted. I think that one night's discussion on such a large matter, involving so much money and so many subjects as that Vote of Account, is not sufficient. It is not a question of an ordinary Vote in Supply, and it is rather misleading to call it a Vote in Supply. The right hon. Gentleman has said that, after all, if there is to be another day granted to this Vote it must come out of the private Members' time. That is quite true, but I think it is a very reasonable solution, and it is not asking the Government to sacrifice any Government time, to grant what the hon. Member has asked for. It would come out of the time allotted to Supply, and I think it would be a good way of dealing with this question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I fear there is still a certain amount of misconception in the House in regard to this matter. I have already endeavoured to remove it, but once again I will try to explain. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment said he did so on the ground that two millions of the amount of the Vote on Account was for Irish purposes in which Irish Members were interested, which he thought should be discussed, and he thought the proper place to discuss it was on the Vote on Account. But the right hon. Gentleman, on general grounds, expressed an

opinion that more time should be given to the Vote on Account. So far as the Government are concerned, it matters not a farthing whether the whole of the twenty-three days are devoted to discussion of Estimates in the form of Votes on Account or in the specific form of separate Votes. It is a more convenient proceeding to discuss Votes by arrangement when you know what the Votes are, than in the loose and uncertain fashion which is inevitable if they are discussed on the Vote on Account. I quite grant that hon. Gentlemen opposite have a natural and legitimate desire to discuss both the Irish Local Government Board and the Irish Constabulary Votes, but the only question is whether it would not be more convenient to discuss them on the Irish Estimates on a day fixed beforehand when these Votes would be put down first. I would point out to the right hon. Gentleman that his legitimate desire to discuss these Votes might not be fulfilled

if I followed the course he suggests; for, suppose the Report of the Vote on Account were put down as the first Order next Friday, those Votes might never be reached. It is in the power of the Government to print the Votes in what order they like; following a practice which, I admit, is unusual, but which is I think, convenient, and which was adopted to facilitate discussion; and therefore I made an appeal, through the proper channel, to the Leader of the Opposition to know what Votes he desired to come on first.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Did the right hon. Gentleman make any communication to the Irish party in settling the order of the Votes?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir; I did not.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The right hon. Gentleman has boasted over and over again, if I may use the expression, that in settling the order of Votes he has taken care to consult the convenience of Members in all quarters of the House; and it has been the practice to consult the representatives of the Irish party. But on this occasion he neglected to do so.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In deciding in what order the Votes on the Irish Estimates should come up on the day fixed for these Estimates, the wishes of the Irish Members are supreme. I have always admitted that; but in regard to the Vote on Account, the Government have to consider the wishes of the Opposition as a whole, and not a particular section of it. Now, what I come to is this: having, to the best of my ability, put down the Votes in the order which I thought was most convenient, it is impossible that that order can be altered on the Report stage. If the Vote on Account was put down first on Friday night, it would not prevent any Member of the House from raising points on an earlier Vote than those in which the hon. Gentleman is interested; and we should be as far off from the Votes for the Irish Local Government Board and the Irish Constabulary as on Tuesday last. Therefore, if it were the view of the Opposition that more time should

be given to the Irish Local Government Board Vote at the expense of other Votes, the Government are quite ready to accede to that wish. We have no desire to burke discussion on that Vote or any other Vote; but the convenient method for arriving at it, is not to put down the Vote on Account, but to fix a day convenient to the Irish Members for the discussion of the Irish Estimates. I

regard it as almost an essential part of the new Supply rule that the greater part of the time should be devoted to specific Votes and the smallest portion of time to vague discussions of Votes on Account. If the Opposition prefer a broad, loose, and mixed discussion to precise, specific, and fixed discussion, I think they are wrong; but it is not for the Government to complain, as the total amount of time taken from the Government resources is not increased. But I do beg hon. Gentlemen to understand, if they want the Estimates to be properly discussed, that the proper way to arrive at it is not by promiscuous debate on Votes on Account, but by insisting on specific Votes being brought forward on Fridays. I assure hon. Gentlemen opposite, if they are going to press me to give another of the twenty-three days for Supply to the Vote on Account, I shall accede to the request, but I would rather that they would allow us, as soon as possible, to go into the orderly, businesslike, and pre-arranged debates which are only possible when we take the Votes in their order.

MR. T. M. HEALY said the right hon. Gentleman had spoken of the Opposition, but he seemed to have forgotten that there was only one Opposition now; the Irish Opposition; at least, since the Liberal party had chosen to tread "the Primrose path of dalliance" marked out for it by Lord Rosebery. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that he had now successfully demonstrated that there should be no discussion on the Vote on Account. His argument had gone the full length. He had proved satisfactorily to Irish Members that they should never open their mouths on Votes on Account. The right hon. Gentleman, of course, now suggested topics for debate interesting to the party of Lord Rosebery; and therefore it was inevitable that no Irish question could ever be considered on Votes on Account. It was due to his colleagues for him to say that their demand for discussion was reasonable in view of the decision recently given by the Irish Court of Appeal in regard to the action of the Local Government Board; a decision which affected not merely their Imperial relations with Ireland as taxpayers, but the local relations as ratepayers. That decision involved tens of thousands of pounds to the county councils and local bodies, and the Irish Members had been expecting some discussion upon it, though evidently that was not to be allowed. Why, therefore, were the Irish Members brought here at all, if they were never to be allowed to say a word on the expenditure of seventeen millions of money? He did not suppose that the right hon. Gentleman took so much interest in Irish subjects as he did when he occupied an Irish office, but he was sure if the right hon. Gentleman was aware of the intense interest which centred round the dispute between the Local Government Board and the county and district councils, some evening would be given to the discussion of it. The right hon. Gentleman must recollect that new orders of the Local Government Board were being moulded at this moment. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman as an escape out of the difficulty that there should be some understanding in the House that he should put down Report of Supply some evening with a view to this Irish subject being thoroughly threshed out. The matter could be easily arranged by Mr. Speaker calling first on some Irish Member.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think it would be really practicable to give another

night to the Vote on Account, unless there was some general arrangement as to the Supplementary Votes to be taken before Easter. As it is, I am afraid that, in order to comply with the law, late nights and Saturday sittings will be necessary up to 31st March. I do not see how the views of the hon. Gentlemen opposite can be met unless all other Members waive all questions that arise on the Vote on Account before the Irish Votes; in the second place, unless they give the Government the remaining Supplementary Estimates, so that we may meet the law; and in the third place, unless they submit to one of the twenty-two remaining days being taken away in order to have the desired discussion on the Vote on Account. If, on the contrary, they are not prepared to give all these three things, I venture to suggest that, if this be a question of such immediate pressure, the best plan would be to ask me to give them the first free Friday after we have complied with the law. I want to give them every facility they can legitimately claim.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said that the right hon. Gentleman was constantly saying he would oblige those on that side of the House. The right hon. Gentleman did not do justice to their feelings. They wanted something more than time; they wanted satisfaction. He wanted to support the Amendment in order to get further consideration for the Report of Supply of March 5th. They were dealing on Tuesday last with a concrete subject full of details, which was very pressing, especially in London; but the House of Commons had no attention whatever paid to it from, and certainly no satisfactory answer given by, the Government in regard to that subject. If the right hon. Gentleman conceded a short time to the House of Commons, it might possibly do; but if he would listen to nothing, the discussion would not be of a very productive character. He saw the Vice-President present. That right hon. Gentleman told them the other night, and he had repeated it since, that he could do nothing on this educational matter. What they wanted was that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, who could do something, should come there; and then the matter could be disposed of very quickly. If they were met in a spirit of consideration or compromise in regard to some administrative details which they thought very pressing, then the business of the House; could go on.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that the claim his friends had made was reasonable, and the right hon. Gentleman should find a way out of the difficulty. He did not know whether the right hon. Gentleman was under a misapprehension as to what was, really wanted. He suggested to the right hon. Gentleman not that one of the allotted Irish days should be devoted to discussing Report of Supply, but that on some day in the near future two or three hours before midnight should be devoted to it. In that way the right hon. Gentleman would be making what was after all a very small concession, but one which would go a considerable way to meet the difficulty in which they were placed. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to concede this reasonable claim, and rob them, if he might put it in that way, to some extent of a grievance.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My objection to the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman is that it is quite impossible for me to bind the House, nor do I see how it is possible

to make a time arrangement unless there is a consensus of opinion that the matter to be discussed is one which the House desires to hear. [Sir E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT was understood to dissent.] Of course my hon. friend the Member for Ecclesall would have something to say on foreign affairs; If I were to make some concession to the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman, he might make some concession to me in regard to time.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he had no power to give any such undertaking. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of a mutual compromise. He was to give the Irish Members two hours, and they were to give him all the time necessary to get him out of the difficulty caused by his calling Parliament too late.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) observed that the main difficulty in carrying out the very reasonable suggestion of the hon. Member for Waterford was that no security had been devised, either by arrangement or otherwise, that the Irish Votes would be taken first.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) said he desired to support the Amendment because in his opinion it was undoubtedly the fault of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury that the House found itself in its present position. If the right hon. Gentleman was so desirous of concluding the financial business in the legal time.

he should have called Parliament together a month earlier than he did. That the Government found itself in a difficulty was due entirely to the action of the right hon. Gentleman, not only for not calling Parliament together earlier, but also through closing the debate in the previous week, by which means many matters were entirely cut out from discussion. The proposal of the right hon. Gentleman simply amounted to this, that if the Irish Members desired to discuss Votes on Account, they would have to discuss them during an all-night sitting, merely because the Government had not taken proper precautions to ensure facilities being given to Parliament to discuss the Votes. Such a state of things, if carried to its logical conclusion, was bound to affect the health of Members and render them physically unable to carry on the work of the House. It was a physical impossibility to continue to sit night after night without the health of Members being affected. It appeared to him that the House sat, not for the accommodation of humble private Members, but for the wealthy classes; *MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is travelling into matters unconnected with the question. The question is whether the words "except Report of Supply of 5th March" shall be added.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have exhausted my ingenuity in finding methods by which we can both keep the law and meet the views of hon. Gentlemen opposite. But I now make this suggestion that after this rule has been passed I shall not put down the Vote on Account after twelve o'clock until I am absolutely driven to it by the arrival of the 25th March. I will put it off and take the Report of Supply after twelve o'clock, and then I will put it down, if I can, at a convenient hour.

MR. J. P. FARRELL said that, in the absence of the Leader of the Irish party, he could not reply to the offer of the right hon. Gentleman, but he thought every facility should be given for the discussion of the Votes affecting Ireland,

which were of the greatest importance to the country, affecting as they did over a million of money. The right hon. Gentleman had already encroached far too much on the time that used to be given to Irish Supply, and although the Irish Members were only a small minority in the House, they had exercised fully and fairly the duties of opposition, they had taken every opportunity of pressing upon the Government important reforms, and they ought to have a fair opportunity of ventilating the grievances under which their country suffered. If such opportunity were given to them he had no doubt whatever they would be able to bring home to the mind of the right hon. Gentleman the necessity for important reforms in the administration of the country from which they came. Upon the Vote for the Local Government Board, for instance, they would be able to bring home the absolute despotism with which that bureaucratic body governed Ireland; the Public Works Office would give an opportunity to discuss another office of the same kind, and there were many other important matters. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way to accept in its entirety the Amendment of the hon. Member for South Leitrim. It was not a great concession to make, seeing that there were still Parliamentary days to discuss Supply, that there was no great legislative proposal before the House, and no very important matter to be discussed. He could not understand under the circumstances why the right hon. Gentleman had curtailed the time of the House, nor could he see any reason why he should not accept the Amendment.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

A VOICE FROM THE IRISH BENCHES: Oh, oh; gag at once.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; If I knew who the hon. Member was who called out "gag" I should certainly take notice of his conduct.

*SIR E. ASHMEAD BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall) said he desired to call the attention of the House for

one moment to the very great danger of its forgetting what Votes on Account really were. They embraced all the subjects in the Estimates for the whole session; every subject, English, Irish, Scotch, home, foreign, and colonial. It had been the practice to have what the First Lord of the Treasury had, in his opinion, unfortunately called promiscuous discussions. The discussion was varied, necessarily, because the subjects were varied and promiscuous. He was very glad to hear the right hon. Gentleman decline to be a party to binding the House to an isolated discussion upon one subject, upon a Vote on Account. With all due respect to hon. Gentlemen who represented Ireland, and who no doubt desired earnestly to discuss Irish subjects, there were other subjects which ought to be discussed. There were many Members in the House who felt that discussion was more necessary on foreign affairs; on Chinese affairs; than upon Irish affairs. He also desired to call attention to the unfortunate result of what happened the other night when one Vote only was put down and the discussion of it arranged for the whole evening.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Nobody arranged that. What I did arrange was what Vote should be taken first.

*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said when the Educational Vote was put down first, and a reduction moved, it was the general scheme that it should be dis-
AYES.

Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.

Ambrose, Robert

Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan

Holland, William Henry

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Delany, William

Jones, David B. (Swansea)

Atherley-Jones, L.

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles

Jordan, Jeremiah

Barlow, John Emmott

Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)

Joyce, Michael

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Duffy, William J.

Kennedy, Patrick James

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Dunn, Sir William

Kinloch, Sir John George S.

Bell, Richard

Ellis, John Edward

Layland-Barratt, Francis

Black, Alexander William

Emmott, Alfred

Leigh, Sir Joseph

Blake, Edward

Farquharson, Dr. Robert

Leng, Sir John

Boland, John

Farrell, James Patrick

Levy, Maurice

Brigg, John

Fenwick, Charles

Lloyd-George, David

Broadhurst, Henry

Ffrench, Peter

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)

Flynn, James Christopher

M'Dermott, Patrick

Burns, John

Furness, Sir Christopher
Mather, William
Caine, William Sproston
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Mooney, John J.
Caldwell, James
Grant, Corrie
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Clancy, John Joseph
Hammond, John
Murphy, J.
Cogan, Denis J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Nolan, Col. John P (Galway, N.)
Cremer, William Randal
Hayden, John Patrick
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Crombie, John William
Helme, Norval Watson
Norman, Henry

cussed all the evening. That proceeding resulted in the absolute curtailment of discussion on any other business whatever. He did not accuse the right hon. Gentleman of doing this deliberately, but he asked him to consider how easy it would be for a Government, when they found a subject which they, in their judgment, considered a dangerous subject for discussion, to arrange with the Opposition to put down a Vote for discussion upon some other subject in which great interest was taken by the House, and, by encouraging that discussion to continue, shut out entirely the subject which they wished to avoid. He protested against that sort of procedure, and he hoped that the Irish Members would not allow the Irish Estimates to be made a means of preventing discussion upon all other subjects. He should certainly vote for the Amendment.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said that the First Lord of the Treasury had spoken of the necessity for economising the time of the House. In his view the management of affairs by the right hon. Gentleman had consumed more time than anything else. The very motion the right hon. Gentleman now made was a condemnation of these big Supplementary Votes.

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The House divided:;Ayes, 107; Noes, 189. (Division List No. 56.)

Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Pickard, Benjamin

Trevelyan, Charles Philips
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Tully, Jasper
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Reddy, M.
Weir, James Galloway
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
O'Dowd, John
Roche, John
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Russell, T. W.
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Yoxall, James Henry
O Malley, William
Soares, Ernest J.
O'Mara, James
Stevenson, Francis S.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Sullivan, Donal
Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Haviland-Burke.
Philipps, John Wynford
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower)
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Lowe, Francis William
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Duke, Henry Edward
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Maconochie, A. W.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Man'r
Manners, Lord Cecil
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Fisher, William Hayes
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Baird, John George Alexander
Fison, Frederick William
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Balcarres, Lord
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Milton, Viscount
Baldwin, Alfred
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Ger. W. (Leeds)
Forster, Henry William
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch'ch
Garfit, William
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
Bartley, George C. T.
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Morrell, George Herbert
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M H.(Bristol
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Beckett, Ernest William
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts

Mount, William Arthur
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Muntz, Philip A.
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Bigwood, James
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Myers, William Henry
Bond, Edward
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Nicholson, William Graham
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gretton, John
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Parker, Gilbert
Hull, William James
Hain, Edward
Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Midl'x
Pemberton, John S. G.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Pilkington, Richard
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Harris, FLevertton (Tynemouth
Plummer, Walter R.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Pretymann, Ernest George
Chamberlain, J. Austen (W'rc'r
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Chapman, Edward
Heaton, John Henniker
Purvis, Robert
Charrington, Spencer
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Pym, C. Guy
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Higginbottom, S. W.
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hogg, Lindsay
Rentoul, James Alexander
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Hoult, Joseph
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Round, James
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Cranborne, Viscount
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Knowles, Lees
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Dewar, T. R (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Law, Andrew Bonar
Smith, H. C (Northmb, Tyneside
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Lawson, John Grant
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Lee, Capt. A H (Hants, Fareham
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Douglas, Rt. Hon A. Akers-
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Stroyan, John
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Thornton, Percy M.
Webb, Col. William George
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Valentia, Viscount
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E. (Taunton
Young, Commander (Berks., E.
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wills, Sir Frederick
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Wilson, Fred. W Norfolk, Mid.
Sir William Walrond and
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)

Mr. Anstruther.

Main Question again proposed.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) rose to continue the discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.

Knowles, Lees

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Dorington, Sir John Edward

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Law, Andrew Bonar

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Doxford, Sir William T.

Lawson, John Grant

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Duke, Henry Edward

Lee, Capt. A H (Hants, Fareham

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy

Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph D.

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn E.

Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.

Bain, Colonel James Robert

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

Lowe, Francis William

Baird, John George Alexander

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth

Balcarres, Lord

Fisher, William Hayes

Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.

Baldwin, Alfred

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.

Maconochie, A. W.

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

Flannery, Sir Fortescue

M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W

Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds

Fletcher, Sir Henry

Manners, Lord Cecil
Balfour, Maj. K R (Christchurch
Forster, Henry William
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Bartley, George C. T.
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond, Uni.)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Garfit, William
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lon.
Milton, Viscount
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Gibbs, Hon. V. (St. Albans)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Bigwood, James
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Moore, William (Antrim, N.
Blindell, Colonel Harry
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Bond, Edward
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Morrell, George Herbert
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Greene, Sir E. W. (B'y St Edm'ds
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Mount, William Arthur
Bull, William James
Gretton, John
Muntz, Philip A.
Bullard, Sir Henry
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Cavendish, V.C. W. (Derbysh.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Myers, William Henry
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hain, Edward
Nicholson, William Graham
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Chapman, Edward
Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)
Parker, Gilbert
Charrington, Spencer
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Pemberton, John S. G.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N. W.)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Heaton, John Henniker
Plummer, Walter R.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Helme, Norval Watson
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Higginbottom, S. W.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)
Purvis, Robert
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hogg, Lindsay
Pym, C. Guy
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Hornby, Sir William Henry
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Hoult, Joseph
Rentoul, James Alexander
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Rilley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Cranborne, Viscount
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Dickson, Charles Scott
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Round, James
Dickson Poynder, Sir John P.
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Ivenvon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Russell, T. W.

and claimed to move, "That the Main Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Main Question be now put."

The House divided:;Ayes, 193; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 57.)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Stone, Sir Benjamin

Wills, Sir Frederick

Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)

Stroyan, John

Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley

Wilson, John (Glasgow)

Sinclair, Louis (Romford)

Thorburn, Sir Walter

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

Skewes-Cox, Thomas

Thornton, Percy M.

Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Valentia, Viscount
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Smith, H. C (Nrth'mb. Tyneside
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Warde, Lieut. Col. C. E.
Spear, John Ward
Warr, Augustus Frederick
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Wason, John Catheart (Orkney
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Webb, Colonel William George
Stock, James Henry
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E (Tauntn
NOES.
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Dowd, John
Ambrose, Robert
Grant, Corrie
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Hammond, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Harlow, John Emmott
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
O'Malley, William
Harry, E. (Cork, S.)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Mara, James
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Bell, Richard
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Philipps, John Wynford
Black, Alexander William
Holland, William Henry
Pickard, Benjamin
Blake, Edward
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a

Pirie, Duncan V.
Boland, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
Power, Patrick Joseph
Brigg, John
Joyce, Michael
Reddy, M.
Broadhurst, Henry
Kennedy, Patrick James
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Redmond, William (Clare)
Burns, John
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Caine, William Sproston
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Caldwell, James
Leng, Sir John
Roche, John
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Levy, Maurice
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cawley, Frederick
Lloyd-George, David
Soares, Ernest J.
Clancy, John Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sullivan, Donal
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Mather, William
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower)
Cremer, William Randal
Mooney, John J.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Crombie, John William
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Tully, Jasper
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan

Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Murphy, J.
Weir, James Galloway
Delany, William
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, Imke (York, E. R.)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W. R.)
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Dunn, Sir William
Norman, Henry
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Emmott, Alfred
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Yoxall, James Henry
Farrell, James Patrick
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Fenwick, Charles
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Ffrench, Peter
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Mr. Patrick O'Brien and Mr. Haviland-Burke.
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Furness, Sir Christopher
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Main Question put accordingly.
AYES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir. M. H. (Bristol
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wore.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Beckett, Ernest William
Chapman, Edward
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Charrington, Spencer
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Clare, Octavius Leigh
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Bigwood, James
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bond, Edward
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Bain, Col. James Robert
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Baird, John George Alexander
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Balcarres, Lord
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Baldwin, Ahred
Bull, William James
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Bullard, Sir Harry
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Balfour, Maj K. R (Christchurch
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Bartley, George C. T.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.)
Cranborne, Viscount
The House divided::Ayes, 190; Noes, 103. (Division List No. 58.)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Purvis, Robert
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Pym, C. Guy
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Johnston, William (Belfast)

Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Dickson, Charles Scott
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T.(Denbigh)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Kenyon, Tames (Lancs., Bury)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Knowles, Lees
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Lambton, Hn. Frederick Wm.
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Duke, Henry Edward
Law, Andrew Bonar
Round, James
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lawson, John Grant
Royds-, Clement Molyneux
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Lee, Capt A. H. (Hants, Fareh'm
Russell, T. W.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Fisher, William Hayes
Lowe, Francis William
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Skewes-Cox, Thomas

Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, K.)
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Maconochie, A. W.
Smith, H C (Northmb. Tyneside
Forster, Henry William
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Foster, Sir M. (London Univ.)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Spear, John Ward
Garfit, William
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans
Maxwell, W. J. H.(Dumfriessh.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Gordon, Hn. J E.(Elgin & Nairn
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Stock, James Henry
Gordon, Maj E.-(T'r Hamlets)
Milton, Viscount
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Stroyan, John
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Medley
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edw'nds
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire
Thornton, Percy M.
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Morrell, George Herbert
Tomlinson, W. Edw. Murray
Gretton, John
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Valentia, Viscount
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Guthrie, Walter Murray

Mount, William Arthur
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Hain, Edward
Muntz, Philip A.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G.(Mid'x
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Webb, Col. William George
Harris, FLeverton (Tynemouth
Myers, William Henry
Welby, Lt. -Cl. A. C. E. (Taunt'n
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Nicholson, William Graham
Wills, Sir Frederick
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Heath, J. (Staffords., N. W.)
Norman, Henry
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Heaton, John Henniker
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darling'n
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Higginbottom, S. W.
Pemberton, John S. G.
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Hoare, Ed. Brodie (Hampstead
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Hogg, Lindsay
Plummer, Walter R.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Hope, J F (Sheffield, Brightside)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Pretyma, Ernest George
Hoult, Joseph
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
NOES.
Allen, C. P. (Glouc., Stroud)

Crombie, John William
Helme, Norval Watson
Ambrose, Robert
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Holland, William Henry
Barlow, John Emmott
Delany, William
Jones, David Brynmor (Swansea)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Jordan, Jeremiah
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Duffy, William J.
Joyce, Michael
Bell, Richard
Dunn, Sir William
Kennedy, Patrick James
Black, Alexander William
Emmott, Alfred
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Blake, Edward
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Boland, John
Farrell, James Patrick
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Brigg, John
Fenwick, Charles
Leng, Sir John
Broadhurst, Henry
Ffrench, Peter
Levy, Maurice
Brown, George M (Edinburgh)
Flynn, James Christopher
Lloyd-George, David
Burns, John
Furness, Sir Christopher
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Caine, William Sproston
Goddard, Daniel Ford
M'Dermott, Patrick
Caldwell, James
Grant, Corrie

Mather, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Mooney, John J.
Clancy, John Joseph
Hammond, John
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Cogan, Denis J.
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Murphy, J.
Cremer, William Randal
Hayden, John Patrick
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N
Philipps, John Wynford
Tully, Jasper
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Pickard, Benjamin
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Norton, Capt. Cecil Wm.
Pirie, Duncan V.
Weir, James Calloway
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Power, Patrick Joseph
White, Luke (York, E. R.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tiperary Mid
Reddy, M.
Whiteley, G. (York, W. R.)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmar
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)
Wilson, Fred. W (Norfolk, Mid.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
O'Dowd, John
Roche, John
Yoxall, James Henry

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Shipman, Dr. John G.

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N

Soares, Ernest J.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

O'Malley, William

Stevenson, Francis S.

Mr. Patrick O'Brien and

O'Mara, James

Sullivan, Donal

Mr. Haviland-Burke.

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Thomas, J A(Glamorgan Gower

Ordered, That the Proceedings on the Reports of the Committees of Supply and Ways and Means and other Committees authorising the expenditure of Public Money may be entered upon at any hour though opposed, and shall not be interrupted under the provision of any Standing Order regulating the Sittings of the House, except of Standing Order No. 5.

SUPPLY;ARMY ESTIMATES.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair.";(Mr. Brodrick.)

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford) said that before dealing with the subject of this motion he wished to say a few words with reference to the extremely elaborate speech made by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. That speech was a very clever one, but he could not help thinking that they had heard something like it before. He could endorse every word the right hon. Gentleman had said about Mr. Cardwell, whose reforms had cost the country not a single penny, and that was a good deal to be able to say. He remembered a speech by Mr. Gathorne-Hardy in which he stated that there were to be eight army corps, but his promise proved to be absolutely futile and utterly worthless. Then they had the speech of Mr. Stanhope in 1892, which was very much of the same character. The Secretary of State for War had made a clever, lawyer-like and ex parte statement, but it reminded him of a magnificent superstructure without any foundation at all, because the raison

d'être of the whole speech was the men, and if they could not get the men, the bottom fell out of the scheme. The right hon. Gentleman never told the House how he was going to get the men to enlist, except in reference to the Militia, who were going to have an extra bounty of 2d. per day. The number of men required this year did not bear any proportion to what were required in former years. There was sure to be a slump in recruiting next year, and the getting of the men would form a very considerable difficulty. There were at present in South Africa thousands of time-expired men, and they would go. The Reserve would be depleted, and although the right hon. Gentleman mentioned the number of Militiamen and Volunteers, he did not make the slightest provision for getting them. He noticed that the Royal Reserve battalions were to be formed

into Regular battalions to take the place of those troops now serving in the Mediterranean fortresses, but was the Secretary of State for War sure of getting those Reserve battalions?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The hon. and gallant Member is in error. I am not in the least depending upon the Reserve battalions.

MAJOR RASCH said he understood the Reserves were to be asked to volunteer, so as to relieve those battalions now serving in the Mediterranean fortresses. It was all very well to assume that you were going to get so many Militiamen and a certain number of Yeomanry and Volunteers, but how were they going to be got? As was pointed out in a very sensible article in The Times, this system was not suited to the con-

dition of things existing in this country. There were some good points in the right hon. Gentleman's speech which they all appreciated, and which hon. Members had urged on the War Office for years, and which the right hon. Gentleman himself always opposed whenever he had the chance. One of them was decentralisation, and he congratulated the right hon. Gentleman upon having grasped that fact. Then there was the important question of reducing officers' expenses in the cavalry. There was no reason why a young fellow should have to pay £22 for a busby. If hon. Members desired to know how matters stood, they could not do better than look up in Thackeray's "Snob Papers" the passages relating to Major Ponto. Unless the right hon. Gentleman carried out drastic changes with reference to kit and uniform, the state of things there described would be likely to continue. There was no reason why this should be so expensive, and even Lord Wolseley had said that a British officer in uniform was like a monkey on an organ. Surely the right hon. Gentleman ought to try to get rid of some of the absurdities of dress, and he had made a very good suggestion that officers should be allowed to get their kit from a Government depot. The right hon. Gentleman was quite right in getting rid of that obsolete force the Militia Reserve. As for the Yeomanry, he had never been a great admirer of the force; still, after the experience in South Africa, he should never vote against the Yeomanry again, and he was delighted to find that they were to be put in khaki; that would make the force less expensive and more popular. Then the Secretary for War stated that he was going to get rid of the inefficient officers. But why had he not thought of doing that before? His hon. friend the Member for Tunbridge had stated that the only way to obtain the men was by a Militia ballot, but there were great difficulties in the way of such a measure.

The Secretary for War had been ten years at the War Office, but it was hardly fair to press him when he had so much heavy work on hand, and he did not propose to move his Amendment. As the right hon. Gentleman prophesied some months ago, the war was being prolonged. He feared

that that was owing to a repetition of mistakes made by the right hon.

Gentleman's own Office in Pall Mall. There had recently been what the French would call an extraordinary *claircissement*, and the ex-Secretary for War had been severely criticising the late Commander-in-Chief. The Prime Minister had also told them that at the War Office everything had happened for

the best; if there was any fault it lay with the British Constitution. He was not sure that the attack upon Lord Wolseley was not a sort of red herring drawn across the scent, and he should like to hear whether Lord Roberts had accepted office under those conditions which Lord Wolseley had found to be absolutely intolerable.

He wished to say a few words about the reinforcements which should have been sent out to South Africa. There was the greatest danger in the continuance of the war, because the longer our troops continued unsuccessful and the longer the end of the war was delayed the nearer came the possibility of foreign intervention. He was anxious to know why reinforcements were not sent out as they should have been during the past six months. Reinforcements were called for by Lord Kitchener, but until the last three months the Government sent hardly any forces. The Member for the Forest of Dean alluded to a statement made by General Mackinnon, in which he condemned the hasty and haphazard way in which recruits were sent to the front. He himself had seen some of the South African Constabulary embarking, and they were all without arms and accoutrements. Those were the men whom the War Office sent out as mounted men. With regard to the Yeomanry, he did not know why the right hon. Gentleman called them yeomen; at any rate they were nothing like the yeomen who used to exist in the county of Essex, who had been extinguished by foreign competition. The right hon. Gentleman had appointed two War Office Departmental Committees, but surely he must be aware that there had been something like forty such Committees appointed since 1815, and the concentrated result of their wisdom had been the recent disasters in South Africa. They knew that the Prime Minister had suggested the formation of rifle clubs under the auspices of the Primrose League. Nothing could have shown the blissful ignorance of the Premier more than that statement. The Prime Minister had stated practically that the defence of the country was not the business of the Government, and under those circumstances they need not expect very much reform at the War Office from him. With regard to the Reserve battalions, they were very fine regiments, although the men measured rather more round the waist than they did round the chest. The unfortunate part of the matter was that the battalions cost £3,000,000, and in two or three weeks time they would disappear, and there would be nothing to show for the expenditure. If the War Office had put the money into the Militia there would have been something to show for it, and it would have put some backbone into the force, which it had not had for years. The Royal Reserve regiments contained some of the finest men he ever saw, and it was not proposed to ask them to serve in the Mediterranean garrisons. He ventured to say that that was a great waste. Some years ago, when it was proposed to send the Foot Guards to Gibraltar, he ventured to say that it was very foolish, because there was not room for them to drill, and now they were bringing the Guards back again. The other evening the Secretary for War stated that the Government were going to allow £5 per annum to the soldier who provided his own horse. Those hon. Members who were generally called the "Colonels" in the House did not receive very much attention; but he thought that the hon. Member for Oldham, with all the experience of the South African War behind him, and all that he had said

with reference to guns and horses, should hardly have made the remark that he did. Of course some gentlemen were of the Service Members, but not with them. The remarks of the right hon. Baronet the Member for the Forest of Dean were always received, as they should be, with great attention, as those of the greatest military expert in the country, but the remarks of the Service Members were not. However, they did their duty to the best of their power in laying their views before the House. He would respectfully remind the right hon. Gentleman on the Front Bench of an incident that occurred a hundred years ago across the Channel. The Ministers of Louis XVI. were confronted by a reformer. He did not know whether Jean Jacques Rousseau was a military reformer or not, but they had it on the authority of Carlyle that though the Ministers of Louis XVI. laughed to scorn the first edition of his book, their skins went to form the binding of the second. However, he did not anticipate any such calamity happening here, and he should be the first to deprecate such a proceeding as applied even to the Secretary for War. After all, the man in the street considered that War Office reform was a matter of business, and should be carried through as such, and surely the Government, with the assistance of the Secretary for War, whose eloquent speech they had all admired, should be able to add up the cost of putting the defences of the country on a proper footing and be prepared for anything that might happen. The doggerel of the American poet might be appropriately quoted;

"Thrice armed is he who has his quarrel just, But four times he who has his fist in fust."

*MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland) said he had put down a motion on the Paper to call attention to the fact that the Army was not a profession in which the officers could support themselves on their present pay; that the unprofessionalism in the Army, about which the Secretary for War had complained the other night, was chiefly due to the present expensive standards of living amongst many officers in many regiments; and that unprofessionalism would not be remedied until the pay was raised so as to attract quite a new class of officers into the Army. His feelings in introducing this subject were different from what they would have been two or three days ago, before the right hon. Gentleman's speech. Hon. Members in all parts of the House had received that speech with great approbation; they were delighted at its businesslike tone, and its spirit of true and energetic reform. No part of the speech, however, bore the ring of determined conviction more than that in which he spoke of the necessity for insisting upon a professional spirit on the part of the officers, on the necessity of promotion by merit, and on the necessity of cheaper living. That was a clearer statement of what Army reformers wanted than anything that had come from the War Office since the abolition of purchase; and, personally, so far as the greater part of the right hon. Gentleman's fiction was concerned, he intended to support him with all his vigour. He did not particularly believe in civilian criticism on the details of Army matters, such as the best kind of artillery and the best sort of rifles. But such criticism might usefully be directed to huge questions of principle.

The fact was the door of the Army was closed at the present moment to any man

who had not got an independent income. It was admitted on all hands that in order for a man to be an officer in a cavalry regiment he must have, at least, £;500 for his outfit, and at least £;500 a year in addition to his pay. He was talking during last summer to a colonel who had just retired from a cavalry regiment, and he asked him how much it was necessary for an officer in that regiment to have. The colonel replied, "From the first moment he comes into the regiment, something between £;1,000 and £;1,500." The situation was, that a subaltern of twenty-two or twenty-three years of age must, forsooth, have as much money to horses free and spend as any hon. Gentleman who was sitting in that House for a county constituency. [An Hon. Member: Exaggeration.] An hon. Gentleman said that that was an exaggeration; but in regard to his general statement that an officer of a cavalry regiment required to have an income of £;500 over and above his pay, and an officer in an infantry regiment £;150, he quoted a higher authority than himself; namely, the late Under Secretary for War and the present Chief Secretary for Ireland. When the war was at its height, and there was great need of officers, the Government went to the universities and asked them to give so many men from each university to become officers, and they put it in the hands of the Vice-Chancellors to make this selection. The Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University issued a memorandum inviting candidates, and one sentence in that memorandum was to the effect that he could not recommend any candidate to the War Office unless he could find an income sufficient for the branch of the service he wished to enter. He would not say anything against the paternal solicitude of the Vice-Chancellor, but he must say that it was most extraordinary that that confession should have been deliberately made, and that the War Office should have said they could not blame the Vice-Chancellor for making that recommendation. It showed how obvious it was that it was impossible for many men to go into the Army. He had made special inquiries in Cambridge, and had been told that there were many young men who were prevented, though ready to offer their services, from doing so by that clause in the Vice-Chancellor's memorandum. But further, anyone who went into the Army had to look forward with an increasing anxiety to the time when he rose in rank. The low pay in the higher ranks was just as much a deterrent to a man who thought ahead, who did not go into the Army to amuse himself, and who did not wish to run into debt. The proposals of the Secretary for War hardly seemed to him to meet the situation. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to promote in future to higher commands much more strictly by merit; to cheapen the cost of officers' clothing, to give them various other advantages; but that did not make the Army a profession in which a man would be able to live on the pay he received. A great many people were very much afraid of democratising the Army. Personally, and many others agreed with him, he would not be afraid of democratising the Army to any extent. Honours were open from the lowest ranks to the very highest in the Napoleonic armies. Every private soldier, it was said, carried a field marshal's baton in his knapsack. In one great Anglo-Saxon army, Cromwell's, the officers were many of them mere millers and blacksmiths and brewers. [Laughter.] Yes, and brewers, too, who in those days were humbler people than they were at present. [An Hon.

Member: They brewed pure beer.] Again, another great Anglo-Saxon army, that of the Civil War in America, was democratic, and admitted to the position of officer any man of merit, however humble his birth or the class from which he came. What was wanted in the Army was more of the professional, the middle, and the manufacturing classes, who were the strongest classes in the country, and on whom the industrial prosperity of the nation chiefly depended. These were excluded from the Army now. It was perfectly true that there were in the Army the sons of many men who had made their money in manufactures; but he came from the middle of one of the great industrial districts in Yorkshire, and he said with certainty that there were hardly any of the sons of these manufacturers who ever went into the Army. They knew that they could not afford it, and their fathers very wisely prevented them. Therefore, he said, something more drastic was needed, than what the right hon. Gentleman had proposed. They wanted to find a minimum of pay on which a man could live as an officer in the Army. This great nation could afford to pay that minimum standard. They wanted to get good brains, and to pay the men better in the upper branches. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman would find it difficult, if he wanted to carry out his reforms, to entirely avoid sumptuary laws. He did not at present wish to do anything which might appear hostile to the progressive plans of the right hon. Gentleman, but if this question of expensive living and inadequate pay in the Army was not taken up voluntarily by the Government, there would be a movement in the country to demand it. The Government kept on speaking of the enthusiasm of the colonies for the mother country; but he was rather surprised that the right hon. Gentleman, in the course of his speech, had said nothing about the colonies or of asking them to join in this great Army reform. He thought that that was to be regretted, but they might be quite certain that the colonies would never take part in any Army in which they could not send their own sons to form some part of the officers. They would not be content that the only officers should be the sons of rich squatters; they would insist, if they were to take some part in it, that the Army should be made more democratic than now. In conclusion, he would say that in view of the sympathetic treatment of the general question by the right hon. the Secretary for War he would not move the motion of which he had given notice.

*MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said that in rising to move the motion standing in his name he recognised the extreme difficulty and delicacy of the task he had undertaken. The House was invited to form a decision on a question of personal right and justice to an individual. He deeply and unhesitatingly deplored the necessity of adopting that method, for he did not think it was a suitable one, and if there had been a better he would have taken it. For this discussion, however, he could not be blamed. It had all along been and still was in the power of the Secretary for War by granting an inquiry to prevent the discussion taking place. It was not any part of his intention to make a partisan attack upon the right hon. Gentleman. If he had had that desire, there was nothing which would have made him less inclined to gratify it than the brilliant speech made by the right hon. Gentleman on Friday night. Especially he did not dissent from that part of the speech in which the right hon. Gentleman expressed

his adhesion to, and urged on the House the policy of, only employing in peace commands generals who had shown themselves fit to hold those commands in war. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take it that that policy lay altogether outside of the area of any difference that might arise between them. He recognised further that it was a matter of common sense as well as simple justice that the Commander-in-Chief should choose his own officers, more especially when engaged in a campaign and bearing a responsibility which even the most foolish person in the country would not desire to share. He thought it was altogether right that the Commander-in-Chief and the Government should refuse to recall an officer from his command merely because there was a little popular clamour on the subject. The people of the country, however, had shown their willingness, almost their eagerness, to suspend their judgment in all such cases because they had perfect confidence in Lord Roberts, and there was a general feeling that they ought to approach the judgment of men who were risking their lives and reputation for the sake of the country with peculiar care and peculiar humility. There had been throughout the nation a very sincere desire that no man should be punished without a full, complete, and thorough trial.

The more he felt the delicacy of the task the more he felt it incumbent upon him to be perfectly frank with the House. One matter he would refer to in the outset. A very considerable prejudice had been created against General Colvile by the fact that he had published in the newspapers a statement of his treatment by the War Office. He did not defend that action of General Colvile's. It was most desirable and necessary that they should uphold and fortify the great tradition of Army reticence. Sometimes it led to hardship, but it was essential to discipline, and more than ever necessary now in view of the extreme activity displayed by the newspapers. He did not defend General Colvile's action, but he hoped the House would allow him to submit one or two considerations in regard to it. In the first place, reticence could not be all on one side. If their generals were never to take means of vindicating themselves publicly, then he ventured to think that a little reticence should be observed by the War Office. When General Colvile returned to this country the first thing which he saw was a newspaper paragraph, which was obviously inspired.

MR. BRODRICK: The only statement I saw came from Gibraltar, and could not have come from the War Office.

*MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS: So far as the right hon. Gentleman is concerned, I entirely accept his disclaimer. On the other hand, if he denies that the statement came from the War Office, then I must invite him to perfect his information. But I will read the article, so that the House may judge of its character,

GENERAL COLVILE'S POSITION.

AN IRREVOCABLE DECISION.

"The Daily Mail learns that the communication to the Press relative to the request for General Colvile's resignation did not emanate from the War Office.

"The request was, of course, made with the full acquiescence and authority of the Secretary

of State for War after minute and full inquiries had been instituted into the affair at Lindley as well as that at Sanna's Post.

"No further investigation is considered necessary by the authorities, who fully recognise the gravity and importance of the step they have taken.

"General Colvile will, despite his attitude on the matter, have to bow to the inevitable, and, though naturally considerable sympathy will be felt for an officer who has served his country in several campaigns, the decision is irrevocable.

"The General's pay ceased from the date on which the notification reached him, and no action on his part can affect the decision which has been arrived at by the Secretary of State and his advisers."

If that be not a communication which comes from the War Office, then a miracle must have happened, and if it had so happened it was not with the knowledge of General Colvile, and he was entitled to assume that that article came from the War Office. Even apart from that, I shall presently show the House that there was most grievous provocation. In the meantime, I shall only say that I believe that what General Colvile did he did in anger; his action was not calculated or premeditated; it was brought about by the most justifiable resentment aroused by gross insult and intolerable wrong. And, again, what other course was open to him? What other appeal had he? None whatever. The right hon. Gentleman, in answer to the hon. Member for Chester, the other day gave the following reply; "No officer has a right to appeal to a court martial, but to the Commander-in-Chief and to the Sovereign in accordance with Section 42 of the Army Act." Precisely. Having been condemned by the right hon. Gentleman in consultation with Lord Roberts, he is graciously allowed to appeal to Lord Roberts in consultation with the right hon. Gentleman.

The case I have to submit to the House is not the propriety of publication. It is not the action of the War Office in placing General Colvile on retired pay, although I admit that I have a natural curiosity to learn by what series of irregularities the right hon. Gentleman arrived at the amount of, what has been euphemistically called, a "special pension." although the pleasant phrase hardly does justice to the fact that it is £100 a year less than General Colvile was entitled to receive. I want to know what went before that. It is said that General Colvile was put out of court by what he did in making a public statement. I do not admit it. But if he were, we are not out of court. We are still entitled to consider the right hon. gentleman's management of our army. Now, Sir, I am very much confirmed in my belief in the necessity of some inquiry by the extraordinary ignorance lately displayed by the Secretary of State for War as to certain matters nearly affecting General Colvile's claim to consideration. I think he adopted a view which we all endorse when he explained lately in the case of Sir George White and others that their general service was to be taken into account in estimating any particular defect of theirs. I submit he was bound to do that in General Colvile's case. The right hon. Gentleman told the House, in answer to a question, that General Colvile had sent on to the Commander-in-Chief no report on the battle of Paardeberg. The fact is that he did send in such a report, but the right hon. Gentleman did not know even a few

weeks ago that any report was sent to Lord Roberts. That report is here. I can give it to the right hon. gentleman. I have evidence of its being written at the time, the evidence of the officer who wrote it to dictation from General Colvile, and the evidence of a letter from Lord Roberts's secretary, who wrote requiring some little alterations in it; of no importance; and this despatch bears so closely on General Colvile's services in this war that no judgment of his case can possibly be complete or final until it is taken into account. But the case itself amply justifies the demand for inquiry. Consider the steps by which this matter has reached its present unhappy position. On the 29th of June Lord Roberts had an interview with General Colvile at Pretoria, an interview which lasted a quarter of an hour. At that interview the affairs at Sanna's Post and Lindley were discussed. Lord Roberts said he was dissatisfied, and that he had broken up General Colvile's command; and he asked him what he would like to do. General Colvile said he wished to go home, and Lord Roberts assented. He reached this country in July, and gave Lord Wolseley a detailed account, verbally and in writing, of what took place at Sauna's Post and Lindley. After this General Colvile received a memorandum from Lord Roberts on Sanna's Post, dated 21st of May, and I offer that to the right hon. Gentleman as an interesting specimen for his museum of military delays.

Now, General Colvile had up to this point no official intimation that an inquiry was being made, and he was never given an opportunity of making an official defence. When he had his interview with Lord Roberts he did not know that he was on his trial. Between the 9th and 31st of August, however, a report from Lord Roberts was at last received by the War Office, and on the 15th of September General Colvile received the following letter, dated from the War Office;;

Sir,;I am directed by the Secretary of State for War to inform you that the Commander-in-Chief has approved of your resuming the command of the Infantry Brigade at Gibraltar from the 1st of October next to complete your period of service therein, exclusive of the time you were serving in South Africa, and I am to request that you will hold yourself in readiness to embark in time to take up the duties on the above date.

Please acknowledge the receipt hereof, and return enclosed family form to this department.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) H. C. B. FARRANT,

A.A.G. for A.G.

Now I submit that that is a decision on General Colvile's case and conduct. I know from a personal letter that the case had been considered on the basis of Lord Roberts's report and General Colvile's statement. I know the decision was arrived at three and a half months after the Lindley incident, and two and a half months after General Colvile's conversation with Lord Roberts at Pretoria and after Lord Roberts's report to the War Office. I think we are entitled to assume that what Sir H. Colvile did in connection with the loss of the Yeomanry at Lindley was considered in the decision arrived at by Lord Wolseley. Therefore the case was tried and decided by those who had a full statement before them

from both sides. Lord Roberts, when he was in Africa, had no written statements in answer to any charges. He had only the despatch of the march from Wynburg to Heilbron. He had no other statement in writing, only his recollection of the very short conversation which took place between him and General Colvile at Pretoria. Now his case having, as I say, been considered, the House will easily imagine the surprise with which General Colvile received a letter some months after marked "Confidential," but which I do not now treat as a confidential letter for several reasons, which will be apparent to the House when I read it. In the first place, it was the only official intimation which he received of his having been deprived of his command; secondly, it contained the only statement of the grounds on which he was removed; thirdly, a copy was sent to Sir George White; and, fourthly, that the letter was subsequently referred to in official correspondence. Such a letter as this I cannot, having passed, treat as confidential. The letter runs as follows;

War Office, 16th December, 1900.

My dear General, In the temporary absence of the Military Secretary, an unpleasant duty devolves on me.

The Secretary of State having discussed by telegraph the incidents of the surrender of No. XIII. Imperial Yeomanry battalion, concurs with Lord Roberts that you were mainly responsible for the surrender, and has reluctantly come to the conclusion that you cannot be permitted to retain your command.

I am directed to request you will hand in your resignation to Sir George White on receipt of this letter and quit Gibraltar.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Sir George, but do not propose to write through the usual channel, as it may be less vexations to you if the resignation appears to be voluntary.

Yours truly,

(Signed) EVELYN WOOD, A.G.

That letter was subsequently, and, I venture to say, inaccurately described in a letter of the 19th January last, in which occurs the following;

"Towards the end of December last you were informed in a confidential letter from the Adjutant-General that the Secretary of State, concurring with the recommendation by telegram from Lord Roberts, had reluctantly come to the conclusion that you could not be permitted to retain your command, and you were given the opportunity of resigning it."

In the first place, I want to call attention to the slight discrepancy; it may be nothing more; between the two statements which I want explained. The first letter states that the Secretary for War has come to the conclusion that General Colvile cannot be permitted to retain his command, and the second letter states that the Secretary of State concurs

in the recommendation by telegram from Lord Roberts. Did the recommendation come from Lord Roberts and the right hon. Gentleman concur, or did the right hon.

Gentleman receive a military criticism from Lord Roberts and initiate the recommendation? A simple question to which I desire an answer is, Did Lord Roberts know or did he not when he arrived at Gibraltar that General Colvile had been removed? There is a very gross inaccuracy in the second letter in the

statement that "you were given an opportunity to resign." The real fact appears to be that General Colvile was not given any opportunity to resign even if he chose. He saw Sir George White and said he refused to resign, and Sir George White's reply was that his command had become vacant, and that his instructions were that General Colvile must quit Gibraltar immediately. If that is voluntary resignation I do not know what compulsion is, unless it means that General Colvile was to be taken home by force. If there had been any doubt in General Colvile's mind that he had been compulsorily and finally removed it would have been put an end to by the inspired article which appeared in the Daily Mail. I need say nothing more of the provocation under which General Colvile took the action he did. I do not defend that action, but I say the Government gave him great provocation; provocation that was boundless and unpardonable. I want the explanation. Why was the case of General Colvile re-opened? Why was the decision of the Commander-in-Chief reversed? Why was General Colvile removed from his command without an opportunity of meeting any charges whatever? It will be noticed that the ground of his removal was explicitly stated in Sir Evelyn Wood's letter; his failure to relieve the Yeomanry at Lindley. That was the charge on which General Colvile had been condemned. He knew of no other. Other charges had, indeed, been referred to. His action at Sanna's Post was criticised. What was wrong with it has never been stated in definite and clear terms to him since this first inquiry took place. I am quite prepared to meet what is said on that point. Another charge has been spoken of outside this House, and a statement has been attributed to those who stood high at the War Office that General Colvile was deprived of his command on a charge of cowardice. I will not stoop to meet that charge until it is made, but I cannot altogether ignore it. In view of these rumours about a charge that ought never to have been made behind a man's back. I think I am entitled to ask the right hon. Gentleman either to make that charge with evidence, if it is to be made, or else to do General Colvile justice, as I am sure he will, by disclaiming any intention of making the charge. That is all I ask. Let us, at all events, have all the charges before us, and have done with all the mystery that has been accumulating about this business. Let us have all the cards on the table, so that we may know what to think and how to act. The matter of Lindley has been definitely alleged as the ground of General Colvile's removal, and therefore I am compelled to deal with it very shortly. I do not, of course, offer any opinion on the military questions involved. The House would properly regard such opinions as worthless; but the view has been put forward that then¹ was that in General Colvile's action which rightly created prejudice against him; prejudice not against his military judgment and ability, but against his character as a man and a soldier. And in that connection I am bound to say something about this incident, for we require of a soldier, not only that he should be skilful and have foresight and personal courage, but that he should be chivalrous; that he should be ready to help other men and be willing to take risks on their behalf, and that he should not fight for his own hand, but in loyal comradeship with other men, and direct his efforts to the end of a victory common to him with them. I must, therefore,

submit a few facts to the House. Now, what happened so far as General Colvile was concerned in connection with the Lindley episode was this. On May 19th of last year the Chief of the Staff telegraphed to General Colvile to say that the 12th Division was arriving at Wynburg, and that he should therefore join the remainder of his division at Ventersburg; that he should wait at Wynburg for a battery of Field Artillery; that he would be joined by some Eastern Province Horse on the 21st; and that the 13th

Battalion of Yeomanry was to meet him on a day to be announced. On 20th May the Chief of the Staff sent the following cipher telegram;

"From Ventersburg the Highland Brigade march to Lindley, and thence to Heilbron. Brigade will be concentrated at Ventersburg 23rd, reach Lindley 26th, Heilbron 29th."

Those, it will be observed, were very precise instructions as to places and times. Later, on the same day, he received a second telegram from the Chief of the Staff;

"Only two companies of 13th Battalion of Yeomanry, and possibly one company of Lovats Mounted Corps, will be able to join at Ventersburg, but other two Yeomanry companies will follow as soon as possible."

The House will, therefore, see that General Colvile was despatched to his destination with such haste that he was not allowed to wait for his full complement of mounted men, although they were, essential to his safe progress. On 22nd May he left Wynburg. On the 23rd he arrived at Ventersburg; on the 24th he left. On the 26th, after some hours fighting, he arrived at Lindley, and on the next morning, 27th May, he marched from Lindley. He was engaged almost all day, and bivouacked in the evening north of Rhenoster River, twenty-three miles out from Lindley and nineteen miles from Heilbron, which place he had the strictest orders to reach the next day. The enemy were in front of him in numbers superior to his own, and they were also behind him and to his right. He was in that position when he received this letter;

"Colonel Spragge to General Colvile.; Found no one in Lindley but Boers; have 500 men, but only one day's food. Slopped three miles back on Kroonstad road. I want help to get out without great loss."

It was in such circumstances that General Colvile took the decision for which he has been visited with so appalling a punishment; the termination in disgrace of his career as a soldier. Let me invite the House to consider the facts as he knew them, and his conception of the circumstances. He had definite orders to be at various places on certain days. He was told above all to beat Heilbron on 29th May, and it was never explained to him why. He knew he was hurried away from Ventersburg without waiting for the necessary mounted men; he knew that the first line of the army was within striking

distance of the Vaal River; he knew that Heilbron had been occupied by General Ian Hamilton; he knew it was the depot for General Buller's force, and he knew that he himself was only rationed to arrive at Heilbron. It was natural to suppose from the precise orders which he had received, and from the peremptory haste with which he was sent off, that he was acting in a concerted and definite movement of which his force formed a part, and it was also natural that he

should suppose that General Hamilton would be detained at Heilbron until his arrival, just as he himself had been detained at the precisely similar depot and railway terminus of Wynburg in precisely analogous circumstances. It was natural to believe that, and the proof that he did believe it, if proof be needed, is that he sent a message from Lindley to Heilbron asking that the mounted men whom he believed to have gone there should be sent to him, as he was in need of them. That message never reached Heilbron, because General Colvile's supposition was wrong. He was not taking part in a combined movement. General Hamilton had left Heilbron, and when General Colvile got near it, it was occupied by the Boers. Still I submit that his was a natural supposition. No doubt a general is expected to exercise discretion in carrying out his orders, but he can only exercise discretion if he is given material for doing so. He cannot exercise discretion if he is not told what general plan is being followed, and to what result he is contributing. If he is given the orders of a subaltern he can only act as a subaltern. In the second place, I think it will be, recognised that, in the absence of any contrary instructions or intimation, General Colvile had a knowledge of facts which compelled him to regard it as necessary that he should be at Heilbron on the 29th May whatever it might cost, because everything pointed to the necessity of his being there if Lord Roberts's plans were to be carried out. It was impossible for him to be there on 29th May if he went back to Lindley. As a matter of fact, he only reached Heilbron late in the evening of the 29th, after a good deal of fighting. It must be remembered that his force of infantrymen had only two days' rations, that they were provisioned only to Heilbron by direct route, that his ambulances were overflowing, that his ammunition was short, and that his oxen were dying on the road. It may be possible to take the view that he should have compromised the safety of his own force by going to the assistance of valuable mounted men, because mounted men were recognised by everyone as of the greatest importance. Granting that, however, I think the House will come to the conclusion that the view he had formed was perfectly intelligible and just, and I believe would commend itself in all the circumstances to military men. Moreover, in view of the circumstances and of what he believed to be Lord Roberts's intentions, he was bound to lead his force out, and that was his decision. He wrote to Colonel Spragge explaining his position, and advising him to retire on Kroonstad. Colonel Spragge had not said that he could not retire, but that he could retire with loss. It was General Colvile's view that he could retire, and he sent a message advising him to do so. I do not know whether that message ever reached Colonel Spragge or not, we know so little of the circumstances. Three messengers were sent to carry the message, but they were intercepted by the Boers, and a fourth messenger got to the railway in the evening, but whether Colonel Spragge actually received the message or not I do not know. As I have spoken of the Yeomanry I should like to say, in case there might be any misunderstanding, that I, for my part, do not wish to impute any blame to the Yeomanry who surrendered. The circumstances were fully stated in a manner very gratifying to the House by the right hon. Gentleman. It must be remembered that they were summoned to

Lindley, and that they believed that General Colvile had telegraphed for them. They received a telegram asking them to come to Lindley, a telegram which was afterwards proved to have been forged by the Boers, because it purported to have left Lindley before General Colvile arrived there. They believed they had been summoned to Lindley; they were therefore perfectly entitled to expect help, and they were bound to remain. I do not pose as a military expert, but it should be remembered in any judgment formed of the Yeomanry that they surrendered, not because they could not in the first instance have escaped, but because they would not escape, as they considered that that would mean that they had failed to do what had been expected of them. I desire the House, however, to believe that this action of General Colvile's is not merely a case of a selfish, callous, unchivalrous disregard of other men. I submit that hon. Members should remove from their minds any erroneous impression of that kind which would prejudice them against the demand for an inquiry.

I have very little more to add, and I apologise to the House for having troubled it at such length. The question I submit is whether in the case that I have laid before the House there is not something that demands inquiry. I fully admit the right of the Commander-in-Chief to control the discipline of the Army, but that is a right which, like every other right, is to be exercised subject to the control, the criticism, the censure of this House. The responsibility for its exercise rests primarily and finally with us, because it is a right which is derived from those whom we represent in this House, and I am bound to say that I think that the House cannot rid itself of the responsibility for seeing that justice is done to the soldier whose honour and fortunes are placed in its hands to-night, without any reserve or doubt or hesitation. I ask hon. Members to consider whether it would be in accord with our best sense of justice and equal rights to re-try a man already acquitted, to condemn a man on an accusation of which he was never informed, and to punish him on evidence which, he has allowed to challenge. It must be remembered that this is not merely a case of disciplinary regulation of the Army. It is not merely a case of not offering employment to a general out of employment. This is the removal of a soldier from his command, and that is punishment; punishment which it is impossible for any words of mine to exaggerate. What greater punishment could you inflict on a man? You take from him in one act his career and his

reputation with every circumstance of contumely and disgrace. He has worked all his life for his profession and the goodwill of his fellow countrymen. You deprive him of both without even the form of a trial. Who is this man? He is a soldier who has given to the arms of this country thirty years of brilliant service. He served you in the Nile campaign in 1884, and his name will be found mentioned to his honour in the despatches on El Teb and Tamai. On many occasions he was the only white man in charge of black troops on difficult expeditions, and twice he was sent single-handed to deal with mutinous or doubtful black troops. He fought in Burma and in the Toka expedition, and he rendered to the Imperial policy of this country in Uganda services of which I have heard those who were in charge of the foreign affairs of this country at the time speak in terms of grateful admiration. He is a scientific soldier who was appointed only

a few years ago as umpire at the manœuvres on Salisbury Plain. [An HON. MEMBER laughed.] I am merely showing that to a man who had a first-rate position in the Army is being meted out punishment which could not be given to a common soldier in the ranks. Only once in these thirty years has he been the subject of an accusation. In 1885 he was accused by Major Kitchener of murdering six natives. The charge was investigated and was found to be devoid of foundation. Consider what his record is in the present war. He was sent to South Africa in charge of the Brigade of Guards. He served under Lord Methuen at Belmont, at the Modder River, and at Magersfontein, and he was referred to in despatches again and again in terms of the highest praise. Lord Methuen writes in one of his despatches (to select one case only out of many); "Major-General Colville has already gained my entire confidence; nothing is ever likely to shake his coolness." Lord Roberts appointed General Colville to command the Ninth Division, and during the following three weeks he was actively engaged in the operations which culminated at Paardeberg. In relation to that victory his countrymen are under a debt of gratitude to General Colville, of which, I believe, they are not sufficiently aware, for I

have the high authority of Lord Roberts for urging that it was General Colville who counselled and devised the brilliant attack of 27th February, by which a doubtful and critical position was turned into a decisive and fruitful victory. This is the man whose counsel and decision won the battle of Paardeberg; the greatest and most comprehensive victory in the campaign; and the right hon. Gentleman has devised for him a fitting reward

Is it well that this officer should be punished untried? That is the question which I place before the House. I am bound to say that I feel myself completely justified in having raised this question, when I reflect on the confusion and uncertainty which have been displayed; the vacillation of the War Office and then its blundering precipitancy; the puzzled consternation with which the country has regarded the right hon. Gentleman's proceedings, and the dismay with which the Army has viewed the somewhat rudimentary conception of justice which he has lately unfolded with so much simplicity. Let me repeat once more that the discipline of the Army must be despotic, but I submit that the more despotic the administration the more necessary is it that your actions should be wise and just. I am not so foolish as not to recognise the difficulty of challenging a decision arrived at by a brilliant and experienced Minister, especially when it is supported, as we are given to understand it is supported, by a Commander-in-Chief whom the people of this country regard with a gratitude and an admiration of which I shall not presume to say more than this; that they have been earned over and over again not only by his heroic services, but by the noble example of his life. Yet I do so appeal in this House of Commons from this exercise of their despotic authority, to a despotism that is above all despotism, and an authority that is over every authority; to the great necessity to which the mind of every man in this House will bow, that justice and fair play shall guide our decisions and govern our actions.

That is all I have to say, I thank the House for its consideration, and perhaps I may be allowed to submit one request to it. I am sure that in the

minds of some hon. Members there must be some doubt as to the propriety of my action in raising this matter, and it is still more certain that by the manner in which I have done it, I may have given offence to those whom I would not willingly offend; well, let all that be my business. I beg hon. Members not to allow any mistakes of judgment on my part to prejudice them against the gallant and distinguished soldier whose case I have laid before the House.

MR. GKETTON (Derbyshire, S.): I cannot keep silent when an appeal has been put before the House to obtain justice for a distinguished constituent of mine. We appeal for a full and a fair inquiry. I pass by the professional questions, which may be more fittingly referred to the court of inquiry which we are appealing to the House of Commons to support us in demanding, and I will only call attention to the very anomalous position in which the whole question is placed by the fact that it had already been investigated by the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor and the distinguished officer who recently held the position of Commander-in-Chief. A decision was arrived at by these two distinguished gentlemen. Then there was a change in the officials of the War Office, and with that change there came a practical reversal of the decision, without any reference to the man chiefly affected. I appeal to this distinguished assembly to support us in asking for this inquiry. We do not want to prejudge the case, but I think with the hon. Gentleman opposite that there is a *prima facie* case for a full, fair, and open inquiry. If the decision of the right hon. Gentleman is proved to be correct, then the country will be satisfied, and if it is proved to be wrong an injustice will be removed from a distinguished officer, and the House will have the satisfaction of knowing that justice has been done. The case has raised a great deal of feeling outside the House. In my own constituency petitions have been very largely signed asking for an inquiry, and in many parts of the country doubts have arisen as to the justice of the decision of the War Office. I appeal to hon. Member to listen with fair and calm minds to both sides, and to judge without prejudice, and I think they will see that there is a strong case indeed for an inquiry.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words in the opinion of this House, the public interest requires that a complete and immediate inquiry be made into all the circumstances connected with the removal from his command at Gibraltar of Major General Sir Henry Colvile, K.C.M.G., C.B.," instead thereof."; (Mr. Charles Douglas.)

Question proposed, "the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*MR. BRODRICK: Mr. Speaker. I am sure that those who have listened to the two speeches of the hon. Gentlemen in support of the Amendment on this very delicate subject will be glad that the question has fallen into hands at once so capable and so moderate, because I think it is very important that we should discuss questions of this kind with the dignity which befits an assembly like the House of Commons. I confess that my own feelings in the matter are partly feelings of relief and partly of regret; relief because of opportunity of connecting a great many statements which have appeared about this case, and from what the hon.

Member has said apparently a considerable amount of misapprehension prevails; but much more of regret because the motion which has been made makes it necessary for me to say things which I would rather have left unsaid about an officer who in the past has had an honourable career in Her Majesty's service. I do not say it in any way as a reproach to the hon. Member's, but it is noticeable that this case should have fallen into the hands of two hon. Members neither of whom has any special knowledge of the campaign in South Africa, and neither of whom has any military experience; and I note that the more because the House of Commons has a large number of Members at this moment who fulfil those conditions. I am sure the House will not complain if, as I am forced to discuss the question, I tell the House the truth, and the whole truth, with regard to it. As far as I am concerned, I have nothing to apologise for in the course which has been taken by the War Office with regard to the late proceedings against Sir Henry Colvile.

I should like to clear away two misconceptions which have not found their way into the speeches this evening, but about which a great deal has been said, and therefore if I did not contradict further misconception might possibly be produced. The first is that in this reconsideration of Sir Henry Colvile's case I acted on my own initiative and responsibility, without the advice of the military authorities who are bound to advise me in the circumstances. I shall show that this is absolutely the reverse of the fact. The second point, which I would not have referred to if it had not played a part in the statement of General Colvile himself, is the suggestion that the particular corps which was the subject of the Lindley inquiry; namely, the Yeomanry; had some special form of influence which it brought to bear, and which had in some way affected the decision. I think it due to that corps to say; I should not think it necessary to say it on my own behalf to the House; that no member of the corps, any friend of the corps, or any one directly or indirectly connected with the corps had ever in any way approached me; or, so far as I am aware, any member of the War Office; on the subject. They suffered severely in action. They felt, as all Englishmen would feel, the fate which fell upon them acutely; and they took their beating and subsequent hardships like soldiers. They never, so far as I am aware, attempted to get any interference on their behalf or any consideration of their case except such as the military authorities would naturally give to it.

I will mention as briefly as I can what were the points which brought Lord Roberts's censure on General Colvile. The first was the action at Sauna's Post on 31st March last year. I will recapitulate in a few words what the position was at Sauna's Post when General Colvile and his command arrived there. General Broadwood, with the cavalry brigade and horse artillery, had been attacked by the enemy in the neighbourhood of Thaba Nehu, about twenty miles to the east of Sauna's Post. General Broadwood on the day before the action at Sauna's Post was warned about eleven o'clock that a force of Boers was advancing upon him. His outposts were about seven miles out, and they were told to hold the Boers as best they could. He telegraphed to Lord Roberts that he intended to fall back on the waterworks, and

he proceeded to hold the Boers at a distance while his convoy got into line of march and fought its way to the waterworks at Sauna's Post. The effect of that was that the convoy arrived there during the night, and General Broadwood and his cavalry found his way to bivouac at three o'clock in the morning of the 31st. Before dawn came, however, the Boer guns opened on the whole bivouac and from the neighbouring hills. I have never myself been in such a position, but hon. Members who have been are aware that whatever may be done extreme confusion is certain to result; shells bursting among a number of natives and horses and mules stampeding. The consequence was that General Broadwood's convoy was in the greatest confusion; he despatched two batteries of horse artillery and mounted infantry to protect the convoy, and himself went with the cavalry to make head against the enemy. Without General Broadwood's knowledge the Boers had seized a spruit which had to be crossed by the convoy. They seized the convoy as it came across, and they seized one gun after another, and a most desperate struggle ensued. The horse artillery managed to get out somehow and save five of their guns by an amount of hard fighting, perseverance, and courage which I do not suppose has been surpassed in any action in the war. But General Broadwood, when he fell back, found the remnant of his horse artillery and mounted infantry in dire difficulties. He had himself to fight his way across the spruit, going some miles down, and after a very serious further opposition from the enemy he made his way to the near side of the spruit at Bloemfontein and began to draw up his scattered forces. That was at eleven o'clock on the 31st. General Broadwood had then been marching and fighting without intermission, except for an hour and a half, from eleven o'clock on the preceding day. His horses and his men had not been fed since four o'clock on the previous day and were all in a state of exhaustion. They had lost about one-third of their strength, seven of their guns, and the whole of their baggage. That was the moment when General Colville's com-

mand, consisting of about 4,000 fresh troops, arrived at Bushman's Kop, situated about two and a half miles from the post where General Broadwood was then drawn up. I am not now talking of anything that is in dispute, and anything that I have to state to the House, either as to this action or that at Lindley, will not be, so far as I am aware, of a character that is disputed by General Colville. I propose to lay on the Table of the House, after I have quoted from it, the explanation which General Colville himself gave. General Colville arrived at Bushman's Kop at about eleven o'clock. At that moment his position was as I have stated, but what remained of General Broadwood's force was then within two and a half miles of him, and also on the Bloemfontein side of the spruit. At that moment the guns which had been taken had not yet been moved off, and (is far as I myself can make out, from what I have read and heard officially on the subject, (those guns were not removed until between twelve and one o'clock, in the day.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I am very sorry to interrupt my right hon. friend, but he said that he was not making any statement disputed by General Colville. But General Colville distinctly traverses the statement that these guns were not removed until between twelve and one.

*MR. BRODRICK: I extremely regret that I have to make this admission; General Colvile did not take the means to ascertain where the guns were, and the evidence I am obliged to give on that point is that of the other officers, who were in a position to give it. I was aware that General Colvile disputed that those guns had not been removed, but I was not aware that he disputed that they were not removed until between twelve and one.

MR. YERBURGH: I think it is in his evidence.

*MR. BRODRICK: General Colvile's own explanation was, that on arriving at Bushman's Kop he was informed that General Broadwood's brigade was then forming up about two miles to the east-

ward. He at once sent his Deputy Assistant Adjutant General, Captain Ruggles-Brise, to General Broadwood with a message that he wished to see him. On his return Captain Ruggles-Brise reported that General Broadwood replied that he was too tired to come. "Under ordinary circumstances," said General Colvile, "I should have taken serious notice of such an answer, but as I gathered that under the circumstances in which he found himself, General Broadwood appeared to be completely broken down and incapable of co-operation, I thought it better to let it pass." Lord Roberts subsequently had occasion to comment on what appears to me to be an extraordinary narrative. The general whom he had sent to relieve General Broadwood and assist him, being himself two and a half miles from the scene of action, sent to General Broadwood an order to leave his troops, which were still in touch with the enemy, while there was still firing going on, in order to come two and a half miles to the rear to confer with General Colvile as to what was to be done. Lord Roberts thought it an action which was in itself a mistake, and he thought that in the situation in which General Broadwood found himself he was amply justified in refusing to leave his troops. I would sooner not have to inform the House what followed. General Colvile appears to have taken, as his own words show, serious exception to General Broadwood's behaviour. Even in his own account to Lord Roberts he practically takes credit that he did not immediately call to account from a disciplinary standpoint the officer who was commanding these hungry and wearied men still fighting with the enemy. But it is almost impossible to realise the state of mind which caused General Colvile to take the action he did after eleven o'clock that day. At a moment when information as to the enemy's position was of the highest value, when he himself has admitted that it was imperative that he and General Broadwood should come together, on General Broadwood's explaining that he was unable to leave his troops General Colvile made no further effort whatever to come into touch with him. At an hour of the day when every moment was of importance with regard to the rescue of the guns, General Colvile, by his own account, waited till nearly two o'clock without taking any steps in any direction whatever. At the moment when it was of the utmost importance that by bringing forward these fresh troops he should do what he could to restore confidence, he left General Broadwood's shattered force severely alone; and finally, without receiving any further indication from General Broadwood as to his situation, he marched his troops in another direction. General Colvile states that he had no intimation of the suggestion which Brigadier General

Broadwood reports, that a direct advance on the spruit offered the best chance of assistance. Whichever way that statement cuts, it cuts, I fear, against General Colvile. General Broadwood states that he made that intimation. If he did not make it, then General Colvile neither knew what General Broadwood wished him to do, nor took pains to find it out. As between two generals in the field within two and a half miles of one another, one of whom possessed information but the other did not, that conduct seemed to Lord Roberts, and will seem, I think, to the House, very extraordinary. The result;the net result of these operations was this, that, after having left the men he had been sent to help without assistance. General Colvile blundered about with his force;when I use that word I mean he moved without proper guidance to show him where to go;until dark, when his men were wearied out; and alter they had marched twenty-three miles evening came on, and in the meantime the Boers had carried off the guns quietly and unmolested. Lord Roberts considered that he had shown a want of enterprise in this matter, which had the worst possible effect on those whom he bad to lead and those whom he had to relieve. One at least of the brigadiers finally endeavoured to get General Colvile where be ought to have marched;straight up to the enemy.

MR. YERBURGH: What was the opinion of the other general with Sir Henry Colvile?

*MR. BRODRICK: I do not think, Sir. I am in possession, of the other general's opinion. I have seen in General Colvile s own handwriting, in a letter that was not marked private, that he was not in the habit of taking the opinions of his subordinates. As the result of what happened, General Colvile lost Lord Roberts s confidence. Lord Roberts had not an opportunity for some time of hearing all the facts. General Broadwood's report did not reach him for three weeks afterwards. General Colvile's reply to General Broad wood did not reach him for a much longer period, and meantime Lord Roberts thought the best course was to take General Colvile away from the division and send him further back with a less command; and he awaited, with that moderation which has always distinguished him, the full knowledge of the event before be finally dealt with General Colvile's case. Unfortunately, before that occurred a fresh incident had taken place. I do not want to labour any of the incidents. General Colvile says he did know the Yeomanry were coming, and that he himself started on his inarch in the firm belief that his duty was simply to confine himself;

*MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS: I do not think I said, and I did not intend to say, he did not know the Yeomanry were coming. What he did not know was that they would come by that route. He expected, reasonably, that they would go by another route.

*MR. BRODRICK: All these questions of the telegrams are quite immaterial to the case I have to present to the House, which is of the simplest character. General Colvile marched from Lindley on 27th May. When he had got to a point which the hon. Member calls twenty-three miles off, but is called by others eighteen miles, he received this message from Colonel Spragge, which he himself quotes: "Colonel Spragge to General Colvile.;Found no one in Lindley but Boers. Five hundred men and only one day's food. Have stopped three miles back on the Kroonstad road. We want help to get out without great loss.:(Signed) B. SPRAGUE, Colonel."

General Colvile received that message early on the morning of May 28th. As to whether General Colvile should have gone forward or back, that is a question with which I think military men are more fitted to deal than any of us who have not military experience. But I can say only this; that General Colvile was eighteen, twenty, or twenty-three miles from the scene of action, that he got this demand from a body of troops undoubtedly in difficulties, and that he had no means of knowing that they could get out of them without surrender. Other generals took a different course from his. Lord Methuen, who was forty-four miles away, marched forty-four miles in twenty-seven hours in trying to relieve the Yeomanry. General Rundle, who was forty-five miles off, threw himself on the Boers in front of him in an attempt to draw them off Lindley. He incurred a loss of 150 men, and even then he could not get through. The one man who sent back a message to this earnest appeal that Colonel Spragge was to find his way out of his difficulties as best he could was the only [officer in the Army who twice within eight weeks left a body of troops in difficulties without making the slightest effort, to relieve them. There is a French; maxim to which the great Napoleon expected his generals to conform *Marcher toujours au feu*. That is the maxim of our Army for all time. It has always been the maxim of our Army that when a body of your own troops are in difficulties you must go straight for them.

I will state as briefly as possible why, when he had come home in consequence of these operations. Lord Roberts found it necessary to raise the question again. Lord Wolseley looked; into the question and made a recommendation to Lord Lansdowne. He thought that General Colvile should be allowed to return to Gibraltar. But there were two points which had altered. The first was that when the court of inquiry with regard to Lindley came before me at the beginning of December it was clearly proved that Colonel Spragge's surrender was not due to any default of Colonel Spragge himself; that he could never have got out of his own difficulties; that he had done all that man could do, and that he and those who were with him were guiltless of any lack of military talent in having to surrender. But there was another point. As far as I was concerned, I did not take up this question, as has been suggested, as a mere question of seizing on something and then framing a charge against an officer already tried. The result of the inquiry was brought before me by the acting Commander-in-Chief, Sir Evelyn Wood, who made various recommendations, I saw by the official Papers that though Lord Wolseley had made a recommendation to Lord Lansdowne, and had before him an official report as to General Colvile's conduct in the field by Lord Roberts, yet Lord Wolseley had never communicated with Lord Roberts, and had never asked his opinion as to whether the employment of General Colvile in the field being deemed to be undesirable, his employment at home was not also undesirable. It seems to me that there was no opinion on that point so important as the opinion of Lord Roberts, under whom General Colvile had served. I was asked by the hon. Member to say directly, did Lord Roberts know, before he arrived at Gibraltar, that General Colvile was to be removed? Most unquestionably he did. On Sir Evelyn Wood's making this recommendation, I telegraphed to Lord Roberts and mentioned to him that the effect of the court of

inquiry at Lindley seemed to bear upon General Colvile's position, and I asked him for his opinion. He stated his opinion unhesitatingly in agreement with that of the Acting Commander-in-Chief, that General Colvile should not be allowed to retain his position at Gibraltar. I had no alternative in the matter. I know that I took a responsibility in regard to it; but I put it to the House, should I not have taken a much greater responsibility if, in face of the recommendations of the man under whom General Colvile had served and the officer who advised me at home, I had retained him in a command which, in their opinion, it was not desirable he should fill? The Secretary of State has the power, of course, of over-riding all his military advisers; but I do not think that the House of Commons will hold that, as a rule, in such cases, he would be wise in doing so. What I did was to direct that, in the circumstances, General Colvile should be communicated with quietly and should be given an opportunity of resigning. The hon. Member said that was compulsory resignation. It may have been; but it would have proceeded from General Colvile himself; and it would not have been necessary to call public attention to it. If General Colvile had intimated his desire to resign his command at Gibraltar, no further notice of any kind would have been taken.

*MR. CHARLES DOUGLAS: My point is that that is not voluntary which one is compelled to do.

*MR. BRODRICK: The question is whether a public stigma would have been put upon General Colvile. That is what I wished to avoid. After that General Colvile's action cannot be defended by anyone. He left for England. He did not avail himself of his right of appeal to the Commander-in-Chief. He made no representation to the War Office. He immediately published what he called a justification, but which consisted rather of an attack upon the staff officers in the Transvaal; and which also included, I regret to say, what appeared to be some ungenerous sneers against the cavalry whom he had found it impossible to relieve. And obviously it is impossible that officers, whether on the Full-pay List or the Half-pay List, should be allowed to make reflections on their superiors as General Colvile did. He was placed on retired pay, and any officer who follows his example will necessarily share the same fate.

I will just say distinctly what is Lord Roberts's opinion with regard to General Colvile's position. I will say, first, that Lord Wolseley by no means exonerated him when he allowed him to go back to Gibraltar. On the contrary, he stated his view in regard to Sauna's Post, that whether he could have captured the guns or not he ought to have tried. Lord Roberts stated that, in his opinion, on two occasions in the field General Colvile had shown a want of forwardness, of enterprise, and of sound judgment which are essential qualifications for a command. He considered that in twice leaving a body of cavalry in difficulties he set an example which, if followed, would be fatal to an army in the field. Other circumstances had come to Lord Roberts's notice in which General Colvile's relations with his subordinates and the absence of sufficient control and supervision in his command, were such as to seriously impair the confidence which troops should have in their leaders. I make that statement by Lord Roberts's desire. Under these conditions Lord Roberts felt that the retention of

General Colville in his command at Gibraltar, being in principle indefensible, would have a prejudicial effect on the army in South Africa, and, in agreeing that he should not be retained in command, Lord

Roberts considered that even then he would be dealt with much more leniently than would have been the case had he been brought to a court-martial for his conduct at Sanna's Post and Lindley. I am myself strongly in favour, where possible, of bringing an officer to a court-martial; but I am not at all convinced that, if this House does not accept the views of Lord Roberts, Sir Evelyn Wood, Lord Kitchener, and other officers of that character, it will more readily accept the views of officers of less distinction who may preside over the court-martial.

I would like to say one word as to my own action in the matter. I have had to remove a considerable number of officers on different grounds. Those officers mostly have no high connections, no powerful friends, no access to the press, but their career is every bit as important to them, and the tragedy of the loss of their position is every bit as great as that of the highest placed officer in the Army. In this case there is no private pressure which could be exerted upon me which has not been exerted. There is no degree of false statement in the press which has not been made in certain organs; there has been a continuous stream of attempts to influence, corruptly as I consider, the judgment of those who were forced to come to a decision against a general who had this distinction only as compared with other officers; that he had occupied the unique position of commanding the Brigade of Guards. I am willing to take any odium on myself in such matters, but I will not give way to this sort of clamour. I will not accept the view that because a man has powerful friends he is to be retained in a command for which nearly every man who served in South Africa, knowing that he had been sent home for incapacity in the field, considered him unfit. To that I will stand, whether I am attacked or applauded, whether I am criticised or encouraged, whether I am followed or not followed. So long as I hold the position I now hold these things shall not be done with impunity. Lord Roberts has received every distinction that a man can receive from a grateful Sovereign and from his fellow-countrymen, but all those decorations that have been so fitly worn and all those high titles so nobly won would be as travesty and tinsel if they are not to be accompanied by the confidence of his fellow-countrymen with respect to his decision as to comrades with whom he has served in the profession to which he has given his life. It is for that reason that I earnestly beg the House to put confidence in the Government in these matters.

I hope the hon. Member will not think it necessary to divide on this motion. I should regret the acceptance of it more than any motion that could be put before the House at this moment. I ask the House to have some confidence in the Commander-in-Chief, and not to open the door more widely to proposals of this character, and to remember that if these decisions are to be made the subject of continued discussion in this House, they must militate against the discipline of the Army, and are, not likely to add to the credit of the House of Commons. It being midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

SUPPLY [4th March].

Resolutions reported::

NAVY (SUPPLEMENTARY) ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

1. "That an additional number of men and boys, not exceeding 600, be employed for the Sea and Coast Guard Services for the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901."

2. "That an additional sum, not exceeding £;1,250,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for additional Expenditure on the following Navy Services, viz.::

£;

Vote 1. Wages, etc, of Officers, etc.

500

Vote 2. Victualling and Clothing for the Navy

84,000

Vote 8. Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, etc.::

Section I. Personnel.

98,500

Section II. Matériel

630,000

Section III. Contract Work

207,000

Vote 11. Miscellaneous Effective Services

230,000

Total

£;1,250,000."

Resolutions agreed to.

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 12th March, 1901.

Another Member made and subscribed the Affirmation required by law.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 63 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 63 has been complied with, namely::
Golborne Gas Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

WOLVERHAMPTON CORPORATION WATER BILL. (By ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

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

*Mr. ALEXANDER BROWN (Shropshire, Wellington) said he regretted opposing the Second Reading of the Bill, because he was aware that the House was always anxious to get private Bill business out of the way as quickly as possible, and that the general practice was to send private Bills to a Select Committee. Had this been an ordinary case he thought that would have been the proper course to

take, but he now proposed to move that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, because of exceptional circumstances. In most large towns it was obvious that the question of water supply was one of growing difficulty. He admitted that in some large towns the water supply must be considered to be a matter of public necessity, which should override private rights; but in this particular case there were circumstances which altered that presumption, which he would explain. The case of Wolverhampton differed from that of many other towns, because by reason of legislation which had been passed they had had the opportunity of getting all the water they wanted, and there was no reason or necessity for them to come

to Parliament at present for powers. The facts were very simple. In 1892 the House was engaged in considering a very large and magnificent scheme of water supply for Birmingham. As a Member of Parliament at that time, he remembered there was a great discussion upon that Bill, and that the proposal to go to South Wales for water for Birmingham met with a great deal of discussion, and much was said for and against the scheme. During the passage of that Bill through the House, at the instance of Wolverhampton, a clause was inserted, giving power to Wolverhampton under the Birmingham Act of 1892 to obtain water on demand from the Birmingham Corporation. That was the position of the law now, and Wolverhampton would be able, when the works were completed, to send in a requisition to Birmingham to get the water for its own population which it no doubt needed. They contended, therefore, that there was no need for Wolverhampton to come forward and ask for another independent supply when an enactment of the House had already given them the proper remedy. Before going into the case itself, which was really very simple, he would refer to Clause 62 of the Birmingham Bill, which gave power to Wolverhampton to demand water on giving one year's notice, and to demand a supply equal to 25 gallons per head of the population, and the cost of such supply was a charge regulated on a four per cent. basis. There was nothing in those provisions at all onerous or hard upon Wolverhampton, and the proper step for them to take would be to proceed with the powers under the Act, and apply to Birmingham as soon as possible. There was no need for them to come to Shropshire and put down works which would undoubtedly do great damage to the county and to the works in the Borough of Wenlock, and under the circumstances he thought the Bill ought not to be read a second time. Two reasons had been alleged why that Bill should be brought in as an alternative to the power that Wolverhampton already had to go to Birmingham. He had an extract from a speech by Mr. Alderman Marston, reported in the Midland Evening News of 5th January

last, when the Chairman of the Water Company had been explaining his view of the matter, and had urged for consideration two facts which he said ought to bring him support for this Bill. The first was the time in which the supply was to be obtained, and the second the cost. Undoubtedly Wolverhampton wanted the water quickly, but he would point out that the Birmingham scheme could come into operation by 1902, and although there might be a delay, he thought that within two years, at any rate, the water would be in the neighbourhood of Wolverhampton. But this Bill provided five years for works, and ten years for

compulsory powers. Therefore, if the element of time was to be considered it was obvious that by going to Birmingham they would get the water which Wolverhampton wanted quicker than by going for powers under this Bill. As to cost, he took Alderman Marston's figures. That gentleman estimated that the cost of going to Birmingham would be £;80,000, and that that would be the capital charge laid upon Wolverhampton. But by this Bill the capital charge that was going to be laid upon them was £;200,000. Therefore, if there was anything to be said on the element of cost, it was obviously in favour of the Birmingham scheme. Therefore he thought that upon those points there was evidence that the Second Reading of this Bill should not be agreed to, and if Wolverhampton wanted water it should hasten to give notice to Birmingham, and to get the water when Birmingham herself got it. His first contention was that if water was wanted Wolverhampton ought to put in force the powers of the Act of 1892, and that it was unfair to go to other quarters. As to the case of Shropshire against the Bill, that was a case which rested upon two grounds. There were large interests which it was alleged would seriously be damaged by putting down works in their neighbourhood. First there were the interests of the landowners, of the large proprietors, and the damage that would be done to their present water supply. Secondly, there were those who got their supply from some public authority. In explaining the Bill he would point out that certain works were to be put down, and certain wells were to be sunk in the red sandstone, or upper Bunter bed, which would inevitably affect all the wells in the neighbourhood. The Wolverhampton Corporation had already a well there, which it was known had already had a very considerable effect upon the underground water in the district, and now they had been told that Wolverhampton was coming for further powers to put down new wells in the same locality. Therefore when pumping was going on they would find that all the water necessary for their supply would be taken from them, and they would have no remedy. In addition, there was the public supply for the borough of Wenlock, where at great cost a well had been put down, and it had been charged upon the rates. That well supplied a large number of parishes, and the effect of the new wells would be to empty and drain it, and consequently all the works that had been put down, for which £;20,000 had been already borrowed, would become worthless. The House was now asked to sanction a new scheme which would ruin the Wenlock supply, and the ratepayers' money would be thrown away. The law on the subject might be explained as follows: If A were to dig a well to get water, and B were to dig beside it, and B's well drained A's well, then A would have no remedy at law. The only remedy of A would be for him to dig deeper than B's well. But who was going to enter into competition with the Wolverhampton Corporation? The consequence was that in law there was no remedy whatever. The whole question was whether in allowing this Bill to go forward great damage should be done and no compensation received. He maintained that there was no remedy whatever, except to come to the House and ask them not to give a Second Reading to the Bill. The Wolverhampton Corporation were proposing to dig a well at Stapleford, which would drain the Wenlock well at Harrington, and if the Bill were passed all the money expended for the public supply of Wenlock would become useless, the taxpayers would be saddled with a heavy

burden, and an injustice would be done. The two hon. Members for Wolverhampton, who were present, no doubt knew the locality, and he would point out to them that the cost of £20,000 arose from the fact that the water on one side had to be taken down the bed of the river up on the other side, and therefore the cost to a small and poor community like that would be considerable. For years the supply to the parishes mentioned had been deficient, and the difficulty so great that the Corporation of Wenlock now came forward to obtain the protection of the House for their works. To sum up his case, he would observe that Wolverhampton ought to go to Birmingham for their water supply. Having got their remedy and supply there was no reason for their doing an injury to Shropshire. Under this Bill, by Sections 13 and 15, they had very large roving powers, which, if exercised, would practically amount to a roving commission to go all over the place and take anything which might be chosen. In conclusion, he asked the House to throw out the Bill on the Second Reading, and he moved that it be read a second time that day six months.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"; (Mr. Alexander Hargreaves Brown.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

*Mr. STANLEY LEIGHTON (Shropshire, Oswestry) said that a Wolverhampton alderman had declared that the works going on now represented "a robbery of people without any compensation." The Bill proposed to treble the works. It had also been said that the water supply was insufficient for the growing needs of Wolverhampton, but the fact was that Parliament had already supplied the town with an inexhaustible store from the Birmingham reservoirs. Yet, before they had found out whether that would fail (and it never could fail), they came to Parliament with a new Bill, not to supply Wolverhampton with water, but to put profits in the pockets of the Wolverhampton ratepayers by taking other people's water. The chairman of the Water Committee had said that for the last thirty years they had made a fairly good profit out of the waterworks in Shropshire; waterworks,

which had caused ruin to all the surrounding neighbourhood, had dried up all the wells, turned the grass meadows into and fields with great fissures in them, compelled the unfortunate villagers to go two or three miles for a can of water, and put the farmers at their wits' end for water. In the meantime those waterworks, which had scattered ruin over all the neighbourhood, had been putting profit into the pockets of the Wolverhampton ratepayers; "a fairly good profit." Therefore, this was not a Bill to supply a large population which was starved of water, but was a Bill to enable the ratepayers of Wolverhampton to make a profit out of the water, the taking away of which meant ruin to the people of Shropshire. He believed the House had never, in any of the water Bills brought before it, allowed the taking of anything but surplus water from any district, and had always left to the people enough to satisfy their wants. The great waterworks of the north, the great waterworks in Wales, had always been required to leave a sufficiency for those who lived in the neighbourhood. But this Bill proposed not to take the surplus or the surface water, but to go down

900 feet into the sandstone and abstract all the water-storage which supplied the district, and upon which the very existence of the district depended. Through the Upper Bunden bed of sandstone, he explained, the rain percolated quickly, and formed at 900 or 1,000 feet below a great storage of water, which came up again in springs and supplied the whole neighbourhood. If a pump were to be put into that storage, after a time the whole supply could be taken away. That had been proved by the well, 900 feet deep, which Wolverhampton had already put down. The pumping well provided 4,500,000 gallons per day sixteen years ago; it only now provided two and a half millions. If this Bill were passed it would mean that acres and acres of land in Shropshire would be converted into a desert. The whole county came forward as one man and protested against the Bill, and surely the 230,000 who formed the population had as good a title to consideration as the 170,000 inhabitants of Wolverhampton. Shropshire was fighting a principle which was of importance to every county council throughout the country, and Shropshire appealed to the representatives of counties to maintain the principle which had always been upheld by that House; that one county should not be deprived of a necessity of life which it possessed, in order to give it to another county. The Bill proposed that the Wolverhampton Corporation should be a new sanitary authority placed in Shropshire, a sanitary authority without representation, and in which not a single inhabitant of Shropshire would have a voice. Under that Bill the Corporation would have at its own option to supply water or not, for Section 5 said;

"If at any time after the expiration of five years from the passing of this Act the Corporation are not furnishing or prepared on demand to furnish a sufficient supply of water in accordance with the provisions of this Act in any parish by this Act added to their limits for the supply of water, the local authority for the district comprising such parish may provide a supply in the whole or any part of such parish in accordance with the provisions of the Public Health Acts, or any company, body, or person may apply for an Act of Parliament or Provisional Order for the purpose of supplying water in any part of such parish not sufficiently supplied by the Corporation as if in either case this Act had not passed."

and the Corporation had ten years option. If at the end of five years they were not supplying sufficient water, then the local authorities might provide it for themselves. But then the Corporation would already have taken all the water, and the local authority would be compelled to go elsewhere to find some at unreasonable cost. In other words, with a kind of cynicism seldom found in Acts of Parliament they said: "Go elsewhere; you must find your water elsewhere; we have taken it from you, and we decline to give you compensation." The Bill introduced new principles which were contrary to public policy, and contrary to the principles already applied by Parliament in private and general Acts. He appealed to the House not to introduce new forms and principles of legislation under the guise of private Bills.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said he felt overwhelmed by the description of the magnitude of the crimes of Wolverhampton which they had just

heard. He could

only tell the House a plain and simple story, without attempting at all to reply to the rhetoric and, if he might so call it, the imagination of the hon.

Gentleman who had just addressed the House. The object of the Bill was to increase the supply of water available for the large manufacturing population of Wolverhampton and its neighbourhood. The history of the supply of water to Wolverhampton he could put in a nutshell. All acquainted with Wolverhampton knew that it was a difficult place to supply with water, on account of the height above the sea level, and the water supply had always been a problem of considerable difficulty. The House, after the indignation which had been expressed from Shropshire at the invasion of Salopian territory, would be surprised to learn that about fifty years ago some enterprising public-spirited landowners of Shropshire proposed to construct works there to supply Wolverhampton with water. That was the inception of the present scheme, and they got their supply from a Shropshire brook. That supply, however, was insufficient and unsatisfactory, it being subjected to a great deal of turbid matter coming down, making it inferior in quality and deficient in quantity. After the Wolverhampton Corporation had bought the waterworks, some thirty-five years ago, and taken the matter into their own hands, they sunk a well into the red sandstone. That operation was a success, and had supplied Wolverhampton with a large quantity of water during the last quarter of a century. The fullest and amplest consideration had previously been paid to all the riparian proprietors down the whole course of the brook where it joined the Severn, so that no complaint was ever made against the Corporation of Wolverhampton on that score; against the diversion of the water. It was bought and paid for, and he thought no legal proceedings had ever been taken against them in regard to the taking of the water. The population of Wolverhampton now supplied was about 154,000. The water supply was already taken by 137,000 of that population; there were still 15,000 within the limits unsupplied, and there were also large manufactories; and whether through their own fault or through their misfortune, the Corporation were now bound to complete the supply. He would tell the House a few facts, and they would see where the pressure arose. The average supply of water during 1900 was 2,977,000 gallons per day, and on many occasions last year four million gallons were required, one day there being 4,138,000 consumed. The present quantity of water on which the town could depend was practically only the three million, gallons to which he referred. The demand was daily increasing, and the very competent advisers of the Corporation of Wolverhampton said that they must supply a demand equal to twenty-five gallons per head, or 4,000,000 gallons per day, subject to a considerable increase. The present scheme was intended to meet that want, and the House would be very surprised to hear what a very small scheme that was. It really interfered only with a rural district containing a population of about 13,000 people, and the Wolverhampton Corporation were quite willing to recognise their obligation to the people in the locality, whose water it might be said they took. He ventured to say that if the Bill were allowed to go upstairs it would be seen that the Corporation would be compulsorily obliged to supply the

whole of the inhabitants of the district, extending the limits to something like ten additional parishes. So that if there were any claims in consequence of the interference with wells, the Corporation would be ready and in a position to supply them with water. He would not dispute that there were local cases of hardship, where certain other wells might be interfered with in consequence of the sinking of new wells to great depths, and compensation ought to be given; but the idea of trying this case in the House of Commons by speeches on the one side and on the other, with no particle of reliable evidence, would be a travesty of the judicial functions of the House. A Committee ought to have the case to deal with, and no objection would be raised to the *lotus standi* of anybody who considered himself aggrieved. The hon. Member for the Oswestry Division had said that there had been a great infliction of pains and penalties, which had done his constituency much injury, but he had been told that their scheme had not yet come into action at all; they had not pumped a drop of water, and it the people of Much Wenlock were prepared to sell what they had already spent, in reference to sinking that well, then Wolverhampton were prepared to buy it, and to supply Much Wenlock with water. Surely that, again, was a case for a Committee. He frankly admitted that the most serious part of the case was that which had been referred to by the hon. Member for the Wellington Division, Wolverhampton Corporation, no doubt, had the power to take the water from Birmingham, but it had to be taken upon terms, and they had been advised that a certain proportion of the original capital cost of the Birmingham scheme would have to be paid. Then again there was the difference of levels to be considered, they having been informed that there was no point on the Birmingham route where the water could be taken by gravitation, and that it would have to be pumped, and that meant a great expenditure.

*MR. ALEXANDER BROWN said the cost of the pumping was included in the statement.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER said he appreciated that point, but the ground on which the proposed scheme was recommended to the people of Wolverhampton, apart from the consideration of time, was that it would be a much more economical scheme than the supply from Birmingham. That, again, was a question for a Committee. As to the question of time, the Birmingham scheme was to be finished within ten years. He did not know if any hon. Member would say that it could be done within the remaining two years, but he was informed that a considerable time must elapse; and when the scheme was completed twelve months notice would have to be given, and a proper aqueduct would have to be constructed from the point of junction into the town of Wolverhampton. Those were difficulties which had beset the Water Committee of that Corporation. This was no scheme promoted for the benefit of some interested individual, but was an undertaking promoted by a public company in the discharge of their public duty to supply their town with water, and they, acting under the best engineering advice, had come to the conclusion that this was not only the cheapest but the most effective and most expeditious means by which they could discharge their duty. As to the five years to which his hon. friend had alluded, that simply related to the fact that somebody else must do the work if the Corporation did

not; but from the moment they put down a supply of water from the two wells which they proposed to sink, they would be obliged to supply water to that particular locality. This was eminently a case for a judicial investigation by a Committee upstairs. He was one of those who very firmly believed in the impartiality of a House of Commons Committee, and he was quite sure the people of Wolverhampton would readily accept the decision of such a Committee after hearing evidence and cross-examination, and after having had the advantage of the learned representatives on all sides. No obstacle would be given to any man giving evidence; and they did not desire to shelter themselves behind any technicalities. They had a simple duty to discharge to the public, and in endeavouring to do so they asked the House as a matter of fairness not to judge the case against them without a hearing, but to send the Bill upstairs, where it would be fully and impartially considered and satisfactorily dealt with.

*COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY (Shropshire, Newport) said he cordially acknowledged the tone and temper in which the right hon. Gentleman (Sir H. Fowler) had addressed himself to the question, and he only wished that that had been the temper which had characterised the negotiations and various dealings with the matter on the part of the Corporation of Wolverhampton. If it had been, then the state of things might have been very different; but there seemed to him to have been some evil influences which prevented the question being considered in the way in which such controversies ought to be approached. He felt bound to tell the right hon. Gentleman, and he appreciated his position in the House as much as anyone, and he had had the pleasure of often supporting him in his public acts; but on this occasion he really must challenge his consistency. He recollected when the right hon. Gentleman was introducing the Parish Councils Bill, in which he gave the right hon. Gentleman support, he used these words; "The parish council will have the power of utilising any supply of water within the parish. There are a great many parishes which cannot bear the cost of waterworks, but which have an adequate supply of water if there were anybody to look after it, keep it pure, and see that it was distributed. There would, therefore, be great advantage in giving a parish council power to utilise a supply of water within the parish. I may say, in passing, that it is, of course, the absolute statutory duty of the district council, and we hope to make it more binding upon them, to see to the supply of water of every parish within their area."

Now, the right hon. Gentleman was in this position: every single parish council concerned in that particular area objected to the action which the right hon. Gentleman sought to force upon it. Every single district council objected most absolutely to the attempt of the right hon. Gentleman to take away from them the very power which he conferred by that Act, and on which he laid that stress. And not only that. Every single person exercising any public office whatever throughout the whole county united in most absolute objection to forcible means of taking away from them that which years ago the right hon. Gentleman took great credit for conferring upon them. Therefore he begged leave in the first instance to impugn the right hon. Gentleman's consistency and the consistency of any of those who, having once upheld the extension of powers to rural

districts, now, at a moment which seemed to them advisable, took away those powers and placed the authorities in the maw of some great corporation merely because they happened to be connected with it.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER asked to be allowed to explain. The Bill contained a clause which compelled the Corporation to sell the plant and works in any district to the local authority whenever they chose.

*Colonel KENYON-SLANEY asked how could those small local authorities by any accident be able to deal with questions of purchase and sale? The right hon. Gentleman might just as well tell him that he could go and buy out one of the great concerns of Wolverhampton to-morrow. The thing was an absurdity and a farce, and was well known to be such. He now knew that it was his duty to try and convince the House that it should in justice and equity take a course which was allowed to be rather unusual. In order that that might be done he wanted to indulge, like his hon. friend, in a short historical retrospect. His interests were to some extent personal. At all events his experience enabled him to lay before the House information which he could assure hon. Members was firsthand, and to the accuracy of every detail of which he publicly pledged himself. Firstly, people were apt to talk as if this was a Bill affecting landowners. In this case he asked them to remember that the landowners represented all the rural population living on the land. It was not a selfish vested interest on the part of the landowners, because, although they happened to be in the forefront of the battle by virtue of their interest in the land, it was a matter in which the landowners really represented everybody living on the land. There were several points to which he desired to ask the attention of the House. In the first place he could not help being rather amused at the right hon. Gentleman's description of the public-spirited landowners of Shropshire who came forward with a desire to supply Wolverhampton with water. The right hon. Gentleman, whose recollection was as good as his, smiled. In its inception this was a mere job for the purpose of enabling a certain landowner to sell his land at a high price, as he thought. It never was carried out, and as far as that went the public-spirited landowner was utterly sold. Passing to another question, the right hon. Gentleman had taken credit to himself and his fair-dealing Corporation for having given great consideration to the riparian owners. If consideration were given to the riparian owners, he assumed that it was long before the Corporation came into possession of those works, and that it was given by the company which preceded the Corporation, from whom the Corporation took the property. He was a riparian owner himself for some considerable distance; and he had never been able to trace the passage of a single sixpence on that account. It did not appear on any estate account with which he was acquainted; certainly not in his own; neither were there any records such as were usually kept in estate offices of anything of the sort having passed. The only case he knew of was where a sum of £700 was paid when the site at Cosford was compulsorily purchased by the company which preceded the Corporation. As he had promised, he must go more carefully into an historical retrospect. This was a consideration which the House would bear in mind in coming to a fair conclusion. The position of the Corporation was a position of

having succeeded a company. That company in 1855 secured a Bill in Parliament, and on the strength of the power given to it by Parliament it proceeded to buy the site at Cosford. It was a matter of fact, which would not be disputed, that there was not a single reference made in that Act to any powers to sink any wells whatever. That Act conferred, and was meant to confer, solely power to deal with overground water. There was no allusion whatever to well sinking in that Act of 1855; neither was there, he believed, at that time the slightest intention to sink wells; nor was there, according to the geological knowledge of that time, any encouragement for people to make the Attempt. Anyhow, there was no such power there. The consequence was that Parliament, when they granted the present powers, did not safeguard the district in the matter of sinking wells.

Had there been any mention of the possibility of wells being sunk, it was obvious that Parliament would have safeguarded the interests of the surrounding districts; but inasmuch as there was no reference made to any such thing, there were no safeguarding clauses, and the result was that they had been handed over, tied and bound, to the tender mercies of the Corporation, which had shown no mercy whatever, and had never made any attempt to show mercy to those whom it had victimised. He would ask the House to consider, not of course as affecting the

Corporation, but the position, whether it did not almost amount to a fraud on Parliament that powers which Parliament gave for certain purposes should be used for other purposes, and that thereby Parliament should be deprived of the right to give that protection which otherwise it certainly would have given. In consequence of that action of 1855 great losses immediately began to be incurred in the neighbourhood. The water sank in the brook; the supply for cattle was affected; water for motive power was done away with, and it could not be used for the purpose of safeguarding mansions or farms from fire. In 1867 the Corporation bought out the company, and then became, under the same title and with the same limitations as their predecessors, the possessors of Cosford Works. The result was that as they pumped more water more damage accrued. Those immediately before them suffered, and more severely and heavily. Time after time they were asked whether they would consider the question of any reasonable compensation, and all consideration of that question was refused. In 1880, he thought, the Corporation sank this deep well of 918 feet. The right hon.

Gentleman must recollect that no public notice was given of that. None of them had any reason to know that this operation was being carried on, and they had not a chance, therefore, of opposing it, even if they had had the power. Of course, the House would appreciate that the sinking of a well did not lead to any immediate change in the neighbourhood. The results were gradual, and gradually and surely the results of the well sinking became apparent. He owned a property of some 3,000 acres immediately above the works at Cosford, in which the effects became very gradually but certainly apparent. His wells began to sink and he spent considerable sums in deepening them. They held for a short time and then gave out. They constantly failed. In 1889 he took the advice of an expert civil engineer, who compared the position with what had been in 1884, and he found that the water level between those years had been lowered by the action

of the Cosford pumping by twenty-eight inches; that was to say, over five and a half inches in the year. Consequently this was the position; that for a mansion, several farms, many cottages, and for all the ordinary transactions of agricultural life, he had not one spoonful of water left, and he had no access to any other source whatever. Water had to be carried from one place to another in order to get on at all, and he had sometimes to rely on the rainfall. In 1889, when this desperate state of things had to be faced, he went to the Wolverhampton Corporation and saw the chairman of committee and the chief engineer of works. He laid before them the position in which he was placed, and they replied: "We have taken all your water; if you find any more water, Colonel Slaney, we will take that too, and we will not give you any compensation." The House could imagine, therefore, how bitterly he contrasted that reply with the language of the right hon. Gentleman when he talked of the readiness and willingness of the Corporation, and admitted that compensation ought to be given. All these were incontrovertible and incontestable facts. The two gentlemen he saw conversed with him, and suggested it would be possible under certain circumstances to supply him with water. He asked what the conditions would be, and was informed that for a limited time, and only at a slightly preferential price, they would give him water on condition that he paid the whole cost price of laying down every main and pipe required in the system. The first calculation put before him was £;800 for doing a little portion only of what was required. What was he to do? Well, it turned out that he became, within a year, possessed of another little property abutting on his former property some two miles from the works already erected, where he put up pumping works for resupplying his farms, his people, and himself. The cost of doing that had been over £;3,000 in absolute cash, and would be practically over £;5,000 in direct and indirect value. He need hardly say that he did not raise his rent in order to meet any part of that cost. It was an elementary right that every tenant should receive water from his landlord, at any rate he thought every tenant should receive water from his landlord; at all events, in his case every tenant had received it, and now he was enjoying that supply. But what position, he asked, would he and his people have been in if he had not had the means and good fortune to get that supply? The countryside would have been derelict. Agricultural operations could not be carried on without water, and it was idle to contend that this was a small case, and that he was asking for anything excessive. This was a serious example, and the House ought to take warning and apply the only remedy which was in its power. He had not calculated the probable future expenditure on renewals, etc., and no doubt a great part of the outlay would have to be renewed. As to what was now happening, he would say that some of the most valuable land was that along the edges of the brook referred to, and was formerly celebrated as hay-growing land. Now acres of it were absolutely broken into fissures and cracks, so large that it was not safe to turn stock upon it, and the value of the fields had almost entirely gone for agricultural purposes; in fact, in those districts where there was thirsty, light, dry soil the damage was spreading year by year, and the land becoming

valueless. He thought the House would appreciate his putting a personal case before them, showing the results likely to follow the passing of this Bill. One of the first results of developing the existing well would in all geological probability be to deprive him of his source of water, provided at a cost of £5,000, on which all his district now absolutely depended, and as far as the Bill went there was not one atom of an idea of any compensation being provided for that. Let the House consider what it meant. Wolverhampton already had deprived him to the extent that he had put before the House, and they now came and said: "Give us further powers, of which one of the first results will be to take away from you that which you have provided for your people, and to replace you in the condition in which you were before you spent that money." He had intended to make a very strong appeal to the House on the subject of locus standi. Up to that afternoon no indication whatever had been given by Wolverhampton that they would not oppose, and oppose bitterly, his locus standi, and that of

others in the same position as himself in this matter. He believed that now a concession on that point had been made, and he would not labour the point at large; but the House would appreciate that it would at all events have been handsomer fighting if the Corporation in the first instance had let them know they would give them that locus standi, so that they would have the elementary right of making their case known to the Committee to which the Bill might be referred. But there was nothing of that sort, and only that afternoon had he been informed that the opposition to his locus standi was to cease. As to some interesting facts in connection with this matter, he might say that not longer ago than 1900 the President of the Institution of Civil Engineers, Mr. Mansergh, delivered an address in which he made it clear enough for the understanding of laymen, or lawyers, that the law as it stood was absolutely a gross iniquity and injustice; and one of the objects he had in dealing with this ease sofully, and in laying it so thoroughly before the House, was that he hoped the case might go some step towards sweeping away a law which was absolutely obsolete and untenable. He might say that he was not the only person concerned in the Bill, and was not going to be the only sufferer. He had only used his own case as an illustration of what had happened, and therefore of what might presumably happen again. But, besides himself, there were all his neighbours who stood to suffer in the same way, fearing the same results from the same treatment, and he appealed to the House as heartily on their behalf as he did on his own. There was not one single local body the whole way throughout this area who did not join heart and soul in this opposition to what they considered would be a crushing misfortune brought upon them. Every public body; county councils, district councils, parish and urban district councils, and sanitary authorities; were all united in universal complaint that this measure would be ruin and destruction to them. With regard to the position of Much Wenlock, which had been laid before the House by his hon. friend, it had raised £20,000 of public money with the sanction of the Local Government Board for the purpose of a water supply; and when the right hon. Gentleman said, "Oh, we will supply you

with water," on his own showing he would not have water enough from those sources to supply Wolverhampton, or one half of it; he was bound to look after his own borough first; his own ratepayers would want all the water available from those wells, and he (the hon. Gentleman) and his people would have to take second place. Underground reservoirs were not continuously maintained at a certain level. When one was tapped no doubt they could draw a sufficient supply for a long time, but afterwards it would be found that one would be living on the capital of his water supply and not on the income. Therefore, in the case of Cosford, the well 918 feet deep had already diminished its supply by one half, at any rate by many thousands, or even by millions, of gallons, and that in only a comparatively short time. Therefore it was clear and evident that such a kind of supply was the most precarious and unsatisfactory source to reckon upon. Indeed, if he recollected rightly the evidence given in the case of the Birmingham Water Bill, many of the experts laid great stress on the fact that it ought to be the upland sources of water which the large towns should place reliance upon, rather than the underground well systems. Then he would pass to another instance, which he thought the House would appreciate. In Shifnal, where he resided, and which he therefore represented, there was this curious consideration in regard to the Bill. Shifnal had already, by the sanction of the Local Government Board, spent £10,000 in carrying out a sewerage system, which discharged into a brook. This Bill took the power to the Wolverhampton Corporation to inspect, interfere with, pull down, and to deal in any way with any works which affected the purity of the supply within the area over which they wished to be made free masters. If, therefore, this Bill passed, and those powers were exercised, they must spend another £10,000 in order to pump up to a high level that which they were now able to get rid of practically by gravitation. Again, Shifnal had an arrangement under which it would get its supply at a considerably less price than Wolverhampton would give it them, for if Wolverhampton got the powers; but Wolverhampton would want every drop it proposed to take from them, and the chance of the rural parish getting anything at all was nebulous and hazy. Their taking those powers would result in the piling of this additional agony upon a small rural population. Now, what did the Local Government Board say to that? Surely it was an absolute stultification of the trust and confidence that they should have, in them if they were to allow a Bill of this kind to pass, by which the whole of the money borrowed and spent was to be squandered. What confidence could there be, and how could small local bodies be encouraged to do work, and how could advantage be taken of these borrowing powers in order to supply the necessities of the localities if this were to be the position in which they were to find themselves? He had tried to put before the House sound arguments, and when the right hon. Gentleman talked of a sparse population of 13,000 the House must be asked to consider what the position of the respective policies was. At present there was a supply which it was not possible to get from any other source, and if it were taken away he did not know where the people would turn for that which, after many years seeking, they thought they had at last found. It being the fashion to take the strongest interest in the counties and

localities, why should not he, as one of the Members, ask why a large Staffordshire town, ten or twelve miles over the borders of Shropshire, on another watershed, come in and take from the county of Salop that which that county wanted for itself? There was not in that any elementary justice or elementary right. The soil there was thirsty, and they themselves wanted all the water they could get; in fact, the two great needs at present were pure water and pure beer. He desired to warn the House against the possible use, that might be made of another power that lurked mysteriously in the clauses of the Bill. There lurked there a power to take up to fifty acres of land anywhere where the Corporation of Wolverhampton could arrange to take it. Somebody had sunk a well producing sufficient water for their purposes. The Corporation became aware of it; under the operation of the clause, if they could only get, by paying a high price, some portion of the land, they would dump down one of those wells, and away would go the whole of that source of supply. In fact, they would dot the surface, of the country over with those dumped-down works, every one of them stripping and denuding some rural locality of the water they required. No one acknowledged more, than he that in the face, of the needs of a large population the rights of the minority must give way. He, accepted that, and was prepared to act up to that acceptance, but he maintained that the case was not established. He would say to the promoters of the, Bill, "You have not established your needs; you have not established the fact that you cannot supply your needs better and more equitably, and for a longer time, from other sources." He would like to reply to the argument that the whole, of the matter could be thrashed out before a Committee upstairs. This suggestion, seriously put, would be appreciated: "Go and spend more of your money upstairs in costs." There, was no reasoning in that. Here was a large Corporation commanding the rates, and they were told that they were to go and fight them before a Committee. To some members of Corporations like that it was an amusement, to some an interest; aye, and a matter of professional advancement; to be considered in fighting such matters. But what was the position of poor localities or of private individuals? The burden was so heavy as almost to deprive them of the ability to contest the cases at all. If they were now forced to go to a Committee they would fight, but he could not hide the fact that in addition to the enormous impost which had already been placed upon him by the Wolverhampton Corporation, he should be mulcted in further sums in order to obtain justice upstairs. He hoped he, had shown that a principle was involved in this Bill, something to induce the, House to recognise that there was a case of common justice and equity against the Bill, and to induce the House to throw out the Bill on the Second Reading; and further, he hoped he had shown some good cause why the law officers of the Crown should no longer delay in bringing in an Act which would amend the monstrous, intolerable laws which now governed the subject of water supply.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I should like, with the permission of the House, to say a few words upon this question. I do not propose to follow my lion, friend, who has just made a most eloquent and powerful speech. I am quite sure that he will have the sympathy of

the whole House in the personal grievances he has put forward with so much clearness and moderation, and the thanks of the House for having indicated to them the general danger which is involved in Bills of this kind, against which the House undoubtedly has to guard. I have a distinct interest in this measure, inasmuch as I represent the Corporation of Birmingham, and the taxpayers of Birmingham, who are responsible for the great works which that Corporation are carrying out. It is rather with a view of laying before the House one or two general considerations than with any expectations that I shall be able to follow my hon. friend in all the details which he has brought before the House that I now rise. Sir, I suppose the material interests of the Corporation of Birmingham are against this Bill. When we undertook our great scheme to bring water from Wales, at an enormous expenditure, we most readily accepted the responsibility of supplying all the places on the route who desired to take a supply, and I will say we did so most readily, in the first place, because it was a matter of justice to all those localities; in the second place, we thought that to some extent they would share with us in the responsibility of the undertaking. I think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton was mistaken in reference to the terms of the arrangement ultimately made. I do not think the Corporation of Wolverhampton, had they decided to take their water from the supply of the Corporation of Birmingham, would have had to find any part of the original cost. The capital cost was provided by the Corporation of Birmingham. No doubt, if the cost is greatly increased, the cost of the water would be increased, and the price of the supply to any corporation on the route would be its cost price. But the Corporation of Birmingham was to make no profit in the matter; we were to supply at cost price any locality on the route. Therefore, I say that I think that the Corporation of Birmingham would be somewhat disappointed if the Corporation of Wolverhampton does not take advantage of this opportunity. But with regard to that point, I lay down my first general principle; when you give local authority to a district you ought practically to cease to interfere with its administration. The line which I am now laying down is that so far as the affairs of the locality to which you have given local government are concerned, they should be employed as loyally as possible; that, in fact, you have no right to interfere unless some other interest is concerned. The moment an outside interest is concerned it may be this House is called upon to protect that outside interest. But so far as the policy of Wolverhampton is concerned in refusing to take its water from Birmingham, and in desiring to enter into a large and possibly speculative scheme of its own, we in Birmingham offer no observations. That is the business of the Corporation of Wolverhampton, and if it is their desire as a great corporation to enter upon the scheme, whatever we may think of it, we do not oppose. On the contrary, on the general principle we are prepared to support them. But, of course, there comes into the case the element of the position of outside authorities, and it is in regard to these authorities my hon. friend has just made his powerful appeal to the House. There again I ask the House to take into account certain general considerations. My hon. friend behind me says truly, I have no doubt, that every small local

authority on the route of this water supply is opposed to the Bill.

*COLONEL KENTON-SLANEY: Every corporation and every county council.

MR J. CHAMBERLAIN: But I hope my hon. friend will agree with me when I say that that ought not to be conclusive against them, because if you once admit that these local authorities are to have this power, and that their veto is to be accepted, you will find yourselves in the most serious difficulty with regard to other great towns whose supply of water depends absolutely upon power being given them to go to a distance. Where there is a vast population, where a great deal of the energy and wealth of the country is concentrated, and upon which the prosperity of the country depends, you must give them the means of living and having the water which is absolutely necessary to them. If they cannot get their water within their own limited space they must go outside, and therefore I conclude with the principle to which I hope I shall have the unanimous assent of the House, that the opposition of these local authorities is not in itself conclusive. But, Sir, on the other hand, nothing can be more unjust than such action as my hon. friend attributes to the Corporation of Wolverhampton in his own case, and I say that anyone in such a position would say that he had been subjected to an intolerable injustice. The action of the Corporation cannot be defended, and it is the duty of this House to prevent such action. What is the principle which I lay down in regard to water supply which must come from a distance? It is that the localities which are affected should not be injured, that all that the central bodies should be allowed to take is the surplus and nothing more, and that it shall be bound to supply to the localities first all the water in which they stand in need, to which they have a legitimate claim, and at a reasonable price;

*COLONEL KENYON-SLANEY: First.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: First; and only the surplus should be the property of the authority seeking this power. That I believe to be a perfectly fair principle to lay down. My hon. friend says this is a matter for scientific experts and not for this House. He says that if that principle is adopted there will be no surplus water. That is one of those questions which ought to go to a Committee. My feeling is that having regard to the principles, if I may venture so to call them, which I have laid down, this Bill should be sent, as all such Bills are, to a Committee, with, however, the expression of the opinion of the House that in no case should these districts be damaged by subsequent proceedings; that full protection should be put in the Bill for the future supply of water to the various localities concerned. I agree with my hon. friend that, in the Bill as it stands, there is no sufficient protection. I cannot doubt that such protection will be inserted by the Committee on the representation of the authorities concerned, and though I regret that they should be put to any expense, yet, as their interests are identical, I think they might combine in their opposition before the Committee, so that the cost to each individual or each authority may be very small.

MR. STANLEY LEIGHTON: Will the right hon. Member accept an Instruction to that effect?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am not in charge of the Bill, but if my hon. friend asked

me if I would support an Instruction to that effect, most certainly I would, because it seems to me to be absolutely fair that outsiders should have a right to that protection.

*MR. ALEXANDER BROWN: I suppose the right hon. Gentleman would include all public bodies as well as private bodies in that?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Clearly, it fortiori. If I say that a single individual, because he is a landowner, should not be unjustly treated, à fortiori I am prepared to do justice to those who represent the community or the district in which they reside. Subject to that understanding, I hope the Bill will be sent to a Committee. I hope the Committee will examine into the question, and if there be this surplus water, as is contended, I think we ought not to allow the prejudice or the suspicion, or even the irritation caused by past conduct on the part of the local authorities to interfere in what, after all, is an absolute necessity to the prosperity of a very large and important town.

SIR ALFRED HICKMAN (Wolverhampton, W.) said that what this Bill really proposed to do was to provide an absolute necessity for 154,000 people. The Wolverhampton Corporation proposed to sink wells at a very great depth; in that way they got rid of the possibility of the interference with existing rights upon which such stress had been laid. As to the necessity for an improved water supply there could not be any doubt. The present supply from wells amounted to 3,000,000 gallons a day, but on many occasions the consumption had amounted to as much as 4,000,000 gallons a day. The Cosford brook ran through, a very cultivated district, and cattle were pastured on its banks; also, many cottages drained into the brook. In time of drought there was very little water, and in time of flood the water was very much too muddy to be used, so that the water was insufficient at the present time even with the brook, and what it was proposed to do in the future was not to take any water at all from the brook. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had said that under the proposals of this Bill Wolverhampton would not have enough water, but the opinion of the most eminent experts was that the quantity which would be obtained would allow for about 6½ million gallons per day; that was fifty per cent. more than the present requirements. That would be sufficient not only for the town of Wolverhampton, but for the whole of the area which was supposed to be affected. It was said that water was a necessity of life and that it was a great grievance to take away their water from these small districts. That was true; but what Wolverhampton proposed was not to take away, but to give them water. He himself was in the position of a landowner on a small scale in the very area that had been mentioned. He had an ample supply of beautiful water, but he found it better and cheaper to take the Wolverhampton water and pay the Corporation for it rather than go to the expense and trouble of pumping his own water. Nobody would be in a worse position under this Bill; all the persons affected would have an ample supply of water at such a rate as should be considered by the Committee to be a fair rate. It was said that there was no need for this Bill, because Wolverhampton had powers to take the supply from Birmingham. That was quite true, but the Birmingham works would not be finished for something like three years. Then the terms were that when they were finished Wolverhampton must

give twelve months notice before they would be entitled to take the water; further, there would have to be an arbitration at the expiration of the notice to decide what the terms should be. What was to become of Wolverhampton in the meantime? Were 154,000 people to be on a short supply of water for three or four years? Surely that was a question at any rate for the Committee to consider. He quite sympathised with the hon. and gallant Gentleman in regard to the mischief he had suffered by his fishing, and so on, being interfered with, but surely these were all questions which could be threshed out in the Committee, and the House would not reject altogether a Bill which was of such enormous importance to a large number of people. The hon. and gallant Gentleman said that this was not so much a question of supplying people who were short of water, but that it was a commercial undertaking and intended to profit the Corporation of Wolverhampton. The hon. and gallant Gentleman could not have been acquainted with the facts, or he would never have made that statement. The truth was that last year the whole net available profit of the undertaking to the Corporation only amounted to about 2s. per house supplied. That was not a very extravagant profit. With regard to the opposition of the county councils and the rural district councils, he submitted that the expense of appearing before the Committee and giving evidence, on the subject would not be very formidable when divided between the riparian owners and these numerous local bodies. With regard to the matter of compensation, that again was a detail which would be settled by the Committee. The Corporation would not offer any objection to paying fair compensation. He reminded the House that the Wolverhampton Corporation had given a distinct pledge not only to give a full and ample supply of water to every person whose supply was interfered with, but that they would give that supply on such terms as the Committee might consider reasonable and fair. In conclusion, he submitted that the House ought not to throw out the Bill on the Second Reading, but should, following the ordinary practice, allow it to go before a Committee upstairs.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 154; Noes, 239. (Division List No. 59.)

AYES.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Aird, Sir John

Graham, Henry Robert

Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)

Anstruther, H. T.

Gray, Ernest (West Ham)

Penn, John

Arrol, Sir William

Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry

Reed, Sir Edw. Jas. (Cardiff)

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Greville, Hon. Ronald

Rentoul, James Alexander
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Hy.
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Ridley, Hn. M. W (Stalybridge
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Hain, Edward
Roe, Sir Thomas
Balfour, Maj K R(Christchurch
Hall, Edward Marshall
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Barlow, John Emmott
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Bell, Richard
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Broadhurst, Henry
Helder, Augustus
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Helme, Nerval Watson
Scott, Chas. Prest wich (Leigh)
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Caine, William Sproston
Holland, William Henry
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Caldwell, James
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cameron, Robert
Horniman, Frederick John
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Sinclair, Capt. Jn. (Forfarshire)
Causton, Richard Knight
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)

Cawley, Frederick
Jacoby, James Alfred
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Jones, David Brynm'r (Swansea
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Chapman, Edward
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Soares, Ernest J.
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A.E.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Spear, John Ward
Coddington, Sir William
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Northants-
Coghill, Douglas Harry
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Kitson, Sir James
Stroyan, John
Colville, John
Langley, Batty
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Leng, Sir John
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Levy, Maurice
Thomas, J. A. (Glam. Gower)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Lough, Thomas
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Crombie, John William
Lowe, Francis William
Tomkinson, James
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Lowtber, Rt Hn J W (Cum Penr.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
M'Kenna, Reginald
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Dewar, T. R.(T'rH'mlets, S. Geo
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan>
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Markham, Arthur Basil
White, Luke (York, E.R.)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John Wm.
Whiteley, George (York, W.R.)
Dunn, Sir William
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Middlemore, Jn. Throgmorton
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Elibank, Master of
Milward, Colonel Victor
Williams, Rt. Hn. J Powell-(Bir.
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Wilson, J. W.(Worcestersh. N.
Emmott, Alfred
Morgan, J. Lloyd(Carmarthen)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Flower, Ernest
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Mount, William Arthur
Yoxall, James Henry
Fuller, J. M. F.
Myers, William Henry
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Newnes, Sir George
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir Henry Fowler and Sir Alfred Hickman.

Goddard, Daniel Ford
Norman, Henry
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
NOES.
Abraham, William(Cork, N. E.)
Bartley, George C. T.
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Bull, William James
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Blake, Edward
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Burke, E. Haviland-
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Boland, John
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Boulnois, Edmund
Cavendish, V. C. W.(Derbysh.
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Bowles, Capt. H. F.(Middlesex
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Baird, John George Alexander
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Charrington, Spencer
Banbury, Frederick George
Brassey, Albert
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Brigg, John
Cogan, Denis J.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hoult, Joseph
O'Mara, James
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversh.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Cranborne, Viscount
Jeasel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Palmer, Sir Charles M (Durham
Crean, Eugene
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Percy, Earl
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Joicey, Sir James
Pickard, Benjamin
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Jordan, Jeremiah
Pilkington, Richard
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Joyce, Michael
Pirie, Duncan V.
Cullinan, J.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Plummer, Walter R.
Delany, William
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T.(Denbigh
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Dickson, Charles Scott
Kenyon, James (Lanes., Bury)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Kimber, Henry
Pretymann, Ernest George
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Kinloch, Sir. John George Smyth
Price, Robert John
Donelan, Captain A.
Lambert, George
Priestley, Arthur
Doogan, P. C.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Purvis, Robert
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Law, Andrew Bonar
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert

Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Rankin, Sir James
Duffy, William J.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Duncan, James H.
Leighton, Stanley
Reckitt, Harold James
Edwards, Frank
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Reddy, M.
Egerton, Hon. A de Tatton
Lewis, John Herbert
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)
Ellis, John Edward
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Faber, George Denison
Long, Col. Charles W.(Evesham)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Fardell, Sir T. George
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Roche, John
Farrell, James Patrick
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James(Kent
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Fenwick, Charles
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Russell, T. W.
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Man r
Lundon W.
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Ffrench, Peter
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Field, William
Macdona, John Cumming
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Smith, H C(Northmb. Tyneside
Fisher, William Hayes

Maconochie, A. W.
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
M'Govern, T.
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Stevenson, Francis S.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
M'Killop, Jas, (Stirlingshire)
Stock, James Henry
Flynn, James Christopher
Malcolm, Ian
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Forster, Henry William
Manners, Lord Cecil
Sullivan, Denial
Garfit, William
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H E (Wilton
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Tennant, Harold John
Gilhooly, James
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hasti'gs)
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts
Milton, Viscount
Thornburn, Sir Walter
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Thornton, Percy M.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachini
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants.)
Tomlinson. Wm. Edw. Murray
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Mooney, John J.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Greene, Sir E. W. (B'ySEdm'nds
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)

Tully, Jasper
Grenfell, William Henry
Morgan, Dav. J. (Walthamst'w
Valentia, Viscount
Gretton, John
Morrell, George Herbert
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Gunter, Colonel
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. H.
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry
Murnaghan, George
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Hammond, John
Murphy, J.
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C.E. (Taunt'n
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Hare, Thomas Leigh
Murray, Col. Wyndham(Bath)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Harris, FLeverton (Tynemouth
Nicholson, William Graham
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wills, Sir Frederick
Hay. Hon. Claude George
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R)
Hayden, John Patrick
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Wilson John (Glasgow)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanl'y
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Heath, James (Statfords. N.W.
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Young, Commander(Berks, E.)

Herman-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Higginbottom, S. W.

O'Connor. T. P. (Liverpool)

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

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Alexander Hargreaves Brown and Colonel Kenyon-Slaney.

Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.

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

Hope, J. F. (Shef'ld, Brightside

O'Dowd, John

Hope, John Deans (Fife, West

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Horner, Frederick William

O'Malley, William

Words added.

Main Question, as amended, put and agreed to.

Second Reading put off for six months.

BLACKPOOL IMPROVEMENT BILL. (By ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

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

MR. JEFFREYS (Hants, N.): I understand that the promoters are willing to introduce certain desirable Amendments, and under the circumstances I withdraw my objection to the Second Reading.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY BILL. (By ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

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

*MR. BELL (Derby) moved that the Bill be read a second time that day six months.

He was, he stated, very anxious to say a few words on behalf of a large number of men directly concerned in the measure, being in the employ of the railway company. One of the chief objections entertained to the Bill had reference to the scheme of the promoters as contained in Clause 27, in which the company seek power to contribute towards certain provident funds, etc. Clause 27 reads;

"If a society is or shall be hereafter constituted from amongst persons in the pay of the company for the purpose of providing by means of the subscriptions of the members, with the aid of donations or subscriptions from the company and others, for the relief or maintenance of members of such society during sickness not arising from injuries in respect of which such members are entitled to compensation from the company by statute or common law, or under the Great Eastern Accident Fund Scheme," etc.

From those words Members might assume that the company were actuated by some extraordinary feeling of philanthropy in putting forward this clause, and that they were simply moved by the interests of their employees. He proposed,

however, to prove to the House that they were not actuated by either philanthropy or generosity. Their object was common to a great many rail, way companies in the present day. It was to attach their employees to them, and to deprive them of that to which they had a perfect right; namely, liberty of choice in regard to connection with provident institutions. There was in connection with the Great Eastern Company a provident society which had been in existence since 1851;

*MR. SPEAKER: I would point out to the hon. Member that this Bill is an omnibus Bill, and that only this one clause (27) has reference to the provident society to which the hon. Member objects. If he has no substantial objection to the Bill as a whole, I would suggest to him that his better course would be to reserve his observations until the House comes to the proposal on the Paper, That it be an Instruction to the Committee to strike out Clause 27." I do not say the hon. Member is out of order in moving the rejection of the Bill; but if his objection is only to that clause, that, I would suggest, would be the proper and usual place to move it.

*MR. BELL said he had another reason for opposing. There was in connection with the Great Eastern Railway Company a provident society, which has been in existence since 1851. It was a compulsory society, and men employed in certain grades in the company's service were required, as a condition of employment, to become members of that society. Up to 1888 there were in the society three scales of payment, and the men had to contribute 8d. per week. It was found in the year 1884 that the society was insolvent, and arrangements were made whereby the members paid an additional 1d. per week. So it went on until 1898, when, on an actuarial valuation being made, it was shown that up to the end of 1894 the society had been insolvent to the extent of over £34,000. An effort had been made by those having the management of the society; namely, certain employees who paid the money into the funds; to make certain alterations, but, as a matter of fact, the employees could not under any circumstances alter or amend the rules, or make new ones, without the sanction and approval of the directors, Notwithstanding that, in 1899 and 1900 it was decided that the contribution should again be raised 1d. per week, the subscription having been raised in 1888 to 9d. The men who paid that amount received in return no more benefit than was, in many instances, received by men belonging to other societies outside the company's for a much smaller payment. One of the chief grievances in connection with this society was that the chairman and directors of the railway company were aggrieved because members of their society, who were compelled by the conditions of their employment to contract out of the Workmen's Compensation Act by joining an insurance society, should receive when they were sick from accident a certain amount from the insurance society as well as a certain amount from the benefit society. The Chairman of the Great Eastern Company felt so much aggrieved that he had endeavoured to obtain a clause forbidding employees who had met with injuries from receiving benefit from the provident society as well as from the insurance society. That was clearly a gross injustice to the men. It is tyrannous and unjust to dictate to men belonging to a society when and under what circumstances they should draw benefits. That formed a serious objection to

the proposal of the clause. On the 15th June, 1900, the chairman of the company, Lord Claud J. Hamilton, sent a circular to the committee of the railway fund, in which he said;

"The strongest proof of this is the fact that only since January last it has been necessary to withdraw £;2,000 from the reserve funds, and further withdrawals will have to be made if the present benefits are to be continued." That £;2,000 was what the company pretended to pay. By some arrangement, in 1888, when they found that the society was insolvent, they came to terms with the committee of management and agreed that the company should contribute a subsidy of £;2,500 a year towards the funds of the society. But that contribution had been in name only. They had not subscribed the sum annually, but it was there as a reserve fund, guaranteed by the company, to be drawn upon if necessary. From 1886 to 1900 something like £;3,700 was all that been drawn from the reserve

fund, and so long as the society had a penny in hand received from its members nothing came from the company. Lord Claud Hamilton went on to say in his circular;

"Almost the whole of the staff are members of the Company's Accident Fund, and any member of the Provident Society incapacitated by injury arising in the course of his duties in the company's service receives allowances from the Provident Society as well as from the Accident Fund. This does not appear to me to be reasonable, and in other respects it is open to objection. I suggest, therefore, that the members of the Provident Society should agree to renounce any allowances from the society whilst they are receiving an allowance from the Accident fund, except in cases where the Accident Fund allowance by effluxion of time has been reduced to half-pay, in which case the Provident Society should grant its half-pay allowance."

He concluded this circular by saying;

"As regards the future, it is proposed to start a new society on a different basis, on the establishment of which the existing society will discontinue to accept new members."

Apparently the directors and chairman of the Great Eastern Company considered it unreasonable that men who might have been injured by accident in the company's employ should receive payment from the provident society as well as from the accident fund, the full amount of which would not be more than £;1 a week. The directors were not successful in getting the men to accept this alteration in the provident society, so now they were trying to start a new fund, letting the old one die a natural death. The company said that they had already subscribed £;35,499 towards superannuation, pensions, and to supplementary accident and other benefit funds of the company. Much of that money which they said they had subscribed was simply entered on paper and not actually subscribed to the funds of the society. A large proportion of that money went to pay for accidents for which otherwise the men would have been entitled to compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act.

The report of the Accident Fund established in July, 1898, in substitution for the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1896, stated that;

"During the year the total number of claims was 3,635, including twenty-seven in regard to accidents that terminated fatally, six that resulted in the loss of an eye, four in the loss of a leg, one in the loss of an arm, and one in the loss of sight."

He maintained that a very large proportion of the £35,499 which the chairman had referred to would have gone under the Compensation Act to pay the workmen in these 3,635 cases. These matters had been discussed from time to time by the men, and eventually they wrote to the chairman of the company on 3rd December a long letter, which contained the following words;

"The committee, delegates, and members generally regret that it was decided to start a new society rather than enrol future servants of the company in this society on an equitable footing, but such a step having been taken they have no option but to accommodate themselves to the altered circumstances, and seek to enable the Provident Society to fulfil its mission to each and every one of its members."

That proved that it was not at the request of the men that these powers were now being sought by the company. The matter was discussed at the last meeting of the directors, and the chairman said;

"In drawing attention to the Provident Fund the directors asked leave to subscribe to that fund another £500 a year. The fund was established in 1851, and was contributed to and managed by the men themselves, and the membership was now about 9,000."

So far as the men were concerned they could make no alteration or amendment in the rules of their society without the sanction of the directors. The company's subsidy was not paid into the fund, and there was at the present time £40,000 to the credit of the reserve; money which was not paid over by the company, but was a guarantee to meet contingencies should the men's contributions not be sufficient to meet the liabilities of the fund. Rather than that the subsidy of the company should be drawn on, the members had paid an extra penny a week. He wished, further, to draw attention to the effect of the clause referring to superannuation or pensions. The original rule was as follows;

"31. That any free member, of not less than two years standing, who may by accident, infirmity, old age, loss of sight, or other cause be rendered incapable of earning his livelihood, shall be placed upon the pension list and entitled to receive a weekly pension as defined in the following table," etc.

It seemed to be another sore point with the chairman of the Great Eastern Company and the directors that men should be thus entitled to a pension, the maximum of which, on the higher scale, was 6s. 10d. per week, and the chairman had insisted upon the rule being so amended that it should be left wholly to the discretion of the directors to say whether or not a man who should become entitled to superannuation or pension should receive it. The clause as amended was as follows;

"Rule 31. That any free resident member of not less than two years standing who has, on account of physical or mental incapacity, been discharged by the directors of the Great Eastern Company, or who has, on the like account, retired from the service of the company, with the approval of the said directors, shall

be placed upon the pension list, and he entitled to receive a weekly pension, as defined in the following table," etc.

The objection to that was clear. The rule contained the words "with the approval of the directors." That meant that a man who might be in receipt of 25s. or 30s. a week, and who might have been in the service of the company for thirty-five or forty years, when he attained the age of sixty-five years and thought to himself. "I have done enough railway work and I will take my 6s. 10d. a week pension and retire." could not put his desire into execution without the consent of the directors. It would be in their power to say, "You shall not retire; if your present occupation is too hard for you, we will find you another office at less wages, but you have five or six years work in you yet." The men knew this, and it was at the desire of men on all parts of the Great Eastern system that he was opposing the Second Reading of the Bill unless this clause was withdrawn. Some members might think it generous on the part of the railway company to subscribe to a fund for the benefit of their employees, but it was really a condition of service, that the men should join this, that, or the other fund.

Nearly all the companies had two or three of these funds attached to them. One was voluntary and another was made compulsory, and in the compulsory one there was sometimes a clause which made it necessary to join the society which had not such a clause. This rule was evidently designed to assist in compelling men to contract out of the Workmen's Compensation Act by joining the Insurance Society.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member appears to me to be discussing generally what should be the nature of funds of this kind, and to be citing from the regulations of other societies. That is clearly not in order on this Bill.

*MR. BELL: I am quoting to show the objections to these compulsory societies. I think I have given sufficient facts to prove that these societies are objectionable to the men employed in the railway service. At the outset of my remarks I said that many people would consider at first sight that the railway companies were actuated by a spirit of philanthropy. But I find that no such spirit prompts them. If it were otherwise; if they were really philanthropic and kindly disposed towards their servants; I ask why should they forbid their employees to take part in political or civic duties? This company forbids its members taking part in civic duties.

*MR. SPEAKER: Is there a clause to that effect in this Bill?

*MR. BELL: No, Sir.

*MR. SPEAKER: Then it is a rule of the House that a matter affecting railway companies generally cannot be dealt with in debate on a private Railway Bill unless there is a clause in the Bill dealing with that matter.

*MR. BELL: I am sorry that I am debarred from entering upon that question, but at any rate the subject to which I was going to refer is familiar to the whole of the Members of the House, and it is one that has caused a vast deal of indignation amongst railway men.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not in order in continuing on the subject.

*MR. BELL said he was not going to discuss it. He asked the House to register their disapproval of the attempts of employers, where it was not desired by the men, in any way to attach them to societies, and make it a condition of their

employment that they should become members thereof.

MR. MAEKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield) seconded the Amendment. As it had been ruled that any discussion on the proceedings of the Great Eastern Railway Company would be out of order, he would not be able to raise the question he wished to raise. He would ask the Speaker's special ruling on this question. The Great Eastern Railway Company was the only company in this country that had refused;

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to make a speech and then ask if it is in order.

MR. MAEKHAM: I beg to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words 'upon this day six months.'"; (Mr. Bell.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. PENN (Lewisham) said that Clause 2 was put in the Bill by the directors as a purely permissive clause, in order to enable the railway companies, if they thought fit, to subscribe towards the funds raised by their employees. He must say as a director of the company that he failed to agree with the hon. Member for Derby when he said that the company wished to make membership of the society a condition of employment. That would be a most arbitrary proceeding, and one with which he could not possibly associate himself. But in asking that they might have power to subscribe to the fund, they only took permissive power in the event of the society being started. The society, if started by the men, would be managed by the men, and the company desired to have power to help them. He could not agree with the hon. Member that there were a large number of open sores in connection with the matter, as had been suggested by the hon. Member for Derby. The directors were anxious to help the men in every possible way to practise habits of thrift.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) said he did not think the hon. Member who had spoken as representing the Great Eastern Railway Company had met two material points raised by the hon. Member for Derby. Though the hon. Gentleman said it would be a voluntary fund, as a matter of fact the men had experience of other funds, and they knew that every man in the service would be practically forced to join.

MR. PENN: I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon. There are 30,000 members of the staff who are eligible under the existing fund, and only 9,000 are in the fund.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON asked the hon. Member if he would pledge himself on behalf of the railway company that they would put some words in the Bill which would make it perfectly clear that the question of joining or not would be left absolutely voluntary to every servant of the company? Unless the hon. Member gave that pledge he certainly would vote against the Bill as it stood. The hon. Member said that the society would be managed by the men, but that would be useless unless a pledge to this effect were given. The other question raised by the hon. Member for Derby was that the men would not be able to make any alteration whatever in the rules. It seemed to him that while the fund might be nominally managed by the men it would be entirely under the control of the directors of

the company. On that point the hon. Member for Lewisham had given no satisfaction.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil) said the hon. Member for Lewisham, who spoke for the directors of the railway company, said the employees of the company would be free to join as many like societies as they pleased, even if the Bill became law, but he overlooked the very important factor in the situation that of the employees of the company there were thousands earning less than 20s. a week, and thus they were not in a position to contribute to more than one society. Those who had experience of the industrial world were aware that the man who did not join the society promoted by a company would stand very small chance of being promoted in his occupation. He respectfully submitted that the fact that the fund was

to be invested as a part of the Great Eastern Railway Stock removed it outwith the control of the members of the society. It was therefore a purely nominal control which the members would exercise over the fund. The Bill provided that the railway company "may contribute half-yearly out of the revenue of the company such sum as they may from time to time determine towards the funds of the society." This was an attempt to pauperise the working class which should be deprecated most strongly. Let the Great Eastern Railway Company pay their workmen sufficient wages to enable them to pay their contributions to their trade society, and then they would be under no obligation to the company for yearly or half-yearly grants. His strongest objection to this form of society was that it tended to undermine the self-respect of the employees of the company. If this proposal became law and the society was formed it would result in making every employee of the Great Eastern Railway Company who joined it subservient to the will and the wishes of the company. There was no provision in the clause that members of the society on leaving their employment or being dismissed were entitled to be recouped for the payments they had made to the funds of the society. That was a very serious consideration. Unless men were obedient and submissive in every respect, not only to the directors themselves but to the officials under the directors, who were often a thousand times worse than the directors, they were liable to be dismissed, and to lose not only the benefits of the society but also the money they had paid into it. He trusted, therefore, as a matter of fair play that the House would not endorse Clause 27.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said it seemed to him exceedingly strange that two Members representing the working classes should object to the scheme proposed. Here was a large company coming forward asking power to subscribe to the funds of a benevolent institution, and it was met by objection. Large corporations had been told that they ought to do more for their employees, and it did seem strange in this case that a gentleman on the Front Opposition

Bench should get up to object to such a scheme. It ought to be the duty of every large corporation, and of small companies also, to subscribe to these funds.

*MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck) said they did not object at all to employers of labour encouraging their workpeople to be thrifty and prudent and to lay by for a rainy day, but they objected to such a scheme as was foreshadowed in this Bill, which might be made a condition of employment between

workmen and their employers. Frequently such provisions as this were converted into machinery for coercing workmen to do things which of their free will they were not disposed to do. It was because of the coercive powers that such a provision gave to large employers that they objected to its being inserted in the Bill.

*COLONEL BOWLES (Middlesex, Enfield) hoped that the Bill would be allowed to pass the Second Reading, as the question could be so much more thoroughly discussed in Committee upstairs.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said that working men wanted to do their own business, without the intervention of railway directors. There was an element of compulsion running right through the whole of this Bill, which was distasteful to working men who sought independence. They were entitled to form their own opinion, without being led by Committees upstairs.

MR. YOXALL (Northampton, W.) said this matter had been discussed upon a totally new principle. A clause like the one suggested had been inserted in a number of Bills last session, and a Departmental Committee had distinctly laid it down that Parliament might properly interfere by providing against a rule of this kind. If the hon. Member in charge of the Bill maintained silence upon this point they would be bound to vote against the measure.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said he rose to support the hon. Member for Derby in his opposition

to the Bill. Men would be forced to enter the service of this company, and they would be compelled to become contributors to this fund. They claimed the right of a workman to contribute to any fund which he thought was best calculated to advance his own interest. They asked for a free hand for the men, so that in sickness or death, or in leaving one district for employment in another, they could go to their particular society for assistance from the funds. If they carried this objectionable clause to its logical conclusion, this advantage would be denied to the workmen. He entered his strong protest against the clause, which he believed was the thin edge of the wedge for the purpose of intimidating and coercing the workmen.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I think the hon. Member for Lewisham would shorten this discussion, and save the time of the House, if he would undertake that this clause should make it clear that no compulsion or pressure should be put upon the men to join these societies.

MR. PENN replied that there was no compulsion, simply because the rule was not in existence.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick) contended that in a matter of this kind everything should be done fairly and aboveboard. Workmen should be allowed to choose their own societies. These great companies should not be given the power to coerce their employees to join those societies, which were a source of terror to their employees, who were often tyrannised over by every little official. It was a monstrous thing to try and force such a clause through this House, and he hoped it would be eliminated.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said he was surprised that the Government had not given the House the benefit of their advice on this question. The hon. Member for

Lewisham had replied to the appeal made to him by saying that the rules were not yet made. What they wanted to know was whether the company would engage, if the Bill passed and they were empowered to make rules, that it should be part of those rules that

no sort of compulsion should be applied, and that this should be embodied in the Bill when it went into Committee. If an undertaking of this kind was not given, it was clear that they would be obliged to proceed to a division. If the Bill was lost it would be entirely the fault of those who were promoting it for not giving the undertaking which was asked for on this particular point.

MR. GRAY (West Ham, N.) said his hon. friend the Member for Lewisham was in a very awkward position, because he was not personally responsible for the Bill, but was merely acting as a mouthpiece of the directors, I with whom it was impossible for him to consult. But there was an Instruction on the Paper with regard to the Bill, which would come before the House on Thursday, when a definite reply could be given. There were many other valuable clauses in this Bill, relating to level crossings and the building of bridges, which ought not to be delayed on account of this dispute. He sympathised with the view that this fund should be a voluntary one, but he thought it was a question which could be settled in the Committee upstairs.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I understand that the promoters of this Bill, or those representing them, do not feel that they have any authority to give the undertaking which is asked for. Therefore I suggest that in the general interest we should give them an opportunity of obtaining the undertaking we ask for, and for that purpose I now move the adjournment of the debate.

Debate adjourned; to upon Thursday.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Committee::

1. "That, in the case of the Cowes Ferry Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with::That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."
2. "That, in the case of the London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Bill, Petition for additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with::That the parties be permitted to introduce their additional Provision, if the Committee on the Bill think fit."
3. "That, in the case of the Birmingham (City) Tramways Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with::That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the powers to construct Tramways Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4. and 5 be struck out of the Bill, unless the consent of the local and road authorities shall be proved before the Committee on the Bill::That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."
4. "That, in the case of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board (Canada Dock Works, etc.) Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with::That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the power to enable the promoting Board to purchase 500 acres of land for future dock development be struck out of the Bill::That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."
5. "That, in the case of the Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [Lords], the

Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with;;That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Tramway No. 3 be struck out of the Bill;;That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

6. "That, in the case of the Harrogate Corporation Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with;;That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that Clause 7 be struck out of the Bill;;That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

7. "That, in the case of the Sutton-in-Ashfield Urban District (Water) Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with;;That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."

Resolutions agreed to.

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

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

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

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

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Coventry; and Middlesbrough; to lie upon the Table.

OFFICERS OF THE INDIAN STAFF CORPS.

Two Petitions from Officers of the Indian Staff Corps, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.

Petition from Hastings, for extension In women; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT. 1890.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Leicester (two); London; North Shields; Bradford; Leicestershire; Wharfedale; Kennington (three); Durham; Shipley; Scoonie; Plymouth; Glasgow; Inverness; Sheffield (seven); Kingston-upon-Hull; Dundee; Worthing; Middlesbrough; Newport Pagnell; and Bolton; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Auchterarder (two); Biggar; Cruden; Lanark; Dumfries; Torryburn; Port Glasgow; and Galashiels; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

MINES (COURRIERES COLLIERIES).

Copy presented, of Report to the Secretary of State for the Home Department by four of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines on the methods of preventing falls of roof adopted at Courrieres Collieries. Department of the Pas-de-Calais, France [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (LIEUTENANT GENERAL SIR H. E. COLVILE, K.C.M.G., C.B.).

Copy presented, of Correspondence relative to the recall of Lieutenant General Sir H. E. Colvile, K.C.M.G., C.B. [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (YEOMANRY CAVALRY).

Copy presented, of Training Return of Yeomanry Cavalry for 1900 [by Command]; to

lie upon the Table.

NAVY (TRAINING OF JUNIOR NAVAL OFFICERS) (COMMITTEE).

Copy presented, of Report of the Committee appointed by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to inquire into and report on the Training and Examination of Junior Naval Officers, with the Circular announcing the Changes to the Fleet [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CYPRUS.

Copy presented, of Annual Report for 1899–1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN AVAR;PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WITH GENERAL ROTH.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the negotiations with General Louis Botha are concluded; and, if so, can he state the result.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have at present no information the hon. Gentleman. I will give it bun as soon as I can.

BURNING OF TOWNS IN ORANGE RIVER COLONY.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any reports have been received at the War Office of the burning of the towns of Bothaville and Ventersburg in the Orange River Colony, and of the villages of Wilpoort and Dullstroom in the Transvaal; and, if any reports have been received, whether they will be laid upon the Table of the House.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): No despatch has reached the War Office on these points. I will ask Lord Kitchener for a report.

FARM BURNING;CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN LORD ROBERTS AND GENERAL BOTHA.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when the correspondence between Lord Roberts and General Botha, in reference to farm burning, will be laid upon the Table of the House as promised.

MR. BRODRICK: The correspondence will be laid as soon as possible.

WELSH HOSPITAL IN SOUTH AFRICA.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that there is dissatisfaction among the subscribers to the fund for the establishment and maintenance of the Welsh hospital for South Africa on account of its discontinuance or absorption with another hospital, although Lord Lansdowne had accepted the offer of the committee to provide for its maintenance for another three months; and whether he will state into what hospital the Welsh hospital was absorbed; and whether the order for its absorption was given in accordance with instructions from the Commander-in-Chief or some, and, if so, what, officer in South Africa.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): At the same time may I ask the Secretary of State for War whether, upon the discontinuance of the Welsh hospital in South Africa and its absorption into a military hospital, the plant, medicines, and appurtenances of the hospital were taken possession of by the military authorities; whether any, and if any how many, members of the staff of the Welsh hospital were transferred to the military hospital by which it was absorbed;

into what hospital was the Welsh hospital merged; and what were the military or administrative reasons which made the absorption of the Welsh hospital expedient after the acceptance by Lord Lansdowne of the offer of the Committee to maintain the hospital for another three months.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton): I will reply at the same time to the two questions. I am not aware that there exists the dissatisfaction complained of. The hon. secretary of the Welsh Hospital Commission recently called at the Army Medical Department and stated that the committee were perfectly satisfied with the action taken. The hospital has been absorbed into No. 2 General Hospital, by order of the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa, By the terms of the agreement between the committee and the War Office, the hospital equipment is to be handed over to the latter on the former ceasing to maintain the hospital. I am making inquiry from South Africa as to the remaining points raised by the hon. Member for Swansea District.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES: Is the noble Lord aware that the secretary he refers to is the secretary of the executive committee, and not of the general committee who were instrumental in raising this large fund?

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware of that.

MR. G. T. KENYON (Denbighshire): Is it not the fact that a considerable amount of the money originally subscribed is still unexpended? What steps are being taken in regard to it?

LORD STANLEY: I am afraid I cannot go into details. Perhaps the hon. Member will put the question down.

SOUTH AFRICAN MEAT CONTRACTS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that a contract, dated the 27th October, 1890, was entered into with the South African Cold Storage Company for the supply of fresh meat to the troops in the field at 11d. per pound, the terms implying that it was a live cattle contract, but notwithstanding this, three-fourths of the three million pounds of meat supplied; under the contract up to the 1st February, 1900, was refrigerated; whether the contract was renewed in January, 1900, on the same terms subject to a reduction of 2d. per pound on all frozen meat accepted; whether the company has now agreed to refund to the War Department 2d. per pound on all frozen meat paid for at 11d. per pound since the war broke out; what is the date of that agreement; what is the amount of the sum to be refunded; and has the arrangement been carried out; and whether the War Office regards the refund of 2d. per pound as adequate having regard to the fact that very shortly after the 27th October, 1899, the date of the earlier contract, the Cape Government suspended the collection of customs duties upon the importation of fresh and frozen mutton and beef, and that these duties (2d. per pound on mutton and 1d. per pound on beef) would have been recoverable by the War Department from the colony had they remained in force, their suspension being pro tanto a loss to Imperial funds and a further gain to the contractors.

LORD STANLEY: The answer to the first two paragraphs of the hon. Member's

question is in the affirmative. As regards the third paragraph, the company has agreed to make the refund in question, the agreement being dated 22nd September, 1900. The General Officer Commanding received instructions in December last to make the necessary deduction, but the exact amount of it has not been reported. As regards the fourth paragraph, the suspension of customs duty referred to involved neither gain nor loss to the contractors, as no duty was ever charged by the Colonial Government on meat imported for the use of the troops. The reduction in price is therefore a real reduction of charge.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: May I ask whether the Controller and Auditor General was wrong in saying that the reduction in the duty made no change in the circumstances of the terms of the contract?

LORD STANLEY: I think the last was wrong. No duty was imposed by the Colonial Government on meat imported for the troops.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick's): Has the company refunded the money as agreed?

LORD STANLEY: I have said that the General Officer Commanding received instructions in December last to make the necessary reduction.

PENSIONS FOR DISABLED SOLDIERS.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the general interest attaching to the subject, he can now give further information concerning the scale of pensions to be awarded to non-commissioned officers and men who have been rendered wholly or partly incapable of earning a livelihood by reason of disease contracted while serving in South Africa; and whether any communication on the subject has yet been made to the Commissioners of Chelsea Hospital.

LORD STANLEY: The scale contemplated in my former reply is that applicable to men incapacitated by wounds, and a communication has been made to the Chelsea Commissioners to this effect.

VOLUNTEER INFANTRY BRIGADE CAMPS.

COLONEL LUCAS (Suffolk, Lowestoft): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the conditions under which Volunteer infantry brigade camps are to be held this year.

MR. JAMES KENYON (Lancashire, Bury): At the same time may I ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he proposes to have this year camps of exercise or training for Volunteers; and, if so, for how many days; and will opportunities be given to them to fire their musketry course whilst in camp in the same manner as given last year; and will Volunteer officers who attend camps of exercise or training be paid according to the Army rate; namely, the same scale as paid to Militia and Yeomanry officers.

LORD STANLEY: An Army Order will shortly be issued giving the necessary information.

RE-ARMAMENT OF THE VOLUNTEER ARTILLERY.

MR. ORMSBY-GORE (Lincolnshire, Gainsborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what progress is being made towards the re-armament of the Volunteer Artillery with weapons of modern ordnance, and, having regard to the statement made by the late Under Secretary for War in the last Parliament as to the probable re-armament of that force with semimobile

guns, whether steps will be taken to ensure the provision of such guns to the Volunteer Field and Position Artillery as will not impair in any way their mobility in the field.

LORD STANLEY: As my right hon. friend has informed the House, the 4·7 guns for the Volunteers are in course of manufacture, and will, I hope, be delivered before very long. Every consideration is being given to this question, as was explained on Friday last.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Will the noble Lord be kind enough to say where the guns are being manufactured; not in Germany, I hope?

LORD STANLEY: In various parts of England.

RESERVE REGIMENTS; DISBANDMENT.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is in a position to state approximately the dates upon which it is proposed to disband the different reserve regiments of cavalry and infantry.

LORD STANLEY: I cannot give exact dates. The regiments will disband at the conclusion of a year's service, or earlier in cases in which a General Officer Commanding recommends it.

CAPTAIN NORTON: Will the officers be disbanded at the same time as the men?

LORD STANLEY: In a great many cases they will, but not in all cases.

ENLISTMENT AGE RULES.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the experiment which was made to ascertain the approximate true age of proposed recruits for enlistment recognition was given to the necessity of making the production of reliable testimony as to age dependent upon acceptance of the recruit; whether, in view of the importance of the question, he will consider the advisability of carrying it out as far as is found possible, and stating on the recruit's attestation paper the proof by which his age was arrived at, so that at least the percentage of men whose correct age is known should be ascertained, and that a safeguard should be given against the despatch of soldiers to India and abroad under the age prescribed by the regulations; can he state how it is intended to determine the correct time at which the proposed pensions are to become due; and whether steps could be taken for arriving at the correct age of the large majority of recruits, seeing that the correct ages of children are ascertained in schools and under the Factory Act.

LORD STANLEY: The acceptance of a recruit is not dependent on the production of a birth certificate, nor could it be made so. It would be quite impracticable to keep recruits waiting while inquiries were being made for the certificates. In the experiment referred to it was impossible to obtain the certificates in the case of forty-five per cent. of the cases taken, and of the rest fifteen per cent. were very doubtful. The medical officer states what he considers, after careful examination, to be the apparent age on the attestation. The age given by the recruit on oath is held to be his true age for reckoning Army service, and the qualifying period for the age pensions will depend on this.

ARMY CONTRACTS; RATIONS, ETC.; PURCHASE IN IRELAND.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the

amount paid to contractors for native meat and home grown produce supplied to the troops and horses stationed in Ireland, and whether he can give the amount paid to contractors for foreign meat and imported forage supplies; and whether he can state the amount paid for fittings for men and horses of goods manufactured in Ireland, and, approximately, the total amount so claimed as a set-off to the over-taxation of Ireland.

LORD STANLEY: As I have previously explained to the House, it is not possible to obtain figures of the kind referred to without great difficulty, and I am not at present prepared to inflict the labour entailed upon the officers concerned, who are already overworked.

Captain DONELAN (Cork, E.): Can the noble Lord give us the proportion of foreign to home grown meat at present supplied to the troops in Ireland?

LORD STANLEY: I cannot.

MR. FIELD: Will the noble Lord inquire?

[No answer was returned.]

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether prime oxen were purchased in Dublin market for the use of Boer prisoners at St. Helena, while at the same time the troops stationed in Ireland were mainly fed on imported foreign meat; and whether, seeing that native meat could have been purchased from contractors at the fractional difference of a few pence in each hundred pounds weight, and that the tendered price for the supply of native Irish meat was about half the price paid for frozen meat in South Africa, he can explain why native meat was not purchased for the troops in Ireland.

LORD STANLEY: Cattle were purchased in Dublin for the troops and also for the Boer prisoners at St. Helena. In reply to the second paragraph, I can only say that native meat is largely purchased for the troops in Ireland.

MR. FIELD: Where is it purchased?

LORD STANLEY: In various parts of Ireland.

MR. FIELD: Can the noble Lord specify the places?

LORD STANLEY: I am afraid I cannot.

WINCHESTER SCHOOL RIFLE RANGE.

MR. HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that an offer was made to the War Office by a private individual in July, 1897, to provide the School and City of Winchester with a suitable rifle range free of all cost, and that the War Office thought so well of the scheme that they expressed their desire to take it over themselves; and whether he can explain why, after a delay of three and a half years, an intimation has been sent from the War Office that nothing is intended to be done, with the result that rifle shooting in the neighbourhood has been killed, and persons elsewhere discouraged from making similar offers in their respective localities.

LORD STANLEY: The head master of Winchester School made a suggestion in 1897 that he should erect a range without any expense to the public, but subsequently, in the course of negotiation, proposed to contribute handsomely to a range to be laid out by the War Department. The estimated cost was found to be £20,000 for 500 acres; Dr. Fearon's proposed contribution was found to be

£;500. The War Department, none the less, endeavoured to carry through the matter, but found;after long negotiation;that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners required £;15,500 for 170 acres. As the range would have cost double the sum estimated, and other ranges had been provided for the troops in the neighbourhood, the Secretary of State did not feel justified in pursuing the matter further at so great a cost for the use of the school.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): How many Irish schools are provided with rifle ranges?

[No answer was returned.]

NEW BATTLESHIPS;LAUNCHING WEIGHTS, &c.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty what were the respective launching weights of the battleships "Ocean," "Implacable."

"Bulwark," and "Montagu,"

and the period intervening in each case between the laying down and the launching.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The launching weights of the ships named and the periods intervening in each case between the laying down and the launching are as follows::

Launching weight

Period intervening between the laying down and the launching.

Tons.

Months.

Days.

"Ocean"

7,266

16

22

"Implacable"

6,000

8

;

"Bulwark"

5,930

7

;

"Montagu"

5,560

15

11

CHINA;STRENGTH OF BRITISH AND OTHER NAVIES IN CHINESE WATERS.

SIR CHRISTOPHER FURNESS (Hartlepool): I beg to ask the Secretary to the

Admiralty if he will inform the House as to the number and description of the ships representing Great Britain in Chinese waters and on the Yang-tsze River;

and also as to the number and description of the ships representing each of the other European Powers and the United States.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Naval forces of the Powers named now in Chinese waters

appear from the last published Returns to be as follows:;Great Britain: 4 battleships. 15 cruisers, 23 small vessels (of which 2 cruisers and 4 small vessels are on the Yang-tsze River); France: 1 battleship, 9 cruisers, 22 small vessels (of which 3 small vessels are on the Yang-tsze); Russia: 5 battleships, R cruisers, 30 small vessels and torpedo boats; Germany: 4 battleships, 10 cruisers, 10 small vessels (of which 2 cruisers and 2 small vessels are on the Yang-tsze); Italy: 6 cruisers; Austria: 4 cruisers (of which one is on the Yrang-tsze); Portugal: 1 cruiser, 2 small vessels; United States: 1 battleship, 2 coast defence ships, 8 cruisers, 2 small vessels.

NORTH CHINA EXPEDITION;CLOTHING OF INDIAN TROOPS.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.K.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has any official information showing that the Indian troops and camp followers serving in North China were not provided with such suitable warm clothing as would enable them to resist the intense cold of that region, and that consequently they suffered great hardships; and will he state how many casualties and deaths from sickness have occurred among them up to the date of the last official reports received here or in India.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have not seen the reports referred to. An ample supply of warm clothing was provided for troops and followers, and we have no reason to suppose that there has been any sickness or suffering from any deficiencies in this respect. The percentage of sick troops in hospital from all causes on the 1st January was only 3½. The deaths have not been reported.

TRADE IN AFRICAN PROTECTORATES.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs what has been the total trade (exports and imports) of each of the following protectorates, namely, Uganda, East Africa, Central Africa, and Somaliland, since their creation up to 31st December, 1900; and whether he can state approximately the figures of the trade in each case from and to Great Britain and Ireland.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The statistics available are to be found in the "Statistical Abstract for the Colonies and other Possessions of the United Kingdom." presented to Parliament in 1899 and 1900. As regards Uganda, figures are not available for the years after 1896, owing to the protracted disturbances in that protectorate. The trade, however, has been comparatively small, and, such as it is, it may be considered to be practically included in the figures representing the imports and exports of the East Africa Protectorate, through which they must have passed.

Even with regard to the remaining protectorates, in consequence of the recent character of their creations there has been a want of uniformity in the method of computing the statistics, both as between the several protectorates and in respect of the basis of computation in any one protectorate. Omitting Uganda, for the reasons stated, the totals of exports and imports are:;For East Africa, from 1895 to 31st March, 1900, excluding "administration" imports and imports of

material for railway construction and of provision for those engaged thereon, the figures are: Imports, R.24,711,876; exports, R.6,200,215; total, R.30,972,091 (£;1,970,091). For British Central Africa, from 1895 to 31st March, 1900, including "administration" imports, the figures are: Imports, £;580,001; exports, £;187,718; total, £;777,779. For Somaliland, from 1892 to 31st March, 1900, the figures are: Imports, R.42,160,470; exports, R.42,501,390; total, R.84,661,860 (£;5,157,559). The proportion of British trade to total trade can only be given to a very limited degree. As regards the East Africa Protectorate, the imports from the United Kingdom are approximately from 25 to 30 per cent. of the total. The exports to the United Kingdom were about 25 per cent. of the total in 1896–7. Later information is not available. As regards British Central Africa, nothing can be stated as to the proportion of the exports going to the United Kingdom. Of the imports, between 80 and 90 per cent. came from the United Kingdom in 1899–1900. In regard to Somaliland, no particulars can be given of the share of the United Kingdom in the total trade.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Will Papers giving further information be presented before the Supplementary Estimates are taken?

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The hon. Member forgets that at the beginning of my answer I said that this information was given in Papers presented to Parliament in 1899–1900.

MR. LOUGH: But will the figures be brought up to date before the Supplementary Vote is taken?

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I cannot promise.

NICARAGUA CANAL;HAY-PAUNCKEOTE TREATY.

SIR CHRISTOPHER FURNESS: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if, without detriment to the public interest, he can inform the House what is the existing position of the negotiations relative to the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty for the repeal of the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, and whether it is intended that the Treaty shall be modified in the sense proposed by the United States Senate, namely, that in the event of a canal being constructed it shall be fortified by and shall be under the control of the United States in the event of war; whether negotiations are proceeding with other Powers in regard to this question; and when he proposes to place copies of the Correspondence relating to the matter upon the Table of the House.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The modifications in the Hay-Pauncefote Convention proposed by the United States Senate have not been accepted by His Majesty's Government. A communication to this effect was made yesterday by Lord Pauncefote to Mr. Hay. His Majesty's Government are not engaged in negotiations with any other Power in regard to this question. I will ask the hon. Member to postpone his question with regard to presentation of Papers for a few days.

ASHANTI EXPENDITURE;THE GOLDEN STOOL.

*MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, before the Supplementary Estimate for expenditure incurred in respect of the recent disturbances in Asbanti is brought forward, he will distribute to Members Papers dealing with the events which led up to those disturbances; and whether he will now state what were the instructions given to

Sir F. Hodgson as to obtaining possession of the Golden Stool and the collection of a war indemnity.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Papers have been presented, and I am informed that they will be distributed on Tuesday. No instructions were given to Sir F. Hodgson

as to the Golden Stool, but he was authorised, on the advice of himself and the Resident at Coomassie, to take steps to raise a revenue of £12,000 a year. The Resident recommended that this should not be called a tribute, or tax, but should be levied as interest on the unpaid war indemnities, which he believed the Ashantis would consider a perfectly just and legitimate debt.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Isle of Thanet): Can my right hon. friend say whether any estimate has been placed upon the value of the Golden Stool?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The Golden Stool has a "moral and intellectual value."

*MR. C. P. SCOTT: Is not the Golden Stool regarded as the symbol of possession?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Precisely; that is the "moral and intellectual value."

MR. LOUGH: Did Sir James Willcocks make any settlement on this point?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir; that was left to the present Resident.

MR. LOUGH: Shall we see the Papers before the Supplementary Estimates are taken?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think there is any chance of getting them before Friday.

INDIAN CABLE RATES.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Indian Government receives the same rate for the transit across India of messages between the Governments of the Australasian Colonies and the United Kingdom as is received for commercial telegrams; and, if not, what transit rate is paid by each of the various Governments concerned, and for what period in each case such rate has been in use; will he state the total number of words which, for each year from 1891 to 1913, till the present time, has been exchanged between India and the United Kingdom as State or Government messages; whether, for each of the years in question, the Governments of India and the United Kingdom have paid for Government telegrams the same rate as currently charged for commercial telegrams; and, if not, will he state during what period and to what extent such rate for Government telegrams between India and the United Kingdom has been varied; and, if it is convenient to furnish the number of words in these Government telegrams, will he give the sum annually paid since 1801 to 1913 by the Indian Government for such telegrams sent and received between India and the United Kingdom.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The transit rate across India for messages of the Governments of the Australasian Colonies and the United Kingdom is the same as that received for commercial telegrams. The second and fourth questions will have to be referred to India for an answer. State messages from India include messages to the War Office, Admiralty, etc., and we have no information in this Office regarding these. The answer to the third question is "Yes." Government messages between India and the United Kingdom are paid for at the same rate as commercial messages.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in

view of the impossibility of gathering complete information on the subject from some of the annual reports published by the Indian Government Telegraph Department, he will give separately the number of words constituting the telegrams which for each year have passed over the Indian land lines from Bombay to Madras and vice versa as transit messages under the headings of private, State, and press, since the Indian Government became a partner with the Eastern Telegraph Company, the Eastern Extension, etc., Telegraph Company, and the Indo-European Telegraph Company, in the fund which, being known as the Australian Message Fund, was formed in 1891;2 in connection with the reduction of telegraph rates between the United Kingdom and Australia; and will he give separately under the above headings the total sum for each year since India became partner to this Australian Message Fund, which has been received by India as transit rate; and also the total sum for each year which would have been paid to India for the number of words which have actually been carried in transit, at the rate which prevailed before the reduction in 1891;2 of the Indian transit rate, made in favour of telegrams to and from Australia and the Far East.

LORD G. HAMILTON: As I understand the question, it means a wish to know the number of words, divided into private, State, and press, which have transited India between Bombay and Madras, and have been exchanged with Australia on the one side and the west of India on the other. Also the revenue derived from such messages under the present Indian transit rate, and the revenue which would have been derived from the same number of words under the Indian transit rate in force previous to the Australasian Message Fund Agreement. I am afraid I cannot give this information, though I could give the revenue or charge without much difficulty. If my hon. friend will communicate with me I will see what I can do to enable him to get the information he desires.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he would say whether in all cases, as is the case at present in communicating with India, the full commercial rate is charged for Government telegrams exchanged with the United Kingdom; and, if not, in the case of which telegraph companies and to which countries a rate less than the full rate is charged for Government telegrams; and can he state the number of words or the total value of telegrams which, annually passing as Government telegrams, have been sent and received between the United Kingdom and India since the year 1891;2.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): No, Sir. Reduced rates are charged to South Africa and certain places in East Africa and West Africa by the Eastern Telegraph Company and its associated com-

panies; to Australasia and certain places in Asia beyond India by the Eastern Extension Telegraph Company; to North America by the North Atlantic Cable Companies; to the West Indies by the North Atlantic Cable Companies and the West India Telegraph Direct Company; to South America, so far as the Eastern and its associated telegraph companies and the North Atlantic Cable Companies are concerned, and to Cyprus, by the Eastern Telegraph Company. The Postmaster

General is not in a position to state the number of words or the value of Government telegrams between the United Kingdom and India, seeing that many of the telegrams do not pass through the hands of his officials, but are dealt with direct by the companies.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON: Can the hon. Gentleman say where I can get the information?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I do not know, except by applying to the companies.

LAW OFFICERS' SALARIES.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the burdens placed on the nation by the prolongation of the war in South Africa, he proposes to make any reduction in the sums that are paid, partly for fees and partly for salary, to the Attorney and Solicitor General.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): No, Sir, I do not contemplate making any such proposal.

PORT SANITARY AUTHORITIES COST OF MAINTENANCE.

COLONEL SADLER (Middlesbrough): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the ever increasing expense of maintaining the various port sanitary authorities of the country, which now falls solely on the seaport local authorities, and having regard to the fact that inland towns and districts are also interested in the prevention of the importation of infectious diseases into the country, he will recommend that all or part of the expenditure thus incurred should become a national charge.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this question. This matter has been carefully considered on more than one occasion in recent years. His Majesty's Government see no sufficient reason for altering the decision that has been arrived at by previous Governments, or for relieving the outports from the duty that has always been incumbent on them of preventing, at an expense by no means large, the introduction of infectious diseases into the country.

COINAGE; HALF-CROWNS AND FLORINS.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, considering the confusion arising from the similarity of the florin and half-crown pieces, he will take the opportunity of the proposed issue of new coins to withdraw the latter from circulation.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It is not proposed to discontinue the coinage of half-crowns, and I do not think such a course would meet with general approval. Consideration, however, will be given to the point whether the designs of the two coins can be made more distinct.

INFECTIOUS DISEASE IN THE WHARFEDALE UNION, YORKSHIRE.

MR. FLOWER (Bradford, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state the number of cases of infectious diseases in the Wharfedale Union in Yorkshire which have been reported in the last five years.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, E.): The Returns for 1900 for this Union are not at present complete, but in respect of the five years ending on 31st December, 1899, the total number of cases was 1,181.

SMALL DWELLINGS ACQUISITION ACT, 1899.

MR. HORNER (Lambeth, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state how many local authorities in the United Kingdom have put in operation the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act, 1899; how many local authorities in the County of London have done so; what has been the number of applications in the United Kingdom generally since the passing of the Act; what the number in the County of London for the same period; and how many of these applications respectively have been granted.

MR. WALTER LONG: The Local Government Board have no jurisdiction under the Act in Scotland or Ireland. As regards England and Wales, I am afraid I cannot give the particulars desired. As was intimated recently in reply to a question by my hon. friend the Member for North Islington, Disinformation is limited to cases of applications by local authorities to the Board for sanction when loans are required for the purposes of the Act. I may add that in London such loans are not sanctioned by the Local Government Board, but by the London County Council.

MR. HORNER: Will my right hon. friend say where I can get the information?

MR. WALTER LONG: I only have information of the cases in which application is made to the Local Government Board. Where the local authorities do not apply to the Board, I have no information.

MR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): Is it a fact that in January last the Local Government Board had applications from Fulham and Hampstead to put the Act in force, and sent a reply?

MR. WALTER LONG: As I believe the reply was sent to the hon. Member, he himself knows best.

MAGISTRATES AND THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether on the demise of the Crown magistrates already on the Commission of the Peace are obliged to take the oath of allegiance to the new Sovereign, or whether it is merely optional on their part.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I am advised that magistrates who are duly qualified may, notwithstanding the demise of the Crown, lawfully proceed in the execution of their duties without taking any fresh oath; but that it is proper and desirable that they should embrace an early opportunity of taking anew the oath of allegiance and the judicial oath.

DRAYCOTT (DERBYSHIRE) CEMETERY.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that, notwithstanding that the Burial Act of 1900 came into operation on the 1st of January last, the Parish Council of Draycott, Derbyshire, have been required to divide their cemetery, opened since the 1st of January, into consecrated and unconsecrated parts, in accordance with a plan sanctioned by the late Home Secretary prior to the passing of the said Act; and whether, seeing that this deprives the burial authority of the discretionary power in regard to consecration given by that Act, and subjects them to an enactment which has been now repealed, he will take steps for the withdrawal of this requirement.

*MR. RITCHIE: The division of the burial ground in question into consecrated and

unconsecrated parts was approved by my predecessor in accordance with an application made by the parish council before the Burial Act of last year was passed. I am advised that the obligation of the burial authority to proceed to the consecration of the part so approved is not affected by the passing of the Act. I may add that even under the new law the question of the consecration of burial grounds is not left entirely to the discretion of the burial authority. In reply to a further question by Sir WALTER FOSTER, Mr. RITCHIE said he was of opinion that burial grounds approved prior to the passing of the Act must be dealt with in accordance with the old Act.

REPORT OF PATENT LAW COMMITTEE.

MR. CAWLEY (Lancashire, Prestwich): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can say when the Report of the Committee on Patent Law will be published.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The Report of the Committee was presented yesterday, and will, I hope, be in the hands of Members very shortly.

ALLNIGHT SITTINGS; TEMPERATURE OF HOUSE.

*MR. ARTHUR LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he could undertake that on any future occasion when circumstances may require that Members of this House should be kept up all night the normal temperature of the House should be kept up also.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I can assure my hon. friend that every care shall be taken to keep up the normal temperature of the House throughout the night, if, unfortunately, we should again have to undergo the experience of an all-night sitting. The records taken, which I shall be pleased to let my hon. friend see, show that the temperature was very evenly maintained throughout the early hours of Friday last.

DUCHY OF CORNWALL; COAL ROYALTIES IN SOMERSETSHIRE.

MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the amount received from royalty by the Duchy of Cornwall upon coal worked in the parish of Farrington Gurney, Somerset, and also the amount received from royalty upon coal worked in the parish of Clandown, Midsomer Norton, Somerset.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I regret that I am unable to give the information asked for, as the boundaries of the collieries which work coal belonging to the Duchy of Cornwall do not coincide with the parish boundaries, and coal of other owners is raised through the same shafts, the royalties upon such coal not being known to the Duchy officers. The total amount of royalties received by the Duchy is given in the accounts annually presented to Parliament.

STOLEN POSTAGE STAMPS.

MR. LODER (Brighton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, seeing that new postage stamps will now have to be issued, the Postmaster General can see his way to perforating or otherwise marking in a distinctive manner penny stamps which may be used in filling up the shilling Savings Bank forms, so that the fraudulent use of the ordinary penny stamp may as far as possible be avoided.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has no evidence of any extensive use of Savings Bank stamp deposit forms for the disposal of stolen postage stamps; and to provide that none but special stamps should be used on such forms would detract from the simplicity and consequent usefulness of the arrangement. No perforated stamp is accepted as a part of a deposit; and any firm can thus remove temptation to dishonesty of the kind indicated by having its ordinary penny stamps perforated.

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES; BINDING OF FREE COPIES.

COLONEL MILWARD (Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the binding of the volumes of Hansard's Debates supplied to Members may be improved, and whether a cloth binding similar to that used for the public general statutes, which are also supplied gratuitously, may be employed.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir, this shall be done if I receive from my hon. friend any evidence to show that the change is generally desired by Members.

SECOND DIVISION CLERKS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can state how many senior assistant clerks (abstracter class) have been promoted to the second division under Clause 15 of the Order in Council of 29th November, 1898.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir; sixty-eight.

ROYAL PARKS, KEW GARDENS, ETC.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he would consent to a Return showing the acreage of the Royal Parks in Great Britain and Ireland, and their annual cost for the last ten years, with details of expenditure showing the weekly wages of workmen engaged respectively on roads, on paths, in gardening, the road and path mileage and cost per yard, the cost of gravel, sand, and stone, the number of lamps per mile and cost, the salaries of park-keepers, gatemen, rangers, and officials in each grade, and any other heads of expenditure.

I beg also to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he would give a Return showing for Kew Gardens, London, and Botanic Gardens, Dublin, the respective acreage; the area under glass; the annual cost for ten years of trees, shrubs, flowers, and seeds; the number of workmen and their wages; the number of scientific men employed and their salaries and emoluments; the date of the respective foundations; and the total cost of both to the State.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I shall be happy to give a Return showing the acreage of the Royal Parks in Great Britain and Ireland, of Kew Gardens, and of the Botanic Gardens, Dublin, and the total expenditure on each during the last ten years. I am unable to ascertain the total cost of each to the State since their foundation. On 21st March, 1899, my predecessor gave to the hon. Member the information which he desires as to the road mileage and cost per yard, and details of the expenditure on wages and salaries will be found in the Estimates.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the hon. Gentleman include in the Return the details I ask for, so that all can understand them?

† See The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxviii., page 1558.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I see no objection to giving some of them, but to include those not already available would involve a great deal of trouble and labour without compensating advantages.

POSTAL SERVICE; AGE LIMIT FOR COMPETITIVE EXAMINATIONS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether it would be possible to allow those who entered the postal service under the old regulations to compete up to the five years limit, seeing that it has been impossible for a majority of those affected by the alteration to make any improvement since the intended change was notified.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir, this has been arranged.

SCOTTISH MUSSEL FISHERIES.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that the Commissioners of Woods and Forests and Board of Trade are preventing the mussel fishermen of Port Glasgow, Greenock, Dumbarton, and Cardross from having the free use of the banks and mussel beds; whether the Fisheries Board have leased the mussel beds opposite Port Glasgow to an ex-official member of their own Board at a nominal rent of 20s. on a thirty-one years lease; and whether he will hold a public inquiry into all the circumstances connected with this transaction.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): I am informed by the Fishery Board that the reason for the action stated in the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question was the long-continued complaint of the line fishermen of Scotland of the growing scarcity of mussels for bait on account of the reckless depletion of the Clyde mussel beds, which are supported by the recommendations of the Departmental Committee of 1889. Under Section 12 of the Sea Fisheries Regulation (Scotland) Act, 1895, the Fishery Board leased the mussel beds in question from the Crown at an annual charge of £;1, and publicly advertised for a sub-tenant

on terms that were the same to all. The lessee was never an official of the Fishery Board and was not in their employment at the time of entering on the lease, though, as an expert, he had been employed by them formerly. He was selected entirely on his merits, being one of the best authorities on the subject in Scotland. The terms of the lease were adjusted after consultation by the Fishery Board with the town councils of Greenock and Port Glasgow. The Secretary for Scotland sees no cause for any inquiry.

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD STAFF.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if the Local Government Board for Ireland have increased their staff of auditors, inspectors, and clerks since the Local Government Act (Ireland) came into operation; and, if so, can he say how many of each have been appointed, and at what salaries.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): There has been an increase in the staff of the Local Government Board since the passing of the Act of 1898. Details of the increase under the heads mentioned in the question, with the

salaries of the officers, will be found on a comparison of the Estimates of the Department for 1901 (Class II., page 201) with the Estimates for the current and past two years.

SMALL HOUSES ACQUISITION ACT.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he would be willing to introduce an Amendment to the Small Houses Acquisition Act, Clause 2, subsection (c), that the title to the ownership is one which an ordinary mortgagee would be willing to accept, and insert the word "purchaser" instead of "mortgagee," and also modify Registration Clause 7 by removing the personal liability of the registrar, and the limit of time reduced to twelve years as under the Conveyancing Act.

Mr. WYNDHAM: I have already informed the hon. Member that this Act, which became law in August, 1899, has been in operation in Ireland for so limited a time as to offer insufficient grounds for considering the question of further legislation. When the Government are in a position to form an opinion as to how far it would be desirable or possible, by legislation, to modify the machinery of the Act, the suggestions of the hon. Member will be considered.

ROXBORO ROAD SCHOOLS, LIMERICK.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state to what uses are the premises of the Roxboro Road Schools, Limerick, and the lands that constitute that endowment, now applied.

Mr. WYNDHAM: The Roxboro Road Schools have been let to Dean Gregg, at a rent of £20 a year, which, with the dividends on the funded portion of the endowment, is being accumulated in the hands of the Commissioners of Education.

COUNTY DOWN CONSTABULARY.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state how many constables off the seniority list in County Down have been advanced to the rank of acting sergeant since 1st January, 1900, and how many of them are Roman Catholics; and whether he can state what proportion the Roman Catholic constables in the county bear to non-Catholics.

MR. WYNDHAM: Seven constables serving in Down have been promoted to the rank of acting sergeant since the 1st January, 1900; one of them is a Roman Catholic. There is no seniority list. There are 117 Roman Catholic constables in the county at present, and 91 of other religious denominations.

NURSES IN IRISH WORKHOUSES.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he explain why the Local Government Board are insisting on the appointment of trained nurses for the position of assistant nurses in workhouse hospitals, and refusing to allow boards of guardians to appoint girls to these positions who could be trained (at a great saving to the rates) under the eyes of the medical officer and nurse in charge; and whether he will order this order of the Local Government Board to be withdrawn.

Mr. WYNDHAM: In the interests of the sick poor it is necessary that the assistant nurse of a small workhouse hospital should be an experienced,

qualified nurse, as she has entire charge of the sick during the temporary absence of the nurse from any cause, besides having probably to take charge of patients at night in many cases. The opinion of the Local Government Board is that no person should, be appointed and paid for discharging the duties of a nurse unless she has been sufficiently trained. The Board does not ask that an assistant nurse should be fully trained within the meaning of Section 58 (2) (a) (ii.) of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, and the Board has always been glad to encourage boards of guardians to train nurses whenever a systematic course of training has been proposed under sufficient and competent teachers. This has been done in some unions. The Board is, however, unable to approve of proposals that inexperienced untrained girls should be permitted to attempt to discharge nursing duties, and to acquire the status of a nurse without any sufficient or systematic instruction.

Mr. J. P. FARRELL: If the boards consent to send these girls to be properly trained, will the Local Government Board be prepared to make them a grant-in-aid in the same way as is done in the case of fully-trained nurses?

Mr. WYNDHAM: That is a proper subject for inquiry, and I will look into it.

LONGFORD CROWN SOLICITOR.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to state what is the salary of the Crown Solicitor of Longford county; what amount he receives for the office of local registrar of titles; can he state how many appearances this Crown Solicitor makes in court in the exercise of the duties of his office; how many consultations he has to attend; whether he prepares any reports or gives advices to the constabulary; and how long has he been now appointed to this office.

MR. WYNDHAM: The salary of the Crown Solicitor for Longford is £275 a year; as local registrar of titles he is paid a salary of £300 a year. The Crown Solicitor conducts all Crown business at assizes or quarter sessions, and also at petty sessions when so directed. He prepares reports when such are necessary in the discharge of his duties, and likewise advises the constabulary. The present holder of the office was appointed to the united offices of Crown and Sessional Crown Solicitor in 1889; he was originally appointed to the latter office in 1863.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Can the right hon. Gentleman give the number of appearances which this gentleman made last year in return for his salary?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir; but I gather that his duties are very multifarious in their nature.

IRISH EDUCATION COMMISSIONERS' STORES.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether complaints have been received from the Dublin branch of the Bookbinders' and Machine Rulers' Society as to the quantity of Readers and other school books which have been imported into the Education Commissioners' stores in Marlborough Street, and of the hardship inflicted on Dublin bookbinders by this action; and whether he will give a Return showing the number of such books sent to these stores, with the names of the publishers supplying same and the places where the work is executed.

MR. WYNDHAM: Complaints of the character mentioned were recently made to the Commissioners of National Education by the society in question. The Commissioners, upon communicating with the firm by which the books are supplied, were assured that they were printed and bound in Dublin. In view of this assurance. I do not think any useful purpose would be served by granting the Return indicated, but if the hon. Member has any further representations to make in the matter, and will communicate them to me. I shall be happy to cause further inquiry to be made.

IRISH NATIONAL SCHOOLS; BUILDING ESTIMATES.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the Treasury when it is proposed to reconsider the Estimate for building national schools in Ireland under Plan No. IV. A of the Board of Works; and whether, in the case of managers whose claims for extras have been recommended by the Education Board inside the last two years for an increased grant, such claims will be considered in any increase in amounts proposed to be given.

Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The revision referred to in the first paragraph is now in progress, and will be proceeded with as rapidly as the pressure of other work allows. It will not be possible to make the decision retrospective so as to apply it to cases already dealt with.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Can the hon. Gentleman say when the result of the revision will be made known?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am afraid I cannot; but there will be no unnecessary delay. The staff which has to do the work has, however, other pressing duties which must not be neglected at the moment.

BOYLE GUARDIANS; CASE OF JOSEPH GRADY.

Mr. TULLY: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether a claim has been received from the Boyle Board of Guardians for a sum of £;5 5s. for the maintenance of a boy named Joseph Grady, the son of Private John Grady, now serving with the first battalion of the Connaught Rangers; and whether he will direct that this sum, which is calculated at 3d. a day, will be forwarded to the workhouse authorities in Boyle.

LORD STANLEY: This claim has been received. Under the Army Act the man is only liable to a stoppage of 3d. for the support of his family. This 3d. has been paid to the man's wife. The clerk to the guardians has been informed accordingly.

NAVY ESTIMATES.

Mr. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury when the Navy Estimate be circulated.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I hope this evening.

Mr. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): When does the right hon. Gentleman propose to move the Speaker out of the chair on them?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot indulge in any conjectures on that subject at the present moment.

NEW BILLS.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACTS AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Acts relating to Industrial Schools, ordered to be brought in

by Dr. Macnamara, Mr. Flower, Captain Norton, Sir Fortescue Flannery, and Mr. Corrie Grant.

INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Acts relating to Industrial Schools," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Friday, 22nd March, and to be printed. [Bill 94.]

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION.

Bill to amend the Sovereign's Accession Oath as regards the statements in it concerning the Roman Catholic religion, ordered to be brought in by Mr. William Redmond, Mr. Blake, Mr. Abraham, Captain Donelan, Mr.

Patrick O'Brien, Mr. Flynn. Mr. Hayden. Mr. Murphy, and Mr. Boland.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

"To amend the Sovereign's Accession Oath as regards the statements in it concerning the Roman Catholic-Religion," presented.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the first time."; (Mr. William Redmond.)

*Mr. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I rise to oppose this Bill. The First Lord of the Treasury told us yesterday that there would be no objection to the appointment of a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament to consider this question. I think it entirely premature to introduce a Bill dealing with the matter, until the presentation of the report of the Joint Committee of the two Houses appointed to consider whether any alteration of the King's Oath is necessary. The hon. Member who is going to introduce this Bill would like to obliterate from the Oath taken by His Majesty on his Accession and Coronation, the word "Protestant," and everything that would maintain the Protestant succession to the Crown of these realms, I feel very strongly on this question, and that it is extremely undesirable in the present state of political opinion and the state of affairs in Europe, that the one throne in Europe which is securely fixed in the affections of the people should be tampered with. I do not say if the Oath taken by His Majesty in the House of Lords were to be considered now for the first time that the form of words in it would exactly suit the present day; but I feel sure that our ancestors who assisted to build up the great fabric of the British Constitution, and based it on the Protestant religion, were fully justified in the protest that they made against the efforts which had been persistently used from time to time to destroy the civil and religious liberties of the people, and to establish the Roman Catholic religion. I will not take up the time of the House ;[Cries from the Irish benches of "Go on!"];for I hope I know what is due to the House. I know hon. Members are anxious to consider other important matters, and I am not one of those who will trespass on the time of the House of Commons at any undue length. Still I feel bound on this occasion to enter a protest against any attempt to tamper with the Protestantism of the British Constitution.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 3rd April, and to be printed. [Bill 95.]

SUPPLY (ARMY ESTIMATES).

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment to Question [11th March],
"That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

And which Amendment was;

"To leave out from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words in the opinion of this House, the public interest requires that a complete and immediate inquiry be made into all the circumstances connected with the removal from his Command at Gibraltar of Major General Sir Henry Colvile, K.C.M.G., C.B.; instead thereof.";(Mr. Charles Douglas.)

Question again proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince): I have no knowledge of Sir Henry Colvile's case or of the case of the Secretary of State for War, beyond what I heard last night. The reason why I wish to make a few remarks is that this is, in my view, a case of an officer invited to resign his appointment for one thing only, when, in reality, he is removed for something else. In my view the false or incomplete issue upon which Sir Henry Colvile was called upon to resign has wrecked his career by inducing him to write to the press. He was invited to resign upon the Lindley affair, but the whole facts of that affair had been gone into before he was reappointed to the command at Gibraltar. Whether Colonel Spragge made a good or a bad defence could not affect the question whether Sir Henry Colvile should have gone on when he got Colonel Spragge's message. The fateful moment for General Colvile was when he decided to go on and not to go back to Lindley. Sir Henry Colvile's decision, which was either right or wrong, was made anterior to Colonel Spragge's defence. I venture to think that he was recalled for the reasons stated in the speech of the right hon. the Secretary of State for War, which I will read.

"Lord Roberts stated that, in his opinion on two occasions in the field General Colvile had shown a want of forwardness, of enterprise, and of sound judgment which are essential qualifications for a command. He considered that in twice leaving a body of cavalry in difficulties he set an example which, if followed, would be fatal to an army in the field. Other circumstances had come to Lord Roberts's notice in which General Colvile's relations with his subordinates and the absence of sufficient control and supervision in his command were such as to seriously impair the confidence which troops should have in their leaders. I make that statement by Lord Roberts's desire."

Now, to suggest resignation upon the Lindley affair, which had already been decided, was what no man who was prepared to stand a court-martial about the Lindley affair could possibly accede to. I venture to think that, in such a complicated case, it would have been better to have recalled Sir Henry Colvile direct. He need not have been employed again unless the views of the authorities changed. But they might have changed, for it must be recollected that at Paardeberg it was the action of part of his division; the Canadians and the 7th Company of the Engineers, supported by the Gordon Highlanders; in pushing forward at three in the morning, and entrenching themselves within eighty yards of Cronje's defences, which finally forced on the surrender of the Boer commander. This act showed resource and an appreciation of the conditions of modern warfare

which we do not always find; now the question arises, ought General Colvile to have the credit of this? I think so, because I recall that he advocated the same system at Maggersfontein. Thus General Colvile had a great deal to his credit, even if he had other instances to militate against it. I think the action of the War Office has been very fitful in this matter, and that it does not tend towards the interest of discipline as it used to be regarded in the Army.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON (Leeds, S.): The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary for War pointed out in his speech last night that he was not influenced in his view of this case either by the social position which General Colvile occupies, or by the newspaper clamour which he told us had been raised in support of it. If that declaration was made by the right hon. Gentleman in order to assure the House of his impartiality and of his firmness the House needed no such assurance. But if the observation sprang from a feeling that a reflection could be made upon the character of this attempt to secure for General Colvile some hearing by a competent military tribunal, then I venture to ask the House to believe that those of us who are taking an interest in this subject entirely disclaim any such motive. We approach the case in no partisan sense. It involves a great public question relating to the status of military officers and the steps that ought to be taken before they are deprived of their position in His Majesty's service. So far as I am personally concerned, the issue of this discussion is a matter of indifference. Except that I have had placed in my hands some papers by my hon. friend the Member for North-West Lanark, who drew attention to the subject, and that I have had the opportunity of a general explanation from General Colvile, that officer is a complete stranger to me. What we ask the House to establish by the acceptance of the Amendment is that a military officer before he is deprived of high command shall have his conduct investigated by a competent military tribunal, before which he may be heard in his defence. The most fundamental principle of justice is that an accused person should be heard before he is condemned. There is no jurisdiction so barbarous as not to be founded on that principle; there is no system of jurisprudence which fails to be arbitrary if that principle is not observed. I think that in a very few minutes I can satisfy the House that General Colvile, an eminent officer, has been compulsorily retired without ever having had an opportunity of even hearing the materials upon which the charges against him are founded, or of offering to any competent military tribunal an answer to these imputations. What is the case against him? It resolves itself into two charges. The first is an indictment connected with Sanna's Post; the second connected with the surrender at Lindley. The right hon. Gentleman fully appreciated the relative importance of these two accusations and he put in the forefront the conduct of General Colvile in relation to Sanna's Post. What is the accusation It is that General Colvile, when a short distance removed from General Broadwood, communicated with General Broadwood, who was in action with the Boers, and invited General Broadwood to neglect the immediate duties which devolved upon him in connection with the command of his troops, and travel a distance of two or three miles in order to hold a personal interview with General Colvile. The second charge is that General Colvile, instead of proceeding to capture or

rescue the lost guns, withdrew his troops in another direction. The right hon. Gentleman made these charges against an officer of tried capacity, and, led the House to believe that these constituted an accurate statement of facts, which had been accepted by General Colvile. Now, so far from General Colvile accepting that statement as accurate, he has all along strenuously contested all of these allegations, and therefore it is obvious, in the interests of justice and fair play, that a case has arisen for inquiry. General Colvile's argument is that, so far from having called upon General Broadwood to join him while General Broadwood was engaged in military operations, he issued that summons hours after the military operations had concluded; and that, so far from withdrawing his troops and avoiding his duty of rescuing, or capturing the lost guns, he withdrew his troops in order that by a flank movement he might intercept the Boers, and so secure the guns. If that allegation is founded on fact, surely General Colvile is entitled to have his view presented for consideration before a properly constituted military tribunal.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. Brodrick, Surrey, Guildford): The whole case was put by General

Colvile to Lord Roberts and considered by him before any action was taken.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON: I should like to know; and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will give us the information; in what form, where, and on what occasion General Colvile ever presented for the consideration of the present Secretary of State for War or the Commander-in-Chief the statement of his case. If the right hon. Gentleman will only bear with me for a moment, I think I will make it clear to him that the only statement ever made to Lord Roberts by General Colvile was a statement briefly made in the course of an interview of a few minutes, before any charge had been formulated against him and when there was no opportunity of framing an accusation which he might have challenged or answered. A statement was put into writing by General Colvile at a later stage, and that statement was submitted to the Army Committee at the War Office, consisting of the predecessor of the right hon. Gentleman, Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Wolseley; and that statement was considered so entirely satisfactory that they approved of General Colvile resuming his command at Gibraltar. That statement, so far from leading to censure, established General Colvile's acquittal from the charges made against him. In regard to Sanna's Post, I say that there is on the part of General Colvile a complete answer; and what is more important, until last night, Sanna's Post has never been relied on by the right hon. Gentleman in supporting the action taken against General Colvile. It has never before been put forward as a ground for this distinguished officer being removed from his command. Let me establish that proposition. The first reference to Sanna's Post appears in the despatch which Lord Roberts wrote and sent to the War Office. In that despatch he describes General Colvile's operation of withdrawing his troops in order to intercept the Boers and guns by a flank movement as not quite an error of judgment, because the phrase used was;

"It would have been better if General Colvile, instead of seeking to rescue the guns by a flank movement, had operated directly upon the position where the guns were, and from which the Boers were transporting

them."

That is a qualified and indirect reflection on the exercise of judgment on the part of General Colvile. Later a letter was written to General Colvile, when he was at Gibraltar, explaining to him the grounds upon which; and in which the right hon. Gentleman concurred with Lord Roberts; it had been decided to withdraw him from his command. That letter was written on 16th December last, and stated that the gravamen of the ease against General Colvile was in connection with the Lindley affair alone. It runs as follows;:

"The Secretary of State having discussed by telegraph the incidents of the surrender of No. XIII. Imperial Yeomanry battalion, concurs with Lord Roberts that you were mainly responsible for the surrender, and has reluctantly come to the conclusion that you cannot be permitted to retain your command. I am directed to request you will hand in your resignation to General Sir George White on receipt of this letter, and quit Gibraltar."

If Sanna's Post was relied on on 11th December as a ground for the peremptory withdrawal of General Colvile from Gibraltar, why was it not mentioned in that letter? The right hon. Gentleman intimated last night that the history of Sanna's Post had gradually developed, and that new light had been thrown on that unfortunate affair; but as late as 21st February in the present year the Secretary of State alleged as the only ground for the measure against General Colvile the Lindley surrender. Sanna's Post was not mentioned at all. What reliance can be placed upon the case which rests mainly on General Colvile's conduct at Sanna's Post, when no inquiry on that affair has ever been held, when General Colvile has never had an opportunity of hearing the statements made to Lord Roberts in regard to it, and when no mention has been made of it until last night, and it has never been put forward as one of the reasons?

*MR. BRODRICK: The hon. and learned gentleman is speaking from a brief supplied to him by General Colvile. I am therefore surprised he does not know that there is a memorandum by General Colvile dealing with the whole question of Sanna's Post.

*Mr. LAWSON WALTON: I fail to appreciate the force of the right hon. Gentleman's interposition; the only motive apparently was to indulge in a cheap sneer at my expense, which will not serve the right hon. Gentleman. The point I understand him to make is this, that with regard to the story of Sanna's Post, General Colvile has had an opportunity of clearing himself. The right hon. Gentleman gave us what he said was the story of Sanna's Post, but what was the source of inspiration from which that story came? What are the historical data upon which that version rests? They were supplied by Lord Roberts, and I have no doubt were conscientiously believed in by Lord Roberts and by the right hon. Gentleman himself; but where does Lord Roberts get these statements? He got those statements through various officers from information derived from various persons and through various channels, and General Colvile has had no opportunity of checking those statements or of cross-examining those persons who made them. Lord Roberts is put into possession of a version of these incidents through statements made behind the back of the officer involved, who has had no opportunity of giving his answer to them. Yet, when those statements are put

forward, it is said that they are the result of an inquiry in which General Colvile had every opportunity given to him for defence, and therefore he is not injured in that matter, having had a full opportunity of putting his case before his judges.

Now, I shall show the House in a moment that all that has ever been produced by General Colvile was a memorandum which was sent to the War Office when his conduct was under investigation after the Sanna's Post affair and the Lindley disaster, and when that explanation was regarded as satisfactory by those who were qualified to express an opinion. Before going further, let me first touch upon the Lindley case. What was the Lindley case? It was that General Colvile failed to go back eighteen or twenty-two miles in order to rescue Yeomanry in difficulties. That, in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, was a most inhuman proceeding.

He implied it rather than said it, because he told us of other officers who had travelled twice the distance and succeeded in rendering important service to the Yeomanry. But he did not tell the House that General Colvile did not follow their example because he was under orders to go elsewhere, The other officers were under orders to go to Lindley. General Colvile was under orders to go to Heilbron, and, according to those orders, he had to be at Heilbron the next day, and he could not go back to the rescue of the Yeomanry at Lindley without disobeying the specific orders which he had received. I do not suggest to the House that this is a matter which we can investigate, but it is a matter which should be investigated. I say that General Colvile has a case with regard to the Lindley disaster which should be tried, a case upon which a competent military tribunal should express some verdict. Now Lindley is in a different position from Sanna's Post, because, while there never was an inquiry into the affair at Sanna's Post, with regard to the Lindley disaster there were two, the one which most nearly approached a judicial inquiry being directed by the right hon.

Gentleman himself. When General Colvile returned to this country from South Africa he was told that Lord Roberts had criticised his action, and was asked to furnish an explanation, which he did: but the right hon. Gentleman fails to see the distinction between an answer to an accusation framed and an explanation given by an accused person before he knows the charge made against him. General Colvile told his own version, and shortly after a despatch was received from Lord Roberts, and a Committee consisting of Lord Lansdowne, the then Secretary of State for War, and Lord Wolseley investigated the matter, and they approved of General Colvile taking up his command at Gibraltar. That took place in August. In the month of December the right hon. Gentleman succeeded Lord Lansdowne at the War Office, and Lord Roberts succeeded Lord Wolseley as Commander-in-Chief. Last night the right hon. Gentleman told us that the decision of that Committee was arrived at without the knowledge of Lord Roberts.

*MR. BRODRICK: What I said was that the committee of inquiry with regard to the Lindley disaster was brought to my knowledge by Sir Evelyn Wood, and by me referred to Lord Roberts, who had not been previously consulted.

*MR. LAWSON WALTON: But even so, supposing that the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor Lord Lansdowne and the late Commander-in-Chief had come to the

conclusion that they might restore General Colvile to his command at Gibraltar without consultation with Lord Roberts, surely, if the Secretary for War for the time being and the Commander-in-Chief for the time being had investigated the circumstances of an officer's conduct and come to a decision upon it, there ought to be an end to the matter. How long was an officer to hold his command subject to the change of the political Minister at the War Office, subject to the review- of a more vigorous and sweeping Secretary of State with reforms in prospect and a new Commander-in-Chief with different ideas of discipline? Without any intimation to him of any sort or kind, without any new charge being brought against him, that decision in his favour was cancelled, and he was withdrawn from the command which he had been allowed to take up. The right hon. Gentleman was quite correct when he said that a new fact came to his knowledge, namely, the report of the inquiry in South Africa with regard to the Lindley disaster. Let us assume for a moment that the court in South Africa did investigate the cause of the Lindley disaster; that investigation was behind General Colvile's back; he was not there either personally or by representation; there was no one to sift the evidence on his behalf, and no one to establish conclusions which might tell in his favour. Yet the right hon. Gentleman proceeds to act upon that report without calling the attention of General Colvile himself to it or even sending him a copy of it. The action taken by the right hon. Gentleman in this case is an action taken upon the report of an inquiry at which General Colvile was not present, and he acted upon it without asking General Colvile whether he had anything to say with regard to it. I suggest that the action of the right hon. Gentleman was absolutely unfair, and I submit that the right hon. Gentle man has failed to show any new facts in view of the decision which was arrived at by his predecessor and Lord Wolseley, who had a statement before them on which they acted, and which, so far as I know, is the only statement General Colvile has published with regard to this matter. No one can feel a higher respect for Lord Roberts than I entertain, but he is but mortal; he was not himself an eye-witness of the conduct of General Colvile either at Lindley or Sauna's Post. He only derived his impressions of these incidents from versions given by others. Lord Roberts never pretended to have conducted any independent investigation at which General Colvile had an opportunity of being heard, and therefore the fact that Lord Roberts had formed this impression upon ex parte statements and evidence never submitted to cross-examination was not sufficient ground for the Secretary of State for War to review the action of his predecessors in removing him; General Colvile; from his command.

The question rests, as I have said, upon this, that Sauna's Post has never been a subject of inquiry at all, and with regard to Lindley there has been no inquiry at which General Colvile has been present, or with regard to which his defence has ever been heard. Let not our view be clouded by General Colvile's unfortunate communication to the press. I am not here to approve or disapprove that action, it falls altogether outside the scope of this motion, because all the motion asks is that General Colvile's conduct in South Africa, upon which his withdrawal from South Africa was founded, should be the subject of

investigation. So far as the communication to the press is concerned, though it may be blameable, there is a good deal to be said in extenuation of it. The action of the Secretary for War in regard to General Colville's communication to the press only illustrates the arbitrary way in which the War Office acted even towards officers in high command. After that paragraph appeared in the newspapers General Colville received a short letter from the War Office asking him whether it was published on his authority. He was not invited to offer any explanation of the circumstances which might in some degree have extenuated his conduct. He was simply asked if it was published by his authority. He replied in the affirmative, and then he was compulsorily retired, and his retiring pay permanently reduced. That may be right or it may be wrong, but before the War Office judges a man and metes out punishment to him, they ought to investigate the circumstances under which his conduct took place. As my hon. friend said, General Colville had received the greatest possible provocation; he had received a letter from his superior in command that he must resign his command forthwith and immediately return home. After thirty years brilliant service in the Army, to be withdrawn from his command and bade return by the next mail steamer because of action in South Africa months before, after a favourable opinion had been expressed of his conduct by the War Office, was conduct calculated to provoke a man to an act which in calmer moments he would not be guilty of. One must remember, too, that General Colville was a half-pay officer, and he was entitled to communicate with the press and sit in this House and to stump the country and point out the mode in which military matters have been or are being conducted, and I say with regard to this matter, although his defence and vindication may fail on inquiry, he ought to be allowed a hearing, and that the circumstances ought to be investigated by the War Office and receive that consideration which they appear to warrant.

So much for that part of the case which the right hon. Gentleman has made; but part of the case of the right hon. Gentleman has been abandoned. The right hon. Gentleman stated on the 21st of February that General Colville had been deprived of his command owing to inefficiency in the field. If the right hon. Gentleman meant to rely only upon the misconduct of General Colville on the two occasions to which he referred I understand his answer, but a very large proportion of this House are under the impression that Lord Roberts was expressing a general opinion with regard to General Colville in connection with his capacity as a commanding officer. The past record of General Colville as regards South Africa is that he has received on four occasions the commendation of his commanding officer. First of all, at Belmont and Magersfontein. Despatches sent to Lord Wolseley by Lord Methuen both refer in complimentary terms to General Colville; next in regard to Paardeberg and Poplar Grove, he had the commendation of Lord Roberts himself. In that campaign General Colville was mentioned favourably by his superiors on four occasions. There were these two blots, and in regard to those he has never been heard. No materials have ever been supplied to show the grounds of this action by the War Office, and all that General Colville asks by this motion is that he shall have the satisfaction of knowing that his case has been heard, before his career in the public service is finally

ended. The right hon. Gentleman has said that this remedy is useless to General Colvile, because he would be no better off after that inquiry has been held; that, in fact, he would be in a worse position than if he was condemned unheard. That was always the view of the prosecution before the trial takes place, but it is no answer to a man who asks to be fairly tried to say so. At all events, that is a line which I hope we shall never follow in this country when a military case arises for consideration. That was the logic which influenced the French War Minister when the case of Captain Dreyfus arose, but by a British Minister of War no such argument can surely be put forward. All that General Colvile asks is that he may have the satisfaction of learning what the materials were upon which this action was taken, so that he may be able to put before the country the answer which he seeks to make to the accusation. I submit that it is a small requital for thirty years of brilliant public service to yield to an officer the small demand that his case shall be heard before his condemnation is finally recorded.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYXDER (Wiltshire, Chippenham): In a portion of his remarks last night the right hon. Gentleman stated that he was in favour of bringing officers before courts-martial, but

that if the House of Commons is not prepared to accept the decision of such distinguished officers as Lord Roberts, Lord Kitchener, and Lord Wolseley, there is very little likelihood of their accepting the views of any subordinate officers. No one has a deeper and more profound respect for the opinion of such a distinguished man as our Commander-in-Chief than myself, and in saying that I believe I am echoing the opinion of every one in this House; but at the same time I cannot help feeling with the hon. Member who has just sat down that when the case of a very distinguished general, who for the last thirty years has given distinguished services to the country, is brought before the bar of public opinion it should not be subjected to individual opinion, but should go through all the military machinery possible for the law to give. It has been clearly shown that in the case of General Colvile, judging from the view of courts-martial, there has not been a complete case presented on the side of General Colvile, and in coming to a decision like that which the Commander-in-Chief has arrived at they have come to it not through hearing evidence on both sides, but by hearing the evidence for the prosecution only.

There is no better instance of this than in the case of the Lindley disaster and Sauna's Post. It is upon the Lindley affair that General Colvile has been condemned practically to expulsion from the Army. I was not an officer in General Colvile's column, nor in the 13th Yeomanry; I was not actually on the spot when the matter occurred, but I was next door to it. I was an officer in Lord Methuen's column, which came with great, but, unfortunately, not sufficient, despatch to try to relieve Colonel Spragge's Yeomanry. From the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman last night one would have thought that Lord Methuen's column being at Kroonstadt and General Colvile's between Lindley and Heilbron, and messages being sent to both, they were each in a position to proceed, and that Lord Methuen's column did proceed, with the greatest possible despatch, to the relief of Colonel Spragge's Yeomanry at Lindley. That, however,

is not the fact. The fact is that sitting at Kroonstadt as we were, after a very tedious march through the whole of the western portion of the Orange River Colony, we had not been there for more than thirty-six hours before an order came to Lord Methuen to proceed with the greatest despatch to the relief not of Colonel Spragge, but of General Colville. The House might have supposed that General Colville, moving aimlessly and quietly along to Heilbron, received a message that Colonel Spragge was in dire distress and yet refused to return. But the case is that General Colville immediately he left Lindley was attacked most severely for two days by a large Boer force, so much so that a message was sent to Lord Methuen to follow the Heilbron road to assist General Colville. Therefore, when the latter received the message from Colonel Spragge he was in an extremely difficult position himself. General Colville and Lord Methuen were each in command of a column, but it is as well to scrutinise how those columns were composed. Lord Methuen was in command of a column of 1,200 mounted men with several guns and a brigade of infantry, while General Colville when he left Lindley was in command of a column consisting only of a brigade of infantry and fifty mounted men, with possibly a battery of artillery and two naval guns. It is difficult for the House to appreciate the position, but anybody who has been in South Africa will bear me out that such a force as General Colville's was altogether inadequate to go through that extremely difficult country when opposed by a large body of Boers. The artillery itself, useful and indispensable as it may be, is a great encumbrance to a general going through such country, and a force of considerably more than fifty men was needed to adequately protect the guns alone. Three days after Lord Methuen arrived at Lindley he was ordered to proceed to Heilbron, thus going through much the same country as General Colville had traversed, but, in spite of his much larger force, Lord Methuen for two days met with severe opposition from the Boers. It was most difficult country to operate in; without an adequate supply of cavalry it would be very hard for a force to get through, and practically impossible for a brigade of infantry to attempt any turning movement against the enemy. My contention is that in the interests of a distinguished general the case is really worth sifting. General Colville may have been wrong not to return to Lindley, but at any rate he has a very good answer for not so doing in the facts I have described. I may be presumptuous in making a remark upon a military point, but this is worth considering. Had General Colville decided to return to Lindley, what would have happened? There were 2,000 Boers around him. The moment he attempted to retire with his inadequate force, the Boers, as we have seen in several instances, would have become much more venturesome, and he would have had the greatest possible difficulty in finding his way back. If he had succeeded in getting back, he would have found an immense force of Boers surrounding Colonel Spragge, and it is quite a question whether, with the force at his disposal, General Colville would have been able to relieve the Yeomanry. My only reason for rising was to bring this point before the House, because in these matters a little local colour is needed. When Lord Methuen's force arrived at Lindley and found that Colonel Spragge's column had surrendered, the general

opinion was against General Colvile. But after we had proceeded to Heilbron and had the opportunity of appreciating the local incidents, circumstances, and difficult conditions under which General Colvile had laboured between Lindley and Heilbron, I am prepared to say, perhaps not the universal, but certainly the prevalent opinion in Lord Methuen's column was that General Colvile was absolutely exonerated from all blame with regard to the Lindley surrender. There is at any rate a sufficiently good case for a thorough investigation. Therefore, though it is with the greatest reluctance I have risen, recognising the public obloquy and, disgrace under which a general with such a distinguished past has been placed, without, in my judgment, having had due consideration or a proper opportunity of defence, I feel under the circumstances I must associate myself with the hon. Gentleman who has moved this motion. My right hon. friend says that the practice of introducing these questions into the House of Commons may militate against the discipline of the Army. I

have no such fear. I rather believe if you are to have discipline on its surest basis it must be built upon the most equitable and just foundations, and it is because I feel that, whether General Colvile is right or wrong, there has not been the fullest investigation of all the circumstances which surround this matter, and of the difficult conditions in which that general was placed, that I associate myself with the motion before the House.

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

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) said that when he read in the newspapers of the dismissal of General Colvile from his command at Gibraltar, he thought that he must have behaved very badly indeed, because if half-a-dozen men had been ordered to go and shoot the general it would have been a punishment but very little more severe than that of dismissing him from the Service without trial and practically without inquiry. When he read General Colvile's statement in the press he came to the opinion that he had a good deal to say for himself, but that it could not possibly be true, otherwise he would not have been dismissed. He was, therefore, greatly astonished to find on the previous evening that General Colvile had spoken within the truth, and that the only difference of opinion was as to whether he was eighteen or twenty-three miles from Lindley.

The affair at Sauna's Post revealed the weak spot in the staff administration. The staff were very badly informed. The Boers were much stronger and more mobile than the staff fancied. When this country was last engaged in a big campaign; at the time of the Peninsular War; there was a Quartermaster's Department, which looked after the marching of the troops, settled the routes, and generally saw that the general's ideas were carried into effect. That Department was now practically abolished. There was a Quartermaster General, but he was little more than a commissariat officer. There was no specialised staff to look after the marching and location of the troops or the general conduct of the war, and in the absence of such a specialised staff the general staff had to discharge those duties. The Germans had such a body of officers. There had been many failures during the war in consequence of the bad condition of the staff;

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must keep to the question of General Colvile. Colonel NOLAN explained that he was trying to prove that General Colvile was a victim of the bad staff. That to a Certain extent was admitted, and he was attempting to relieve the members of the staff by throwing the blame on the system. At Sauna's Post the staff left the right flank in a very weak position, and that the Boers were very strong was proved by the ease with which they swept Colonel Broadwood in. That their strength was unknown to the staff was shown by the very weak force which guarded the waterworks, because the retention of the waterworks was essential to the health of Bloemfontein. from the debate of the previous evening one who had read nothing about the matter would have supposed that General Colvile was, in some indirect way, mixed up with the disaster at Sauna's Post, and had somehow lost guns, prisoners, horses, and men The tact was that General Colvile was nowhere near the place and had nothing to do with Colonel Broadwood at the time the losses were experienced. As soon as General Colvile's troops were felt to be near, the attack on Colonel Broadwood ceased, and so far as concerned the main purpose for which General Colvile was sent out, the object was achieved As to saving the guns, it was impossible for an infantry force to overtake fully-horsed artillery, and even if they could have caught them it would have been a matter of a very few minutes for the Boers to have destroyed the guns and left them mere masses of useless steel.

He contended that General Colvile did everything he was able to do in order to save General Broadwood at Sauna's Post, and that he exercised a proper discretion in not following an ambuscading force of Boers into a spruit in a time of tropical heat. In his judgment the staff did not do their work well on the right flank at that time; they undervalued De Wet's forces, and the staff did not like the prospect of an inquiry into the affair at Sauna's Post. Sir Evelyn Wood never alluded to Sauna's Post, and General Colvile was not dismissed for that mistake. The message which General Colvile received from Colonel Spragge at Lindley was not a very urgent message, and the Yeomanry, besides, appeared to have been summoned by a false message, which, in some way not explained, was not in cipher. Any common sense man would have ordered General Colvile to have stayed at Lindley for a day until the men rallied, and there was no common sense in leading 500 men by themselves. If Colonel Spragge's message had stated that his force was in danger of being destroyed, then General Colvile might have decided to return at all hazards to try to save him. It was said that the Yeomanry were summoned by a false message, but it so how were they summoned, and how did Colonel Spragge act on such a message? Colonel Spragge in his opinion was the man who should have gone through all this trouble, and should have been brought to a court-martial. If this were done he did not think Colonel Spragge would get out of it with honour. Why they had fastened upon General Colvile was difficult to understand. He should be very much astonished if the debate in the House did not produce a very great effect upon public opinion in favour of General Colvile, who had served the country very honestly and bravely as a general. He obeyed all his orders and saved Colonel Broadwood at Sanna's Post, and he brought his force safely through a difficult country, although he was not able on every occasion to rectify the errors of his staff.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) said it was the exception which generally proved the rule, and in this case the exception was the speech of the hon. Baronet, whilst the rule consisted in the impossibility of imagining a court of appeal more unfitted than the House of Commons to sit as a military tribunal. This House could not be worse constituted to form a decision upon a military question like this, and it ought not to be asked to form such a decision. Whether from the point of view of Members of this House or the Service, this was a most important and grave question, and he begged the House not to run away from the main point at issue, which was not whether General Colville was to be dismissed from the Army, but whether he was entitled to a court-martial or a court of inquiry. That was the wording of the resolution, and it was only a minor point that night as to his military conduct. He agreed with the hon. Baronet opposite, that ultimately, as a last resource for the military discipline of the Army, this House should be referred to, but before cases came before this House they should be threshed out by evidence at a military court of inquiry, and then the verdict of this House could be asked for. To say that they were in a position to debate this question from the point of view as to whether an officer was efficient or not was quite a mistake. He took the view that the Army system of such condemnation as in the present case was wrong. Every officer before dismissal was entitled to the same justice which a private soldier was entitled to, and which he had a right to demand.

During the five years he had been in the House no less than at least four cases presenting the same features as this one had come before the House. He would not recall them at any length. There was an unspeakably painful case in 1896, in which a gross crime had been condoned and an injustice had been done, and where no court of inquiry had been held, and it was brought up in the House on account of that reason, the House giving most unfortunately a distinct party vote on what was in no way a party question. The following year there was another case in connection with the disbandment of a Volunteer battalion, where had there been a court of inquiry by the military authorities the matter would never have come before the House of Commons. In the year before last he himself brought up a very painful case where an officer had been denied an inquiry, and this preyed on him so much that his mind was unhinged and the unfortunate man committed suicide. It was imperative that the House should guard itself against the repetition of such cases by insisting that in all such cases a court of inquiry or a court martial should be held. In this case the Government were shrinking from publicity, while General Colville courted it. He would, not go into the military aspect of the question, but he thought this man should have a fair trial, and his defence in vindication of his action should be heard, and more especially so in view of the condoning of General Colville's conduct to a great extent by his reappointment to Gibraltar on his return from South Africa. He regarded the communication made to the press by General Colville as indefensible and subversive of all military discipline. He could not be oblivious of the fact, however, that General Colville considered himself, and, legitimately so, in his opinion, to be on half-pay when he issued his statement to the press. Another palliation of that action was to be found in the unhappy

precedents which were set by other British generals who had come from South Africa, and whose first object on reaching home seemed to be to let their views be known to the press. There was the case of Sir Charles Warren and of others who communicated their views to the press. In palliation also of General Colvile's action the very fact of leakage of statements regarding him, from the War Office must have been, very trying in his particular case, and this matter should receive strict investigation from the Secretary of State for War. A great parade of leniency had been made by the right hon. Gentleman in dealing with General Colvile, and he said he had acted out of consideration for this general and had let him down lightly. He accepted the statement, but he considered that a brave man did not want leniency but wanted justice. There was naturally a desire on the part of the House that there should, be no leniency and no favour shown when they remembered the great disasters which had happened in South Africa, but all they should ask themselves was whether this man was getting fair play and justice. In granting a court of inquiry they would be adopting a severer course than the Government themselves had adopted, and yet they would be acting in accordance with the views of the Secretary for War himself, for he had already stated that he was in favour of bringing an officer before a court martial whenever it was possible. Why was it not possible in this case? He hoped the Government would see that justice was done to General Colvile. The Secretary of State for War said he had no assurance that if there was a court-martial the House would accept its verdict any more than the present decision. But if the decision of the court-martial came before the House it would come with the evidence for and against it, and that was a very different thing.

Mr. BRODRICK: What would happen if, after hon. Members had read the evidence, their opinion was different to that of the court-martial?

*MR. PIRIE said that in such a case the House would be in a very much better position to judge. It must be plain to everybody that after a fair trial by a court-martial, naturally the House would not differ nearly so readily with the decision of such a court as it would with the decision of one officer, no matter how highly placed. The right hon. Gentleman had said that he would not yield to favouritism or to backdoor influence. He thought this showed a loss of a sense of what was seemly and right, that the Secretary for War should think it necessary to take credit for such action as that; it was on a par with his famous statement that no high appointments for service in the field were to be made but of men of tried capacity in war; that any other system should have existed reminded one forcibly of the analogy of China, already alluded to in another place. He had also stated that if appointments in the field were undesirable for certain men, then appointments at home for the same men were also undesirable. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman it was only too well known that there were already certain appointments which had been made at home and given to generals who had left South Africa because their appointments in the field were considered undesirable, and that what was wanted in all cases was stern even-handed justice and nothing else. The Secretary for War made a very just point against his conduct being called

into question, seeing that he was called upon to act on the advice of high military authority. He agreed with that view, but for this very reason he urged more strongly than ever a court-martial in this case, as such cases would constantly recur and continue coming before this House, to the detriment of discipline in the Service so long as the present system of arbitrary dismissal existed. He begged to support the Amendment of his hon. friend.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham): Those who have not themselves had any actual experience of war may have some difficulty in understanding in what way the occurrence of a disaster may affect the character of a general responsible for it. I would like, so far as I may be permitted to do so, to clear that difficulty out of the way. Hon. Members asked, very naturally, why, if a certain general was removed for this disaster, a certain other general should not be removed for that disaster, and indeed why all generals should not be removed for all disasters? War is a game with a good deal of chance in it, and, from the little I have seen of it, I should say that nothing in war ever goes right except occasionally by accident. The fact of a successful or an unsuccessful action being fought does not appear to be any accurate measure of the capacity or military character of the general officer who was in command. It is quite possible that in an unsuccessful action a general may show qualities of courage and resource for which there would otherwise have been no scope. General Broadwood, for instance, was responsible for the command of the convoy at Sanna's Post. Such, however, was his bearing and conduct, and the high reputation which he had held and which he still holds in the Army, that after the disaster at Sauna's Post, General Broadwood's position was even more secure than before; he was even more trusted by his superiors and his men. On the other hand, there are general officers who have been responsible for no particular disaster, but who even in their success, or I should perhaps rather say their immunity from failure, have gained a most unenviable reputation. General officers or officers in high command in the Army ought not to be broken merely because they are responsible for disasters, but only if those disasters throw a light on their incompetency or inefficiency. When it is known by a competent superior officer that an officer is not a good officer, though he was not responsible for any disaster, there may be good grounds for removing him from his command, or appointing him to another command. We have listened to two very effective Speeches; one from the hon. and learned Member for South Leeds, who put the legal aspect of the question as powerfully as it could be put, and the other from the hon. and gallant Member for North-West Wilts, who made a contribution to the debate which was most striking, from the fact that it came from one who had personal experience of these events. The hon. and learned Member for South Leeds has put the legal aspect of the question; but soldiers are not lawyers, and their methods will not always bear the strict scrutiny of those who have given their life to the study of the law and the study of words. So long as the House is satisfied of the motives by which military officers have been actuated, it ought not to lay too great stress on technical or legal detail which may appear to have been neglected. The substance of the charge against General Colvile is the case of Sauna's Post.

There may have been occasions before Sanna's Post; I do not say there were; when the conduct of that gallant officer did not give entire satisfaction. But it is upon Sanna's Post almost entirely that the rights and the wrongs of this question stand. I venture to say that a more damning case than the one laid by the Secretary for War before the House last night, on the subject of Sanna's Post; if the representations and statements were correct; was hardly ever preferred against a general officer in this House. The hon. and learned Member for South Leeds has disputed the facts. If it came to a question of balancing the evidence, I am much inclined to pin my faith to the decision come to by Lord Roberts. As to the Lindley affair, I wrote a long time ago to the War Office giving my humble opinion, having personally collected information on the spot. If the Lindley affair had been the only case against General Colvile, that would not have been worth pressing, but it must be considered together with the affair of Sanna's Post. These affairs had a cumulative aspect which rendered them much more significant. They were complicated, difficult, and technical matters, and we must trust to the men on the spot. In this case the military expert on the spot was Lord Roberts, who has been trusted, not in vain, in the greatest crisis of our history, with the largest army we have ever sent beyond the seas.

The hon. and learned Member for South Leeds made a point against the Government, which I feel is a very legitimate and valid point. He said, if it be true that General-Colvile made a fault, why was it that the official despatch, published since, did not make any reference to that fault or point out the blame he incurred? Perhaps it will not be entirely agreeable to many of my friends on this side of the House if I say that I have noticed in the last three wars in which we have been engaged a tendency among military officers; arising partly from good nature towards their comrades, partly from the dislike of public scrutiny; to hush everything up, to make everything look as fair as possible, to tell what is called the official truth, to present a version of the truth which contains about seventy-five per cent. of the actual article. So long as a force gets a victory somehow, all the ugly facts are smoothed and varnished over, rotten reputations are propped up, and officers known as incapable are allowed to hang on and linger in their commands in the hope that at the end of the war they may be shunted into private life without a scandal. On whom does the responsibility for the continuance of the system rest? When Lord Roberts went out to South Africa he struck out a new and true line. The truth, the whole truth, was to be told to the country frankly and fairly. The House will remember the publication of the Spion Kop despatches and the reception that that publication met with from hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite. That settled the policy of candour in military matters, for some months to come at any rate. That is why the despatches contained no incriminating matter in regard to General Colvile. General Colvile was retained in his command, but it was reduced; he was put in the second line, placed practically, if not actually, in an inferior position to a general a very long way his junior in rank; General Ian Hamilton. It was no doubt thought he would be able to get out of the matter without any scandal or disturbance arising. But at

length it became impossible to keep up appearances any longer. At length the crash came. Lindley was piled on Sauna's Post, there was a stormy interview, the Ninth Division was broken up, and its commander returned to England, complimented certainly, cleared in the despatches, but ruined for ever in the field. It seems to me it does not lie in the mouths of those who attacked the Government so vehemently in respect to the publication of the Spion Kop despatches to complain that now, and since that occasion, a very judicious discretion and diplomatic reticence has been practised by the War Office and the military authorities. There is some apparent misconception as to the method of removing officers from the Army, and that is because there are two ways of doing the thing. In the first place, there is the process of a court of inquiry and court-martial, and in the second place, there is the process of selection. Suppose an officer has committed no specific fault, but it is a matter of common knowledge that he is an incapable officer, would it be right that that officer should be given the command of a large body of troops? Surely it would be wrong to employ such an officer in time of peace if he was not thought good enough to employ in time of war. I have always been an enthusiastic advocate of selection. For I hold most strongly that the more nearly we can make our methods of promotion in the Army approximate to the methods employed by business firms, the more efficient the Army will be and the less soldiers we would have killed and captured in time of war.

Lord Roberts and the right hon. Gentleman did not care to take the responsibility of appointing an officer to a peace command when he had just been found unfit for an important command in the field of war. I understand that hon. Members opposite,

including the hon. and learned Member for South Leeds, differ from that view, and think it is an improper and vicious mode of procedure. Their argument is that once General Colville was appointed to the command in Gibraltar anything that had happened in South Africa was condoned. But what about the brigade? Were 3,000 British soldiers forming the efficient part of the garrison of our greatest Mediterranean fortress not to be considered? Had they not a right to expect to be commanded by as good an officer as those best qualified to judge could get? Of course some reasonable assurance of fixity of tenure must be given to subordinates; but the paramount principle which must be held before our eyes is that the Service exists not for the benefit of individuals, but only for the advantage and security of the State. Under the process of selection mistakes are made and, unwittingly, injustice done; but the process is at work not only in the Army, but in every branch of commerce, in every walk of life, and it is nowhere more essential and more vital to efficiency than in the military service. We have to look no further than the House of Commons to see the principle of selection working in all its glory. We know that sitting around there are Members just as able, just as conscientious, quite as intelligent, as any who now adorn the Treasury Bench, but no one would think it worth while to urge the claims of anyone who has not been preferred. Selection is the only hope for increased efficiency in the Army, it is the only way in which we can prevent the upper ranks being clogged with incapable men. The principle of selection is

challenged, and would be destroyed if a Commission were appointed in this case. I have been told by a distinguished general officer that, in consequence of the outcry which has occurred, already several persons against whom it had been proposed to take steps have been screwed back into their places. In regard to the selection of officers, the House ought not to interfere in any particular instance except for grievous reason. Personally, I have no hesitation in expressing my firm support of the attitude of the Secretary of State for War, and I exhort the right hon. Gentleman, not only for the sake of the Army, but also in the interest of the House, not to budge an inch from the position he has taken up.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester) said he entirely endorsed every word which had fallen from the hon. Member for Oldham on the question of the efficiency of the Army. Every Member of the House was with him when he said that what we had to do was to secure that efficiency, and that officers should be selected from the best men in the ranks of the Army. It was not because he and his friends took any other view that they were urging this enquiry upon the Government. The point at issue was not the question of selecting proper officers, but whether they were to give a man who was charged with a specific want of efficiency in his duty on evidence which he had not had an opportunity of testing, the chance of having the evidence placed and tested before a properly constituted military tribunal. Whether a mistake had occurred or not had nothing to do with the question. He contended that more efficiency would be secured if a rule was laid down that a man who was in the position of General Colville at this time should have an opportunity of putting his case plainly before the authorities. That in no way controverted the view of securing efficiency in the Army.

It had been said that the whole of the indictment against General Colville rested upon Sanna's Post, which was the damaging point against General Colville. That being so, it became necessary to deal with some detail in regard to that affair. Certain specific statements were made by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, to which General Colville took exception. His right hon. friend had stated that when General Colville arrived at Bushman's Kop at 11 o'clock the guns had not yet been moved off; that they were not removed until between 12 and 1 o'clock; that the troops with General Broadwood were still in touch with the enemy; that firing was still going on; that no effort was made to come into touch with General Broadwood; and that no steps were taken to find out what General Broadwood wished General Colville to do. The facts of the case as stated by General Colville were that he arrived at Bushman's Kop about 11.15 a.m.; that firing had ceased with the exception of two guns which were firing from a position held by the British troops; that when his aide-de-camp arrived at Broadwood's position he found that that General had formed up his troops; that they were out of touch with the enemy and were absolutely safe; and that, as a matter of fact, the engagement had ceased. The problem which General Colville had to face was not that of giving assistance to General Broadwood's troops, but that of seeing whether he could secure the guns. General Colville having arrived at Bushman's Kop, a high elevation from which he could survey the country with effect, he invited General Broadwood to come up

and take a survey of the country, with the idea of securing the guns. General Broadwood did not come. General Colvile, after surveying the country from Bushman's Kop, and giving his troops refreshments, decided to move on Waterval Drift. The Secretary for War told the House last night that one of his brigadiers advised General Colvile to advance straight upon the Waterworks in order to recover the guns. But his hon. friend did not tell the House, what was stated by General Colvile, that his other brigadier, General Smith-Dorrien, gave the opinion that General Colvile was perfectly right to advance on Waterval. After he had moved on he received a heliogram from Lord Roberts stating that the enemy would be in the spruits.

*MR. BRODRICK: What was the hour at which that heliogram was sent?

MR. YERBURGH: The message was received at 3.38.

*Mr. BRODRICK: Exactly four hours afterwards.

MR. YERBURGH said that was not the point; that General Colvile having arrived at Bushman's Kop, and finding the troops under General Broadwood were perfectly safe, was faced by the problem of how to recover the guns. He decided that the right way was to take the Waterval Drift, for the reason that between him and the Modder River there were two spruits to be crossed, which he believed to be occupied by the Boers, and the taking of which would have entailed serious loss on his troops.

In the other route there were no spruits to cross, and General Colvile thought that if he could cross the Modder at Waterval Drift he would be able to seize a point which would give him a commanding position. That was the decision at which he arrived, and that decision was supported by his brigadier general, Smith-Dorrien, and it was the very decision which was afterwards suggested by Lord Roberts in his heliogram.

The right hon. Gentleman had said that General Colvile had left the men he had been sent to assist without any assistance, but as a matter of fact, judging from the orders sent by the Chief of the Staff, General Colvile, was not sent to assist General Broadwood at all; it was not true that, as alleged, he went "blundering about the country." In proof of this contention the hon. Member read extracts from the despatches and from a letter written by a prisoner, and said that if the cavalry had arrived as promised General Colvile would have been in a position to launch them against the enemy. Who was responsible for the disastrous delay in the arrival of the cavalry? That was a matter for inquiry, but they must not in the meantime place the blame on the head of General Colvile. If that commander had been properly supported he might have dealt a blow at the Boers, and probably have recaptured some, if not all, of the guns. General Colvile made his report to Lord Roberts, whose reply was. "You have made an excellent inarch, and it is rather a pity that I did not send you the day before." It was perfectly obvious that had General Colvile been sent the day before the result would have been very different. He would have arrived in ample time to assist General Broadwood. Nothing more was heard about the matter until about ten days afterwards, when General Colvile heard that Lord Roberts was very angry with him, because he was held responsible for the loss of the guns. He at once wrote to him to say he was not to believe any idle rumours, but if he had

any complaint against him he should make it to him personally. For ten days after Sanna's Post no charge whatever was made against General Colvile, the soundness of whose judgment was demonstrated.

In conclusion the hon. Member said that he had put before the House various points that commended themselves to him as an outsider. So far as he could do so, he would assist his right hon. friend against any corrupt influence. He had no personal acquaintance with General Colvile until being asked to look through the Papers he did so, and, thinking General Colvile had a good case, he supported it in the public interest. With regard to Lindley there were two questions to be considered ;first, whether he was right in going back at all; and second, whether he was able to go back. The second question had never been put to the House until it was brought forward by the hon. Member for the Shipley Division, who told the House that it was not possible for General Colvile to go back to the assistance of the Yeomanry. The telegram from General Colvile fully described his position, and the question was, Would he have been justified in going back? His right hon. friend said this was a small point.

*MR. BRODRICK: If I might interrupt the hon. Gentleman, I did not say it was a small point. I am afraid I must have been misheard in the gallery. What I did say was that it was more a point to be left to military men.

Mr. YERBURGH said this was an illustration of the disadvantage of the discussion in the House instead of the inquiry asked for. General Colvile had received direct orders to be at certain places on certain days, and naturally supposed he was taking part in a combined movement. Was he, at the bidding of a party of Yeomanry of whom he knew nothing, to turn back and perhaps sacrifice the result of a great movement? Hon. Members were not competent to pronounce an opinion on such a question; it was a question for military judgment. The court of inquiry reported at Lindley, apparently, adversely to General Colvile, but before that court Colonel Spragge was defendant, not General Colvile; and it appeared to him that the right course to pursue when the court exculpated one man and inculpated another man was to hold another inquiry for trying the other man. But the right hon. Gentleman did not do this; he took the verdict of the court, before which the other man had no chance of appearing, the evidence of which he did not know; he took that as establishing the case. It appeared to him that the right hon. Gentleman entirely denied the right of General Colvile to establish his defence. If Colonel Spragge had the right to be heard, why not General Colvile? At the court of inquiry his hon. friend said there was the evidence of certain generals whom he named.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL said that he never mentioned the names of any officers who gave evidence; all he said was that Lord Roberts could have availed himself of the evidence of three distinguished general officers whom he had mentioned by name.

MR. YERBURGH said that if he had in any way misrepresented his hon. friend he apologised. What he would like to know was who were called to give evidence before the court of inquiry, and, after the speech of the hon. Member for Chippenham, whether any of the relief column of Lord Methuen were called? Who were the people who gave evidence? They did not know. General Colvile did not

know, and he had no means of knowing. He had practically been tried by a court before which he had not appeared. The hon. Member asked the House to understand that he did not wish the hushing up of charges against any officer. Let the charge be openly made, and put the man on his trial. He heard the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War say the other night that he was in favour of courts-martial. He asked nothing more. Give a court-martial, and that would satisfy every shade of opinion in the House.

*Mr. MUNRO FERGUSON (Leith Burghs): We have heard excellent speeches on both sides of the House, and I am reluctant to intervene in this debate. But there are one or two points to which I should like to call attention. The question of Lindley has been dealt with by the hon. Member for the Chippenham Division in a speech in which he put forward a powerful claim for the trial of General Colvile; and the question of Sanna's Post has been effectively dealt with in the speech to which we have just listened, and also in the interesting speech of the hon. Member for Oldham,

in which he gave us his own experience. In reply, I should like to say we are not here engaged on a question of holding a trial upon efficiency. It is a question of holding a trial for alleged inhumanity and callousness shown by a general in the field, who is accused of not going to the relief of others when he had the opportunity of doing so. That is really the charge, and it is upon that we hold that an inquiry should take place. As to the principle of selection, there is no principle that I should adhere to more myself, but this is not a question of selection. General Colvile had been appointed to the command at Gibraltar, having been sent home from South Africa. He was reinstated there by the Commander-in-Chief. There is therefore before us no question of selection. It was for Sanna's Post. I have always heard, that General Colvile was "broke." but the inquiry into that incident has, I believe, been wholly inadequate to enable him to state his defence. It is upon that ground that I maintain a court-martial should have been held. I believe he has never yet had a fair opportunity of stating his case.

I have noticed that everyone who has spoken in the last half-dozen speeches has disclaimed any acquaintance with General Colvile. It seems to be imagined by the Secretary of State for War that hon. Members who have spoken in this case have been hounded on by "smart society" to put pressure on the War Office. I cannot say that myself even know smart society. It is twenty years since I knew General Colvile, when we happened to be brother officers in the same regiment, and all I have seen of the case are two notices in the press; one a statement which seemed to me to bear obvious signs of being an official record of the circumstances under which General Colvile was being recalled from Gibraltar, and the other a statement by General Colvile himself. I thought General Colvile's statement impermissible. I thought the other statement as to the reason why General Colvile had been recalled from Gibraltar showed a leakage somewhere at the War Office. It would not be difficult to trace where the leakage occurred. I think that was serious provocation to General Colvile, and he also, suffered considerable provocation in the way he has been dealt with in having been tried and retried for the Lindley case, I am myself entirely against public

inquiries into these personal questions. The pledge given by the Government with respect to that was much too wide. I am quite prepared to support the Government if they could, by some more successful means than they adopted the other night, get clear of their pledge. But what I do think a safeguard against public inquiry is to have that system of courts of inquiry and courts-martial which the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War so ably described the, other night. A court of inquiry, which is secret, should be held first, to be followed if necessary by a court-martial. The right hon. Gentleman stated that a court-martial might be fatal to an officer, and therefore it was more humane to have a court of inquiry first. What could be more fatal to an officer than the course you have pursued with respect to General Colvile? After having two secret courts on the accused, trying him behind his back, and after refusing him a court-martial, where he could defend himself, it is unfair to tell him that he would have been less well treated if he had been tried by court-martial. We all know General Roberts's kindness of heart. I do not believe there is a kinder hearted man in the world, but to suggest that General Colvile was more likely to get off easily in the way he has been dealt with than if he had been tried by court-martial is, as I have said, an unfair assumption. These matters should be settled in the Army, by the Army, and by the Army alone. [Cheers.] Hon. and right hon. Gentlemen cheer that, although they have given no opportunity for military trial in this case. I take part in this discussion with great reluctance. I do not know that I have ever undertaken a more distasteful duty than the present one. I think, after the services Lord Roberts has rendered to the Empire at a time of the greatest emergency, there could be no more ungracious task than seeming to dispute a decision at which he has arrived. It is because I believe that I am following the path of justice in this matter that I support the plea of my hon. friend.

There is one matter to which I should like to refer for a moment, and that is the various insinuations made against General Colvile, which from my knowledge of him I do not think fair. The right hon. Gentleman last night said; "I will say, first, that Lord Wolseley by no means exonerated him when he allowed him to go back to Gibraltar, Lord Roberts stated that, in his opinion, on two occasions in the field General Colvile had shown a want of forwardness, of enterprise, and of sound judgment which are essential qualifications for a command. He considered that in twice leaving a body of cavalry in difficulties he set an example which, if followed, would be fatal to an army in the field. Other circumstances had come to Lord Roberts's notice in which General Colvile's relations with his sub-ordinates and the absence of sufficient control and supervision in his command, were such as to seriously impair the confidence which troops should have in their leaders."

I have received one or two letters, which I should like to read very shortly, and if I am challenged I shall give the names of the officers by whom they were written, but I shall not mention them unless I am challenged, because I do not consider it desirable to bandy about names here. An officer who was by General Colvile's side in all his hottest engagements during the war has written to him expressing indignation at what has taken place about him in this case. He says;

"If ever there was a libel it was in the word 'inefficiency.' I can only tell you that we and your stall' had the most absolute confidence in you if it came to a tight place, and I think it will lie allowed that your stall' are the people to judge."

It has been said that there was cowardice on the part of General Colvile, and although my hon. friend the Member for North-West Lanarkshire asked about that matter, the charge has not been repeated here. I have heard it in every possible form, and I mention it merely because I think it has very much prejudiced General Colvile's case in the general estimation. An officer who served under General Colvile wrote that every man who had been with him under fire could testify to the absolute absurdity of the charge. Another officer who was with General Colvile at Belmont. Magersfontein, Paardeberg, and Poplar Grove, said he had never hesitated to go where the bullets were flying thickest. He wrote that no one could have been more cool under musketry fire, and he could not believe that such a base slander could be brought against a brave man. I feel entitled to read these letters. I will only repeat that General Colvile has not had a fair opportunity of defending himself. I cannot see how in a quarter of an hour's interview with Lord Roberts, although I have no doubt the case against him was tersely put, he on his part could have sufficient time to make his defence. I do not dispute for a moment the unrivalled capacity of Lord Roberts and other generals for investigating cases of this kind, but the question is whether they knew all the facts. Both as regards Lindley and Sauna's Post the decisions of the officers who judged the cases were come to on imperfect evidence. General Colvile's removal from the command at Gibraltar was, under the circumstances, wrong. If General Colvile cannot prove his case before a court-martial, let him be disgraced and let him suffer all the penalties you can put upon him. We have endeavoured to give the reasons why he should have a trial. We appeal with confidence to hon. Members. I do not believe that any lover of British fair play can be altogether deaf to this appeal. I am quite aware that this motion is not a thing to be lightly undertaken, but under the circumstances in this case it had to be done, and I therefore cordially support the motion of my hon. friend the Member for North-West Lanark.

The FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I can well understand that the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down and my hon. friend who has spoken on this side of the House in the same sense are animated by nothing but the desire to see what they describe as fair play being carried out in the case of General Colvile. Nothing I shall say in the course of the few remarks I shall address to the House will impugn the motives with which they have acted. I believe those motives to be wholly disinterested; and if I take a different view from that which they take, if I even go the length of saying that the policy which they advocate, if carried out, would impair the functions of this House and destroy the Army, it is not because I in the least question the excellence of their intentions or their desire in this case to see justice done, quite irrespective of persons or parties. What have we been asked to do by several hon. Gentlemen, some of them very good friends of mine on this side of the House, in the course of yesterday's and to-night's debate? We have been

asked to constitute ourselves into an amateur court for the purpose of deciding on various difficult and delicate questions of fact. ["No, no."] I hear loud cries of dissent from that view. If that is not true, all I can say is that most of the speech of my hon. friend the Member for the Ince Division, the whole of the speech of the hon. Gentleman opposite, the whole of the speech of my hon. friend the Member for Chester, and the whole of the speech of my hon. friend the Member for Chippenham, though excellent speeches in themselves, were entirely beside the point, because they dealt wholly and solely with questions of strategy.

Mr. LAWSON WALTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman read the notice of motion?

Mr. A.J. BALFOUR: I hope the hon. and learned Gentleman will allow me to answer the speeches. I shall come to his speech directly. He also joined the crowd of amateur strategists, though he imported into his speech in addition the distinct flavour of the lawyer. I am now dealing with the speeches that have been made, and very excellent speeches they were. I listened with great admiration and pleasure to the speech, among others, of my hon. friend the Member for Chippenham. What was the substance of that speech, excellent though it was? He narrated admirably, as I think, his own experiences over the field of operations. His defence of General Colvile consisted in the demonstration, or attempted demonstration, that when General Colvile refused to attempt to relieve the Yeomanry at Lindley he was forced into that course by strategical and tactical considerations which showed him that, had he attempted the task, he would have attempted the impossible, with the natural result not improbably that he also would have had to surrender with, his brigade in addition to the, Yeomanry who ultimately underwent that disastrous fate. I am sure my hon. friend will not think that I

have misinterpreted the main consideration of the his speech.

*SIR J. DICKSON-POYXDER: I only brought that forward as a point for the defence, and as a case for inquiry.

Mk. A. J. BALFOUR: Precisely; my hon. friend and I are entirely agreed. My hon. friend brings forward these strategical considerations, as other hon. Gentlemen have brought them forward, to show that there was a strong prima facie case which required the intervention of the House, in order that there might be a court-martial or some other form of inquiry. Is that accepted? [Hear, hear.]

Very well. Then this House is to resolve itself into a grand jury on questions of strategy, in order to say whether there is; [Cries of "Agreed."] Perhaps hon. Gentlemen will allow me to speak. This House is to resolve itself into a grand jury in order to determine whether or not the case should go to a common jury in the shape of some military court of inquiry which is to reverse or endorse, as it thinks fit, the verdict the Commander-in-Chief has come to. What does that mean? It means that this House of Commons is to be a court of supervision over all questions of promotion in the Army. There have been numberless officers superseded in the way in which General Colvile has been superseded. They have not the means he possessed of bringing their cases before the House. But if General Colvile is to have the right to occupy two nights debate in order to consider whether the Commander-in-Chief is or is not justified in the course

which on his responsibility has been adopted, why is this House not to take equal cognisance of the cases of even the humblest of those men who in the ordinary course of promotion have been thought unfit for higher commands and have been superseded by those who were otherwise their juniors? I said just now of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Leeds that, in addition to the position of amateur strategist, which he had adopted in common with many other Members of the House in the course of the debate, he has added to his speech a strong flavour of the lawyer. I said that in no disparagement to the great profession to which he belongs, but in the distinct belief that the hon.

Gentleman, in common with many other Members, has fallen into the extraordinary blunder of supposing that in the action taken in regard to General Colville there is some analogy, it may be distant, but real, to the action a court of law takes when it condemns a criminal for some offence which he has committed. I think it is conclusive proof that I have not misrepresented the hon. and learned Gentleman when I say he has fallen into this legal blunder. The hon. and learned Gentleman actually suggested the Dreyfus trial as affording some parallel to the action taken by the Commander-in-Chief. What was the Dreyfus trial? Of the merits of it I do not pretend to know anything, but it was a criminal trial for a criminal offence, held before a court recognised by the law, and dealing with a man charged with a breach of trust.

Mr. LAWSON WALTON: Dreyfus was tried for a purely military offence by a purely military court.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I did not say he was not tried by a military court. I said he was tried by a court recognised by the law for a crime, and the crime was treason and betrayal of confidence. I do not know whether these were the technical phrases.

MR. LAWSON WALTON: He was tried as a spy, for communicating military information to the disadvantage of his own country.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I suppose the hon. and learned Gentleman is a great authority on criminal matters. I am not. But I should have thought that to betray the secrets of your country to a foreign Power was a crime, and that a man, tried for that before a court recognised as a legal court, was tried for a crime before a court. At any rate, I am trying to make it intelligible to the House. I venture to say there is no analogy whatever, even of the most distant, remote, and shadowy kind, between trying a man either for betrayal of trust or for treason, as was the case with Captain Dreyfus, and trying a man on a specific charge like cowardice, which may well happen on certain occasions in war; and discretion must surely be vested somewhere in deciding who are competent persons for great military employment. That is the real point which the hon. Gentleman, misled by his great legal training and position, has entirely failed to see. It is not a question whether General Colville was guilty of a crime, or could be brought before a court-martial on a specific charge. The question, and the whole question, is whether he showed himself by his action in South Africa to be an officer who ought to be placed in a position of great military responsibility in the Army of this country. And who is to judge of that? Is it to be the Commander-in-Chief, or is it to be the

amateur strategists guiding this House? I think the hon. and learned Gentleman himself, certainly other hon. Gentlemen, pointed out that a case of a sort could be made out for every action that General Colville took, either in refusing to assist the Yeomanry at Lindley, or in refusing to communicate with General Broadwood, or in refraining from action during all those critical hours after Sanna's Post. Of course. For what action in this world will not somebody be found to find an ingenious excuse if it comes to discussion?

The point, and the only point, we have to determine to-night is this: Are we the best tribunal, or the only tribunal, to discuss military appointments in this country, or ought the responsibility of judging the competence of officers to be left with those who have seen them actually at work, and who know, as only those on the spot can know, whether they have risen to the height of the great responsibility which has been entrusted to them? I should like to ask the House.

Do they think that we in this country err by too great severity in our judgment of military officers in the field? Is it our practice to judge too harshly of their performances? Do we allow too little for the inevitable failure which, of course, must occur even to the best officer? Do we attach too small a value to the claims of seniority? Who will answer that series of questions and will not agree with me in saying that if we have erred in the past, if we are likely to err in the future, it is not by excessive severity, but by excessive leniency?

Those responsible for the conduct of the war have been denounced in the last eighteen months for the failure of this general, incompetence of that general, folly of this appointment, for the un-

justifiable character of the other appointment. And yet, Sir, as soon as the Commander-in-Chief ventures to touch a man who has at his command some influence with the press or with the House, a storm of indignation rises and a flood of turgid criticism is poured forth which, unless we are prepared to show that, in the words of the hon. Gentleman, it is the Army which is to judge these Army questions, will not only lead this House into an interminable series of profitless debates, but will undermine and destroy the discipline of the Army. Are we to have an Army? That is the real question here. One of the proposals of my right hon. friend the Secretary for War, in his great speech on Friday night, was that at the head of the army corps of this country should be placed only those officers who, in the opinion of competent military judges, were officers who could lead those army corps in the field should the occasion arise. I do not know what criticisms are to be passed on my light hon. friend's scheme as a whole; I will not anticipate them, but this I say, that on that particular part of the scheme no criticism will be passed from any quarter of the House. And yet how is that scheme to have even the shadow of a hope of success if the Commander-in-Chief, after seeing an officer at work, is not to be allowed to pronounce an opinion upon that man's competence for high military office? The thing surely does not bear argument. Gentlemen who support this motion are asking for a trial in a case which is not a case for a trial at all. It is a case in which a judgment of the competence or incompetence of a man can only be reached adequately in military as in private life by an impartial examination into a multitude of details which cannot be embodied in a distinct proposition,

which cannot be formulated as charges or excuses, but which, nevertheless, as we all know, are the real grounds upon which we form our estimate of a man's power or incompetence to carry out the duties entrusted to him.

Mr. YERBURGH: I desire to point out that the Lindley judgment is the result of a trial.

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend is mistaken. I have really put the case in its true light. My hon. friend the junior Member for Oldham, in his most able speech to-night, hit the nail exactly on the head when he said that this was a question; to quote a phrase that is sometimes used and sometimes abused; of managing public affairs on business principles. As my hon. friend pointed out, what would the head of a great firm say if the promotion of a subordinate could never take place or never be refused without a formal trial; without the charges being elaborately stated with all the pomp and circumstance of a hearing in a public court? The thing is absurd. That is not the way to judge competence or incompetence. That is the way you punish faults or crimes. But there is no crime alleged against General Colvile. What is alleged against him is that he has shown himself on critical occasions incapable of carrying out the duties which we expect of British generals in high places of command; and the man who has expressed that opinion is the Commander-in-Chief. We have been told by almost every speaker on the other side that the Commander-in-Chief arrived at his judgment without having heard what General Colvile had to say. That is entirely untrue. There is not a vestige of foundation for the statement. General Colvile had every opportunity, both in writing and speech, of bringing before the Commander-in-Chief his view of the military episodes in question.

Mr. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Was he told the charge against him?

Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: I have already told the House there was no question of a formal charge. The only question is. Was General Colvile a proper man to be put in command at Gibraltar or not [Several Hon. Members: Who put him there?]; and was he; and this point came first; a proper man to be retained in high command in South Africa? Lord Roberts, the only proper and adequate judge of military questions of this kind, having had a full opportunity of hearing General Colvile's statement, decided, in the first place, that General Colvile was not a proper officer to be retained in high command in South Africa; and, in the second place, that the interests of the British Army would not be furthered by retaining him in high command at Gibraltar.

I venture to tell the House very respectfully that we have before us to-night a decision of far wider scope and far greater import than the treatment of any general officer, be he who he may. If the House were to decide, as I do not for a moment anticipate that it will, that the Commander-in-Chief in exercising his discretion in this matter has been guilty of doing an injustice to an inferior, it would not only decide the particular case but it would lay down a permanent rule, governing our Army, that every case of promotion should be reviewed by the House. Every appointment which was not exactly in accord with seniority might be made the occasion of lengthened debate and division. I venture to tell the House that, if they come to a decision like that, the immediate result of disposing of

one particular Commander-in-Chief and one particular Government, as they most certainly would dispose of them, would be the smallest and the most insignificant result of so fatal a decision, and they would for ever undermine and destroy the high discipline of the British Army.

Mr. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): There is one observation, and one only, in the speech to which the House has just listened, which, I think, will command universal assent, and it is this, that we are not engaged to-night in the discussion of the merits of an individual case; for as regards the bulk of us General Colville is an absolutely unknown person, in whose fortune and fate we have no reason to take any interest whatever, and the interest which has been evoked by this debate on both sides of the House, and which is amply testified to by the crowded state of our benches, would never have been excited by a purely personal question; but it results from and is the expression of a belief that we are dealing here with a large question of administrative principle. The right hon. Gentleman; I do not know whether he has read the motion; has strangely misconceived the proposition actually submitted to the House. He has represented it as if it were a question of this House sitting in review as amateur strategists upon a decision of experts on a question of military discipline. If that were the proposition I should be the first to say; and I doubt whether there would be a dissenting voice; that no

more incompetent tribunal could be selected for the review or reversal of a question of military discipline than this House. The parties are not before it, the evidence is not before it, or, at least, it is only before it in a very imperfect and incomplete state. The tribunal itself is constantly shifting. We have not the advantage of the arguments which might be presented in a complete shape by either one side or the other; and just as I have often said, and will always say, that if it were a question, for instance, of reviewing a decision of the Home Secretary in a matter of criminal justice, no tribunal could be less well equipped than this House, so I will say that, if it were a question of reviewing the decision of a military tribunal, we are absolutely incompetent to undertake the task. That is not the case here.

Let me clear away another misconception into which the right hon. Gentleman fell; namely, that the interest which has been excited about this case; the genuine, deep-seated, widespread interest; is the result of some kind of social influence or social pressure exercised in behalf of an officer in high command, which would not have been felt or, at least, manifested in the same degree if it had been a humble officer or a member of the rank and file. Sir, I entirely repudiate that view. I do not care who it is, whether it is a field-marshal, a general, a colonel, or a private, if the House of Commons is satisfied, if prima facie evidence is brought before the House of Commons, that any man in His Majesty's service, whatever be his rank, has been deprived of the opportunity of continuing to serve his country on insufficient evidence, or, what is more important, by a denial of the canons and rules of natural justice, it is the bounden and imperative duty of this House to interfere. The right hon. Gentleman asked the question, Where is the Army? Let me ask another question in return. Where is the House of Commons? This is not a personal matter; a question of

General Colville, of A, B, C, or D; it is a question whether or not in a specific case and upon specific evidence those rules which we always recognise, not as a matter of technical legal procedure but as the expression of the natural instinct of justice, have in a particular case been observed. Let us come to the actual case which the right hon. Gentleman has dealt with. He referred to the decision of the Commander-in-Chief and the military authorities as regards the promotion or degradation or dismissal of a military officer on military grounds as not a matter with which this House would lightly or properly interfere. But what is the case before us? We have the case of a general officer; I do not lay any stress upon that; but an officer who admittedly has rendered great service to the Crown during a long and honourable career. In the course of this present war his name has been selected no less than four times by the Commander-in-Chief for special mention on the ground of distinction in the field. That officer comes home. Certain charges are brought against him, which when they are examined resolve themselves into one accusation, in respect of one single incident; namely, the incident at Lindley, because Sauna's Post is an afterthought. [Several Hon. Members: No.] I say deliberately Sauna's Post is an afterthought. [Mr. A. J. Balfour: No.] The right hon. Gentleman says. "No." I will read once more the letter from the Acting Commander-in-Chief, dated Kith December. It is addressed to an officer who had returned to this country in August, whose case had then been examined by the Secretary of State and by the Commander-in-Chief, and who, after the examination of his case by these, the only competent authorities able to pronounce on a matter of military discipline, had been formally reinstated in his command at Gibraltar. Having been at Gibraltar from September, on 16th December this letter is written to General Colville;

"The Secretary of State having discussed by telegraph the instance of the surrender of No. 13 Imperial Yeomanry Battalion, concurs with Lord Roberts that you were mainly responsible for the surrender, and he has reluctantly come to the conclusion that you cannot be permitted to retain your command. I am directed to request you to hand in your resignation to General Sir George White on receipt of this and to quit Gibraltar."

What does this mean? There is no allegation of general incompetence, which indeed would be sufficiently refuted by the testimony of the Commander-in-Chief: there is no allusion to Sauna's Post. That is why I say that Sauna's Post is a pure afterthought, brought in after the event to bolster up a decision. There never was a clearer case in which, upon the authority of the War Office itself, an officer was required to send in his resignation not on general grounds, but on one single and specific ground; namely, the Lindley incident. Is that contradicted? [Several HON. MEMBERS: Yes.] The hon. Member for South Leeds in his admirable and convincing speech earlier in the evening pointed out as a reinforcement, if reinforcement were necessary; and I do not think it was; of that argument that, as lately as 21st February; less than a month ago; in this House the Secretary of State was questioned on this matter. The only incident to which he called attention and on which he based his decision was "the case brought to my notice in December last by the Acting Commander-in-Chief, Sir Evelyn Wood, on

receipt of the finding of the court of inquiry into the Lindley disaster." Am I not right therefore? This is not a party question; but I appeal to the general sense of justice in the House when I say that the reversal of the decision deliberately arrived at and authoritatively pronounced by the Secretary of State and by the Commander-in-Chief in August or September last was based entirely;[Several HON. Members: No.] I do not understand that interruption. I have read the letter of the Acting Commander-in-Chief and the answer of the Secretary of State given in the House. It was based entirely and specifically on the Lindley incident alone.

I am not an amateur strategist; I do not know anyone who is. All we have said is that the evidence brought forward is such that in any other case or in any other walk of life it would entitle a man to demand an inquiry. But here is a general officer of great distinction who has taken part in the operations in South Africa. We have had these operations presented to us in the authentic and authoritative account of the campaign since General Colville was superseded in Lord Roberts's despatches describing these events. Some reference has been made to his despatch about Sauna's Post, and I leave it out of the case; but I have read most carefully,

and read with an absolutely open and unprejudiced mind; I must in view of the insinuations which have been made add my disclaimer to the many others which have been put forward; having no kind of knowledge or acquaintance with General Colville or the persons connected with him; the account given by Lord Roberts of the incident at Lindley. It was written two months after the event. It does not contain one word of censure of General Colville's proceedings on that occasion. The case of General Colville is considered by the Secretary of State and the Commander-in-Chief, and all the information we may assume to be then available was brought before these authorities. He was deliberately reinstated in his command. The Secretary of State tells us that in the early days of December he receives the report of a court of inquiry, apparently a second or subsequent court of inquiry, which had been held into the Lindley disaster, and on the strength of the finding of that court, and on that and that alone, this letter is written to General Colville at Gibraltar.

I ask the House, disregarding technicalities of procedure, to treat this matter as if it were a mere matter between the humblest civil servant and the State which employs him. Here is a man who has been acquitted, who has been reinstated, as to whom, after he has been acquitted and reinstated, a court of inquiry, held behind his back, at which he is not represented, of the evidence of which we have no knowledge whatsoever, for it has never been made public, of the charges preferred at which neither he nor we at this moment have any idea; and this man is told on the strength of the verdict of that court of inquiry that he is to be superseded, without having any opportunity whatsoever either of considering the evidence, of presenting his own case, or of submitting it to the review of any military tribunal whatever. I do not think any man would dismiss a servant on the grounds so stated. I express no opinion whatever, and have no opinion, as to whether General Colville did or did not perform his duties as a general or an officer, either at Sauna's Post or Lindley; but I do say

this;and this is really the only point that interests the House of Commons;that when a general, having performed ill or well;I care not which;his functions in the field;having been exposed to censure for the manner in which he has performed them, having had that censure carefully discussed, examined, and reviewed by the then only competent authorities in this country, has been reinstated in his post, he ought not, according to the rules of justice, the traditions of fair-play, and the practice which, prevails in every department of life;social, political, or business;in this country, to have that position reversed, that acquittal set aside, and the status into which he has been put taken away from him, without at least some opportunity of answering the new charges and discussing the evidence. That, and that alone, is my view of the issue before the House. It is not a question as to General Colville or anybody else, it is not a question of military discipline as against the jurisdiction of the House of Commons;it is a question of whether in this specific case a man who has been acquitted upon a charge;[Some HON. MEMBERS: No.];yes, acquitted in the only way in which a man can be acquitted, because he was reinstated in a position for which he would manifestly have been unfit if that charge had been proved against him; *MR. BRODRICK: I beg pardon; I stated last night distinctly that he was not exonerated by Lord Wolseley from the charge.

MR. ASQUITH: I suppose there was no verdict, or finding, or anything on paper;if there was, we should be very glad to see it. All we know is what Lord Wolseley did; and if General Colville was actually responsible either for the disaster at Sanna's Post or for the surrender of the Yeomanry at Lindley;if there was even a prima facie case against him, he ought not to have been reinstated in his command at Gibraltar, and it is the most serious impugment of the judgment of both Lord Wolseley and Lord Lansdowne. It is not I who am responsible for making it, but those who have succeeded them in office who make this insinuation against them. That is the simple issue before the House. It is not a question of censure or military discipline. It is a question of whether we ought to apply in the administration of the Army those principles of ordinary and natural justice to which every one of us would conform in the ordinary relations of life. For my part, having the very strongest view that this House is an unfit and incompetent tribunal to revise the decisions of our military authorities, being one of those who would never either in civil or military matters countenance for a moment the establishment of what I conceive to be an unconstitutional and revolutionary practice, and because I think that in the specific circumstances of this particular cases there is prima facie ground to believe that the ordinary rights of justice and fair play have been violated;for that reason only I ask the House to accept the Amendment.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): From the very earnest but somewhat vehement speech to which we have just listened, I think it is clear that, in spite of what I thought was the lucid exposition of my right hon. friend, the right hon. Gentleman opposite does not agree as to the issue which is before the House. It is perfectly clear from his

speech that we take a totally different view from him as to the matter which is now before us for decision. I was very glad to bear the light hon. Gentleman say that this was in no sense a party question. I hope that is the case, and I hope that the division may show it. But it is a case which evidently has excited the greatest possible interest in the House, and that, perhaps, is not unnatural, for what is it that is at stake? In the first place, there is the position of a general officer of considerable reputation, of high position in the British Army. It is not his character that is at stake. No charge whatever has been made against that, but it is, no doubt, his competency for high military employment; a matter to him of the most intense concern, and in connection with which there would be always a natural sympathy. But there is something else at stake. There is the character of the Government, so far as we have responsibility for what has taken place; there is the character of the Commander-in-Chief. [Several HON. MEMBERS: Which one?] Let me call the attention of the House to the language which the right

hon. Gentleman has used. He said that if we support the decision of the Commander-in-Chief we are false to the principles of ordinary and natural justice to which we should all conform in our private life. He has said that the incident of Sanna's Post was brought in to bolster up a decision arrived at on different grounds. By whom does the right hon. Gentleman suggest that the incident of Sauna's Post was brought in, to use his very strong and offensive language, to bolster up a decision previously taken by the Commander-in-Chief? [An HON. MEMBER: By Brodrick.] The right hon. Gentleman I do not think will say so; at all events, I defy him or his supporters to escape from the logical conclusion to be derived from his words. It is not my right hon. friend; who has told the House that he has acted upon an opinion given to him by the Commander-in-Chief; it is not he who brought in Sauna's Post to bolster up a decision previously arrived at, and therefore hon. Members cannot refuse to accept the fact that in this issue which is now presented to the House it is not the character of General Colvile, but it is the character of the Commander-in-Chief which is involved. The right hon. Gentleman said no one would dismiss a servant upon such evidence as has been presented in the case of General Colvile.

Mr. ASQUITH: Without giving him an opportunity of being heard.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That does not touch in the least the point that I am going to make. He was heard; but that is not the point. No one, says the right hon. Gentleman, would dismiss a servant upon such evidence without giving him an opportunity of being heard. Who dismissed him? The Commander-in-Chief. I say that throughout the speech of the right hon. Gentleman; take it from point to point; he asks the House to condemn the present Commander-in-Chief in order to exonerate General Colvile.

I only bring that forward because I want the House to see the importance of the issue. The issue is this. It is independent even of the position of the present Commander-in-Chief. The present Commander-in-Chief was appointed with the full confidence of his countrymen

to his present position, and almost his first executive act is criticised and questioned in this House by hon. Gentlemen who do not like being called amateur

strategists, and on a question of military discipline this House is asked to condemn the Commander-in-Chief. As I say, it is not merely a question of the position of the present Commander-in-Chief. Of course the result of such a decision as the right hon. Gentleman asks for must be evident and plain to the House; no man with any respect for himself, no Government with any respect for itself, could submit to such a resolution and continue to hold their office. That is almost a platitude, and, of course, there are Members on the other side, although this is not a party debate, who would not be at all sorry to see that result. But that is a matter of small importance compared with the question how the British Army is in future to be organised and administered. What is the position in which we stood a few days ago, before, this debate was raised? Why, we were being criticised in every paper of the Opposition, and in some of our own papers, for too great leniency, for allowing men to remain in command with the lives of soldiers depending upon their action; allowing them to remain after they had shown incompetency. Incompetency is a matter of opinion, and as long as we have a Commander-in-Chief it is the opinion of the existing Commander-in-Chief, whoever he may be, that we have to accept as the final judgment. If the principle endeavoured to be established by the right hon. Gentleman were accepted by the House, it would not matter which Government was in power or who was Commander-in-Chief; there is no Commander-in-Chief and no Government under those circumstances who would dare to dismiss any officer unless they were prepared to bring against him a charge of positive crime. If cowardice were alleged, if treason were alleged, it would, no doubt, be a simple matter to bring the accused person to trial and to punish him according to his deserts. But, as I have pointed out, incompetency is not a matter which can be brought to trial. Is a court-martial to try whether General Colville is incompetent? What is a court-martial? It is a court consisting of officers lower in rank than Lord Roberts, Sir Evelyn Wood, and Lord Kitchener. Lord Kitchener, Lord Roberts, and Sir Evelyn Wood have pronounced their opinion that General Colville is not capable and ought not to be again employed in high military office; and we, forsooth, are to institute a court of appeal against the highest administrator's in the Army, a court of appeal of their subordinates. It seems to me it is perfectly absurd, absolutely inconsistent with all the criticism which we have previously heard from the party opposite. I agree with my right hon. friend when he said that, if the House of Commons were to pass a resolution of this kind, it would not only destroy the Government, it would not only secure the resignation of the Commander-in-Chief, but it would destroy the British Army.

MR. DALZIEL: The speech of the right hon. Gentleman reminds me of a cartoon which was issued during the elections, called "Hiding behind Bobs." This was not a party question until the right hon. Gentleman rose to address the House, but he appealed to the supporters of the Government, and declared that if the division were against them it would settle the fate of the Government and of

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Chamcerlain, J. Austen (Wor'r
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Chapman, Edward
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Charrington, Spencer
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Finlay, Sir Robert Rannatyne
Arrol, Sir William
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fisher, William Hayes
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitz Roy
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Balfonr, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r)
Cook, Frederick Lucas
Flower, Ernest
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Forster, Henry William
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.
Banbury, Frederick George
Cranborne, Viscount
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)
Bartley, George C. T.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred'rick
Bayley, Thomas (Derhyshire)

Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M.H. (Bristol)
Cust, Henry John C.
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'rHmlets
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-
Bigwood, James
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Gorst, Rt. Hod. Sir John Eldon
Bill, Charles
Dewar, TR (T'rH' mlets, S. Geo.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Boscawen, Arthur Griftith-
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Brassey, Albert
Dickson, Charles Scott
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbr'y
Brookfield, Colonel Montagn
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Greene, Sir E W (B'rySEdm'nd's
Bullard, Sir Harry
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Burns, John
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Grenfell, William Henry
Butcher, John George
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred D.
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Carlile, William Walter
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Groves, James Grimble
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Guest, Hon Ivor Churchill
Cavendish, V. C W. (Derbysh.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Hain, Edward
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Duke, Henry Edward

Hall, Edward Marshall
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Hambro, Charles Eric

the Commander-in-Chief. The right hon. Gentleman has no business to make this a party question. The question before the House is not the question of Lord Roberts or of Sir Evelyn Wood. It is whether this House will grant an inquiry into the case of General Colvile. If the decision in his case be right, why are the Government shirking an inquiry? How is it that every unofficial Member who has spoken from the opposite benches has differed as to the reason why General Colvile was dismissed? The hon. Member for Oldham said that the Lindley affair was no charge at all, and that it was for Sauna's Post that General Colvile was dismissed, whereas another hon. Member said that he was dismissed because of the Lindley affair. It seems to me that there is a case for inquiry, and I have no doubt if the House were allowed to exercise its free judgment to-night that it would be in favour of the Amendment. Every soldier has a right to have the opportunity of examining the evidence on which he is convicted, and therefore I will vote for the Amendment of my hon. friend.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 202; Noes, 148. (Division List No. 60.)

Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G. (Mid'x
Maxwell, Rt. Hn. Sir H E (Wigt'n)

Round, James

Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'ry
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Harmsworth, R. Leicester

Meysey-Thompsoh, Sir H. M.

Russell, T. W.

Harris, E. Leverton (Tynem'th

Middlemore, J. Throgmorton

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Harwood, George

Milton, Viscount

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Haslam, Sir Alfred S.

Milward, Colonel Victor

Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)

Haslett, Sir James Horner

Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert

Hay, Hon. Claude George

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)

Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J

Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley

Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hauts.)

Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Helder, Augustus
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Herman-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Higginbottom, S.W.
Morgan, Dav. J. (Walthamstow
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampst'd
Morrell, George Herbert
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Morris, Hon. Martin H. F.
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Hope, J. F. (Shef'ld, Brightside
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Skewes-Cox. Thomas
Hoult, Joseph
Mount, William Arthur
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Howard, Capt. J. (Kent, Favers.
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Smith, HC (North'mb Tyneside
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Murray, Col. Wyndhsm (Bath)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Myers, William Henry
Spear, John Ward
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Nicholson, William Graham
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Joicey, Sir James
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Slock, James Henry

K ennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Stone, James Henry
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Stroyan, John
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Palmer, George Wm, (Reading)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Kimber, Henry
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Parkes, Ebenezer
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Knowles, Lees
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingt'n
Thornton, Percy M.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Penn, John
Tollemache, Henry James
Law, Andrew Bonar
Percy, Earl
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Lawrence, William F.
Pilkington, Richard
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Lawson, John Grant
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Valentia, Viscount
Lecky, Rt. Hn. Wm. Edw. H.
Plummer, Walter R.
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Lee, Capt AH (Hants. Fareham)
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pretymann, Ernest George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Pryce-Jones, Lt. -Col. Edward
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Purvis, Robert
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)

Randles, John S.
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Rankin, Sir James
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Basch, Major Frederic Carne
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Lowe, Francis William
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Lucas, Reginald J.(Portsm'th.)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Wills, Sir Frederick
Lyttleton, Hon. Alfred
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Macdona, John Cumming
Renwick, George
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid.
Maconochie, A. W.
Richards, Henry Charles
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Bidley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Majendie, James A. H.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Malcolm, Ian
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Markbam, Arthur Basil
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter
NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Bunton, Sydney Charles
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Caldwell, James
Donelan, Captain A.
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Doogan, P. C.
Allan, Charles P. (Glou., Stroud)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Duffy, William J.
Ambrose, Robert
Causton, Richard Knight
Duncan, James H.
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Cawley, Frederick
Dunn, Sir William
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Clancy, John Joseph
Edwards, Frank
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Cogan, Denis J.
Elibank, Master of
Bell, Richard
Colville, John
Emmott, Alfred
Blake, Edward
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst.
Boland, John
Craig, Robert Hunter
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Brigg, John
Crean, Eugene
Farrell, James Patrick
Broadhurst, Henry
Cramer, William Randal
Fenwick, Charles
Brown, G. M. (Edinburgh)
Cullinan, J.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Dalziel, James Henry
Ffrench, Peter
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Field, William
Burke, E. Haviland-
Delany, William
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Burt, Thomas
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Flynn, James Christopher
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
M'Govern, T.
Roche, John
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Fuller, J. M. F.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Gilhooly, James
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fredk. G.
Soares, Ernest J.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Mooney, John J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. CR (Northants)
Grant, Corrie
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Murnaghan, George
Sullivan, Donal
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Murphy, J.
Taylor, Theodore Cook
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Tennant, Harold John
Hammond, John
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Hayden, John Patrick
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ryMid

Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Tomkinson, James
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Holland, William Henry
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Tully, Jasper
Hope, John D. (Fife, West)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Wallace, Robert
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Dowd, John
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Joyce, Michael
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Kearley, Hudson E.
O'Malley, William
Weir, James Galloway
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Mara, James
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Kinloch, Sir John George S.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Kitson, Sir James
Partington, Oswald
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Lambert, George
Pirie, Duncan V.
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex
Langley, Batty
Power, Patrick Joseph
Woodhouse, Sir JT (Huddersf'd
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Priestley, Arthur
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong
Leamy, Edmund
Reckitt, Harold James
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Levy, Maurice

Reddy, M.

Lough, Thomas

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Charles Douglas and Mr. Gretton.

Lundon, W.

Redmond, William (Clare)

MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

M'Dermott, Patrick

Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)

Main Question again proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

It being after midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Adjourned debate, to be resumed tomorrow.

SUPPLY [28TH FEBRUARY]

Resolutions reported::

CIVIL SERVICES SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1900–1901.

CLASS I.

1. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;5,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Houses of Parliament Buildings."

2. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;2,500, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Expenditure in respect of Art and Science Buildings, Great Britain."

3. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;2,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for Expenditure in respect of Diplomatic and Consular Buildings."

4. "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £;7,000, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1901, for the Expenses of the Post Office, and Post Office Telegraph Buildings in Great Britain, including Furniture, Fuel, and sundry Miscellaneous Services.

Resolutions read a second time.

First Resolution::

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) referred to the various items of additional expenditure in connection with the opening of Parliament, and said that at every stage they would be resisted by Irish Catholics. He also complained that adequate explanations of the sums required for the extension of electric lighting and the additional cost of fuel had not been given by the First Commissioner of Works.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) understood that a Committee was to be appointed for the purpose of consider-

ing how the accommodation of the House could be best used for the convenience of

Members. Notwithstanding this, a sum of £1,900 was included in this Vote for alterations to the residence of the Clerk. It was very strange that such a sum should be put down, and he desired to know exactly how the amount was arrived at, how the money was to be spent, and to what purposes the residence of the late Clerk was to be put. He hoped they would have some more detailed information upon this point. The items in this Vote ought to attract the attention of British Members more than Irish Members, because at the opening of Parliament by the King the Irish Members were not anxious to go to the House of Lords. One of the principal reasons for this was that if the Irish Members had gone to the other House at the opening of Parliament they would have had their ears offended by the very uncalled-for and unnecessary observations made by His Majesty with reference to the religion to which many of them belonged. He could not emphasise too strongly what took place on that occasion, and some arrangement might have been made to ensure that the proceedings between this and the other House might have been conducted in a manner which would not have been suggestive so much of a football scrummage. The Royal Gallery should have been reserved for Members of this House, but it was occupied by a large number of ladies, who no doubt lent an additional charm to the occasion, but who were wrongfully occupying positions belonging to Members of this House. He wished also to call attention to the unsatisfactory way in which this House and the Press Gallery were ventilated. There were portions of the House where the heat was almost unbearable, and where there were draughts which were calculated to give colds to hon. Members. There was an item for furniture in connection with the opening of Parliament under which hundreds and thousands of pounds had been spent, and as a representative of the people of Ireland, who had to pay their share, he objected to this Vote in toto. He hoped this matter would be pressed to a division, for it was a perfectly monstrous thing that after two days and two nights of a long and exciting debate they should be asked to sit there at that late hour to transact the most important business of Parliament. The Government had not the slightest hesitation in devoting two days and two nights to discussing the case of General Colville, but when the Irish Members attempted to devote a few hours to discussing items of expenditure which affected their constituencies they were closed.

*Mr. SPEAKER: There is nothing about Irish Votes in this Estimate.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said his point was that Votes involving the expenditure of large sums of money should not be brought on at that time of night. [Ministerial interruptions.] He supposed hon. Gentlemen opposite wanted to call in the police again, but he could assure deter him in the slightest degree from saying whatever he was inclined to say.

*Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member must address himself to the Chair and confine himself to the question before the House.

Mr. WILLIAM REDMOND said he knew it was the proper thing to address the Chair, but when he was greeted in a disorderly fashion by hon. Gentlemen opposite he thought he was justified in appealing to the Chair to protect him. He agreed that the Vote did not apply particularly to Ireland, but he maintained that inasmuch as Irish constituencies would be called upon to pay their share of the

expense of this new furniture, electric lighting, and the rest of the expenditure incurred in the opening of Parliament, they were entitled to take that opportunity of objecting to the Vote. There was one way in which the First Commissioner of Works could silence him instantly upon this matter; if he would tell him that no part of this expenditure would be asked for from Ireland he would say no more; but as long as he found that the Irish people were asked to pay any share of such money he should always object. So far as he was personally concerned, and as representing his constituents who in their direst misery had appealed time after time for help in vain, he would protest in that House on every occasion against passing a Vote which he considered a wanton piece of extravagance. He recommended the First Commissioner of Works the next time he wanted to make preparations for a show which at the best could last but an hour, to go to a first class circus proprietor, who would do the whole thing at a fourth, of the cost.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.) said that if there was to be a continuation of the debate the right hon. Gentleman had himself to thank for it on account of the way in which the Estimates had been drawn up and the want of information in regard to them. The only Members of the House who were discharging a most important duty to the taxpayers of the country were those who sat on the Irish benches, who had over and over again endeavoured to extract from the right hon. Gentleman some explanation of the extraordinary manner in which the Estimates were presented to the House. They objected to this Vote because they had taken no part whatever in the ceremony which attended the opening of Parliament, and because £500 of the total Vote would be levied from Ireland. That might seem to be a trifle, but they must consider the misery and poverty of Ireland under British rule. He was very much surprised that they did not get more help from independent Members in criticising the proposals of the Government, who were increasing the taxation by leaps and bounds. He had taken no part in the ceremony. He had stood in the lobby when the representatives rushed past and hardly escaped injury in the scrimmage or the football match;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; There is a ride against the tedious repetition by a Member of arguments of himself or others. The hon. Member is repeating almost word for word the speeches of the hon. Members who preceded him.

MR. J. P. FARRELL said he was not responsible for the utterances of hon. Members who preceded him. He was endeavouring in his own humble way, not perhaps so eloquently or ably as others, to express his opinion on this matter, and really he hoped he would

not be out of order in giving expression to what he saw in the lobby of the unseemly rush on that occasion. He complained because the right hon. Gentleman had given them no particulars. They were asked to provide seats for ladies, which were to be paid for by poor women who lived in mud huts and who were looked upon by these ladies as Hottentots; at least they had been taught to believe that by the Prime Minister. They did not protest with bated breath and whispering humbleness, and so long as they were compelled to contribute to this Vote they were quite entitled to discuss every incident connected with that

occasion. There was an item for maintenance and repairs. Really the number of doors constantly open and the number of draughts were enough to give every person constant influenza. One might as well be on the top of Croagh Patrici in county Mayo so far as protection from draughts was concerned. He hoped hon. Members would persist in asking for information until it was given.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (MR. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent. St. Augustine's): I will answer, as shortly as I can, the questions addressed to me chiefly by the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Clare, for the hon. Member who followed him practically repeated his statements. I am sure it is the desire of the House that I should reply in as few words as possible. The chief complaint of hon. Members appears to lie that a large amount of money is asked for under this Vote for the expense of the opening of Parliament by the King in person. If hon. Members will look at the details of the expenditure as stated in the Estimates, they will find that only a comparatively small proportion of the money asked for in the Supplementary Estimate is for that particular service. The first item of £1,900 has nothing whatever to do with the opening of Parliament by the King in person. It is for alterations to the late residence of the Clerk of the Parliaments and improvements to ventilation of committee rooms. I would remind the hon. Member for East Clare that in 1894 a House of Commons Accommodation Committee was appointed by this House, and part of the Report of that Committee was that when the next vacancy occurred the official residence should be taken over by Parliament, and that a certain allocation of the rooms should be made which would free a certain number of rooms to be placed at the disposal of Members. Acting on that Report, I took on myself to ask for the necessary powers to expend money for the purpose of preparing rooms in the official residence for the occupation of Ministers who naturally from their business desired to be located near this Chamber. By that means a certain number of rooms on the Terrace Front will be set free, and will be placed at the disposal of hon. Members. In reply to a question by the hon. Member for East Mayo, I at once promised to reappoint that Committee. The motion appears on the Order Paper, and the reference is wide enough to enable us to deal with the allocation of the rooms to which I have referred, and also to consider the other questions raised by the hon. Member. There is one other matter I wish to mention in reference to the late residence of the Clerk of the Parliaments. The Committee of 1894 recommended that further accommodation should be given to gentlemen of the press. They have had very scant accommodation, and we have been able to add considerably to it. I may add that I hope to be able to add more, but I am glad to think, from assurances I have received from the Press Gallery, that my efforts to promote the comfort of gentlemen of the press have not been unsuccessful.

With regard to the next item, only £300 has been necessitated by the opening of Parliament by the King in person. With reference to the item for the extension of electric lighting to the Royal Gallery, that is not for the supply of electric light on the occasion of the opening of Parliament by the King only. It is for the provision of electric light in the Royal Gallery for whatever purpose it may be used. It was not lighted with electricity before. The next item,

"Additional Supply of Electric Current," has nothing to do with the opening of Parliament. It is the extra cost of the electric light used by the House during the interim session and the short meeting of Parliament in January, which could not have been foreseen when the original

Estimate was drawn up. The item for furniture is a charge which will not occur again. The opening of Parliament by the Sovereign in full state had not taken place for over forty years, and a large amount of furniture had to be supplied which can be used on future occasions. With reference to the general question of the unfortunate crush which took place at the opening of Parliament, hon.

Members will realise that that is no fault which cannot be placed at my door, or entirely at the door of the Government. The question whether it will be more convenient to open Parliament in Westminster Hall will, however, be referred to a Joint Committee of the two Houses. The reference is on the Paper, and it is only because hon. Members do not desire to get rid of a grievance that they will not agree to it. If hon. Members will allow the motion to pass the Joint Committee can meet and decide.

MR. TULLY: I have objected to the Committee because of the insulting references to Catholics in the King's Declaration.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Hon. Members forget that the general convenience of the House would be consulted by the appointment of this Committee. I am quite sure no one would be more anxious that proper accommodation should be provided for the Members of the House of Commons on the opening of the Parliament by the Sovereign than the King himself.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said he desired to thank the First Commissioner of Works for his more detailed statement. He would, however, protest against the paying away of money in connection with the opening of Parliament by the King because of the Declaration he then made. It would be remembered that when the Vote was discussed in Committee certain inquiries had been made as regarded the price paid for coal, but no satisfactory answer had yet been given on that point. He hoped that a satisfactory answer would now be given. He submitted that the average price of coal was not higher last year than in the previous year, and the matter should be more fully explained. He wished to know why Government offices generally were paying such a high price for coal?

The Vote covered fourteen months;

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The hon. Member is misrepresenting what I said. I said in regard to the other Votes that we were practically taking fourteen months within the year because, whereas we had hitherto paid quarterly, we are now paying pit prices in advance.

MR. O'MARA said the explanation was quite satisfactory, and he thanked the right hon. Gentleman for it.

MR. CREAN (Cork Co., S.E.) said that anyone of experience knew that if they spent £1,900 on alterations nine-tenths of the sum would be lost when portions of the structure were torn down in connection with the general scheme of alterations which was to be carried out. Thus a good deal of this money would be thrown away. It was in many cases to the advantage of the architect to spend as much money as possible. He held that the expenditure of the £1,900 should be

postponed until the Committee which the right hon. Gentleman foreshadowed had reported. If money was spent before it was voted, the House should teach the hon. Gentlemen responsible a lesson by making them pay it out of their own pockets. It was an insult to the House to come forward at that hour in the morning [one o'clock] and ask them to vote money which had already been spent. He objected to money being voted for work which had been executed without the sanction of the House.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said he had several times pressed the First Commissioners of Works to restore the crossing which had been taken away, opposite the Clock Tower.

*MR. SPEAKER said that question did not arise on the Supplementary Estimate now before the House.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.) said he heartily joined his colleagues on the Irish benches in objecting to the Vote of £5,000. He asked the First Commissioner of Works to give more information in regard to the different items in the Estimate. For instance, there was an item of £800 for furniture. Who was the manufacturer of the furniture, was it obtained by tender or otherwise, and was it made in this country, France, or Germany? In regard to fuel, he asked the price paid per ton, and by whom it was supplied. In July last, when coal was at the highest price, why did the right hon. Gentleman enter into a contract for six months, and then, when the price had fallen, why did he enter into a contract for only three months? It seemed to be bad housekeeping. He had received letters congratulating the Irish Members on the action they were taking there in looking after the interests of the ratepayers of Great Britain. They were not there for any pleasure. Personally he might take the liberty of thanking the Speaker for allowing him to enjoy the free breeze of the outside world during the past week.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question before the House is the Supplementary Vote.

MR. FLAVIN: I did not intend to continue that question except in so far;

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must not continue it at all. He must address himself to the Vote, or I must ask him to resume his seat.

MR. FLAVIN: Owing to the stifling atmosphere of this Chamber;

*MR. SPEAKER: There is no question of the atmosphere of the Chamber in this Vote.

MR. FLAVIN said that preceding speakers had been allowed to deal with the question of the ventilation of the House.

*MR. SPEAKER: On looking at the Vote I perceive that there is nothing in it about the ventilation of the House.

MR. FLAVIN said the Irish Members were prepared to go into full detail in regard to the various items of the Vote unless the First Commissioner of Works made up his mind to give more information in regard to them. He was not aware that Irish contractors had been asked to supply materials for the Houses of Parliament. He thought that was unfair. Ireland received no benefit directly or indirectly under the Vote, and he therefore deemed it his duty on the AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Groves, James Grimble
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Hain, Edward
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid 'x
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Arrol, Sir William
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Penn, John
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Pirie, Duncan V.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Hayne, Rt. Hon Chas. Seale-
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Plummer, Walter R.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Holder, Augustus
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Balfour, Maj. KR (Christchurch
Hermon-Hodge, Rbt. Trotter
Purvis, Robert
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M.H. (Bristol)
Higginbottom, S. W.
Randles, John S.
Bigwood, James
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Rankin, Sir James
Brassey, Albert
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Renwick, George
Caldwell, James

Joicey, Sir James
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
Carlile, William Walter
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.
Robertson, H. (Hackney)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Ropner, Col. Robert
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Kimber, Henry
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Knowles, Lees
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Sadler, Col. Samuel A.
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Lawson, John Grant
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Charrington, Spencer
Layland- Barratt, Francis
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Cranborne, Viscount
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Levy, Maurice
Smith, H. O. (North'mb., Tynes.
Dickson, Charles Scott
Long, Col Charles W. (Evesham
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Spear, John Ward
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Stanley, Hon. Arthur (Ormsk.)
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Macdona, John dimming
Stock, James Henry
Doxtord, Sir William Theodore
M'Killop, James (Stirlingsh.)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Duke, Henry Edward
Majendie, James A. H.
Thomas, J A (Glamorgn., Gower
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Malcolm, Ian
Tollemache, Henry James
Elibank, Master of
Manners, Lord Cecil
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Middlemore, John T.
Valentia, Viscount
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Milward, Col. Victor
Warde, Lt.-Col. C. E.
Fisher, William Hayes
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Forster, Henry William
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred'rick
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Gordon, Hn. J.E. (Elgin & Nairn
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Morrell, George Herbert
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Green, Walford D (Wednesbuy
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)

Greville, Hon. Ronald
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)
Duffy, William J.
Lambert, George
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Farrell, James Patrick
Leamy, Edmund
Ambrose, Robert
Ffrench, Peter
Lundon, W.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Field, William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Boland, John
Flavin, Michael Joseph
M'Dermott, Patrick
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Gilhooly, James
M'Govern, T.
Clancy, John Joseph
Hammond, John
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Cogan, Denis J.
Hayden, John Patrick
Mooney, John J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Healy, Timothy Michael
Murnaghan, George
Crean, Eugene
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Murphy, J.
Cullinan, J.
Jordon, Jeremiah
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Delany, William
Joyce, Michael
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Doogan, P. C.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
first occasion given him since last Tuesday to protest against it.
Question put.
The House divided::Ayes, 139; Noes, 57. (Division List No. 61.)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'rary Mid

O'Malley, William
Roche, John
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W)
O'Mara, James
Sullivan, Donal
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Tully, Jasper
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Weir, James Galloway
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Reddy, M.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

O'Dowd, John
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Redmond, William (Clare)

Second Resolution;;

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. TULLY said he thought that the House was entitled to a better explanation regarding the Vote than had previously been given. The original Estimate was £;6,745, and now a sum of £;2,500 was asked for for fuel, light, water, and household articles. The original Estimate for the British Museum was £;3,400, and now an increase of £;1,450 was asked for. The original Estimate for the Edinburgh Museum was £;1,345, and only an additional sum of £;100 was required. How was it that the increase in the case of the British Museum was 42 per cent., whereas it was only 7 per cent, in the case of the Edinburgh Museum? It appeared to him that the cost of fuel, light, and household articles must have been as great in Edinburgh as in London. He was aware that the Scotch looked closely after the ready penny, and he thought that the small increase asked for for the Edinburgh Museum was a testimony to the thriftiness of the Scotch people. For the Natural History Museum the original Estimate was £;2,000, and the Estimate now required was £;2,950, or an increase of 47 per cent. He thought the House should be given some explanation of the increase, and also why, when the Supplementary Estimate for the Edinburgh Museum was only £;100 it should be £;2,400 for the British Museum? The House had been told that the increase was due principally to the increased price of coal, but surely Scotch cord went up in price proportionately with English coal, and if the Edinburgh authorities could get their coal at a low rate, why could not the same be done
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Arrol, Sir William
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r.
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G.W. (Leeds)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch'ch

in London? The House was entitled to know the names of the contractors from whom the coal was bought, and whether any purchases were made from distinguished Members of the Houses of Parliament who were interested in the trade.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND could not understand by what course of reasoning the First Lord of the Treasury arrived at the conclusion that it was fair or reasonable that the expenditure of public money should be discussed in the early hours of the morning, while the ordinary time of the House was devoted to discussing the more or less interesting case of one officer who was unable to conquer the Boers. In this Vote there was an additional sum of £;1,450 for the British Museum in respect of fuel, light, and household articles. He should oppose that and every other Vote in connection with that institution until the First Lord gave an undertaking to restore to Ireland the gold ornaments which were discovered in that country, and taken from them in a most irregular, illegal, and unfair manner, and deposited in the British Museum.

*MR. SPEAKER ruled that the question of the gold ornaments had nothing to do with the Vote before the House, and, therefore, could not be discussed.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND was about to continue his remarks, when;

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:; Ayes, 123; Noes, 70. (Division List No. 62.)

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M.H. (Bristol)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Bigwood, James
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.
Plummer, Walter R.
Brassey, Albert
Helder, Augustus
Pretymann, Ernest George
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Carlile, William Walter
Higginbottom, S. W.
Purvis, Robert
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Hope, J F (Sheffield, Brightside
Randles, John S.
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Ratcliffe, R. F.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Renwick, George
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon J.(Birm.
Kimber, Henry
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Knowles, Lees
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Charrington, Spencer
Lambert, George
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Law, Andrew Bonar
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Lawson, John Grant
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Cranborne, Viscount
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chath'm
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Smith, H.C (N'rthmb. Tyneside
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Macdona, John Cumming
Spear, John Ward
Duke, Henry Edward
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Majendie, James A. H.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Malcolm, Ian
Stock, James Henry
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Manners, Lord Cecil
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh
Tollemache, Henry James
Fisher, William Hayes
Middlemore, John Throgmorton
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Fitzroy, Hn. Edward Algernon
Milward, Col. Victor
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Forster, Henry William
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Valentia, Viscount
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Morrell, George Herbert
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Green, Walford D. (Wednes'y.)
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Groves, James Grimble
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Hain, Edward
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G (Mdd'x
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Penn, John
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Ambrose, Robert
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Joicey, Sir James
O'Dowd, John
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Boland, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Malley, William
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Joyce, Michael
O'Mara, James
Caldwell, James
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Shaughnessy, J. P.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Pirie, Duncan V.
Clancy, John Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cogan, Denis J.
Levy, Maurice
Reddy, M.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lundon, W.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Creanm, Eugene
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Cullinan, J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Roche, John

Delany, William
M'Govern, T.
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Doogan, P. C.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Sinclair, Capt. Jn. (Forfarshire
Duffy, William J.
Mooney, John J.
Sullivan, Donal
Elibank, Master of
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport)
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower)
Farrell, James Patrick
Murnaghan, George
Tully, Jasper
Ffrench, Peter
Murphy, J.
Weir, James Galloway
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Gilhooly, James
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'rarryMid
Harden, John Patrick
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Question put, accordingly, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the
said Resolution."
The House divided:;Ayes, 132; Noes, 57. (Division List No. 63.)
AYES.
Acland -Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Groves, James Grimble
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Arrol, Sir William
Hain, Edward
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Ashton, Thomas Gair

Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G (Middx
Penn, John
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Plummer, Walter R.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Pretymann, Ernest George
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christchurch
Heath, J. (Staffords., N.W.)
Purvis, Robert
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M.H (Bristol)
Helder, Augustus
Randles, John S.
Bigwood, James
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Brassey, Albert
Higginbottom, S. W.
Renwick, George
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas. Thomson
Caldwell, James
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Carlile, William Walter
Joicey, Sir James
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cavendish, V.C. W (Derbyshire
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Kimber, Henry
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Knowles, Lees

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Chamberlain, J Austen (Wore'r
Law, Andrew Bonar
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Charrington, Spencer
Lawson, John Grant
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire
Cranborne, Viscount
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Smith, Abel H. (Hereford, E.)
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.
Smith, HC (Northmb. Tyneside
Dickson, Charles Scott
Levy, Maurice
Smith, Hon. W.F.D. (Strand)
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Spear, John Ward
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Licas, Reginald J. (Portsmo'th)
Stock, James Henry
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Macdona, John Camming
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower)
Elibank, Master of
Majendie, James A. H.
Tollemache, Henry James
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Malcolm, Ian
Tomlinson, Wm. E. Murray

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Manners, Lord Cecil
Tufnell, Col. Edward
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Maxwell, W.J.H (Dumfriessh.
Valentia, Viscount
Fisher, William Hayes
Middlemore, Jno. Throgmorton
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Forster, Henry William
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Morrell, George Herbert
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Hope, John D. (Fife, West)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Ambrose, Robert
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Joyce, Michael
O'Dowd, John
Boland, John
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leamy, Edmund

O'Malley, William
Clancy, John Joseph
Lundon, W.
O'Mara, James
Cogan, Denis J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Dermott, Patrick
Pirie, Duncan V.
Crean, Eugene
M'Govern, T.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cullinan, J.
M'Hugh, Patrick A.
Reddy, M.
Delany, William
Mooney, John J.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Doogan, P. C.
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Duffy, William J.
Murnaghan, George
Roche, John
Farrell, James Patrick
Murphy, J.
Sullivan, Donal
Ffrench, Peter
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Tully, Jasper
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N).
Weir, James Galloway
Gilhooly, James
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Further Consideration of the Third and Fourth Resolutions deferred till
Thursday.
Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn";(Mr. A. J.
Balfour);put, and agreed to.
Adjourned accordingly at five minutes before Two of the clock.