

**<url><https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/feb/20></url>**

**HOUSE OF COMMONS.**

Wednesday, 20th February, 1901.

The House met at Two of the clock.

**PETITIONS.**

**BEER BILL.**

Petitions in favour, from West Sussex; Newport (twenty); Cherrington (three); Tibberton (six); Kynnersley (two); Market Drayton; Great Chatwell (two); Horton; Donnington (two); Lilleshall (five); Heath Hill; Edgmond (six); Caynton (two); Edgmond Common; Chetwynd (two); Pickstock; and Chetwynd Park; to lie upon the Table.

**CHURCH DISCIPLINE.**

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

**ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).**

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Leicester; and Norwich; to lie upon the Table.

**POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.**

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Sunderland; and Cannock; to lie upon the Table.

**SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.**

Petitions in favour, from Newport Pagnell; and Fenny Stratford; to lie upon the Table.

**SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.**

Petitions in favour, from Surbiton; and Glasgow (two); to lie upon the Table.

**RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.**

**CIVIL SERVICE (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1900&#x2013;1901).**

Estimate presented, of the Further Sums required to be voted for the Service of the year ending 31st March, 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and, to be printed. [No. 29.]

**SAINT VINCENT.**

Copy presented, of the Amending Prison Rules, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

**BOARD OF EDUCATION.**

Copy presented, of Minute of the Board of Education, dated 31st July, 1900, modifying Article 101 (g) of the Day School Code, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

**SEA FISHERIES OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.**

Copy ordered, of "Statistical Tables and Memorandum relating to the Sea Fisheries of the United Kingdom in the year 1900, including also a Return showing the Quantity of Fish carried by railway from each of the Principal Ports of England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, in each year from 1895 to 1900, inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 58, of Session 1900).";Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 32.]

**FOREIGN TRADE AND COMMERCE.**

Copy ordered, "of Monthly Accounts relating to the Trade and Commerce of certain Foreign Countries and British Possessions.";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 33.]

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

[FIFTH DAY'S DEBATE.]

Order read for resuming Adjourned Debate on Amendment [19th February] to Question [14th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth;

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.";(Mr. Forster.)

And which Amendment was;

"At the end of the Question to add the words;' But we humbly express our regret to Your Majesty that, having regard to the Reports of the recent Royal Commission on the Licensing Laws and the widespread desire which exists that some effort should be made to diminish the evil, which they describe as gigantic and a national degradation, there is no indication in Your Majesty's Gracious Speech of any intention to deal at all adequately with this subject.'";(Mr. Whittaker.)

Question again proposed, "That those words be there added."

LICENSING LAWS.

\*MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I shall not detain the House at any great length today. When my remarks were interrupted by the twelve o'clock rule last night I was dealing with the aspects of the temperance question as it affects Irishmen in Ireland. I think a most important aspect which should concern Irish Members is also the restrictions on Irishmen in England and Scotland. There are many millions of our race scattered over these countries, and they have only one direct representative in this House. The constituencies have been so arranged that they have been deprived of the representation they are entitled to. I think restrictions dealing with the number of public-houses will press particularly upon the Irish in Great Britain. When the Irish were driven over here in the famine years to seek a miserable existence the few who rose above the ranks of the ordinary labourer in the North of England and parts of Scotland were generally to be found in two or three avocations. A certain number of them succeeded as pawnbrokers, marine store dealers, and publicans. Cries of "Oh&#x0021;" and laughter.] I mean Irishmen of the second generation whose parents were driven over here as labourers. [Laughter.] I am sorry that some of my friends do not agree with me, but that has been my experience. I have noticed in some districts that a great many Irishmen were unfortunately obliged to follow the avocation of a publican.

I will take Glasgow as an instance of how temperance restrictions are applied to Irishmen. Glasgow is municipally the most admirably managed city in the United Kingdom. I remember that some time ago the corporation brought an improvement scheme before Parliament. It was an extraordinary improvement scheme. One clause

was so strong that if a man set a dog or a cat after a mouse in the street he was liable to be arrested and imprisoned. Under that scheme it was proposed to wipe out the houses in a certain area, and the area selected was the particular quarter where there was the greatest number of Irishmen holding public-houses. These Irishmen got no compensation. They simply got five or six years' notice and their property was taken from them by the Puritans of Glasgow, and the result of this confiscation was that a monopoly was created for the Scotch publicans in the neighbourhood. Glasgow is a particular example of what you will achieve by harassing temperance legislation. I have been often in Glasgow, and I know from experience that there is more drunkenness there than in any other city in the kingdom. They have many inventions in Glasgow for evading the licensing laws, and a sort of demoralisation is created by unnecessary restrictions on the ordinary habits of the people. I have seen more drunken men in Glasgow on Sunday than I have ever seen in any city in Ireland or in the whole of Ireland. If a man wants a refreshment on Sunday he has to descend to a subterfuge to get it, and thus they demoralise the man, and probably pave the way for his total downfall. In England and Scotland some of the best supporters of Liberals on these benches are Irish publicans, who cast their own trade interests aside, and support the Liberals as Home Rulers, but we were told by the hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division that when they come into power they will have revenge on the publicans. I have not paid very much attention to the temperance question myself, but I am in favour of giving a licence to every man who asks for it, but I should make it a condition that when there was one conviction against him he should never more have a licence. So long as the Liberal party have leaders like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife, and a tad like the hon.

Member for the Spen

Valley Division, who wishes to confiscate the property of publicans;

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must confine himself to the question before the House.

\*MR. TULLY: Well, I was referring to an argument that fell from the hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division. The hon. baronet the Member for Kirkcudbrightshire last night indulged in a joke in regard to Irish whisky. He said it was like a torchlight procession going down a man's throat. That joke is twenty-five years old.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire): It was originally from the Irish benches.

\*MR. TULLY: But it appears to have taken twenty-five years to penetrate the Scotch perception of humour. Two or three years ago I heard of some friends who were at an hotel in Scotland, and on a Thursday, which was wet, they were unable to go out fishing. They remained in the hotel and began to play billiards. The proprietor came into the room in an advanced state of intoxication and would not allow them to proceed with the game. His wife afterwards explained that he was in the habit of getting drunk on the "Sawbath," and that he had mistaken Thursday for the "Sawbath."

\*MR. SPEAKER reminded the hon. Member that there was a rule of the House against irrelevancy.

\*MR. TULLY: I was merely replying to the attack made by the hon. Baronet on one

of Ireland's national products. I objected to this temperance legislation because some of the most prominent men in the movement are employers who are simply anxious in the temperance cause because they hope to get their workmen at less wages.

\*MR. SPEAKER again called the hon. Member to order, and asked him to confine himself to the question before the House.

\*MR. TULLY: I shall pass from that subject. I was interrupted last night by the hon. Member for Mid Durham. I know that the Irish of Durham have a very high esteem for the hon. Member, and I personally have very great esteem for him. He questioned certain facts which I gave with respect to a village I visited. When I was there I happened to have my camera with me and I took snapshots of the scenes of drunkenness which I witnessed. I have shown them to friends as pictures from real life in an English village. I think that the remedy for intemperance is not to be found in such legislation as that proposed by hon. Members on these benches. I think that a good deal of the evils of which they complain arise from the grinding commercialism and the grinding industrialism, which is wiping out so much rural life here and in Ireland, and killing all the joy of life in these countries. A poor man, whatever his ambition, if he makes any savings, cannot now become a small shopkeeper or tradesman, as formerly. He has to go on in the same groove. Zola, in one of his novels, has described the effect of big concerns; how they brutalise the people.

\*MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Member that he is not confining himself to the Amendment.

\*MR. TULLY: I will not incur your censure any further. Drunkenness and intemperance are symptoms of a disease caused by industrialism and commercialism, and until some statesman deals with the subject in a broad spirit and not in the petty way suggested in the Amendment, we shall not have the peace and prosperity we should like in this country.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I confess that I have listened to the later stages of this debate with the greatest possible pain. Whatever view individual Members of this House may take of this question, it ought to be recognised and it ought to be treated as one of the most serious questions of the day, and I have no patience with Irish Members who furnish amusement for Englishmen in this House. We are sent for a very different purpose and we shall have to furnish them with something else than amusement and laughter if we are to do any good in this House. I have no kind of liking for an Irish Member posturing as a kind of Handy Andy for the amusement and the contempt of English Members in this House. I do not intend

to apply that in any but a general sense, but the tone of the hon. Member's remarks was worthy of Charles Lever's novels and not of the House of Commons. I do not think the Irish people will at all relish the idea of an Irishman providing amusement and laughter for Englishmen in this House.

But apart from this, I desire to say that whatever my own views may be as to what is right and what ought to be done I have no desire to ask the Government to do that which is impossible. You cannot go in advance of public opinion in this matter, and if you attempt it you will be driven back, and you will not get

forward. I am not one of those who are inclined in the least to tilt at the moon and to ask the Government to do things which cannot be done, and ought not to be done in the present state of public opinion. When I say that, surely there is ample margin short of the impossible for the Government to take action upon. Surely there is ample margin for moderate and reasonable legislation on this question which will carry the assent of the House of Commons, and, what is still more, even carry the assent of the best portion of the trade itself. There is one matter as regards Ireland, and one only, to which I will refer in the absence of the Chief Secretary, but, after all, Ireland is under the Home Office in this matter. The House were told last night that nothing ought to be done as regards Ireland. Surely in the face of the way the licensing business of the country is carried on at the present moment no responsible man will say that. What takes place now? I do not say that it has just commenced in Ireland, because the old magistrates were quite as bad as the new ones. [Nationalist cries of "Worse."] So far as this drink trade is concerned, they have made Ireland a place in which there is a larger proportion of public-houses to population than in any other part of the United Kingdom. Her small towns are literally filled with public houses. Before any licensing session is held the magistrates of the whole county are actively canvassed; they travel twenty, thirty, or forty miles after being canvassed openly and above board in fairs and markets, take their seats upon the benches at these far-distant places, and overrule, by the votes they have promised before the evidence is given, the local magistrates, who, knowing the circumstances of the district, desire to refuse the licence.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Temperance people canvass also.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: No, they do not. I was never canvassed; never once. But what difference would it make? The evil would simply be intensified if magistrates with temperance sympathies allowed themselves to be canvassed. It merely shows the intensity of the evil, and the necessity for a remedy. I am not going to urge any change in the licensing authority. Certainly, I am not going to propose that the county court judges or resident magistrates should be the licensing authority. What change is made must be on the responsibility of the Government, but it is absolutely impossible from the standpoint of the administration of justice, altogether apart from the licensing system, that this canvassing should be allowed to proceed any further in Ireland. It is really ruining and destroying the country. I am not in favour of forcing legislation in opposition to the wishes of the people, but when you come to a great crying and admitted evil like this it is absolutely necessary that the Government should step in and prevent the evil going any further than it has already gone. That is not an extravagant demand to make upon the Government. The Chief Secretary for Ireland knows the facts, because they have been placed before the Government by the county court judges and by those who preside over courts of quarter session, and I say that if the Government are not-prepared to remedy this evil they ought at all events to do what the Government did in 1871; they should support a Suspensory Bill stopping the issue of new licences until they can make up their minds as to a proper licensing authority. I had no intention of intervening in

this debate until I heard what pained me from the other side of the House. I have intervened from a strong sense of duty, and I am perfectly certain that both as regards Ireland and Great Britain if my right hon. friend will have the courage to face what can be faced with the consent of all parties he will find a support in this House and of the country of which he little dreams.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): The hon. Member for South Leitrim said that he had given but very scant consideration to the temperance question, and he rather justified his statement by his speech. I have given some forty years consideration to the subject, and I should like, if possible, to bring the House back to the practical consideration of this most important Amendment; the most important, I have no hesitation in saying, that will be brought before the House in regard to the King's Speech.

The last speaker said that all he asked from the Government was that they should bring forward legislation which was not beyond or in advance of public opinion. I will ask the Government for less than that: I do not want them to do more than to meet public opinion half way. I think they will have no difficulty in bringing forward something that will receive general assent on both sides of the House, and be of the very greatest value to the community at large. There is a reference in His Majesty's Speech to the licensing question, but we do not know what it means. I sincerely trust, from something which fell in the debate last night, that the Government mean a very great deal more than appears from the brief statement in the King's Speech. If so, I will try to define how the Government may safely go a good deal further without any serious opposition from any party in this House, from either political party in the country, from the trade itself, or from the temperance party. I think if it is shown that a scheme is feasible that will go a long way in the direction of licensing reform, and receive all this support, it will be a very serious thing for the Government to refuse to introduce legislation. The Commission (of which I was a member) referred to in the Amendment were entirely agreed with regard to the first four portions of the Report. Lord Peel, the chairman, took the whole Commission along with him in the consideration of his Draft Report until he reached the fifth portion, which deals with the reduction of the number of public houses and compensation. We may therefore claim that as to the lines upon which the first four portions of the Report proceed, both sides are practically in agreement. I propose in what I have to say to exclude altogether the fifth portion of the Report, whether in the

Minority or in the Majority Report, from my consideration. If the Government are wise they will do the same. It is really the only portion of the Report which contains any very serious controversy, and a great deal may be done in the direction of temperance reform without touching either of the two vexed questions to which I have referred.

The Amendment divides itself into three portions: it first calls attention to the Report of the Royal Commission and to the fact that very little is said in His Majesty's Speech in regard to it; it then comments on and emphasises the widespread desire for legislation; and then it says "there is no indication in your Majesty's gracious Speech of any intention to deal at all adequately with

this subject." There are many reasons for pressing the Report of this Commission upon the attention of the Government. In the first place, it is their own Commission; they appointed it. They appointed it in consequence of pledges given by every Member of Parliament sitting on the Government bench at the present moment. I do not believe there was one of them who did not in his election address in 1895 declare that if he was returned to Parliament something would be done with regard to temperance legislation. I do not hint for a moment that the Commission was appointed with a view to shelving the question. I believe it was done honestly, with the intention of having a Commission representing all sections of the community interested in licensing reform, who would collect such evidence and make such a report upon the evidence as would enable any reasonable Government to proceed with legislation. There was a singular unanimity with regard to a great number of important reforms, a unanimity which is the more singular from the numbers of the Commission itself. That body consisted of eight members of the liquor trade, eight known and recognised temperance reformers, representing every section of the temperance movement, and eight gentlemen called "Neutrals." How the Government could find anybody neutral on this question I could not understand, but I was a little reassured when I saw one of the neutral gentlemen come in with the blue ribbon in his buttonhole, although I regret to say he did not live up to his blue ribbon by any manner of means. But the singular composition of the Commission would always forbid agreement, and yet there is agreement upon a number of important temperance reforms that are acceptable alike to all the heterogeneous mass of opinion that was represented on the Commission. My hon. friend the mover of the Amendment emphasised a good many of these points. I will venture to go over similar ground, emphasising some of the points of agreement upon which he did not expand, and, even at the risk of being a little tedious, I will try to show the practicability of a most valuable and far-reaching scheme of licensing reform that I believe would pass the House without a division on second reading, and in Committee would meet with serious difference of opinion only on details and methods. I want very respectfully to address myself to the very large section of the House who are personally interested in this question; those who are justices of the peace, who take part in licensing matters, and the very large number of members who for years past have interested themselves in local administration and matters of social reform. I shall refer very briefly to particular points of temperance reform recommended in the Majority Report which receive the unanimous support of those who signed Lord Peel's Report. One very important matter which has not yet been referred to is the question of clubs. We all know quite well that there is an enormous amount of intemperance in this country, and social and moral unhappiness and degradation following that intemperance, in consequence of the large and increasing number of drinking clubs. In 1893 I, in conjunction with four other gentlemen, two of whom were engaged in the liquor trade, introduced a Bill on this subject. That Bill passed the House of Commons without a division and was sent upstairs to a Select Committee. Very important evidence was obtained, and the Bill was reported to the House. The Government, therefore, is not without information in regard to

this matter. During the last three months I have devoted very close attention to this subject, and with the advice of a large body of clubs in the country, including 1,200 Conservative clubs that are gathered together in one association, have considered a Clubs Bill, and if the Government have not time to attend to the subject I shall be very glad to hand that Bill over to my right hon. friend the Home Secretary. I am certain that a wise Clubs Bill would meet with no opposition either from the temperance party, or from magistrates, or from those engaged in the liquor trade. I sympathise very much with those engaged in the liquor trade, because they have to carry a very heavy burden of censure in consequence of the intemperance of the country, a considerable portion of which burden ought to be borne by these drinking clubs which are springing up all over the land. There is no doubt whatever that some legislation ought to be brought in dealing with this matter; otherwise it will become a most serious question. One of the most serious mischiefs connected with clubs is the frequency with which some public-house, which in consequence of breaking the law right and left loses its licence, is at once turned by the proprietor into a club. A late member of this House and of the Liberal Government, Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, who appeared before the Committee in 1893, told us of a case in Kent in which the occupier of a public-house, tied to a small brewer, had been deprived of his licence because the house was the constant resort of poachers and fruit thieves. The man simply called his customers together and turned the place into a club; a fruit-stealers' and poachers' club, really. These men were then able, instead of being turned out at ten o'clock and having to wander about until the grey of the morning, when it was light enough to steal fruit, to stop comfortably in the "club," and for this the membership charge was only 1s. 6d. per year. The man did so well with his club that he owned thirteen beer-houses in thirteen villages, and I am now told that he despises the licences and is in the proud position of having thirteen tied beerhouses, all clubs. I know of many a club tied to a brewer. The brewer furnishes, the club and everything connected with it; the membership is bogus, and it is a tied house. These places defy the police; the people drink as much as they please; and there is no doubt that many of these clubs are simply dens of debauchery and all sorts of uncleanness. The London, police gave evidence before that Committee and before the Commission, and both Reports are in agreement with regard to clubs. The Majority Report recommends that all clubs in which intoxicants, are supplied should be registered; that, the onus of proving bona fides should be placed on the clubs applying for registration; that no club should be registered unless the club property be vested in all the members of the club or in trustees, and unless no individual member is interested directly in the sale of exciseable liquor on the club premises; that the registering authority should examine the rules, and satisfy himself that the club is not formed solely for the purpose of sale and consumption of intoxicating liquors, and that some check is placed on the election of members, on the privileges of honorary membership, and on the introduction of friends by members; that the sale of intoxicating liquors for consumption off the premises should be strictly prohibited. In a town I once had



the honour to represent this was a very serious mischief. The people not only sat drinking in these houses all night, but they took drink home with them. The Report also recommends that no person under eighteen years of age should be admitted as a member of a club in which intoxicants are sold; and that the authority to grant certificates to clubs should be the stipendiary magistrates, in cities and towns where they exist, and in other localities a court of petty sessions, consisting of not less than three justices. That is a very brief and carefully boiled down summary of the recommendations of the Majority and Minority Reports. If the Government brought in a Bill based upon those simple lines it would receive the support of the whole of the House of Commons and the country, with the exception of the bogus clubs themselves; and if the Bill did not meet with the approbation of the members of those clubs, it would certainly have the approval and gratitude of their wives and children.

Another recommendation that I would respectfully urge upon the Home Secretary is with regard to the consolidation of the law. If he would undertake a measure upon these various points of agreement, and then send the Bill to a Select Committee, or to the Committee on Law, with instructions not only that these points were to be included, but that the whole of the Acts relating to the sale of intoxicating liquor were to be consolidated, it would be an immense advantage to those of us who have constantly to do with the administration of the licensing laws. At present they constitute a bundle of absurdities and incongruities which it is very difficult to interpret, and I am certain that this one act of consolidation would have an immense result in increasing the general sobriety of the country. I would also press upon the Home Secretary the fact that the principle of the reduction of the number of public-houses is accepted by both sections of the Commission, but I do not urge the Government to undertake this at the present moment. It would open up controversy on the question of compensation, and I believe it would be better to stick exclusively to those matters which really are recommended by every member of the Commission. Then, the disqualification which applies to the members of the licensing authority should apply equally to the clerk to the licensing authority. The hon. Member for the Spen Valley Division dealt with that so exhaustively and conclusively yesterday that there is no need for me to refer to it. Another very important point which will come home to every member of a licensing body is that the reasons for the refusal of the renewal of a licence should be stated in open court; and, if desired by the applicant, be given in writing; that notice to the licensing authority itself of all applicants for new licences should be required. Then there is a recommendation that a proper interval; say a month; should be left between the grant and confirmation of a new licence, so that the second hearing may be a reality, and that all new licences, including off-licences, should require confirmation. If an interval of a month was left, a great many licences would be refused. It further proposes the abolition of temporary licences, and that the annual licensing sessions should be held in March instead of August and September. I need say nothing upon that, because the hon. Member for North-West Manchester put the case so plainly and clearly yesterday. Then there is another important matter, and this affects Ireland very

largely, that no licence should be renewed to a public-house of under £12 rateable value. That would sweep away a very considerable number of licences. [An HON. MEMBER: Without compensation?] There is no mention of compensation, except that sometimes notice should be required. These small houses, especially the small beer-houses, are frequently of the very worst kind.

Then comes a recommendation of the very first importance, and one which, if we could get no other, would be one of the most valuable items in the whole programme of the temperance reformer; that all "off" wine and spirit licences should be subject to the full control of the licensing authority, as well as all wholesale licences for the sale of wine, spirits, beer, and sweets, excepting those required by brewers, distillers, wine and spirit merchants, and blenders.

I want the House to bear in mind all along that these are the recommendations of the members of the Commission who were engaged in the liquor trade. Then it is recommended that the sale of liquor in passenger vessels plying between ports of the United Kingdom, and in theatres, should be brought under the control of the licensing authority. I hope before this debate closes some Scotch Member, familiar with the Clyde, will say a few words upon this point showing the drunkenness which prevails in many of the quiet places down the Clyde in consequence of excursion steamers on Sundays and at other times which are practically floating public-houses not under the control of the police at all.

Both sections of the Commission are agreed on a reconstruction of the licensing authority, with the inclusion of some element of popular representation.

Then the abolition of the appeal to Quarter Sessions is recommended. That is a matter which is a constant sore to every temperance reformer, and not only a constant worry to every licensing court of first instance, but a grievance of the very first order with borough magistrates. They who know all about the neighbourhood and clearly understand its requirements, who know the character of the man, and, it may be, of the firm supplying the house, exercising their discretion under knowledge refuse the licence. An appeal is made to the Quarter Sessions, and country gentlemen who know nothing of the circumstances of the borough re-impose that licence. It has become so serious a nuisance to many borough magistrates that their whole line of conduct is hampered. The licensing bench on which I sit, one of the best in the country, constantly give decisions which they would very much rather not give, because they do not like being snubbed by the Court of Quarter Sessions and having their decisions completely upset. It is a most im-

portant fact, and I hope the House will note that the Majority as well as the Minority Report urges the abolition of that appeal. Then there is another recommendation on which temperance reformers feel very strongly, and which is but simple justice, and that is that in no case should the licensing authority be liable for the cost of an appeal. We have a case which has established beyond doubt that there is no legal claim whatever to a publican for the loss of his licence; whatever claim there may be is merely sentimental, not legal. That case is *Sharp v. Wakefield*, and in that case Wakefield, the magistrate who initiated the action, had to pay the whole costs of the appeal. It is most unfair that a magistrate placed in a position of responsibility, getting no salary for his

work, should be personally cast in costs for a matter which is certainly of public importance and interest. We have found it impossible to get borough benches to appeal from a decision of a Quarter Sessions because they will not face the enormous cost which has to be incurred. I speak feelingly because I have constantly to fork out £5 or £10 to some fund or other for defending one of these appeal cases. It is not fair that the cost should be thrown on the charitable subscriptions of temperance men or upon members of the benches themselves.

Then there is another point upon which there is not quite practical agreement, but almost, and that is that complete Sunday closing should be extended to Monmouthshire. The Government had an experience last year of the attitude of their followers on this question, but I have no hesitation in saying that the present Parliament is very much in advance of the last with regard to the sentiment on the Government side of the House, and I am sure that if they take up the matter of extending Sunday closing to Monmouthshire there will be no opposition whatever. The only protest made against it on the Commission was by Messrs. Hyslop and Walker, both of whom are engaged in the retail liquor trade, and therefore naturally biased in the objection that they took. Another point upon which these two gentlemen differed from the rest of the Commission was that the licensing authority should have power to impose the conditions of Sunday closing upon a new licence. Another recommendation was that except in London and the principal cities the hours of opening on Sundays should be restricted to two hours at midday and two hours in the afternoon. That is the recommendation of the eight liquor men. Then, that a limited number of licensed houses, where travellers may be served at specified hours, should be selected by the licensing authority, and a special licence duty imposed upon them; and that the statutory distance should be extended to six miles. Then it recommends the amendment of the law as regards travellers drinking at railway stations. That may seem a trivial thing, but I was catching a train at Manchester at ten past eleven and went into the refreshment room, but was unable to get near the counter. The public-houses closed at eleven, and there was a crowd of 500 or 600 people clamouring around the bar for a "last drink." The same scene may be witnessed at any important railway station at a town where the public-houses close at ten or eleven o'clock. The Report then objects to occasional licences being granted except by two or more justices sitting in petty sessional courthouse. There is nothing more abused in the licensing law than the power with regard to occasional licences. They go to the nearest magistrate and get from him these licences, but in my opinion applications of this kind, which may be an intolerable nuisance in the neighbourhood, ought to be obtained in a public court, and ought not to be granted under any other circumstances. Then there is the question of selling drink to children. The Report says; "Sale, either on or off, of any kind of intoxicant to children under the age of sixteen should be forbidden. The penalties now imposed for knowingly serving children under age should be raised, and similar penalties should be imposed on those who knowingly send them."

Messrs. Hyslop and Walker consider this would be most harassing and

inconvenient, but in dealing with a question like this they have got to put up with a little inconvenience. There is a Bill on the subject which has almost secured first place on a Wednesday, and that measure will certainly come on for discussion, and we shall watch with interest the attitude which the Government take up in regard to that measure. If they really wish to be consistent reformers they will not only support that measure but they will give every facility for passing it into law. If they will only do that, it will at least be evidence of their earnestness in regard to this question.

I will not take up the time of the House in going over other questions which are dealt with, but there are also a great many recommendations with regard to habitual drunkards, and this subject is rather indicated in the King's Speech. Strong recommendations upon this question have been agreed to by all the Commissioners with the exception of these two gentlemen, Messrs. Hyslop and Walker. There are no less than thirty-three recommendations of the first class made by the majority and approved by the minority, and there is no controversial matter to be found in any of them. I have no hesitation in promising the support of the whole temperance party in the House and in the country to these recommendations. There is nothing in them to which we object, and every one of them has been approved by Lord Peel's Report. I am not so unreasonable as to expect heroic legislation from the present Government, and I do not ask for it, but I might remind the Home Secretary of a few very significant words which fell from my hon. friend the Member for North-West Manchester yesterday, in which he said;

"He hoped the Home Secretary and the Government would take a more courageous attitude on this subject. Up to a certain point this was becoming less and less a party question, and they would find a great deal of support from those (the Ministerial) Benches."

All I say is that I am satisfied that such a measure would get the solid support of the Liberal party in this House. Leave out of the Report altogether Part V., which deals with compensation and reduction, and with that left out you cannot go wrong on any other points of agreement. I do not want to say a single word about the parrot cry that extreme men stop legislation. I do not think that you will find a more extreme man than myself, for I am an avowed prohibitionist, but I defy any hon. Member to find a case during the sixteen years that I have sat in this House where I have stopped temperance legislation. I do not know whether the Home Secretary would retort that I had stopped very important legislation during the 1886-1892 Parliament or not;

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I feel very much inclined to do that.

MR. CAINE: Then I will deal with that. They carried the Second Reading of the Bill by a majority of seventy-two. They had a very large and substantial majority at their back, and how was that Bill lost? It was lost in Committee after hon. Members had realised what the Bill meant, for it meant endowing the liquor trade with four or five millions sterling. When this was realised the House began to pause, and there was a falling-off in the Government supporters to the extent of some seventy Members, and in an important division the majority

of seventy-two was reduced to seven, and the measure was dropped. It was in consequence of the action of the right hon. Gentleman's own friends that the Bill was lost, and not the extreme men. The Bill was simply defeated by the common sense of his own supporters, of whom at the time I was one.

This resolution speaks of a "widespread desire" that some effort should be made by the Government. It is no exaggeration to say that there are not five men in the Liberal party who have not been returned pledged to support the recommendations of Lord Peel's Report. It has been adopted in two great speeches by their chosen Leaders in this House. As a result of the pressure of the electorate at the last election we had seventy Conservative Members returned who have formed themselves into a temperance committee. This would have been impossible in the last Parliament. Why is it possible not? Simply because they have been in touch with the constituencies, and the temperance movement has made all that difference. My right hon. friend the Home Secretary is a practical politician, and I have no doubt that it will have a great effect on his mind that what was impossible in the last session is possible this, and that seventy supporters on his own side will stand by him in any attempt he may make to bring about a practical settlement of this question. But for the war the test question of the election would have been temperance reform. Public opinion, as expressed and

formulated in this House, is in favour of drastic and immediate temperance reform, and the right hon. Gentleman and the Government need fear no opposition to any of the moderate reforms I have cited as receiving the unanimous report of the Royal Commission.

Let me say a word or two in conclusion. Let me press upon the serious attention of the Government and of the House the important conference held last week at Manchester under the presidency of the hon. Member for North West Manchester at which the following resolution was passed unanimously, and which was confirmed afterwards by two public meetings held simultaneously in the Free Trade Hall and in another of the largest halls in Manchester. The resolution adopted was:;  
"That this Conference, believing that the time has fully come for securing a substantial instalment of temperance reform, and also-believing that the recommendations contained in the Report of Lord Peel, the Chairman. I of the Royal Commission, and eight of his colleagues, would produce an immediate and beneficial effect, hereby pledges itself, without prejudice to any other scheme which may be approved by the general body of workers in the temperance movement, to strive earnestly to secure legislation on the lines of that report at the earliest possible date."

Of course, the larger covers the less. We have now the temperance party in the country practically unanimous with regard to Lord Peel's Report. All these recommendations found in the Majority Report secured the unanimous support of all those organisations which were represented at that important meeting. There were no less than seventy-five important societies embracing practically the whole temperance organisations of the United Kingdom which were represented by various delegates who had been appointed to support the resolution which I have just read to the House. It included all those extreme societies such as the

United Kingdom. Alliance; the National Temperance League, the British League, the two Societies of British Women, the United Temperance Council, the Scottish Temperance League, and the Irish Temperance League were all represented, and their delegates had distinct instructions to support the resolution. I ask the Home Secretary's special attention to the fact that the National Conservative and Unionist Temperance Association had its delegates at that meeting, and they supported the

resolution which I have read in favour of Lord Peel's Report. And now what is the attitude of the religious bodies upon this question? It is impossible for us to ignore the influence of the Church upon this question. The Church of England Temperance Society voted in favour of this resolution, and not only this but all its diocesan branches had representatives present and they also supported the resolution. If the Home Secretary takes up this question he will have the whole power of the Church of England at his back. Amongst other religious bodies who supported this resolution I may mention the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, the Catholic Total Abstinence League of the Cross; which has accomplished perhaps more than any other society; and the temperance organisations of the Church of Scotland, the Church of Ireland, the Wesleyans, the Methodists, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Unitarians, all the Presbyterians of the United Kingdom, and the Society of Friends. Therefore religion is drawn up in one line in favour of Lord Peel's Report. No body of Christian people you can name were absent from that great conference. The Licensing Committees of Westminster and Manchester, whose Bills are familiar to this House, and, in fact, the whole temperance party of the country, moderate and extreme, have joined forces on Lord Peel's Report, and if the Government have been waiting for the agreement of the temperance party, as they so often say, they have got it now. Every recommendation I have quoted forms part and parcel of Lord Peel's Report. Therefore, let the Government take heart of courage, and face this difficult and all-important problem like men.

SIR JOHN KENNAWAY (Devonshire, Honiton): I am not willing to enter into a controversy as to what is the great hindrance to temperance legislation, but I do not entirely agree with the views expressed by the hon. Member who has just spoken. Nevertheless, I desire to emphasise points of agreement and to see how far they can be worked out. A great deal of disappointment has been expressed as to the attitude of the Government, and I must confess that I was greatly disappointed at the mention of the proposed Bill in the Speech from the Throne. I was also disappointed on account of the very unfortunate attitude taken up by the Prime Minister last year in another place, and because of the unsatisfactory nature of the reply which the Home Secretary gave to a deputation which waited upon him early this year. This question has been very prominently brought to the forefront, and I cannot but hope that when the right hon.

Gentleman lays before the House his Bill we shall find a very pleasant surprise, and that many of the points emphasised today will be contained in it. I speak feelingly upon this question, for, looking back over a service of thirty years, it is a deep disappointment to think that practically nothing has been done in the way of temperance legislation. I will not say on whom the blame lies, but I

would venture to say that the cause of it has been, to my mind, because legislation has been attempted very greatly in advance of public opinion. I think we now begin to see the mistake we made then, and we are beginning to realise what a great opportunity there is before us at the present moment. It is encouraging to observe how large an amount of agreement there is in the two Reports of the Licensing Commission, for one might have thought that, constituted as the Commission was, it was a perfectly hopeless thing to obtain any agreement between them. But owing largely to the exertions of Mr. Edward Buxton, who represented the trade interests, a large amount of agreement was arrived at, and it is for us now to turn that agreement to good account and see if we cannot relieve ourselves from the reproach of allowing this evil to continue unchanged. The country expects this of us at this time, and I desire most entirely to endorse the speech made on this side by the hon. Baronet. There are several practical measures which, without, injustice to vested interests or to the spirit of fairness, can be dealt with, and which the country expects to be dealt with. There is the question of the licensing body itself, and I am strongly of opinion that that body should be a fixed body, and that there should be associated with the magistrates representatives of the rate payers. I also think that it is desirable that they should meet in the spring rather than the autumn, and also

that the Court of Appeal ought to be very much strengthened and put on a different basis. The question of new licences has been brought before us very prominently this year, and we ought to consider seriously the enormous gift which is made to the fortunate man who obtains a new licence practically at the expense of the ratepayers. I cannot see why new licences should not be put up to auction. There is another point in regard to the penalty to be inflicted on publicans who deliberately transgress again and again the law and are brought before the magistrates. The magistrates are placed in this difficulty, that in some cases the endorsement of a licence leads to the taking away of the licence altogether, and of course they hesitate very much before they take away such property altogether. It might be worth while considering whether there should not be power given to the licensing authorities, where there are repeated offences, not to take the licence away altogether but to suspend it for a time so that a lesser penalty would be inflicted which would not carry the extreme penalty of extinction. Upon this question I think we also ought to bring before the public how much might be done by the enforcement of the existing law. More ought to be done in this direction, and if my suggestion of a fixed licensing body were adopted they would make themselves more acquainted with their powers and there would be much less difficulty in the enforcement of the law. Of course we can do nothing unless we are backed up by public opinion.

I will repeat again that I believe we have a very great opportunity afforded us at the present time, and there is also a great responsibility upon us. We want as far as possible to keep this question free from all party considerations. We desire to put our statements before Parliament, and what we want to do is to strengthen the hands of the Home Secretary; who, I am sure, is with us heartily on this question; so that the right hon. Gentleman may go forward with a strong

mandate from this House and from the country to carry out necessary and useful reforms. If, however, this House were to censure the Government for not doing more, in the hope that some impossible scheme which would never be passed into law would be forthcoming, and which if it were passed into law would never be carried into effect, I feel we should have

dealt a severer blow to temperance than it has received for a very long time.

MR. DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N.W.) said it appeared to him that the point of the greatest interest to them was to see how far the words of his right hon. friend who had just sat down would be responded to by the Government, and what it was that the Government had in their minds. He observed that those who had spoken on the opposite side of the House had no more conception of what was meant by the Government proposals than hon. Members on the Opposition side. He could not help thinking that the course of the debate would have run more smoothly if the right hon. Gentleman had been able to explain in some degree what the proposal was which was indicated in His Majesty's Speech. If the measure meant that there was to be some more thorough and systematic treatment of habitual drunkenness, then his own attitude towards it would be very different. If it carried out the unanimous recommendation of the Commission that habitual drunkards were not to be supplied with drink in public-houses, then he did not think that any wiser measure, so far as it went, could be adopted. For his own part he had no desire to suggest any such revolutionary legislation as that which had been advocated in previous speeches, but he thought it had been fully recognised that there were many matters upon which they were agreed, and about which there was no serious difference of opinion, with which the Government might deal. There was agreement as to the magnitude of the problem and as to certain very substantial remedies for its solution.

With regard to the proposals contained in the Majority and the Minority Reports of the Commission, he hoped that they would not accept so low a view of the Royal Commission as to suggest that it was making a bargain with an interest. The Commissioners who put their signatures to those proposals firmly believed that they did so in the public interest, and they were prepared to stand by them in their full meaning and extent. Among the points as to which there was agreement they could not, he thought, include the question of the reduction of licences. Undoubtedly there was a nominal agreement to the effect that licences ought to be reduced in number; but, on the other hand it was admitted in both Reports that that reduction could not take effect without some measure of compensation. Compensation was an essential element in the process of reduction, and there was the widest disagreement as to the policy of compensation to be adopted. Therefore, for the purposes of a practical policy, the agreement as to the reduction of licences was nominal and verbal rather than real and substantial, and it must accordingly be excluded from the questions on which the Commissioners were agreed. On other proposals, happily, there was a greater degree of agreement, and he thought it unfortunate that those proposals should be overshadowed by the difficulties attaching to the reduction of licences and to compensation. He thought it still more unfortunate if there were to be an attempt; as had in some quarters, at all events, been read into the speech of the



right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary; to evade those other questions by what was obviously a shallow and, indeed, a preposterous suggestion that all licensing reform was strictly equivalent to a wholesale reduction of licences. He did not propose to discuss the points on which there was agreement, but he should select one, namely, the proposals with regard to the licensing authority, especially as they affected Scotland. He concurred most heartily with what had been said by the hon. Baronet, the Member for North-West Manchester, that the problem before them was in a large measure one of administration, and it was very important that there was such a large measure of agreement between the two Reports on the purely administrative aspects of the case.

He desired to call attention to a few reforms in licensing administration. In the first place, there was the important proposal that the licensing authority should be served by special licensing police; a proposal which had been recognised readily by a great section of the retail liquor trade, as well as by other sections of the community. In the next place it was proposed that the licensing authority should have larger powers over licensed premises, and over the conditions on which the sale of liquor was to be carried on. Then it was suggested that

there should be considerable reform in procedure, which would remove some of its obsolescence, and render it less likely to be abused by interested persons.

Lastly, there was that which was very important, namely, an agreement that the licensing authority should be reconstituted. That was very significant indeed.

It was proposed that every licensing, court, whether for licensing or for appeal, should consist of a definitely selected panel, and not of random people who might happen to be present. It was also proposed that in county courts there should be introduced a definite representative element, appointed, one way or the other, by the people of the district themselves. It would be impossible to over-estimate the importance of those two points in their bearing on the practical efficiency of licensing administration. He believed that if one were to sum up in a word the malady from which the licensing courts chiefly suffered, that word would be "irresponsibility." They had no definite sense of responsibility in their work, but the introduction of a selected panel, appointed by whomsoever it might be, would secure a far greater degree of responsibility and efficiency than at present. He thought it would be generally agreed, even by those who were least inclined to place power in the hands of the people, that nothing was more important, if the action of the licensing authority was to be in full harmony with the people of the neighbourhood, than that these people should have a real and effective 'voice in deciding who were to constitute the licensing court. There was indeed a slight difference in degree as to the number of persons to be elected and the number who would continue to be appointed by the Lord Lieutenants, but the important point was that it was agreed that a deliberately selected court was required and that the opinion of the district concerned should play an effective and official part in the work of licensing. It was a proposal which would involve no question of compensation, no injustice and no fresh machinery, which was perhaps one of its main recommendations. If the Government refused to consider that and other

simple and plain proposals, many would be driven to the conclusion that their minds were fixed against serious reform. For his part he would be very slow to form such an opinion, but no other conclusion could square with the facts if things were allowed to go on as they had been going on. It was certainly somewhat disappointing to those interested in the question to be told, in the first place that the problem of intemperance really belonged to the problem of housing, and then to find that even that problem was not to be dealt with. No duty lay nearer to the hands of the Government than that of temperance reform, in view of the good forces that were at work in society in that direction.

MR. RANGLES (Cumberland, Cockermouth): I desire to associate myself with the appeal of my hon. friend the Member for North-West Manchester, who urged on the Government that they should have regard to the moderate and reasonable requests of their own supporters. I have come myself from a part of the country where the question of temperance reform has been discussed by the most extreme men, and, although I believe there is very little sympathy with these extreme men, I find there is a decided general undercurrent of desire for such temperance reform, both administrative and legislative, as will enable the people of this country to live more soberly and in a more temperate manner, and make it casier for them so to do. We are listening to more moderate proposals and counsels. The old days when we should have the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill, are gone past, and reasonable measures of reform in accord with public opinion will be acceptable to all parties. I have no hope of seeing any reform from the other side of the House, and therefore I trust the Government will be able to do something that will satisfy the reasonable expectations of the people. The mover of the Amendment referred to the time when his party would be in power. They may conceivably be in power in days to come, but oven if they are is it reasonable to suppose that they will ever be able to introduce and carry through a measure which will satisfy their own supporters, let alone Members on this side of the House? I would ask the Government to have regard to the requests of their own supporters and to public opinion in the country, and to introduce from time to time such measures as are to be found both in the Majority and the Minority Reports of the Royal Commission. I believe that while Parliament is young it will be much easier to accomplish these reforms, because we all know how easily people are turned away from their good intentions.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I think the House would like to hear now what I have to say on behalf of the Government with regard to the proposals made in this debate. The hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment referred to some remarks which I made in connection with this matter to a deputation which waited on me not very long ago to urge on me the necessity for legislation in accordance with the Majority Report of the Royal Commission, and he referred to expressions which I used in connection with an evil which all of us recognise and all of us deplore. I have nothing whatever to retract from what I then said as to the evils of drunkenness and the unhappy consequences with which the country is confronted. I believe it is difficult to exaggerate the enormous evils which follow in the wake of drunkenness. I have always felt that these evils were so great that some effort

ought to be made to deal with them in one way or another. I have always been profoundly impressed with the crimes which result from overindulgence in drink, and with its effect upon the health and strength and manhood of the country; and no one, even if he had not previously held those views in regard to the extent and danger of this evil, could have been at the Home Office, even for the short time during which I have filled the position of Secretary of State, without becoming firmly convinced that much of the crime which we have to deplore is caused by drunkenness. The great majority of the crimes which come before me at the Home Office in connection with violence to the person have been traced to drunkenness. I am afraid that many of the men who have to expiate their crimes upon the scaffold have been led, very largely at any rate, to their ruin by over-indulgence in drink. So that, even if I were not impressed before with the evils which follow from drink, I certainly could not shut my eyes to the knowledge which I have obtained during my short connection with the Home Office, and I am sure that my experience of the terrible results of drunkenness has been shared in by every gentleman who has filled the office. SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): Hear, hear.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I have, therefore, nothing to withdraw from the observations which I addressed to the deputation in connection with this question. But there has been some misconception; I think, perhaps, it was a natural misconception; as to the attitude I took up upon the question of reform, in consequence of the answer I gave to the deputation. The deputation came to me to ask that the Government should undertake a very large measure of licensing reform based upon the Majority Report of the Royal Commission. That, of course, at once raised the question which originally led to the abandonment by the Government of which I was a member of their licensing proposals of 1888 and 1890. Having regard to the difficulties we encountered then, I was most unwilling to give the deputation any encouragement to believe that we would attempt to deal with this matter in the manner suggested by the deputation; and, although it is true that one or two other reforms which have been included in those alluded to in this debate were referred to by some speakers at the deputation, the main object of the deputation was to ask for legislation on the basis of the Majority Report; the extinction of licences together with compensation, as recommended by the Majority; and my reply was directed entirely to that particular proposal. But though I said nothing, I think, in reference to the other recommendations, I should be sorry were the House or the country to imagine that by my silence I meant it to be inferred that the Government were to shut their eyes to those recommendations and were not in any circumstances to make proposals to the House in regard to them.

The hon. Member who moved this Amendment accused the Government, in the first part of his speech, which I think was much more aggressive than the latter part, of indifference and inaction. The Government, as at present constituted, has not had very much opportunity for action in the matter. The hon. Gentleman chose to assume that the words in the King's Speech, in reference to the matter, were words which implied that nothing was to be done of the smallest value or importance. I think that was the opinion

also expressed by the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I said it pointed to some police measure.

\*MR. RITCHIE: The right hon. Gentleman with a wave of his hand said he presumed it was some small police measure.

SIR H. CAMPBELL BANNERMAN: That was my impression.

\*MR. RITCHIE: At any rate, the course pursued by the hon. Gentleman in moving this Amendment and accusing us of in action is a somewhat exceptional mode of dealing with a question referred to in the Gracious Speech from the Throne. I can quite understand that if no reference was made in the Speech to action on our part it would have been right to find fault with it; but I think we have some right to ask the House, before judging us, to allow us to make our proposals; and I would point out that if the Amendment were carried we should be deprived of the opportunity which we seek of putting our proposals before the House.

Upon what basis does the hon. Gentle man go when he speaks of our indifference in this matter? The party to which I belong, and myself in particular, have always shown in past years some anxiety to deal, and deal in a large way, with this question of intemperance. The hon. Gentleman referred to our proposals in 1888 and 1890, and I do not think I am doing him an injustice when I say that he treated them with contempt. I am very sorry to have to trouble the House with particulars of past proposals for legislation, but as I am sure that there are many hon. Gentlemen, and perhaps

some hon. Gentlemen who are interested in temperance reform, who are not acquainted with these proposals, I am not disposed to allow the matter to rest in the position to which the hon. Member relegated it, and therefore I should like to indicate briefly some of the points of our proposals in 1888 with the view of showing what the position would have been had we succeeded in carrying them out. We first proposed to constitute an entirely new licensing authority. The proposals in both the Minority and Majority Reports of the Commission do not go nearly so far as our proposals in 1888. The Minority proposal is that a certain number of the licensing authority should consist of local representatives; the Majority proposal is that a smaller number should be local representatives. But in our Bill of 1888 we proposed that the whole licensing authority should be composed of local representatives; and we further proposed, in order to bring local opinion to bear upon the granting of licences, that there should be licensing areas marked out in the various counties, and that the members who were returned on the county councils for those areas should constitute at least one-half of the authority granting licences in that district, so that local opinion should be brought to judge as to the desirability or otherwise of the licences which were applied for. We also proposed to give the licensing authority full power with regard to Sunday closing. They could have closed for the whole of Sunday if they chose or have altered the hours of opening at their discretion. We gave to the new licensing authorities full power of diminishing licences on payment of compensation, which was to be raised out of the trade itself by extra licence duty upon licence

holders. It has been said that this would have destroyed the power which it is alleged the justices now possess of refusing to renew licences. Every power the justices had was carefully preserved by the words of the Bill, and I expressed my willingness to make these words still stronger if it was thought by temperance reformers that they were not sufficiently strong. If our Bill had been carried and any person had applied to the justices that a particular licence should not be renewed, and if they said it ought not to be renewed, they, would be practically an instruction to the licensing authority. These were our proposals, and I venture to say that, looking back upon them now, many of those who at that time were most strenuous in opposition to our proposals;

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Not to those proposals, but to compensation.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I beg pardon; that compensation was to have been paid out of a fund provided by the licensing duties.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: What I mean is that there was no desire to oppose those proposals; on the contrary, there was a great desire that the Government should go on with them, but they would not do so unless their compensation proposals were carried also. These things had nothing to do with compensation.

\*MR. RITCHIE: What? Now, let us see. It is alleged that the justices have power to refuse licences without any reason given. As a matter of fact, that is well known by the case of *Sharp v. Wakefield* in the appeal to the House of Lords. It was then laid down that the justices must exercise their discretion with regard to the particular case which came before them. By altering the licensing authority, by taking from the justices and giving the power to the local representatives, we entirely altered the whole position; and in giving full and explicit powers to the new licensing authorities to refuse whatever licences they chose, it would have been monstrous unless we also provided that the holders of valuable licences should be compensated if they were taken away without good reason. I tell the right hon. Gentleman and licensing reformers generally that I do not believe myself that there is the smallest chance of getting the public of this country to commit such an act of gross injustice as would be entailed by carrying out these extinctions of the existing licences without taking into consideration the question of compensation. What has been done by the refusal to adopt our proposals of 1888? Millions of money have been left in the pockets of licence-holders which would have been available for the extinction of licences;

and so, in 1890, when we again attempted to deal with this question, we proposed to give to the liquor authorities £750,000 (I think) annually without raising any question of compensation at all, for the purpose of enabling them if they chose to do what is done by every local authority every year for public improvement and other matters of that kind; to buy up public-houses if they thought they were not required and ought to be extinguished. We proposed to give them that money out of the revenues derived from the liquors sold, and that proposal was also rejected by the House.

We have thus made two clear and distinct proposals, one of which, the right hon. Gentleman acknowledges, would have been a broad and liberal and well-thought-out

plan, and that was rejected because of the refusal of temperance reformers to accept the principle of compensation, though they must now acknowledge that it would have effected a most salutary and important reform. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment has stated that the number of public-houses which would have been extinguished by the money which we proposed to raise in 1888 would not have been as many as have as a matter of fact been extinguished without it. Does the hon. Member mean that the number that have been extinguished in the ordinary course of things would not have been extinguished in addition to those which our money would have bought out?

\*MR. WHITTAKER (Yorkshire, W.R., Spenn Valley): Certainly they would not.

\*MR. RITCHIE: Why, what is the evidence before the Commission as to the reasons why this reduction has taken place? I will undertake to say that the great bulk of the licences have been reduced because of the refusal of the justices to give new licences without the abandonment of old ones. That is the main reason of the reduction. Of course, there have been reductions from other causes; such as faults on the part of licence-holders, which would have occurred in any case; then houses have not succeeded, and the licences have not been renewed, the fees not having been paid, and so on. But a great number of those that have fallen have fallen in consequence of the action of the justices in not giving new licences unless others are surrendered. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] I think that was proved by the evidence before the Commission. Does the hon. Member think that the new authority which we proposed to constitute under the Bill of 1888 would have been more tender to the licence-holders than the justices? On the contrary, I believe the number of licences which would have been reduced from the same cause would have been greater and not less; but, in addition to that, you would have had those other licences extinguished and compensation paid out of the money which is now left in the pockets of the licence-holders. When the hon. Member stigmatises our proposals of 1888 as insufficient and inefficient he admits his ignorance of what the effect of them was likely to be. My opinion is that the country will have to wait a very long time before they have put before them such a complete scheme of licensing reform calculated to do such an amount of good as that which we then proposed. The hon. Member in his speech also referred to the effect of the reduction of licences. Well, now, it is quite true I told the deputation that I thought they were somewhat exaggerating the effect of the reduction of licences as regards the consumption of liquor. I never denied, however, that a reduction was desirable. There are in point of fact a preposterous number of licences in many districts, and I think that a large reduction in the number of licences is most desirable; but, at the same time, I do not myself believe that it necessarily means less drinking; and that is not my opinion only. In the Report of the Majority of the Commissioners this statement is made, which I repeat now. On page 6 I find the following under chapter IV.;

"EXCESSIVE NUMBER OF LICENSED HOUSES AND ITS EFFECT.

"If the statement made in vol. v., p. 31, under the heading 'Ratio of all licensed premises to population' is studied in connection with Map iv. here inserted ('Drunkennes': Judicial Statistics, 1893, signed by Mr. C. Troup

of the Home Office, a witness before us), it is seen at a glance that there is apparently no relation between the number of licences and the amount of drunkenness."

On page 7 of the Report they give statistics of two groups of counties marked A and B. In group A they state the average licences as one to a population of 164, and the average drunkenness as 492 to a population of 100,000. In group B the average licences are one to a population of 276, and the average drunkenness 892 to a population of 100,000.

\*MR. WHITTAKER: And yet they recommend a reduction?

\*MR. RITCHIE: Certainly. But the statistics cannot be denied; and the figures seem to be as I have stated them.

\*MR. WHITTAKER: I deny not the figures, but the inference drawn from them.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I am in agreement as to the desirability of diminishing the number of licences, but I say you must not rely upon that reduction of licences as affecting very largely the quantity of liquor consumed.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): Will the right hon. Gentleman give the counties?

\*MR. RITCHIE: Certainly. Group A includes Buckinghamshire, Bedfordshire, Cambridgeshire, Isle of Ely, Hertfordshire, Huntingdonshire, Shropshire, and Staffordshire. Group B comprises Cheshire, Cornwall, Devonshire, Durham, Northumberland, Lancashire, and Glamorgan. I would make one further quotation from the addendum to the Report by the hon. Member himself. It is as follows; "While there can be no doubt that reductions in the number of public-houses and more stringent regulation of those which remain would be beneficial and would promote sobriety, Mr. Gladstone was giving expression to an important truth when he said, 'Mere reduction in numbers if it pretend to the dignity of a remedy is little better than an imposture.' Reduction in number is not a remedy. It is at best but a palliative."

That is the position I take up. The hon. Member dealt with some figures of the consumption of drink which I gave to the deputation, and quite unintentionally, I think, misunderstood or misquoted what I said. He gave some statistics which seemed to be antagonistic to those which I gave. The hon. Member says I tried to draw a comparison between the amount of liquor consumed twenty-five years ago and the amount consumed now. The hon. Member says that I was wrong in the comparison I made. Now he took thirty years, and I took twenty-five.

\*MR. WHITTAKER: I took from 1874 to 1899.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I beg pardon; I have by mistake transposed the figures; it was I who took thirty years and the hon. Member who took twenty-five years; and in order to draw his comparison he began with 1874; a year of great inflation. There can be no doubt that the comparison from 1874 to 1899 established the hon. Gentleman's contention; but if we take the period since that time what do we find? We find that (reducing the quantities to a basis of proof spirit) there has been an increase from 3,877 gallons of proof spirit consumed per head on an average, in the five years 1886 to 1890 to 4,351 in 1898, an increase of about 10 per cent, in the consumption of liquor, although the number of licensed houses has been greatly reduced. That is another proof of my

contention that the reduction in licences does not necessarily mean reduction in the consumption of drink.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Then why advocate a reduction?

\*MR. RITCHIE: Because I consider there are far more than are required for the convenience of the public. I am not dogmatising, and I am not expressing my own view as to the result. I am quoting actual figures which cannot be contested, and they show clearly that, notwithstanding the large reduction which has taken place in licences during the last few years, the consumption per head of liquor has increased. The hon. Member in his Amendment asks the House to say that our proposals are inadequate. Of course I know the hon. Member's view of inadequacy, because he has expressed it more than once. He addressed an Alliance meeting at the end of last year at which a resolution was proposed stating that the only adequate means of dealing with this drink question was the total suppression of licences; absolute prohibition. That is the hon. Member's position, and when he speaks about our proposals not being adequate it is well that the House should understand what in the opinion of the hon. Member is adequacy. His proposal as defined by himself was "our aim and object are to suppress the liquor trade."

\*MR. WHITTAKER: I am not putting that forward now in connection with this Amendment.

\*MR. RITCHIE: No; but the hon. Member goes to a public meeting called for the purpose of considering temperance legislation, and he proposes a resolution stating that the aim and object of the Alliance and of himself are to suppress the liquor trade. That is what he wants to impose on the country; and although he is now proposing more moderate measures, we also know that he is not proposing anything like a settlement of this question, but that he is putting forward a stepping-stone to obtain that which he desires; namely, total prohibition.

\*MR. WHITTAKER: Am I to understand that the right hon. Gentleman condemns me for being willing to go by stages?

\*MR. RITCHIE: No, not at all; I am only pointing out to those hon. Members who are likely to be misled by the moderate proposals of the hon. Gentleman that the proposals he makes to them are but a stepping-stone to total prohibition. If it were necessary I should have no difficulty in pointing out to the House that wherever prohibition has been tried, as it has been tried in the United States, it has been a total and absolute failure in all the towns and cities where it has been applied. Let me commend to the hon. Member the study of a most valuable book by Messrs. Rowntree and Sherwell, who have made the most minute inquiries into all the various phases of the temperance question and proposals for legislation, and have done so with an earnest desire to find a solution. They tell us that what the hon. Member proposed has been tried, and it was found to be a gigantic failure in the United States.

\*MR. WHITTAKER: And they recommend its adoption here.

\*MR. RITCHIE: No, they do nothing of the kind

\*MR. WHITTAKER: They do.

\*MR. RITCHIE: They say;



"It has been established that, judged by the most elementary and practical tests; the tests of drunkenness; prohibition in the towns and cities has conspicuously failed. Not only is there indisputable evidence that drunkenness is widely prevalent, but official statistics show that it is relatively greater in the towns and cities of the prohibition States than in non-prohibition States situated in the same geographical division.&#x2026;The absolute significance of the figures is too serious to be ignored.&#x2026; The law so far from increasing the purity of civic life has been productive of serious and widespread demoralisation."

\*MR. WHITTAKER: The authors recommend the adoption in this country of the enactment of Local Veto.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I absolutely deny that is so.

\*MR. WHITTAKER: You will find it in the book.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Read the whole book.

\*MR. RITCHIE: Let us consider the more practical point of the appeal made to the Government as to what they propose to do. It has been suggested by some that we should adopt the recommendations of the Minority, or Lord Peel's, Report. It is a singular thing, I think it is almost unprecedented, that the Government should be asked to legislate on the Minority Report and to ignore the Majority Report. But when we come to the Minority Report what do we find? The Minority Report is signed by nine Commissioners, and seven of them think it necessary to add a memorandum. Five of them say that what they want is not simply what is in the Minority Report, but they want Local Veto; and two of them say they will agree to anything rather than Local Veto; and two of them are utterly opposed to the com-

pensation proposals of the Minority, which they think absolutely indefensible. So that even the Minority Report does not come before the House as the basis of legislation with very much authority. Some reformers desire to legislate on the basis of the Majority Report. I have sufficiently indicated that the Government cannot proceed generally with the proposals in that Report.

But it is said, "Why do you not take those points which are points of agreement?"

"It is a very plausible statement; and I hope that I shall be able to say something on that subject which may prove more or less satisfactory to hon. Members. The question is; What are the points of so-called agreement? I refer to a circular issued by the National Union for the Suppression of Intemperance. Among the several points which they say are points of agreement they include a demand that the number of licensed houses should be largely reduced. That is a most startling pronouncement. It is not very frank, I think, to state that this is a point of agreement. It is true that both Reports agree; as we all agree; that the number of licensed houses should be reduced, but when one comes to consider terms we find that they are not at all agreed. While one proposes to give a ridiculously inadequate degree of compensation, the other proposes to give much fuller and what I think would probably be a juster measure of compensation. Take again the proposal that the sale of intoxicating liquor to children under sixteen should be forbidden under penalties. Both Reports agree as to the desirableness of doing this; but the Majority Report says it may not

be done unless there is a strong force of public opinion in its favour. I frankly admit that, as far as I am personally concerned, I am in favour of the proposal, and I have always expressed that view with regard to it; but I see most enormous difficulties, as the majority of the Commission do, in carrying it into law. I do not think a proposal of this kind introduced in a general Bill dealing with the question of reform would be at all likely to help us to pass the other proposals which had been suggested. Indeed, I think there would be a general

consensus of opinion that, so far, as that particular recommendation of the Commission is concerned, however desirable it may be to deal with it, the Government perhaps would act wisely if they dealt with some of the other questions rather than attempt to bring such controversial points as these into any measure of general legislation.

Well now, it is feared that the words in His Majesty's Speech are words which imply only a very small and insignificant measure. Of course, the House will understand that it is quite impossible for me to take up one by one the points which have been referred to in the course of the debate, and to say whether they will or will not be included in any Government measure. We must reserve to ourselves the liberty of explaining our proposals when we place them before the House in the shape of a Bill, and it would be impossible for me to deal with them point by point in a discussion on the King's Speech. But those who imagine that it is merely what some Gentlemen call a "chucking-out Bill" are quite mistaken as to the scope of the Bill. The hon. Member for North-West Lanarkshire put to me a specific question upon this point. He said that he for one would be delighted to accept the Bill if he thought that it was likely to deal with habitual drunkenness. Well, that is one of the recommendations of the Commission which certainly will be found in the Bill. No one who has had to study the evidence which is given of offences committed against the person can fail to see that a great deal of the evil is caused by people who go about from house to house in a more or less intoxicated state, until they get into a condition almost of frenzy, when they are hardly responsible for what they do. These people may have been convicted half-a-dozen times, and yet they are supplied with drink. I think it is at great offence for a publican to supply a man with more drink if he is in a state of intoxication. I do not think that the law is sufficiently strong against offences of that kind, and I hope we shall make it stronger, and I also hope that we shall be able to provide that where a man has been convicted again and again that man's name shall be put upon a list which shall be sent to the taverns

and public-houses which he is known to frequent, and that a licence-holder who supplies him under those circumstances shall be liable to a special penalty.

[Some Opposition laughter.] That is one of the recommendations of the Commission, and I do not know why right hon. Gentlemen laugh. Many points have been referred to in connection with the construction of the premises of licence-holders, and with what has been called the "back-door service" of drink.

Suggestions have been made by the Commission that the licensing authorities should have special officers to keep them informed of the manner in which houses

are conducted. All these matters may fairly be expected to find a place in the measure we propose to introduce; but there are also many other points in addition with which we hope to deal, and which will, I think, have a very considerable influence on drunkenness.

I am afraid that I can only assure the House that it is the intention of the Government not to confine the measure to the mere "chucking-out" proposals which have been suggested, but to deal in a large and liberal manner with many of the proposals which have been made in common by the two Reports. I think I may fairly ask the House to be content with that assurance on my part, and enable the Government to submit to the House in the usual form the proposals they have to make. I am quite aware, and the Government are quite aware, of the keen interest which is taken in the question of temperance on the other side of the House and on our own side; and I realise that it would be impossible for the Government to ignore the feeling which undoubtedly does exist with regard to these matters. We are not asked to deal with the great burning question of compensation; we are not asked to deal with any general reduction of licences; but we are asked to deal with some of those measures which have been agreed to by both Reports. If we were to include all these joint proposals in one Bill, as suggested by hon. Gentlemen opposite, I am afraid that it would assume such dimensions as would make it extremely difficult to pass. I agree with those who have said, on both sides of the House, that it is a mistake to crowd too much into

one Bill, that it is best to try to arrive at the goal step by step, and that it is desirable to proceed by stages. Such a proceeding, in my view, is much more likely to lead in the end to satisfactory legislation than for the Government to attempt in one measure to deal with all those numerous and very important proposals which find place in both Reports. I hope I have said enough to show that we do not intend to evade the questions which have been brought before the country in the recommendations of the Commission, and I believe that we shall be able to produce a measure which will command general support, and prove that the Government are quite alive to the responsibility cast upon them in regard to this matter.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman was occupied during his speech with two duties. He had first of all to explain and account for the action of the Government in the past, and then he had to give us some insight into the proposed action of the Government in the future. Let me say just now with regard to the Bill which is mentioned in the King's Speech, that I think the right hon. Gentleman cannot find much fault with us, or with me, for instance, who have been singled out specially, for having concluded that it was a somewhat limited police measure, because what he now represents to us is a Bill which may include a great many objects which are common to the two lines of opinion in the Reports of the Royal Commission; to that large list of thirty or forty subjects of which we have heard so much in the course of the debate. But what is the title of the Bill which is hypothetically promised, if time and circumstances permit its being introduced? It is "A Bill for the prevention of drunkenness in licensed houses and public places." Well, I think the right hon.

Gentleman will have some difficulty in reading into a Bill with that limited title many of the reforms which his hon. friends behind him have been impressing upon him. But the right hon. Gentleman was mainly occupied with explaining why it was the Government have not taken any action on this important subject hitherto. He shares to the full our appreciation of the fruitful evils created by drunkenness in the country; and, no doubt with perfect sincerity, he expresses the greatest desire to see them checked. But the Government have been in power for five or six years and have done nothing to check them. Indeed, in one sentence the right hon. Gentleman drew a little distinction between this Government and that which existed before the General Election. I do not know whether we have heard it often before; but he spoke of the Government "as at present constituted." Are we to treat this Government; the question has been asked before; as the same as the last Government, or as a new Government? But, seeing a certain continuity of faces on that bench, we are obliged to believe that the new Government is practically the same as the Government which we have had in office during the last five years. Well, during the five years nothing was done, although there was abundant opportunity; at any rate, an abundant field for action was provided by the inquiry which has taken place. I venture to say that there is no subject of equal importance on which public opinion is so well instructed as upon this subject of licensing. We have had a Royal Commission, which sat for three years, and which reported in eleven volumes with its evidence; and we have also had other inquiries conducted by private persons from philanthropic motives, I such as that to which the right hon. Gentleman referred, by Mr. Rowntree and others. Therefore we are fully instructed and informed; and, while the very largeness and complexity of the subject may make it difficult to deal with comprehensively in one measure, yet there have been exposed to us a large number of subsidiary and contributory causes of the evil with which, surely, it would be possible for us to deal separately or in smaller groups.

But the right hon. Gentleman is not alone in speaking upon this subject and in dealing with it. The right hon. Gentleman, when he met a deputation not long ago, certainly created the impression in all our minds that he was so overwhelmed by the difficulties put in his way by the great problem of compensation and reduction that he shrank from opening the subject at all; and he emphasised that attitude of his by telling the deputation that after all it was not the most important matter, that the question of housing was the key to the condition of the classes of the community with whom we are dealing, and that this question of licensing was comparatively a secondary matter.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I did not say that.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Well, that the other was the most important. But the right hon. Gentleman has not been alone. We cannot forget an episode in another place last year of a singular character. The Prime Minister was then assailed with great zeal, but, as I need not say, in a most reasonable manner, by the Bench of Bishops, or by a certain number of the Bench of Bishops, and all that Lord Salisbury could say on that occasion was that it was necessary to proceed

with the greatest care and circumspection and to avoid anything like haste and precipitancy. This, too, after three years of inquiry and eleven volumes of evidence and five or six years of delay altogether.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley): The Report was only issued in 1899.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: But surely the Government were thinking while the Commission was inquiring. I cannot imagine them putting aside the question altogether until they had the Report in their hands. Lord Salisbury, however, would not listen to the persuasions and arguments of the Bishops, "charm they never so wisely." I think it is worth while recalling the remarkable duel that took place between the Prime Minister and the Archbishop; between Church and State. The State taunted the Church with a want of confidence in the Government in bringing forward their very mild and unobtrusive motion. The Church protested that it retained its full confidence. Where upon the head of the State retorted upon the head of the Church; "The most reverend Prelate may most kindly say what he likes; what I care for is what he does."

And this frank declaration was received by the most reverend Prelate with a meekness which we cannot but all admire. We had almost a repetition of the same thing last night, when the hon. Member for North-West Manchester said that he and his friends, who constitute so large a section of the party opposite, were disposed to be perfectly reasonable, but if they were not properly received by the Government they would become unreasonable. For my part, if I compare the two, I have greater faith in the layman than in the Churchman, because, in the case of the Churchman ecclesiastical pride must yield to that doctrine of submission and humility which right reverend Prelates preach in the exercise of their duties, whereas the layman in this House is always stimulated and confirmed in his action by his knowledge of the feelings of the community, and especially of the feeling among the electors. I think, therefore, that on the whole we are likely to have more effect made by remonstrances from Members of this House than by all the Bishops on the Bench. Indeed, I think we have seen in the proceedings of to-day the effect of those remonstrances.

Let me say that, so far as I am concerned, I am one of those who, from the very first time I took any public part in this question either by voice or vote, have always supported giving the control of licensing to the inhabitants of the district. It matters comparatively little what your machinery or what the method may be for ascertaining that opinion; the great object is to have that principle recognised. And on two grounds. First, because the inhabitants are the men who are best acquainted with local circumstances, and are most likely to be either benefited or disadvantaged by the results of the licensing system: and, in the second place, because you get upon a sound and solid basis of principle; namely, popular control; which gives you something to stand upon, and may lead to a final settlement. No one can fail to see that a settlement on that extreme ground will be difficult of accomplishment. I am not going to enter upon the controversy about compensation, which the right hon. Gentleman has been discussing and with which my hon. friend behind me dealt last night with great moderation and in a

very reasonable spirit, because that is really beyond the scope of the Amendment. Our object is to leave that question aside, and, while inviting the Government to do nothing which may compromise the future or prejudice future reforms of a more complicated and difficult kind, to urge them at all events now to set themselves to carry out such reforms as may be generally approved of. There may be a subject standing by itself on which all sections of opinion may agree. I can imagine many great questions exercising the public mind where a small step may compromise action in the future. Take for instance the whole course of proceeding in regard to the franchise. It might at any time be said that if some small concession were made, it would not be final, but would point inevitably to greater concessions in the future. But these matters, which have been brought so clearly before the House over and over again by hon. Members on both sides, are succinctly set forth in the recommendations of those two Reports; each one of them standing by itself, each independent of the other, compromising nothing beyond their own scope, each of them at the same time capable of effecting a large amount of good. Take the whole question of the licensing authorities and the checks to the licensing authorities and all these other existing provisions of the law, which, according to the moderate representations made to us last night, amounts to a scandal in the present administration of this branch of public duty.

There is another point, I think, which may be pressed strongly, and that is the necessity of greater strictness in the administration of the law as it stands and greater authority and encouragement being given to the police. We are apt to say that the police do not exercise their powers and do not report occurrences which they ought to report. But the police act according to the spirit with which they are inspired by those who employ them. There is a department of the question, standing entirely by itself, to which, I think, at all events some attention might be paid. If those of us who have larger ideas; perhaps what may be called more extreme ideas, who seek more extreme reforms, are willing not to raise the questions connected with them, but to accept and cordially support more moderate but practical reforms, provided, of course, we are not prejudiced for the future, then I think that spirit ought to be met by a willingness on the part of those who dislike those larger reforms to effect those changes which in no degree compromise them. That those changes which have been advocated during this debate would be beneficial is admitted by all friends, not of temperance merely, but of decency and propriety in the provisions and practice of the law; and I trust the right hon. Gentleman will be able to put a little more into his Bill than he has foreshadowed. If he had been able to say that we had altogether mistaken the scope of his Bill, and that it would be such a Bill as would include a great many of those topics to which reference has been made by friends on both sides of the House, then the object of this Amendment would have been gained. But if the right hon. Gentleman confines his Bill to the one question of "drunkenness in licensed houses or public places," as expressed in the King's Speech, I am afraid that in these circumstances we cannot accept his answer as at all satisfactory; and it will be necessary to protest, therefore, by this Amendment

against any further indifference to an evil which eats deeper and closer into the life of our people than any other that Parliament can deal with, and to invite the Government, if possible, to extend their proposed Bill so as to include those reforms which have been advocated by the Royal Commission, by both sides of opinion upon it, and by both sides of the House.

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton): I confess that at the beginning of the speech of my right hon. friend we were very much afraid that the Government did not intend to satisfy the wishes of many Members on this side of the House. But as he proceeded I admit that my hopes were raised, although I do not know that they have been very much raised. I believe that there is an open door, but the door is not open very far yet. I must confess that when I saw those words in His Majesty's gracious Speech from the Throne I was very much disappointed. A great number of Unionist Members in the House before the end of the year signified to the Government very strongly, and in a very plain manner, that they thought the time was now ripe for a reform of the licensing laws. The hon. Member for North-West Lanarkshire complimented hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House on what he was pleased to call our subserviency to our leaders. If he meant by subserviency discipline and the expediency of giving support in good faith to our leaders, and obedience to their orders, then it exists on this side of the House. But, after all, there is a strong feeling; a very strong feeling; on this side of the House, that although discipline may count for much, and may stand almost for anything, so far as we are concerned, still, to disappoint enthusiastic and faithful followers in the country does not seem to me to be true policy.

I will not go largely into the matter, or weary the House, but I may say that in my opinion there was never a moment more ripe for legislation on a subject that at once is not new and is complicated. The present licensing laws are confusing and contradictory, and the licensing authorities all over the country are beset with the utmost difficulty in the discharge of their duties in the administration of these laws. I do not care at the present time about compensation, but what I do care about is that the licensing authority should have full power over licensing matters; full power over licensed premises wherever alcoholic liquor is sold. When the chairman of a licensing authority comes to discharge his duty he is often placed in the most difficult and absurd position. I recall one instance in particular. From a place close to a fully-licensed public-house, in regard to which the licensing authority have full power, there came an application to the licensing authority for an off-licence. The premises were poor and small; they were within twenty yards of the public-house; but they did not come within that line within which the magistrates could refuse at once to grant it, although they were so near the line as to make it a matter for discussion as to whether the licence could be granted or not. Other public-houses were also near. The licensing authority, of which I was a member, refused the licence. We thought it was a most improper application, and we refused the licence, being of opinion that it was against the public interest. We were threatened by lawyers, who came specially to the court for that purpose, that if we refused to grant

the licence they would apply for a mandamus against us to show cause why we should not grant it. Nevertheless, we refused it; we considered it our duty to refuse to grant it. About six weeks or two months afterwards we had to go into court, and by order of the judge we had to grant that licence, and, in my opinion, in that case the law ordered us to do a thing which was wrong. That is a case which shows the absurdity of the position in which the licensing authorities are placed. I think every licence should be under the same authority, and should be granted under the same conditions. Is it fair to the publican, to the trade, that these little bits of places should be able to set themselves up anywhere without the approval of the licensing authority? Then there are other matters before the House. It appears to me that the two things which His Majesty's Government ought to place in their Bill, and which they will settle by legislation this session, I hope, are the question of the position of all the licences under the licensing authority, and that the licensing authority; so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly content that the present authority should continue; should be enabled to deal properly and thoroughly with all the licences. I don't believe that the Government will ever have a better chance, or that this House will ever have a better chance for many years, to give to the country a very good instalment of licensing reform. Everybody is ready for it, and it only wants putting into a Bill. But I hope the idea

of a mere police measure, or a small thing, will be done away with altogether, and the proper placing in possession of the licensing authority of right, reasonable and proper powers, and the reform of the licensing laws, will be the first part of the Government Bill. If any other smaller matter can be put in, by all means let it be done.

MR. BELL (Derby): I rise to make what may be termed my maiden speech in this House. In point of time my speech shall be young, and I hope in point of observation it shall be fair. I did not intend at all to intervene in this debate until it was alleged by the hon. Member for South Leitrim that this reform was not required by the industrial classes. I want to refute that. I think that where hon. Members representing Ireland have not done justice to those who are endeavouring to improve the condition of the workers in this part of the country; the hon. Member certainly did not do so; is that they do not give credit to those of us who advocate some reform on temperance lines in the interest of the working classes. I know something of the workers in this country, and I know something of the workers in Ireland, and just previous to the passing of the new Local Government Act for Ireland I was in several towns in that country, and I am bound to say that, deplorable as was the condition which the hon. Member says he saw in a village in the north of England, I saw some centres in Ireland as bad or worse. So far as the workers of Ireland are concerned, the wages are very far below what they ought to be and what a man ought to receive, and in the interest of the workers of Ireland, as well as of England, some reform should be inaugurated, that this evil might be done away with.

I do not think hon. Members have quite appreciated the position of those who



have over-indulged in the habit of taking intoxicating liquor; and the curse is that we find that many of our best workmen are the men who have fallen in consequence of over-indulgence of the liquor habit. Employers tell us, and I say also, that the workmen who over-indulge, and who lose most of their time, are the best workmen. There are a large number of workers in this country who are perhaps unable to control themselves in this respect, and there are men who have told me time after time that they cannot resist the temptation, and that they wish that something might be done to remove the evil out of their way. Therefore I claim that it is the duty of this House, irrespective of party, to pass legislation to reform this evil, and make things better. I have been to the large provincial towns in this country, and what do I find? In Manchester, for instance, they have common urinals open to the street; and I hope the Home Secretary will not overlook this in his Bill; and it does not tend to improve the morality of a town to find men half intoxicated and half exposed at these places owing to their over-indulgence in drink.

In many of the constituencies sending representatives to this House we find a large proportion of working men electors, and for working men not actually temperance men the possibility of any reform that might remove from them entirely the opportunity of their getting their glass of beer would be unwelcome, but I do not think that any man would be so extreme as to desire to deprive a man of the opportunity of having a glass of beer if he requires it. What I desire to see is some Bill introduced by the right hon. Gentleman which will, without being extreme, not be in any way too moderate. I hope he will introduce a Bill containing more clauses than those he foreshadows. Then we can call the Bill a moderate one. It is in that hope that I have approached the House with these few observations, and now, as the voice of the workers has been joined with that of the employers, all classes, all sections of the community are almost unanimously of opinion that we want legislation which is likely to advance the temperance cause. I do not know what may be the opinion of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, but I do not see how we could advance the cause in any way by bringing the House to a division on this matter, but having had the promise of the Home Secretary, I think we may trust to him on this occasion and may be content to wait and see whether the Bill he proposes to introduce will be one worthy of consideration.

I do not wish to detain the House with any further observations. I merely wished to associate myself with the Amendment in order that it might not be said in the future that it was simply the employers who desired to see temperance reform. MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.): I am one of a great many upon this side of the House who have been trying to make our voices heard to strengthen the hands of the Home Secretary in his contemplation of the proposed Bill, and I must admit I am disappointed at the very vague and shadowy promises which he has made. Not only is the proposed measure very much what we were afraid it would be from the King's Speech, but we find we cannot draw from the right hon. Gentleman's remarks any assurance that the Bill will be introduced at all. I am

ready to believe that the right hon. Gentleman desires to introduce it, and I hope I do not misjudge him when I say he hopes to bring in an extended Bill, but his defence this morning was very weak. The only part of his address that was not was when he tackled local veto and compensation, which we do not ask the Government to deal with. We represent the great and growing moderate feeling in the country. It does not really matter what resolutions were passed at the conference at Manchester last week, because we know what line temperance societies take, and I for one have never had any sympathy with the line taken by them when the licensing question is before the House. But we find there is a growing opinion among moderate men that something requires to be done, and we would much sooner that what is necessary should be done by our own party than that it should be left to the other side; or, at all events, we would rather have the legislation taken in hand by the Government at the time in power. What does the man in the street think of this position? During the last five years we saw a Commission appointed with great promise and, if I might say so, a grand flourish of trumpets; we saw also a most impartial man elected to the chairmanship of the Commission; we saw him laboriously and conscientiously proceeding through the inquiry with an immense mass of evidence before him; and, finally, we saw him produce a more drastic Report than anybody expected, based on his judgment and the facts and circumstances brought before him. We saw at the same time a Report signed by two of the most intelligent representatives of the trade, agreeing in many particulars with Lord Peel's Report. Surely the recommendations which are embodied in both Reports should be given effect to, and the Government would be safe in proceeding on those lines. I am not an old Member of Parliament, but I have sat here five years now, and I am perfectly satisfied that if things had been otherwise last autumn, and the attention of the country had not been diverted to other subjects, or if, at any rate, by the chances of the late election the Government of the country had been placed in the hands of hon. Gentlemen opposite, there would be many on this side of the House quite ready to throw the Reports of the Commission at the heads of the new administration; and as it is admitted that we have been the consistent supporters of the Government we have a right to expect more than the shadowy and indefinite promises which have been given to us this afternoon.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.), who rose amid loud cries of "Divide" and who in consequence was somewhat indistinctly heard, disclaimed any intention of talking the Amendment out. He merely desired to make one remark on the subject before the House, which he

AYES.

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Bell, Richard

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

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

Black, Alexander William

Burt, Thomas

Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert Henry

Boland, John

Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Atherley-Jones, L.  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Caine, William Sproston  
Barlow, John Emmott  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Caldwell, James  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)  
Cameron, Robert  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H

hoped might influence the Irish party, with whom he had always been glad to act, in not throwing their weight into the scale against temperance reform. In that part of Ireland in which he resided he was perhaps better acquainted with the country districts than the hon. Gentleman who directly represented it, and he ventured to declare that no reform was so much required in Ireland as the reform of the licensing laws. That conclusion he arrived at many years ago from a knowledge of the towns and villages in his immediate neighbourhood, and he did not believe there was any rural village in the world where such bad drink was sold from such bad houses, and in which so many licensed houses existed as in the villages of Ireland. In a village near where he lived, with a population of 500, there were 20 licensed houses, and in the county town, with a population of only 3,000, there were 60 licensed houses. That was the way in which Ireland suffered, and he would like to see Irish Members assist the party to get some kind of reform. There was one figure taken from the evidence before the Commission which he desired to recall to the attention of the House, which confirmed his view, In 1842, when the population of Ireland was 8,000,000; millions, there were only 13,000 licensed houses; in 1887, with a population of 4,000,000; millions, the licensed houses had increased to 18,500. That was a most extraordinary figure. In a country where the population had decreased 50 per cent., licensed houses had increased by 40 per cent. All Members of the House were eager to see some wide measure of reform introduced.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 146; Noes, 272. (Division List No. 4.)

Cawley, Frederick  
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Charming, Francis Allston  
Jones, W. (Carnarvonshire)  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Colville, John  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)

Cremer, William Randal  
Joyce, Michael  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Crombie, John William  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Russell, T. W.  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Kitson, Sir James  
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)  
Labouchere, Henry  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Duncan, James H.  
Lambert, George  
Shipman, Dr. John  
Dunn, Sir William  
Langley, Batty  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
Edwards, Frank  
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Ellis, John Edward  
Leigh, Sir Joseph (Stockport)  
Spencer, Rt Hon C.R. (Northants)  
Emmott, Alfred  
Leng, Sir John  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Evans, Samuel T.  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Strachey, Edward  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Lough, Thomas  
Sullivan, Donal  
Fenwick, Charles  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Ferguson, R. C. M. (Leith)

M'Govern, T.  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Ffrench, Peter  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Tennant, Harold John  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe  
Thomas, Alfred(Glamorgan,E.  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Thomas, DavidAlfd. (Merthyr)  
Mather, William  
Tomkinson, James  
Gilhooly, James  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Morgan, J.Lloyd(Carmarthen)  
Wallace, Robert  
Grant, Corrie  
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)  
Morton,Edw.J.C. (Devonport)  
Warner, ThomasCourtenay T.  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Moulton, John Flether  
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan  
Gurdon, Sir Wm. Brampton  
Murphy, J.  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Whiteley,George(York, W. R.)  
Haldane, Richard Bunion  
Newnes, Sir George  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Harcourt,Rt. Hon. Sir William  
Norman, Henry  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Hardie, J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Williams,Osmond(Merioneth)  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Wilson,Fred.W.(Norfolk,Mid  
Harwood, George  
Hayden, John Patrick

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D  
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)  
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Partington, Oswald  
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Holland, William Henry  
Perks, Robert William  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Pickard, Benjamin  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Price, Robert John  
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. M'Arthur.  
Joicey, Sir James  
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Beckett, Ernest William  
Chapman, Edward  
Aird, Sir John  
Bignold, A.  
Charrington, Spencer  
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.  
Bigwood, James  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Bill, Charles  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Archdale, Edwin Mervyn  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Coddington, Sir William

Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Boyle, James  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Arrol, Sir William  
Brassey, Albert  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Austin, Sir John  
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Bull, William James  
Cullinan, J.  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Butcher, John George  
Oust, Henry John C.  
Baird, John George Alexander-  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Carlile, William Walter  
Daly, James  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. Gerald W. (Leeds  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Dewar, T. R. (Tower Hamlets)  
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christchurch)  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Banbury, Fredk. George  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
Hartley, George C. T.  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.  
Doogan, P. C.

Dorington, Sir John Edward  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick TV  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Laurie, Lieut. -General  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Purvis, Robert  
Lawson, John Grant  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Leamy, Edmund  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. E. H.  
Faber, George Denison  
Lee, Capt. A. H (Hants, Fareham  
Radcliffe, R. F.  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Randles, John S.  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Leighton, Stanley  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn E.  
Leveson-Gower, Fredericks.S.  
Reddy, M.  
Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J (Manc'r  
Loder, Gerald W. Erskine  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Finch, George H.  
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S)  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Lowe, Francis William  
Ridley, Samuel F (Bethnal Green)



Fison, Frederick William  
Lowther, C. (Climb., Eskdale)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon Chas. Thomson  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. (Kentl  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft  
Rutherford, John  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Lucas, Reginald (Portsmouth)  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Lundon, W.  
Flower, Ernest  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Forster, Henry William  
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Macdonald, John Camming  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Garfit, William  
MacIver, David (Liverpool)  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Gibbs, Hon. A. G. H. (City of Lond.  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Simeon, Sir Harrington  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Gordon. Maj Evans-(T'rH'ml'ts  
M'Fadden, Edward  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Gosehen, Hon. George Joachim  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Smith. H. C. (N'th'mb, Tyneside  
Goulding, Edward Alfred

Malcolm, Ian  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D.(Strand)  
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Spencer, Ernest(W.Bromwich)  
Greene, Sir E.W.(BurySt.Ed.)  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Gretton, John  
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn W.F.  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart  
Groves, James Grimble  
Maxwell,W.J. (Dumfriesshire)  
Stirling-Maxwell,Sir John M.  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Stock, James Henry  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir F. G.  
Talbot,Rt. Hn. J.G. (Oxf dUni.  
Hamilton,RtHnLordG.(Mid'x  
Milton, Viscount  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'y  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Tomlinson,Wm. Edw. Murray  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Tufnell, Col. Edward  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Mooney, John J.  
Tully, Jasper  
Haslett, Sir James Horner

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.  
More, R. J. (Shropshire)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Heath, ArthurHoward(Hanley  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Heath, James (Staffords,N.W.  
Morton, H. A. (Deptford)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Helder, Augustus  
Mount, William Arthur  
Wason,JohnCathcart(Orkney  
Henderson, Alexander  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Welby,Lt-Col.A.C.E(Taunton  
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.  
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)  
Welby,SirCharlesG.E. (Notts)  
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)  
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd  
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield)  
Newdigate, Francis Alex.  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Hornby, Sir William Henry  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Hoult, Joseph  
Nolan, Col. JohnP.(Galway, N.  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Hozier, Hon. J. H. Cecil  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Wilson,A.Stanley (York,E.R.)  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Jackson,Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies  
O' Doherty, William  
Wilson-Todd, Wm.H. (Yorks.)  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Wodehouse,Rt. Hn E. R.(Bath)  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick

O'Dowd, John  
Wortley, Rt.Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
O'Malley, William  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Young, Com'nder (Berks, E.)  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir J. H.  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)  
Perm. John

#### TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Percy, Earl  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. Wm.  
Pilkington, Richard  
Kimber, Henry  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Main Question again proposed.

Debate arising; and, it being half-past Five of the clock, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed To-morrow.

#### NEW BILLS.

##### EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND).

Bill for the reinstatement of the Evicted Tenants in Ireland, and for other purposes, ordered to be brought in by Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. William O'Brien, Mr. Dillon, and Mr. James O'Kelly.

##### EVICTED TENANTS (IRELAND) BILL.

"For the reinstatement of the Evicted Tenants in Ireland, and for other purposes," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 27th March, and to be printed. [Bill 52.]

##### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT (1897) AMENDMENT (No. 2).Bill

To amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897, ordered to be brought in by Mr. M'Kenna, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. William Abraham (Rhondda), Mr. Bell, Mr. D. A. Thomas, Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Pickard, Mr. Burt, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Markham, and Mr. Broadhurst.

##### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT (1897) AMENDMENT (No. 2) BILL.

"To amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 27th February, and to be printed. [Bill 53.]

##### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (IRELAND).

Bill to amend the Law relating to the Sale, of Intoxicating Liquors in Ireland on Saturdays and Sundays, ordered to be brought in by Mr. William Johnston, Mr. Jordan, Colonel Saunderson, and Mr. Kennedy.

#### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS (IRELAND) BILL.

"To amend the Law relating to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors in Ireland on Saturdays and Sundays," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 20th March, and to be printed. [Bill 54.]

#### ULSTER CUSTOM.

Bill to provide a further remedy for enforcing the Ulster Tenant-right Custom in the case of sales thereunder, ordered to be brought in by Mr. William Moore, Mr. Lonsdale, and Mr. Archdale.

#### ULSTER CUSTOM BILL.

"To provide a further remedy for enforcing the Ulster Tenant-right Custom in the case of sales thereunder," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 13th March, and to be printed. [Bill 55.]

#### TIED HOUSES ABOLITION.

Bill to provide for the abolition of Tied Houses, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Broadhurst, Sir John Brunner, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Levy, and Mr. Thomas Bayley.

#### TIED HOUSES ABOLITION BILL.

"To provide for the abolition of Tied Houses," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 6th March, and to be printed [Bill 56.]

Adjourned at a quarter before Six of the clock.

#### HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 21st February, 1901.

Several other Members took and: subscribed the Oath.

#### PETITIONS.

#### ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

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

#### POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Woking; Northwich; Torquay; and Paignton; to lie upon the Table.

#### RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

#### RAILWAY AND CANAL TRAFFIC ACTS, 1854 TO 1894.

Copy presented, of Twelfth Annual Report of the Railway and Canal Commission, with Appendix [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### AGRICULTURAL SEEDS.

Copy presented, of Report and Evidence taken before the Departmental Committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture to inquire into the conditions under which Agricultural Seeds are at present sold, together with Appendices and Index [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS.

Account presented, showing the gross Amount received and expended on account of the Telegraph Service during the year ended 31st March, 1900, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 34.]

#### EAST INDIA (ROYAL INDIAN ENGINEERING COLLEGE).

Copy presented, of Correspondence relating to the re-modelling of the Studies, and the retirement of certain of the Professors and Lecturers [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2556 and 2557 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 548 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

1. Friendly Societies, Workmen's Compensation Schemes, Industrial and Provident Societies, and Trade Unions.; Reports of the Chief Registrar for the year ending 31st December, 1900 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 35.]
2. Irish Land Commission (Account). ;Copy of Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General upon the Account of the Irish Land Commission for the year ended 31st March, 1900 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 36.]
3. Public Records (Court of Common Pleas).;Copy of Further Schedule of Documents (of the Court of Common Pleas) which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office [by Act].
4. Public Records (Paymaster General's Department.);Copy of Second Schedule of Documents (of the Paymaster General's Department) which are not considered of sufficient public value to justify their preservation in the Public Record Office [by Act].
5. Charitable Endowments (West Riding of the County of York), Charitable Endowments (Bradford). Inquiry into Charities (Parish of Halifax, including County Borough of Halifax), Inquiry into Charities (City of Sheffield), Leeds (Inquiry into Charities), Huddersfield County Borough (Charities).; Further Returns relative thereto [ordered 10th August, 1894, 13th May. 1896; 8th February, 1897; 8th April, 1897; 29th July, 1897; Mr. Francis Stevenson and Mr. Grant Lawson]; to be printed. [No. 37.]

#### POST OFFICE TELEGRAPHS.

Copy ordered, "of account showing the gross amount received and the gross amount expended in respect of the Telegraph Service from the date of the transfer of the Telegraphs to the State to the 31st day of March, 1900 (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 61, of Session 1900).";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

Copy presented accordingly; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 38.]

#### QUESTIONS.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;PROPOSED IMPERIAL MEMORIAL TO THE TROOPS.

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER (Walsall): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government are prepared to consider favourably the erection at the proper moment of an Imperial memorial, which shall record the first co-operation of British and Colonial troops in war, by the preservation in London of the names of the fallen; and whether the Government are prepared to receive a deputation of Members of Parliament and others interested in this matter, in order to take advantage, in any commemoration of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, of

the funds promised and the support already given to this proposal, and not only in the United Kingdom but also in the Colonies.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): At the present stage, at all events, of the proceedings in connection with the memorial to Queen Victoria, the Government have no responsibility, and therefore it would be impossible for them to receive a deputation upon the subject the hon.

Gentleman is interested in.

ALLEGED OUTRAGES BY BRITISH TROOPS ; LIEUT. MORRISON'S LETTER.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government will take any steps publicly to contradict a statement alleged to have been made by Lieutenant Morrison, Canadian Artillery, serving under General Smith-Dorrien, to the effect that outrages of a gross character were perpetrated by His Majesty's troops in the Steilpoort Valley, South Africa, and, having assured themselves of the genuineness or otherwise of the report, deal with the author of the statement accordingly.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Inquiries are being made both at home and in South Africa on the subject.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): Will the report when received be published?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I must defer my answer to that question.

COMMISSION ON EMIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can say when he will lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Commission upon Emigration and Settlement in South Africa presided over by the Secretary to the Admiralty.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: On Tuesday last I informed the hon. Member I could not say when the Report in question would be issued. The evidence has not yet reached me.

MONEY GRANTS TO BRITISH GENERALS.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government intend to propose any votes of money to Lord Roberts, Sir Redvers Buller, and Lord Kitchener during the present session.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I can make no statement on this subject, but full notice will be given of any proceedings of the kind to which the hon. Gentleman refers.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ANNEXATION PROCLAMATIONS AND PEACE NEGOTIATIONS.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Lord Roberts, in proclaiming the annexation of the two Boer Republics, acted on his own initiative or on instructions from the Colonial Office; whether, in declining to agree to the terms of surrender of General Botha's forces, suggested by Sir Redvers Buller, Lord Roberts was acting on his, own initiative or carrying out instructions previously communicated to him by the Colonial Office; and whether, if so, he will lay upon the Table of the House these instructions, together with all other despatches exchanged between Sir Alfred Milner and the Colonial Office, and between that Office and the War Office, in regard to the terms of accommodation which might be offered to the burghers of the two Republics; whether

he can say what is the legal status of the inhabitants of the Transvaal Colony and of the Orange River Colony; and whether those in arms against His Majesty's forces are belligerents or rebels.

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

(1) Lord Roberts proclaimed the annexations under Commissions empowering him to do so at the time he thought proper, as is shown by reference to page 136 of Cd. 261 and page 9 of Cd 420. (2) The terms of Lord Roberts's telegram to Sir Redvers Buller of 3rd June were founded upon the instructions of Her Majesty's Government. I refer the hon. Member to Cd. 35 and Cd. 426, page 3 and page 7. I also refer the hon. Member to Cd. 458, pages 86, 87, and 88, from which he will see that the offer of General Buller to allow Commandant Botha's commando to return to their farms and take their rifles with them, subject to Lord Roberts's decision as to their ultimate disarmament, was refused by Commandant Botha. I believe that Lord Roberts's telegram was not communicated to Commandant Botha, and did not therefore influence his decision in any way. (3) The effect of the annexations was to confer upon the inhabitants the legal status of British subjects. (4) I understand that burghers guilty of no acts other than fighting against us have hitherto been treated as belligerents without reference to their legal position as British subjects.

THE REV. A. HOFMEYR'S MISSION.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Reverend Adrian Hofmeyr has been sent to the Transvaal as a Peace Commissioner, and, if so, by whose authority; whether this is the same person who was until lately minister of the Dutch Reformed Church of Wynburg, and, if so, if he is aware that this person was compelled to resign his position in the church for notorious misconduct, for which he was suspended for an unlimited period; and whether he will cause inquiry to be made into the matter.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no official information upon the subject of the hon. Member's question, but I am inquiring whether Mr. Hofmeyr has been sent to the Transvaal in the capacity mentioned.

SIR A. MILNER'S SALARY.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state what is the salary that is to be paid to Sir Alfred Milner in the post to which he has been recently appointed as High Commissioner of South Africa and Administrator of the annexed Republics.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: He is to receive a salary of £8,000 a year as Administrator of the Transvaal and of the Orange River Colony, and £3,000 a year as High Commissioner.

ALLEGED MURDER OF A NATIVE BY A BRITISH OFFICER'S ORDERS.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has considered the circumstances under which the Special Court of Three Judges, in October last, acquitted a Cape policeman named Smith, on the charge of murdering a native named Dollery, on 22nd November, 1899; whether the defendant was acquitted on the expressly stated ground that he was merely obeying the orders of his superior officer, Captain Cox; whether Captain Cox has since this decision of the Court been arrested and put on his trial;



whether the Cape Colony Attorney General has made any report to the Colonial Office or to the High Commissioner giving reasons for not placing Captain Cox on trial; and whether he will take steps to secure the trial of Captain Cox for a murder admittedly done at his order.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The answer to the first question is that I have received the report of the trial published in the Cape Times in October last. The answer to the second is in the affirmative, and to the third in the negative. In reply to the fourth and fifth, I have to say that under Cape law absolute discretion with regard to all criminal prosecutions is vested in the Attorney General of the Cape Colony, who is responsible to the Cape Parliament. I am informed by Sir A. Milner, to whom I telegraphed on the subject, that the Attorney General has made no report on the case, but states that after careful consideration he has decided not to prosecute.

MR. CHANNING: I shall take an early opportunity of drawing attention to this case.

#### ALLEGED ESCAPES OF BOER PRISONERS.

SIR H. MEYSEY-THOMPSON (Staffordshire, Handsworth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether some Boer prisoners have escaped from one of our ships; and, if so, whether he will tell the House the name of the ship, and the name of the person responsible for the safe custody of the prisoners.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): No report of any escape of Boer prisoners from men-of-war has yet been received by the Admiralty, with the exception of the case of C. K. de Meillon, a prisoner who escaped from H.M.S. "Penelope" in December, 1899. The captain of the ship was responsible for the safety of the prisoners. The court of inquiry which was held did not blame the captain for the occurrence. No intelligence has been received as to the escape of prisoners from transports.

#### AWARDS OF VICTORIA CROSSES.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can say how many Victoria Crosses have been bestowed since the beginning of the South African War.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Thirty-nine Victoria Crosses have been granted up to date.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: What number of these crosses have been awarded to the Boers?

#### REWARDS FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE IN THE FIELD.

LT.-COL. LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that dissatisfaction

exists in the Army over the protracted delay in announcing the rewards to officers and men who have rendered distinguished services in South Africa, and that several of the officers and men who were recommended for reward in despatches written nearly a year ago have since died unrewarded, or have left the service; and whether it would be possible in future to adopt the Continental custom of conferring rewards promptly upon troops whilst in the field, or at any rate to issue such rewards before the services for which they are granted are forgotten both by the renderers thereof and by the general public.

MR. BRODRICK: I have no doubt that the publication of the rewards for services

rendered in the South African War is being anxiously awaited, and I regret that it is the case that some officers mentioned in despatches have died. But I do not think there has been any avoidable delay in dealing with the subject; the work entailed in connection with it is very great, and many of the recommendations have only recently been received. Some are still awaited. The consideration of the names to be recommended is receiving the most constant attention by the Commander-in-Chief and myself, but some thousands of names have been mentioned, and the House will understand that the labour at present falling on the heads of the War Office is exceptionally arduous. I have already considered with the Commander-in-Chief the desirability of empowering the General in the field to give certain rewards promptly as I believe that such recognition is very valuable.

LT.-COL. LEE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in our last great war ;the Crimea;awards were distributed within three months of the battles of Alma and Inkermann? Why should not that example be followed now?

MR. BRODRICK said rewards could not be given before despatches were published, and Lord Roberts's most recent despatches had not yet been fully considered.

PAARDEBERG DESPATCHES.

\*THE MASTER OF ELIBANK (Midlothian): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Divisional Commanders at Paardeberg addressed despatches to the Commander-in-Chief in the battle; and, if so, whether, in view of the casualty list in the Highland Brigade, these despatches will be published.

MR. BRODRICK: The only report addressed to the Commander in-Chief respecting the battle of Paardeberg was one from General Kelly-Kenny, the main points of which were incorporated by Lord Roberts in his despatch recently published. Although it is not customary to publish such reports, there will be no objection to giving this report, and I will lay it on the Table. Perhaps I might mention at the same time that, by an accident due to the rapid movements in the field in March last, a despatch of Sir Redvers Buller relating to the action at Vaal Krantz was not transmitted by Lord Roberts to the War Office. As the Commander-in-Chief in arranging his papers after the campaign has come upon this despatch in the last few days, I will law it on the Table.

MR. DILLON: Did Lord Kitchener make any report on this battle?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir.

SOLDIERS JOINING THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTABULARY.

MR. T. L. CORBETT (Down, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a soldier serving in the Regular Arm) in South Africa, with less than six years service, and being desirous of joining the South African Constabulary, is obliged to purchase his discharge before doing so; and whether it would be desirable to allow men, with the sanction of their commanding officer, to be transferred from the Army to the Constabulary without payment.

MR. BRODRICK: Soldiers serving in the Regular Army who have not less than three years colour service will, if accepted for the South African Constabulary, be passed to the Reserve to complete their term of engagement. They will, therefore, not be required to purchase discharge.

ALLEGATIONS OF BOER BRUTALITY ;CASE OF ESAU, ETC.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has received any official confirmation of the alleged flogging of a coloured man, at Calvinia, named Esau, until his bowels protruded and his subsequently being shot, by the orders or with the approval of General De Wet; and if so, whether he will communicate it to the House; whether he has received any official confirmation of General De Wet flogging and shooting members of the Peace Committee, or of his flogging his own men who desire to surrender; whether the members of the Peace Committee who entered the lines of the forces of General De Wet carried the terms on which the Boers were urged to surrender to General De Wet, or whether they addressed themselves to his soldiers with a view to induce them to surrender, or to withdraw from his forces; and whether this latter action was taken with the sanction of General Kitchener.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War what was his authority for the statement he made on Thursday with respect to the alleged ill-treatment of a coloured man named Esau by the Boer leaders.

MR. BRODRICK: The authority for the statement of the flogging by the Boers of a coloured man named Esau at Calvinia was a Renter's telegram, confirmed subsequently by the report made to Cape Town by the district surgeon of Calvinia. As regards the Peace Committee, Lord Kitchener reported in a telegram of 13th January, published in the morning papers of 14th January, that three agents of the Peace Committee were taken prisoners to De Wet's laager on the 10th, and that one British subject had been flogged and then shot, and two burghers flogged by De Wet's orders. We have no information as to the third and fourth paragraphs of the hon. Member for Northampton's question.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether the agency to which he now refers is the same agency which he repudiated the other day?

MR. BRODRICK: The telegrams followed each other on separate days, and we have every reason to believe they are accurate.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Has the right hon. Gentleman any information with regard to the district surgeon beyond what he read in Reuter's telegram?

MR. BRODRICK: Reuter's telegram contained not merely a general but a specific statement, and it was corroborated.

MR. DILLON: May I ask whether we are to understand that the other day the right hon. Gentleman in his capacity as a Minister of the Crown made a statement in the House of Commons without any official information?

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Member that it is out of order to discuss the answer to a previous question.

M. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Is there any truth in the report?

MR. PIRIE: Will the right hon. Gentleman give the name of the district surgeon?

MR. BRODRICK: I cannot give the name now, but I will ascertain it.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Chief Secretary for Ireland, when acting as Under Secretary for War, refused over and over again to answer questions based on newspaper reports and telegrams?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order &#x0021; That does not arise out of the question.

#### SUPPRESSION OF ENGLISH PAPERS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the circulation of certain newspapers published in this country has been prohibited in districts of the Cape Colony under martial law; what is the reason for this prohibition; whether the prohibition is by his directions or by the directions of Lord Kitchener, or by those of the local military authorities in those districts; and whether any communication has been made to the head of the Post Office at Cape Town by the military authorities in regard to the circulation of any newspapers published in this country, with a view to such papers not being transmitted through the post.

MR. BRODRICK: No report on this subject has reached the War Office. If such a prohibition has been issued, it has been issued by the local military authorities in the exercise of their discretion. It appears to His Majesty's Government highly desirable that such discretion should be exercised.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Does the restriction apply to Punch?

#### FARM BURNING.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what orders have been issued by the General Commanding His Majesty's troops in South Africa regulating the burning of Boer farmhouses, and what General was in charge of the Klopskil, Jagersfontein, and Potchef-stroom districts during the month of December, 1900; whether the farmhouses in these districts were all burned and the cattle and horses belonging to the inhabitants all taken away, although no resistance was offered to the British forces; and if any steps have been taken to put a stop to the practice of house-burning in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony.

MR. BRODRICK: The information promised in regard to farm-burning is in course of transit from South Africa, and I am not prepared to reply to the question without it.

#### PURSUIT OF DE WET; ABANDONED HORSES.

SIR H. MEYSEY-THOMPSON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the abandoned horses passed by our column which is pursuing De Wet are being systematically collected or destroyed, to ensure that they may not when rested furnish the Boers with much needed remounts.

MR. BRODRICK: I have had no special report to this effect, but I think Lord Kitchener may be trusted to take all possible steps to prevent the Boers obtaining remounts.

#### BRABANT'S HORSE; TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the terms of the original engagement of Brabant's Horse differed in point of duration from the terms of the original engagement of the British Imperial Yeomanry; and, if so, to what extent.

MR. BRODRICK: Brabant's Horse were enrolled for six months or as much longer as required. The Imperial Yeomanry were enlisted for a year or for the duration of the war.

#### THE WELSH HOSPITAL AT THE FRONT.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES (Swansea District): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for

War whether Lord Roberts expressed a wish that the Welsh Military Hospital in South Africa should be maintained there for three months longer than the term fixed for its continuance, and that the executive committee of the; hospital agreed to maintain it for a further period of three months; whether Lord Lansdowne, on 5th November, 1900, accepted the offer of the committee; and whether the hospital was broken up or disbanded on 15th November, 1900; and, if so, why.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton): The reply to the first two paragraphs of the question is in the affirmative. As regards paragraph 3, the hospital was absorbed in No. 2 General Hospital on the 15th November for convenience of administration.

MR. BRYNMOR JONES: Does the word "absorbed" mean that the staff of the hospital was continued on the same terms? And are the funds collected for this hospital now being used for an ordinary military hospital?

LORD STANLEY: I am afraid I cannot answer without notice. If the hon. Gentleman will put the question down I will inquire.

RATE OF PAY FOR NEW RECRUITS.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, in view of the fact that the Government is now offering 5s. per day to the recruits for the Imperial Yeomanry, can he state if any increase of pay is being offered, and, if so, how much, to recruits for other mounted infantry and cavalry regiments in His Majesty's service; and what rate per day is being offered to the infantry and engineer volunteers who are invited to join the Volunteer service companies now being organised for active service in South Africa.

MR. BRODRICK: The recruits for the mounted infantry and the cavalry of the Regular forces, and the volunteers for the Volunteer service companies are being offered and paid the ordinary Army rates of pay.

RATES OF PAY FOR VARIOUS FORCES.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state how many men of the rank and file in South Africa are receiving in pay or in pay and allowances as much as 5s. a day, and to what regiments they belong.

LORD STANLEY: I am unable to give the details asked for. I may state that the Imperial Yeomanry, Imperial Bushmen, and the majority of the colonial corps are paid at this rate. In cases in which a lower rate of pay has been issued to colonials it has been supplemented by the different Colonial Governments.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the noble Lord state the reason why the colonial troops are paid at this rate; so much higher than the Regular Army?

[No answer was given.]

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: They would not go otherwise.

GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF IRISH HORSES.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he can state how many Irish horses were bought from dealers in the year 1900, and how many from farmers or non-dealers, and what was the average price paid to the dealers and what was the average paid to the farmers.

LORD STANLEY: The figures are as follows:;From dealers, 5,907 horses and cobs;

from persons other than dealers, 207 horses and cobs. It would not be in the public interest to disclose the prices paid while purchases are still in progress.

MR. FLAVIN: Can the noble Lord say if orders were issued by the War Office not to purchase horses in Ireland?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir, I believe such is not the case.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Chief Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain why, during a portion of the past year, the Army Department ceased to buy horses in Ireland; and whether he has any official information showing which are the best and most suitable horses for Army purposes.

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member has been misinformed. The War Department has not ceased buying horses in Ireland during the past year. Irish and English horses have proved the best of those imported into the Cape for Army purposes, and considerable purchases are contemplated in the immediate future.

MR. CULLINAN: Is it not the fact that orders were given to cease buying horses in Ireland because of the opposition of the Irish people to the war?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir.

#### GOVERNMENT PURCHASES OF HUNGARIAN HORSES.

\*MR. BEAUMONT (Northumberland, Hexham): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the horses purchased in Hungary as remounts for South Africa included a number of young unseasoned horses, and mares too old even for breeding purposes; and whether the officer responsible for the purchase of these animals is still employed in buying remounts for the British Army.

LORD STANLEY: The answer to the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question is in the negative. Two officers of the Department have been employed in Hungary; one of these is still there.

#### TREATMENT OF YEOMANRY RECRUITS AT ALDERSHOT.

MR HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that many of the Yeomanry recruits who recently arrived at Aldershot were kept for several days unprovided with overcoats or boots; that they have been drilled in the snow unprovided with proper clothing or boots; that hundreds of recruits have been obliged to sleep on the floor every night, no beds being provided; and that, notwithstanding the cold and absence of overcoats, they have been compelled to wear thin khaki clothes; and will he cause a full inquiry to be made into the matter.

MR. BRODRICK: I will ask the hon. Member to postpone his question for a few days to enable inquiry to be made.

#### OFFICERS' PAY.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can tell the House what are the rates of pay and expenses of living for officers in the various regiments of His Majesty's forces.

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member will find the rates of pay in the Pay Warrant. It is clearly impossible to state the expenses of living for officers in the various regiments.

#### GRATUITIES TO MILITIA OFFICERS.

MR. EDWARDS (Radnor): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state whether the Militia regiments which volunteered for service abroad, and have been or are garrisoning the Channel Islands, will receive similar advantages to those Militia regiments which are garrisoning stations in the Mediterranean and elsewhere as laid down in paragraphs 601B and 601C of the Royal Warrant; namely, that each officer not on retired Army pay will on the disembodiment of his regiment receive a gratuity of £;100, and after the first twelve months of service a further gratuity of £;100 for each year of service; and whether the regiments stationed in the Channel Islands will be given the six months additional service granted to the regiments in South Africa and elsewhere.

LORD STANLEY: The reply to the first paragraph of the hon. Member's question is in the affirmative. The reply to the second is in the negative, as the gratuity referred to therein is specifically limited to battalions serving in South Africa.

MILITIA EMBODIMENT.

MR. BILL (Staffordshire, Leek): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, considering the length of time during which many Militia battalions now serving abroad have already been embodied, the time has arrived when, at the discretion of the Commander-in-Chief, other battalions should be embodied to relieve them.

MR. BRODRICK: As I recently explained to the House, I am not in a position at present to reply to this question.

MR. LAMBERT: Can the hon. Gentleman say when he will be in a position?

MR. BRODRICK: I must take time to consider, as it is a large and important question. Regiments can only be relieved by others volunteering to replace them.

WAR OFFICE REORGANISATION COMMITTEE.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the deliberations of the War Office Reform Committee have reached a stage which enables him to inform the House as to the intentions of His Majesty's Government in respect of the allocation of Army contracts by persons having expert knowledge of commercial pursuits, and the inspection of deliveries under such contracts by officials possessing technical and professional acquaintance with the stores supplied for the service of His Majesty's Army.

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir. I have not yet received a report, and I must await the opinion of the Committee before taking steps.

WAR OFFICE CONTRACTS IN DUBLIN.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been called to the action of a contractor named Broderick, who is alleged by the Dublin Amalgamated Society of Painters to have employed in executing certain painting work at the Royal Barracks, Dublin, an undue proportion of boys and improvers; and whether he will inquire if the terms of the contract authorised the employment of such a proportion of boys and improvers; and if so, whether such a contract is in accordance with the Fair Wages Resolution of this House.

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware that an undue proportion of boys and improvers were employed on the work in question. The General Officer commanding has reported that the work is completed, and that he therefore cannot verify the contractors' statements. War Office contracts require, in accordance with the Fair Wages Resolution of this House, that the wage current in the district for competent workmen shall be paid by the contractor.

MR. NANNETTI: Is the noble Lord aware it has been acknowledged that this contractor employed only six painters, and eight boys and improvers? Is not that an excessive employment of boy labour, and an invasion of the Fair Wages clause? Cries of "Answer &#x0021;"

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order &#x0021; The hon. Member must give notice of that question.

#### ARMY CONTRACT SYSTEM IN IRELAND.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Government still maintain that Ireland gains over £2,000,000 a year by Army expenditure; and he will undertake that, without grave cause, no change is introduced into the Army contract system previously prevailing in Ireland; on what grounds was Colonel Richardson, of the Army Service Corps, allowed four years ago to introduce changes to all canteens in the Dublin District; and was it with the sanction of the War Office that Major King, Director of Canteen Supplies, was brought from London to assist him; will he explain why the Curragh Camp in the following year adopted the new system, with the consequence that not only ale, but Irish porter and Irish whisky are now contracted for by an English firm; and also why was the Cork District subsequently placed under the new system; will he explain why the new system was never enforced in the Belfast District; is there any intention to establish in Ireland what is called the tenant system as regards these Army contracts, and can he state its nature; and will the Government consider the advisability of allowing regiments quartered in Ireland to give local merchants the benefit of their expenditure.

LORD STANLEY: As I have already explained to the House, the discretion of making contracts for canteens rests with the General Officers commanding districts. The necessity of decentralising such matters is obvious. It would be impossible for the War Office to undertake the control of such contracts, and I am not prepared to interfere with the discretion of the General Officers, but I will draw the attention of General Officers commanding to the desirability as far as possible of employing local firms.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) asked if the officer referred to in the question was connected with the Canteen Co-operative Society.

LORD STANLEY: I cannot say.

#### ARMY BEER CONTRACTS IN IRELAND

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he is aware that the beer and porter used by the troops stationed in Ireland are now got from English brewers; whether he can state if the beer for the soldiers in Ireland is from any of the districts in England where poison was found in the beer; whether he is aware that the ordering of beer from England for the troops in Ireland is a loss to Irish brewers as well as to the labouring



and farming classes in Ireland, where barley and oats are grown; and whether he will advise the War Office to order from Irish brewers beer for the soldiers stationed in Ireland.

LORD STANLEY: I must refer the hon. Member to my reply to a question by the hon. Member for North Meath on Monday, the 18th instant.\* I may add that General and other Commanding Officers are fully alive to the necessity of occasionally having malt liquor analysed.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that an order for 1,000 barrels of ale for the use of the troops in South Africa was recently taken from a Dublin firm and handed over to an English brewery company; and whether, in view of the recent revelations as to the dangerous nature of certain British beers, he will direct that the supply in future for the troops in South Africa and Ireland shall be obtained from Dublin brewers.

LORD STANLEY: I must refer the hon. Gentleman to other answers I have given on the same subject. Nothing is known of the matter alluded to.

MR. NANNETTI: Will the noble Lord answer the last paragraph of the question?  
[No answer was given.]

\* See page 297.

#### IRISH FORAGE FOR ARMY HORSES.

Mr. DALY: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the oats and hay supplied to the Army horses stationed in Ireland are purchased in that country; and, if not, can he say why this is not done.

LORD STANLEY: All forage contracts for the troops in Ireland are made locally and with two exceptions are held by Irish firms.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): Is the noble Lord aware of the fact that Irish farmers do not supply the contractors?

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware of that.

MR. FIELD: Will you inquire?

[No answer was given.]

#### HONOURS FOR WARRANT OFFICERS OF THE NAVY.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can explain the reason why the warrant officers of the Navy who were landed from their ships on the Cape station, and took an active and distinguished part in the general advance from Enslin, remaining with the Naval Brigade throughout the operations of last year, have had no participation in the promotions and honours awarded, notwithstanding the fact that all of them have been favourably mentioned in despatches, and that almost all the commissioned and subordinate officers have been promoted or noted for promotion.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: A warrant officer who distinguished himself in the defence of Ladysmith has been promoted to commissioned rank, and the names of other officers have been noted for special consideration when the opportunity of recognising their services presents itself. Warrant officers are not eligible for honours which are limited by the Statutes of the Orders to Officers of Commissioned rank, but their position in this respect has been for some time under consideration, and it is hoped that a means of recognising the services of this valuable class of officer may be shortly approved.

#### SUBMARINE BOATS.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Admiralty are making experiments with a view to ascertain whether submarine boats can be successfully utilised for purposes of naval warfare; and, if so, whether the particulars of these experiments can be communicated to Members of this House.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The question of submarine boats has for some time past seriously engaged the attention of the Admiralty, and a statement will shortly be made by the First Lord as to the steps which have been or are to be taken. I would, therefore, ask leave to postpone answering the hon. Member's question more fully pending the publication of that statement, which will be presented to the House in a few days.

#### WARRANT OFFICERS' WIDOWS' ANNUITIES; CASE OF MRS. BALL.

MR. KEARLEY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state the reason why the annuity of £25 per annum usually awarded to the widow of a warrant officer has been denied to the widow of W. Ball, late carpenter, R.N., who died on the 19th July last, and who at the time of his death was in receipt of a warrant officer's pension.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Mrs. Ball was ineligible for the award of a widow's pension, her husband having been placed on the retired list on account of misconduct.

#### CASE OF THOMAS REYNOLDS; H.M. NAVAL RESERVE.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been called to the case of Thomas Reynolds, a fireman belonging to H.M. Naval Reserve, who in August or September of 1899 left Pembroke Dock in charge of time-expired men, and was stabbed by one of them in the eye and in consequence lost his eyesight; and whether, seeing that Reynolds was discharged without any pension or compensation and left destitute,

and in view of all the circumstances of the case, he has any power to grant him any compensation or allowance; and, if so, whether he will exercise such power.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, Sir; and Reynolds has been granted 1s. a day for life.

#### NAVAL CADETS' GREAT COATS.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether naval cadets, whether on duty or on leave, in inclement weather are debarred by official regulations from wearing great coats; and whether, as a consequence of recent exposure without great coats, several cadets are now suffering from pulmonary disease, and one cadet has already succumbed to it.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I have endeavoured to get the information asked for, but the notice was too short. If the hon. Member will postpone the major part of the question, I will answer it another day. But I may say that the cadet who succumbed was not one of those who suffered from the inclemency of the weather on the occasion referred to.

#### TIME-EXPIRED SOLDIERS IN INDIA.

MR. COCHRANE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if he can state how many time-expired soldiers are now serving with the colours in India.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The

Viceroy reported on 20th January, 1901, that the time-expired men in India numbered 15,000.

#### NEW INDIAN PROVINCE.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether His Majesty's Government contemplate the creation of a new frontier province which is to comprise several districts of the Punjab; and, if so, to what kind of administration will the new province be subjected.

LORD G. HAMILTON: His Majesty's Government have approved of the principle of a scheme for the creation of an Agency immediately under the control of the Government of India. The scheme contemplates the detachment of two whole Districts, and parts of two others from the Punjab Government; but the details of the administration are not yet settled. I hope to present to the House Papers on the subject at an early date.

#### CHINA;COUNT VON WALDERSEE'S EXPEDITION.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Government have now any information of Count Von Waldersee's reported further expedition into China; whether British commanders have asked for instructions as to co-operation; if so, what instructions have been given them.

The following questions also appeared on the Paper::

MR. YERBURCH (Chester): To ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government have now received information regarding the proposed expedition of Count Waldersee; if so, when the information arrived, and whether he can explain the delay in its transmission; and whether the British troops could take part or prepare to take part in such an expedition without the direct authorisation of the Government.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government will issue orders to the General commanding the British forces in China instructing him not to take part in any further military expeditions without specific orders from the Home Government.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: We have been informed that Field Marshal Count von Waldersee has issued an Army Order in which the Field Marshal announces that in his judgment, owing to the unsatisfactory progress of the peace negotiations, a resumption of larger operations may become shortly necessary. We have asked to be supplied with full information

as to the scope and purpose of these movements, and upon receipt of this information His Majesty's Government will consider whether any instructions different from those already given should be sent to Sir A. Gaselee.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Will precautions be taken that no military movements by British troops shall be carried out until the Government has taken this information into consideration?

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: As my right hon. friend is aware, a state of war prevails in certain parts of North China, and under such conditions it is hardly reasonable to put to me such a question without notice.

#### RUSSO-CHINESE AGREEMENT REGARDING MANCHURIA.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government have received notice of the supplementary

provisions which M. de Witte is reported to desire to add to the agreement between China and Russia with regard to Manchuria; and, if so, whether such provisions conflict with his statement that the guarantee which the Russians expected from China with regard to Manchuria would not take the form of an acquisition of territory or of a virtual or actual protectorate; and whether it is the intention of the Government to secure for this country the full enjoyment of the rights which are guaranteed to it in Manchuria, as well as in other portions of the Chinese Empire, by its treaties with China.

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The answer to the first question is in the negative. No agreement in respect of Manchuria has been communicated by the Russian Government to His Majesty's Government. The statement which I made on Monday was based on a report furnished by His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg, and upon the authority of the Russian Government. The arrangement to which the hon. Member refers is, I assume, that made between the Russian and the Chinese local authorities for temporary and provisional purposes, and such an arrangement cannot affect the rights enjoyed by this country under our treaties with the Chinese Empire.

#### PUNISHMENT OF CHINESE OFFICIALS.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British Minister in Peking has been a consenting party to any communication to the Government of China indicating that the Foreign Ministers would approve of an edict requiring a number of Chinese officials to commit suicide.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The reply is in the negative.

#### ITALY AND BRITISH PROPERTY AT PEKING.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the property occupied for twenty-two years by Sir Robert Hart and his staff in Peking has been annexed by the Italian Legation.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: We have no information on the specific point alluded to. The question is, however, involved in that of the defence of the Legation quarter, which is now under consideration by a military Commission appointed by the foreign representatives at Peking. No decision has yet been arrived at. In this connection I may perhaps be allowed to refer the hon. Gentleman to my answer on Tuesday last.

#### LOOT FROM PEKING.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether since the relief of the Legations at Peking any cases have been transmitted by British officials in China on His Majesty's vessels either to Hong Kong or to any other port; and whether, if so, he is in a position to say that none of these cases contained loot acquired from the Chinese.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No information in respect of any such occurrence as that described by the hon. Member has reached the Admiralty.

See page 476.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Will the hon. Gentleman ask the Admirals on the station if anything of the kind has occurred?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Yes, Sir.

#### SUGAR BOUNTIES CONFERENCE.

COLONEL MILWARD (Warwickshire, Stratford-upon-Avon): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give the House any information as to the proposed Sugar Conference; whether formal or informal invitations have been issued, and by and to what Power or Powers; when and where it is proposed to meet, together with any further information he can, consistently with the public interest, give to the House.

\* VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Suggestions have recently been received from the Belgian Government for the reassembling of the Brussels Conference upon certain bases. These suggestions are at present under the consideration of His Majesty's Government, but at the present stage it would not be desirable to indicate their exact nature. The Powers represented at the last Conference were Great Britain, Germany, Austria - Hungary, Belgium, Spain, France, Holland, Russia, Sweden. It is presumed the above-mentioned suggestions have been made to these Powers.

#### WEST INDIAN PRISONS; PENAL LABOUR.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can see his way to order the abolition of penal labour, and especially shot drill, in Grenada and other West Indian prisons; and whether, seeing remunerative labour has already been substituted in many of these institutions for the treadmill and other forms of punishment, some small proportion of the money earned by these methods might be allocated to the prisoners as a further inducement to their good behaviour.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The prison rules and practice in West Indian prisons are based upon and as far as possible assimilated to the rules and practice in the prisons of the United Kingdom. The hon. Member may be assured that so far as circumstances and resources allow I shall be glad to further the views embodied in his question.

#### OLD AGE PENSIONS IN THE COLONIES.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the systems of old age pensions adopted in certain colonies, together with a Report as to the cost and working of such systems up to the present time.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The only colonies in which old age pensions systems have been adopted are New Zealand, New South Wales, and Victoria. In the case of the two latter States the Acts were only passed at the end of last year, and I have not yet received a copy of the Victorian Act. The New Zealand Act came into force on 1st November, 1898, and I have received reports on its working up to June, 1900, which I shall be happy to place in the Library, with copies of the three Acts.

#### THE NEW COINAGE.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as Master of the Mint, if in the quarterings on any new coinage that may be issued in the reign of His Majesty King Edward he will see that the Principality of Wales is not ignored; and whether he will consider the desirability of marking the value clearly upon the face of every denomination of coin.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): It does not rest with the Master of the Mint to decide what the quarterings of the Royal Arms should be. His duty is only to consider whether they should be represented on the coinage. Unless they are altered, of course they would be represented, if at all, in their present form. Before any new coinage is issued, the question whether any alteration of present designs is advisable will be fully considered, including the point mentioned by the hon. Member.

#### POLICE PROSECUTIONS FOR PALMISTRY, ETC.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether, in view of the recent conviction and fining of itinerant palmists, he can give an assurance that the law will be put in force against the fashionable palmists, clairvoyants, and phrenologists in London.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I have been asked by my hon. and learned friend to answer this question. The important point to consider in determining whether or not it is desirable to prosecute such persons under the Vagrant Act is whether or not the practice is followed with a view to fraud or other unlawful purpose. The police have instructions to watch suspicious cases, and whenever there is good ground for believing that fraud or imposition is being practised they will be directed to prosecute.

#### JUSTICES AND THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE.

MR BROAD HURST (Leicester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the present justices of the peace will have to be resworn in their allegiance to the King; and, if so, whether the magistrates' clerks at petty sessions can administer the oath, or whether they will have to attend quarter sessions for this purpose.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I am advised that it is not necessary in consequence of the demise of the Crown that justices should take anew the Judicial Oath and the Oath of Allegiance, but that it is desirable that they should do so. If they do, the oaths are required by the Promissory Oaths Act, 1871, to be taken before one of His Majesty's judges in open court, or in open court at general or quarter sessions, except that borough justices may take the oaths before the mayor. It would not, in my opinion, be lawful for county justices to take the oaths in petty sessions.

#### NATURALISATION OF ALIENS;FEES.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it is possible that a reduction could be made in the fees charged for the naturalisation of aliens which now press hardly on members of the working classes; whether a general reduction could be made; and whether it could be arranged that working men whose incomes are less than £80 a year, and who have lived over ten years in this country, paying rates and taxes and bearing a good character, could have some special exemption made in their favour.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I do not propose to make a general reduction in the fee for a naturalisation certificate, and I do not think that the suggestion in the second paragraph is desirable or practicable.

#### COLLISIONS AT SEA.

\*MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state what was the number of collisions at sea in which British ships were engaged during the six months ending 31st December, 1900; and in how many cases of such collisions have the Board of Trade held an inquiry.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The number of collisions at sea in which British ships were involved and which were reported to the Board of Trade during the six months ended 31st December, 1900, was 431. The Board ordered formal inquiry in six of those cases. Three inquiries have been held. Three have been abandoned owing to the cases being taken to the Admiralty Court, and two are pending. In addition to the inquiries ordered by the Board of Trade six were held abroad either by Naval or Colonial Courts. I should like to add that the majority of the 431 cases to which I have referred were trivial, that loss of life occurred in only eighteen of them, and that in many instances the Board of Trade did not order inquiry because the cases were already before the Admiralty Court.

ELECTRIC TRAMS; STANDARD GAUGE.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his Department have considered the desirability of prescribing a standard gauge for electric trams in future Acts, so as to enable towns to be electrically connected in this country, as in America, without break of gauge.

\*MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The Board of Trade are fully aware of the importance of a uniform gauge, and when opportunity offers press their views on the subject upon promoters. I think it would be a mistake, however, to insist on the adoption of the standard gauge as an absolutely invariable rule; in hilly districts and in towns with very narrow streets it is sometimes desirable to adopt a gauge less than the usual 4 feet 8½ inches.

MANNING OF MERCHANT VESSELS; THE "PRIMROSE HILL."

MR. HOULT (Cheshire, Wirral): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he is aware that the captain of the sailing ship "Primrose Hill" stated publicly, before sailing from Liverpool, that his ship had been delayed during fine weather for several days wanting a crew, which could not be supplied by the Board of Trade officials; that other persons could have supplied the crew but doing so would have been contrary to the Act of 1854; and that two days after leaving Liverpool the "Primrose Hill" was driven ashore and became a total wreck, only one of the crew being saved; and whether, under the circumstances, he will cause inquiries to be made with a view to increasing the facilities for captains obtaining crews.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; I am aware of the circumstances of the case to which my hon. friend refers and of the statements made by the captain. An inquiry into the wreck of the "Primrose Hill" has been ordered, and I am informed that proceedings for libel are being taken in connection with the case. Until the inquiry has been held I can express no opinion on the point referred to in the last paragraph of the question.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can the right hon. Gentleman state what proportion of apprentices was carried by this vessel, and if they were so carried with a view to obtaining a reduction of the light

dues?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot without notice, but probably this is one of the questions being inquired into.

RAILWAY CARRIAGE COMPARTMENTS ;CORRIDOR TRAINS.

MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the recent case of murder and attempted murder in a railway compartment; and whether he has taken or will take steps to discourage the employment of separate compartment railway carriages on express trains.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The introduction of corridor trains and carriages is a matter within the discretion of the railway companies themselves, and I am not in a position to interfere. Considerable progress in this respect has been made during recent years.

HOLYHEAD PIER.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether the negotiations for the sale to the London and North Western Railway Company of certain property at Holyhead, and the proposals to erect a new mail pier and extend the Mackenzie Pier at Holyhead, have been abandoned; or whether the Board of Trade intend to proceed, during the next session of Parliament, with the Bill to enable them to carry out those arrangements.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; the negotiations for the sale to the London and North Western Railway Company of certain property at Holyhead have been abandoned having regard to the great cost which would be entailed by the erection of a new mail pier, a cost largely in excess of what was at one time anticipated.

SMALL DWELLINGS ACQUISITION ACT, 1899.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can state how many

localities have adopted the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act, 1899; how much money was advanced by these local authorities last year under that Act; and how many dwellings were purchased under its provisions.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): My information is limited to cases in which the borrowing of money by local authorities in England and Wales has been sanctioned for the purposes of the Act. Three local authorities were authorised to borrow money last year in respect of the purchase of eight houses, the amount sanctioned being £;1,830.

DEATHS FROM BEER POISONING IN ENGLAND.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state the number of deaths which have taken place in Great Britain during the past twelve months from the effect of drinking arsenicised beer, and also the number of cases reported during the same period in Great Britain in which people were reported or stated to have been poisoned, or to have suffered from the effects of drinking beer unfit for human use.

MR. WALTER LONG: The amount of exceptional sickness and death in England and Wales attributable to poisoning by arsenic is one of the questions referred to the Royal Commission recently appointed. The Local Government Board are not in



possession of the particulars asked for by the hon. Member. The latest information they have on the subject is contained in the Report made to them by Dr. Buchanan, which was presented to both Houses of Parliament last week.

#### PRECAUTIONS AGAINST SMALL-POX.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board what steps are being taken to preserve London from the danger of an outbreak of the small-pox epidemic so prevalent in Glasgow.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am happy to say that according to the latest Returns there is at present practically no smallpox in London. It is by the vaccination of unvaccinated persons and the revaccination of adults that effective steps can best be taken to prevent an outbreak of this disease.

#### SWINE FEVER.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture how many cases of swine fever occurred in 1898, 1899, and 1900 respectively; what was the total cost in each year in measures for suppressing swine fever; and whether any sums, if so, how much, were deducted each year from the grants in aid of local taxation.

MR. WALTER LONG (for Mr. HANBURY): The number of outbreaks of swine fever which occurred in 1898 was 2,514; in 1899 there were 2,322, and in 1900 1,940. The net expenditure incurred in dealing with the disease was, approximately, £112,000 in 1898; £71,500 in 1899; 1900, and, according to our latest estimate, it will amount to £52,000 for the current year. The amount drawn from the Local Taxation Accounts was £70,000 in 1898; £38,000 in 1899; 1900. We shall probably require £15,000 from the same source from swine fever business during the present year.

#### POSTMEN CANDIDATES FOR POSTMASTERSHIPS.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether postmen who offer themselves as candidates for postmaster and sub-postmaster vacancies that are advertised in the Official Circular are required to have a knowledge of telegraph duties.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): It is open to any officer of the Department whatever his rank and whether possessed of telegraph qualifications or not, to apply for any appointment as postmaster or sub-postmaster advertised in the Official Circular. Of course a candidate who possessed such qualifications would have a better chance of success, other things being equal, than one who did not.

MR. LOUGH: But is a knowledge of telegraphic duties insisted upon?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No. Sir; but, other things being equal, the candidate with the knowledge stands the better chance of success.

#### OVERTIME IN THE POST OFFICE.

MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will grant a Return showing the number of hours overtime, under the various heads in which overtime is claimed, performed at the Central Telegraph Office, London, and in the telegraph department of all the offices in Schedule A, during the twelve months ending 31st December, 1900.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: A general Return for the offices in question would involve a good deal of labour in compilation, and would not in the opinion of the Postmaster General be of any general interest. But if the hon. Member desires to have the figures for any particular office the Postmaster General will endeavour to supply him with the information.

#### SPORTING RIGHTS ON GOVERNMENT LANDS IN WALES.

MR. EDWARDS: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the sporting rights mentioned in the last Report of His Majesty's Commissioners of Woods and Forests and Land Revenues as having been leased in the counties of Radnor and Merioneth to certain persons for terms of 10 and 20 years were duly advertised so that the public had an opportunity of applying for them; and whether a valuation was made by a responsible agent of the sporting right in the county of Radnor which is now leased at a less rent than was previously obtained.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The leases referred to in the question are three in number, two being of sporting in Merionethshire, and one of sporting in Radnorshire; they were not advertised. The first Merionethshire lease was to the old tenant who agreed to pay its full value as estimated by the Crown valuer; the

second Merionethshire lease comprised the shooting over three farms recently bought by the Crown, and over some Crown waste adjoining them. It was part of the bargain with the vendor of the farms that he should have such a lease. The Radnorshire lease was granted to the only person who could be got to make an offer for it. The previous tenant refused to renew, and all likely persons were invited to tender, but it was not thought worth while to incur the expense of advertising or getting a valuation in such a small case.

#### MAIDSTONE ELECTION PETITION.

MR. CHANNING: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the Public Prosecutor will take proceedings against the persons scheduled in the Report of the judges who tried the Maidstone Petition, or whether other steps will be taken locally or by His Majesty's Government to bring these persons to justice; and whether the persons so scheduled will in any case be disqualified from voting in the election of a member to fill the vacancy created by the decision.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): Persons scheduled who have received certificates of indemnity cannot be prosecuted. The few cases in which such certificates were not granted are under consideration. The persons so scheduled are in all cases disqualified from voting in the election to fill the vacancy.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General if his attention has been directed to the judgment given in the Maidstone Election Petition case, when Mr. Justice Kennedy stated that there seemed to have been a more or less systematic provision made for the corrupt wants of the lower class voters, but that the total number of cases of bribery proved was only 25, and that there was no evidence which enabled the court to form a satisfactory opinion as to the proportion of the bribable class of voters; whether the representatives of the Director of Prosecutions who attended the trial called

any witnesses able to give material evidence, as directed by Section 43 (3) of the Corrupt Practices Act, 1883, or took any steps, by applying for an adjournment or otherwise, to assist the election judges to form a satisfactory opinion as to the extent to which corrupt practices prevailed in the borough; and what further steps the Government propose to take to ascertain the truth before assenting to the issue of a new writ.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: My attention has been called to the judgment in this case. The representative of the Director of Public Prosecutions was not in possession of any material evidence, and had no grounds on which he could properly have applied for an adjournment. I am informed by him that the court stated that they had no reason to doubt that all cases in support of which satisfactory evidence could be produced had been brought before them, and that he has no ground to suppose that this is not correct. It is extremely difficult to obtain legal proof in such cases. Under these circumstances it does not appear that any good would result from further delay.

REFORM OF THE CIRCUIT SYSTEM.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether, in view of the fact that the business of the King's Bench Division is at present much delayed through the absence of its Judges on circuit, he can promise any reform of the present circuit system.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The fact that two judges have been of late required for Election Petitions, and that one judge has been ill, has caused some interruption in the normal despatch of business in the King's Bench Division. Any proposal to deprive any counties of Assizes is attended with great practical difficulties. The whole question of improving the conduct of business in the King's Bench Division is being carefully considered.

LEGAL PROCEDURE ; SUPPRESSION OF WITNESSES' NAMES.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether he can state on what grounds the names of witnesses in the recent case of Cory-Thomas v. Spink were suppressed.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The names of some of the witnesses in the case referred to were, in pursuance of an arrangement made by the counsel in the case, not mentioned, with the very proper object of avoiding the infliction of unnecessary pain and annoyance.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I should like to ask the hon. and learned Gentleman whether he thinks the practice should be extended.

\*MR. SPEAKER: It is not in order when a question on the Paper has been answered for an hon. Member to ask another on a matter of opinion.

EDUCATION; REGINA v. COCKERTON.

MR. KENYON (Lancashire, Bury): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, pending the decision in the Court of Appeal in the case of Regina v. Cocker-ton, he will advise the Board to continue the grants to such Schools as may be affected by the judgment of Justices Wills and Kennedy, and whether any legislation is in contemplation on the subject should their judgment be confirmed.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge

University): The Board has already informed the schools affected that the status quo will be maintained until final judgment. The Board will want to see what that judgment is before deciding what action should be taken upon it.

#### ALLEGED ORANGE OUTRAGES IN LONDONDERRY.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether a bomb was discharged some months ago from the city walls of Londonderry into the yard of a house in Wellington Street in the said city; whether complaint about this matter was made by the occupier of the said house to the justices sitting in petty sessions, and if they directed the police authorities to investigate the occurrence; can he state whether any investigation was made as so directed; and, if so, with what result; and, will he see that the police

authorities take steps to have the law at present in force in the said city carried out, and thereby prevent the discharge of firearms and explosives at future Orange anniversaries.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The occurrence referred to in the first paragraph took place on the 6th June last. A rocket of a dangerous character was discharged on the occasion. The reply to the second paragraph is in the affirmative. The matter was very carefully investigated by the police, and the police communicated with the organiser of the demonstration, who was aware that rockets of the character referred to had been used and expressed his regret that they had been discharged. The police are alive to the importance of enforcing the law as regards the use of firearms and explosives, and will use their best endeavours to prevent a breach of the law in this respect in future.

MR. O'DOHERTY: And is a mere expression of regret from a leader of the Orange party sufficient to satisfy the Constabulary?

[No answer was given.]

#### RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION IN IRELAND.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the amount of money granted by Parliament for the construction of railways in Ireland which is yet unexpended; under what account and to what fund these unexpended sums are credited; and, in cases where original plans have fallen through, can these sums or any of them be devoted to the construction or extension of other lines.

MR. WYNDHAM: The amount of the grant referred to so far unexpended is £;270, 286. This sum is not held in a Suspense Account, as the money is lent when required to the Treasury by the National Debt Commissioners, on the application of the Board of Public Works. The whole of the money made available under the Act of 1896, except a small balance to meet possible excess expenditure in carrying out the schemes

already undertaken, has been hypothecated.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Have any schemes had to be abandoned?

MR. WYNDHAM: A sufficient number have not been abandoned to make it necessary to retain the money in hand.

#### OWENMORE RIVER (CO. SLIGO) DRAINAGE.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant

of Ireland whether he is aware of the fact that the drainage of the Owenmore river in South Sligo would be the means of converting hundreds of acres of marsh now practically useless into good arable land; and whether, as this river passes through a congested district, he will favourably consider the question of a grant by the Board of Agriculture in aid of a scheme for having it drained.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information respecting the first paragraph. No application with reference to a scheme for the drainage of the river mentioned has been made to the Department of Agriculture, and I am unable to say that the Department would favourably entertain any such application if made to them. The matter appears to me to be one in which application should be made to the Commissioners of Public Works, who are invested with statutory powers in reference to the formation and maintenance of drainage districts.

MR. O'DOWD: Seeing that this is a matter of great importance locally, will the right hon. Gentleman further consider it?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am willing to consider any matter laid before me, but there is not enough money available to take up every project, however much it may be desired locally.

LAND JUDGES' COURT RETURN.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is prepared to grant the Return in regard to the Land Judges Court on the Order Paper for this day.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not prepared to grant the Return in the form asked for. Its compilation would impose a great deal of labour on a Department which is barely able to cope with its work. Moreover, the Return would prove misleading, since it would embrace many particulars which have no bearing on the question of Land Purchase.

MR. CULLINAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will lay a Return upon the Table showing the number of estates in the Land Judges' Court in Ireland; the number of officials (including local receivers) employed in their management; the gross total of the rents collected in respect of such estates by the receivers during the year 1899; and the net total available in respect of that year for those beneficially interested after deduction of all charges for administration and collection.

MR. WYNDHAM: I regret I am unable to grant this Return, for reasons similar to those given by me in answer to a previous question standing in the name of the hon. Member for South Tyrone.

Mr. CULLINAN put a supplementary question, which could not be heard, and Mr. WYNDHAM promised to speak to him privately.

IRISH POLICE; SICK REGULATIONS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland (1) whether he is aware that members of the Royal Irish Constabulary and Dublin Metropolitan Police suffering from illness or injury contracted while discharging their duty are sent to hospital at their own expense; (2) whether the sum deducted from their pay is equivalent in the case of sergeants to about half their pay; (3) whether a Dublin policeman, if nursed by his wife, suffers a stoppage of a shilling a day, and if it is expected that he can support his

family and pay for medical requisites in these circumstances; (4) whether members of the Royal Irish Constabulary are obliged, in case of sickness requiring hospital treatment, to go to a hospital selected by the authorities, which pro-

vides for the religious comfort of no patients except those belonging to the Irish Protestant Church; and (5) whether the Government will inquire into the whole question of treating members of the two forces when ill, and either provide a hospital or else allow the men to select their own hospital and arrange their own terms of payment.

MR. WYNDHAM: Members of the Dublin Metropolitan Police and Royal Irish Constabulary who are sent to hospital are required to defray the hospital charges. In the case of the former force, these charges amount to 2s. a day for single men, and 1s. 6d. for married men. The rates charged to men of the Constabulary treated at Steevens' Hospital are 2s. 3d. for single men and 1s. 4d. for married men. Men of this force treated in the depot are charged 1s. 1d. a day. The stoppage of a shilling, to which reference is made in the third question, is not enforced in all cases. If the man's officer and the doctor concur in recommending him for exemption, no such stoppage is made. In reply to the fourth question, Steevens' Hospital has been selected by the Constabulary authorities for the treatment of men from that force, except in cases of fever. I understand that clergymen of all denominations have free access to this hospital. It is not proposed to make any alteration in the existing hospital arrangements in either of the two forces.

#### IRISH CONSTABULARY FORCE FUND.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state what amount of money was paid to the late Inspector General of Constabulary from the Constabulary Force Fund on the occasion of his retirement: whether unmarried members of the Royal Irish Constabulary are forced to pay an annual subscription to this fund against their will, and whether there is any provision for their reaping any benefit except their travelling expenses home on retirement; and whether he can state what amount of money has been paid into the Constabulary Force Fund by unmarried policemen since it was subsidised by the Government, and what amount was disbursed in respect of unmarried policemen during the same period.

MR. WYNDHAM: At the request of my right hon. friend I will reply to this question. The late Inspector General received a sum of £171 from the Constabulary Force Fund. Unmarried members of the force who joined before the 18th June, 1883, are subject to a statutory deduction of 30s. per cent. from their pay for the fund, and should they marry, their wives and children would be entitled, subject to the rules governing the fund, to participate in the benefits of the fund in addition to the grants on retirement, referred to in the question as "travelling expenses." As regards the second paragraph, I am informed that the books and accounts do not distinguish between payments made by married and unmarried members, respectively.

#### THE RECENT "DAY OF GENERAL MOURNING"; IRISH POLICE AND SHOPKEEPERS.

MR. M'FADDEN (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord

Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the sergeant of police at Ballybofey, county Donegal, on 1st February last, called upon the publicans of Ballybofey and Stranorlar, county Donegal, and peremptorily ordered them to close their places of business during the next day, being the occasion of the late Queen's funeral, and by whose authority and under what Act of Parliament the sergeant acted.

MR. WYNDHAM: The facts are not correctly stated in the question. It appears that some publicans asked the sergeant of police whether they were required to close their places of business. The sergeant replied in the affirmative, but subsequently he saw his error and at once informed the publicans it was unnecessary to close. They opened their places of business as usual on the 2nd instant,

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland by what authority policemen in Edgeworthstown and Ballymahon informed publicans that the day of the Queen's funeral was a holiday on which they should not open their business places; will he give the names of the policemen who made these statements; and will they be reprimanded for their interference with the trades of these towns.

MR. WYNDHAM: I think the hon. Member is under a misapprehension. No intimation of the nature mentioned was given by the police in either Edgeworthstown or Ballymahon.

STEAM TRAWLING IN GALWAY BAY.

MR. MORRIS (Galway): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the injury done by steam trawlers fishing in Galway Bay and other coast waters in Ireland, and that the prevalence of this illegal fishing is largely due to the smallness of the fine which the authorities are empowered by law to inflict on these poaching steamers when caught; whether he is aware that the highest fine possible to impose in Ireland is one-twentieth of that in Scotland; and whether he will see that measures are immediately taken to have Galway Bay more vigilantly protected, and to have the fine possible to impose in such cases raised.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no doubt that the prevalence of illegal trawling in Irish waters is due, to some extent, to the smallness of the fine that can be imposed under the existing law. I am aware of the fact stated in the second paragraph. If an opportunity arises I hope to assimilate the Irish law to that in force in Scotland in this respect. The special cruiser "Helga," in the service of the Department of Agriculture, is now engaged in policing Irish waters, and the steamer in the service of the Congested Districts Board has also been made available for the same purpose. Every possible effort will be made to suppress illegal trawling in Galway Bay and elsewhere in Ireland.

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE AND REAFFORESTATION, IRELAND.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the county council of the county of Cavan has called the attention of the Local Government

Board and the Board of Agriculture for Ireland to the necessity of amending the Local Government (Ireland) Act so as to enable county councils to execute

arterial drainage works and to re-afforest waste lands, subject to the usual procedure which has to be adopted in making new roads and other similar public works; and whether it is the intention of the Government to take any steps in the present session to amend the Local Government Act in this and other respects.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. As at present advised, I do not propose to amend the Act of 1899 in the direction suggested. The question of arterial drainage is at present one that comes more directly within the province of the Board of Works, who have considerable statutory powers in regard thereto. The Department of Agriculture are fully alive to the importance of including provision for tree planting operations and the expert advice necessary for carrying them out effectively in the schemes which the county councils are engaged in promoting under the Act of 1899, and will be prepared to take the requisite measures for this purpose at the proper opportunity.

#### BEER POISONING IN IRELAND.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of deaths, if any, which have taken place in Ireland during the past twelve months from the effects of drinking arsenicised beer; and whether he can give the number of cases reported, if any, during the same period in Ireland in which people were reported, or stated to have been poisoned, or suffered from the effects of drinking beer unfit for human use.

MR. WYNDHAM: No deaths, or cases of injury, from the cause referred to have been reported to the Registrar General in Ireland during the past twelve months.

#### DONEGAL LAND APPEALS.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the number of appeals from the Sub-Commission Court at present pending from the Innishowen

Union of the county of Donegal; and whether, as some of these appeals are pending for the past three or four years, he can say when the tenants concerned may expect the Appeal Court to dispose of the cases.

MR. WYNDHAM: Appeals are pending in fifty-two cases from the Innishowen Union. A large number of these cases will appear on the next List of Appeals for hearing at Londonderry, but no arrangements have yet been made by the Commissioners for the next sitting at that place.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman make arrangements for hearing these appeals in the Union, seeing that Londonderry is forty miles distant?

MR. WYNDHAM: I will lay the suggestion before the Land Commission, but, as the hon. Member knows, there are a large number of appeals outstanding.

#### LETTERKENNY LAND APPEALS.

MR. M'FADDEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the number of appeals pending in the Land Commission Court in the Letterkenny Union, county of Donegal, and, seeing that a great number of the cases are pending for upwards of three years, when the Land Commission Court will hold a sitting to dispose of the appeals; and if the Commission, considering the number of appeals from this Union, will hold a sitting at



Letterkenny for the disposal of the cases.

MR. WYNDHAM: Appeals are pending in thirty-seven cases from the Letterkenny Union. In only one of these cases is the appeal pending for upwards of three years, but in several others more than two years have elapsed since the appeal notices were lodged. Cases from this district will be heard at the next sitting of the Court at Londonderry, for which, however, no arrangements have as yet been made. It is not probable that the time at the disposal of the Commissioners will permit of their sitting at Letterkenny.

AGRARIAN DISPUTE IN SOUTH SLIGO.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain on whose authority and for what purpose an armed force of the Royal Irish Constabulary, numbering over 200 men, were drafted into the townland of Achonry, South Sligo, on Sunday, 13th January; and whether the costs arising out of such action will have to be borne by the over-burdened ratepayers of that locality.

MR. WYNDHAM: The police force drafted into Achonry on the 13th January consisted of forty-four men, not over 200 as stated. They were assembled by direction of the Government, acting on the advice of the local authorities, to prevent any attempt to intimidate certain persons in the locality who occupy grass farms. The answer to the second paragraph is in the negative.

MR. O'DOWD: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the meeting referred to was one of farmers convened for the purpose of forming a local branch of the United League?

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not in order in entering into explanations of that kind.

CORK ASSIZES; SUB LAND COMMISSION.

MR. BARRY (Cork County, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that the Cork Assizes will open on Saturday, 16th of March, and continue for several days, and that a Sub-Commission will sit in Skibbereen on the 19th of March, he can state what provision, if any, will be made for enabling jurors whose cases are listed for hearing on that date being present in person or represented by solicitors who shall also be absent at the Assizes; and whether he would make a representation to the Land Commission to change the date of the sitting of the Sub-Commission to some convenient day either before or after the Cork Assizes.

MR. WYNDHAM: Under the circumstances the Land Commission will arrange to postpone the sitting of the Sub-Commission at Skibbereen, fixed for the 19th March, until after the Cork Assizes.

OGILBY ESTATE, CO. TYRONE

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that an order was made by the Land Court in 1891 for the sale of the Ogilby Estate, in the county Tyrone, the tenants at the time being served with final notice and schedule, and that the tenants two years ago made application to the Court to purchase their holdings; and will he state whether the necessary valuation in response to the application has been made, and the cause of the delay in carrying out the sale of this

estate to the occupying tenants.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed by the Registrar of the Land Judge's Court that the settlement of the rental of the holdings on this estate will be proceeded with before the Examiner next week, when it is hoped the rental will be finally settled. The case now stands on the list of the Land Judge for the 15th April, but if the rental be settled in the meantime a request will be at once issued to the Land Commissioners under the 40th section of the Act of 1896.

KENNY ESTATE, CO. GALWAY.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the case of the Kenny Estate, situate at Skehannagh, in the county of Galway, at present under the jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery in Ireland, which has been recently offered for purchase to the tenants, the right of game being reserved from the tenants; and whether it is usual in cases of this kind to make such a reservation.

MR. WYNDHAM: So far as can be ascertained no proceedings are pending before the Land Judge for sale of the lands referred to in the question. If fuller particulars are furnished further inquiry will be made.

IRISH DAIRY INDUSTRY.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether it has been brought to his notice that the Danish Government have permanently two Commissioners in Great Britain superintending the distribution of Danish dairy products and safeguarding the interests of Danish agriculturists; and whether it is intended to appoint such a Commissioner (under the Agricultural and Technical Act, 1900) to protect the interests of Irish farmers in the English markets.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department of Agriculture is aware that the Danish Government have an officer or officers in Great Britain for the purpose stated. It is understood that the duties of these officers largely consists in watching the administration of the Sale of Food and Drugs Acts, and furnishing to their Government information concerning British markets which is of value to Danish agriculturists. The Department have already taken steps to promote both these objects in the interests of Irish agricultural produce, and, should experience prove it to be necessary to keep a special officer resident in England for the purpose, they will be prepared to take that measure also.

DUAL OWNERSHIP OF IRISH LAND.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to a resolution recently adopted by the Cork County Council condemning the present system of dual ownership of land in Ireland, and advocating compulsory sale upon equitable terms.; whether he is aware that numerous public bodies in Ireland have adopted similar resolutions; and whether it is proposed to give consideration to the views thus expressed.

MR. WYNDHAM: Representations to the effect mentioned have been made by a number of public bodies in Ireland. The policy of the Government will be more

conveniently discussed on the Amendment to the Address standing in the name of the hon. Member for Water-ford.

#### IRISH ASSESSMENTS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the land of Ireland has not been revalued for nearly half a century, that a majority of the buildings are in the same condition as regards rating, and whether new buildings and improved premises have been valued according to their present rental; whether he is aware that on this account the rateable valuations of land and buildings are unequal and frequently inaccurate in Ireland; whether, seeing that the local authorities in England, Scotland, and Wales are empowered to revalue all property at such periods as they may think desirable, he can state upon what grounds a similar right is withheld from Ireland; and whether the Government will consider the desirability of converting the Valuation Office into a popular board on which all classes of Irishmen may be represented.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is true that nearly fifty years have elapsed since the general valuation of Ireland was completed. There is no power to revise that valuation owing to the fact that Bills introduced by the Government in 1865 and 1878, making provision for a general revaluation, were withdrawn, mainly owing to the opposition of the Irish Members. The inequalities referred to in the second paragraph no doubt exist. It is generally admitted that the Irish system, under which a valuation has been carried out by a central body, is more uniform, consistent, and satisfactory than the system existing in this country. The reply to the last paragraph is in the negative.

MR. O'SHEE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether in the revaluation of rateable property in county boroughs about to be made steps will be taken to obtain a separate valuation of buildings and of land in the same way as in rural districts under Griffith's Valuation; and whether in the case of a revaluation of rateable property in urban districts the same distinction will be adopted.

MR. WYNDHAM: In the revaluation of Belfast now being issued to the rating authorities all lands except what may be termed the curtilages surrounding villas are separately valued.

#### IRISH LABOURERS' COTTAGES; UNEXPENDED GRANTS.

MR. O'SHEE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what amount remains unexpended in each county of Ulster and Connaught out of the Exchequer contribution of £40,000 per annum granted under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, in aid of the rates leviable in respect of cottages provided since 1891 under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have communicated by letter the figures to the hon. Member; they are too lengthy to read out in the form of an answer to a question.

#### REPAIR OF IRISH ROADS.

MR. LONDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the fact that many of the roads in Ireland are in a bad condition and that the labourers are in need of employment, he will, in pursuance of his interview some weeks ago with the deputation from

the Limerick County Council, on the subject of obtaining an Order in Council for repairing and making the public roads of Ireland by direct labour through the county surveyors, and of his communications with the various county surveyors and the various councils connected with that department, now state if he will bring the matter of obtaining such Order before this House.

MR. WYNDHAM: I stated to the deputation that waited upon me that I would direct the Local Government Board to forward to local authorities in Ireland a draft of a Provisional Order which it was proposed to make amending the Local Government (Procedure of Councils) Order of 1899, in regard to the repair and maintenance of roads by direct labour. The Board communicated with the local bodies on the 6th inst., but obviously some little time must elapse before I am in possession of their views on the subject. A number of copies of the draft Provisional Order have been sent to the hon. Member for South Leitrim for the information of his colleagues.

MR. LONDON: Will the right hon. Gentleman have the Provisional Order published in the local papers, as this matter is of great interest to the labouring classes.

MR. WYNDHAM: I gave orders that that should be done.

ENNISCORTHY ASYLUM; ACCOUNTS AUDIT.

MR. FFRENCH (Wexford, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the committee of management of the Enniscorthy Asylum recently passed a resolution complaining of the charge of £;30 demanded by sealed order of the Local Government Board for Ireland for auditing the accounts of the asylum, although the previous charge was only £;23 per annum for similar work; and whether, as the committee of management is a committee of the county council, the charge for auditing the accounts of the asylum should be included in the charge for auditing the accounts of the county council, which is fixed by the 64th section of the Local Government Act.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): I am not aware of whether the resolution referred to has been received or not, nor can I in such short notice state the nature of the details in respect of which the increased charge of £;7 was made. The audit of the asylum accounts has always been separate and distinct from that of the Grand Jury accounts, and was separately charged for; and the Local Government Board are advised that the 64th section of the Local Government Act only alters the former practice to the extent of substituting the County Council for the Grand Jury separate audits, and are properly charged for.

WORKING-CLASS HOUSES IN BOYLE.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he can state the cause of the delay by the Board of Works in issuing to the Boyle Town Commissioners the loan of £;1,800 for erecting houses by virtue of the Provisional Order obtained last July under the Housing of the Working Classes Acts, this loan having been sanctioned by the Local Government Board; and whether he can state when the first instalment will be placed to the credit of the town commissioners.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There has been no avoidable delay. No application for a

loan was received from the town commissioners till the 24th January. Treasury sanction has now been given, and the first instalment will be issued as soon as the legal formalities are completed.

#### ST. MEL'S CATHEDRAL.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that his predecessor in office instructed the Board of Works to send Sir Thomas Deane to make an inspection of and report on the ruins of St. Mel's Cathedral at Ardagh, county Longford; whether the Church representative body refused to agree to vest those works as required before repairs could be undertaken, and will he now give a Return of the correspondence on the subject.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The statement in the first paragraph is correct. The central Church representative body is willing to vest the ruins, but it cannot do so without the consent of the local Church body, which has not been given. As I stated on Monday, no correspondence has passed upon the subject.

#### IRISH SOLICITORS AND SOMERSET HOUSE APPOINTMENTS.

MR. O' DOHERTY: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether, seeing that Irish solicitors are eligible as candidates for the position of First Division clerks, Estate and Legacy, Succession Duty Office, and that a number of the selected candidates are engaged in the Estate Duty Office, Custom House, Dublin, he will explain why Irish solicitors who are candidates are examined exclusively in English law, part of which, such as the law relating to searches and registration of title, does not apply to Ireland; and whether immediate steps will be taken to remedy this state of things by examining Irish candidates on the course prescribed by the Incorporated Law Society of Ireland at the final examination for solicitors.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The greater number of Irish solicitors who are successful in the examinations for First Division clerkships in the Estate Duty Office are appointed to London. Only four Irish solicitors are at present engaged at the Dublin office, and none have been appointed to that office since 1897. It is true that the examination for English and Irish solicitors is exclusively in English law; but for purposes of Estate Duty, English and Irish law are substantially the same, and in this connection the difference in the law relating to searches and registration of titles is of little or no importance.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Is it not the case that Irish tenant farmers pay thousands of pounds in these duties?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order &#x0021; I must remind the hon. Gentleman that he is not entitled to argue.

#### BALLYBOFEY SUB-POSTMASTERSHIP.

MR. BOYLE (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can state how long the position of sub-postmaster in the town of Ballybofey, county Donegal, has been vacant; what is the reason for the delay in filling the position; and whether the delay is due to the fact that the person designated for appointment is a minor and a nonresident of the town.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The appointment of sub-postmaster of Ballybofey, Strabane, has been vacant since the 23rd November last. The reason for the delay

in filling the vacancy is that there were a large number of candidates respecting whose qualifications inquiry had to be made. The person whom it has been decided to appoint is not a minor, and is a resident in Ballybofey.

#### AGRICULTURAL RATING AND TITHE RENT-CHARGE BILLS.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view

of his announcement that it is the intention of the Government to propose the renewal, this session, of the Agricultural Land Rating Act, 1896, and the Tithe Rent-charge (Rates) Act, 1899, the Bills introduced for such purpose will be similar in character to the Acts now in force; and at what period during the session does the Government propose to introduce them.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it probable there will be a single Bill renewing these Acts. I cannot make any statement as regards the time it will be brought forward.

#### ROYAL ACADEMY; PROPOSED ROYAL COMMISSION.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, having regard to the present constitution of the Royal Academy, and the increase in the number of British sculptors, architects, and artists (other than painters) since its foundation, the Government will recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the administration of that body with a view to its reorganisation, and with the object of augmenting the number of corporate members drawn from the sculptors, architects, and artists of the nation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No information has been brought to my notice, or, so far as I know, to that of any other member of the Government, which would seem to justify or render necessary the appointment of such a Commission as the hon. Gentleman suggests.

#### THE CIVIL LIST.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in regard to the Civil List to be voted to His Majesty, it is intended to follow the precedent of 1837, and to appoint a Committee to inquire into the amount necessary to support the state and dignity of the Crown, before bringing in a Bill; and whether he will lay upon the Table a Return of the amounts appearing in the Estimates of the present financial year which are expended either in maintaining the state and dignity of the Crown or in administering or maintaining the Crown Lands.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose to follow closely the precedent set in 1837. I am not quite sure I fully understand the last paragraph of the hon. Gentleman's question, If he will put it in another form on another day I will do my best to answer it.

#### MUNICIPAL TRADING.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government adhere to their intention to ask both Houses to concur in appointing a Committee on municipal trading; and, if so, whether long notice will be given, and the opportunity afforded for debate.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think it would be very desirable the Committee should be reappointed, and I should be very sorry if the reappointment should be the

occasion of any long debate in this House, especially as the matter was debated at considerable length during the last session of Parliament. Of course it is in the power of hon. Members to prevent the reappointment being made after 12 o'clock at night.

#### COST OF THE CORONATION.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can say what will be the probable cost of the Coronation.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot give the hon. Gentleman any information.

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

[SIXTH DAY'S DEBATE.]

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Main Question [14th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth;

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament"; (Mr. Forster.)

Question again proposed.

#### IRISH LAND ACTS.

\*MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): The Amendment which stands in my name on the Paper, and which I desire to move, raises once more for the consideration of Parliament the Irish land question. The importance and vital urgency of that question I do not think will be challenged by one who has any practical acquaintance with Ireland. And yet it is true to say that for the last two decades there has been no question which has occupied so much of the time of Parliament and upon which the greatest statesmen on both sides of the House have bestowed greater pains in an effort to obtain its settlement. Both political parties have dealt with this question, in my own personal experience in this House, again and again in turn. All the greatest leaders of your two parties have tried their hands upon its settlement, and as a matter of fact during these twenty years; I might even say thirty years; measure after measure has been passed by Parliament dealing with this question, and yet, at the end of it all, to-day you find yourselves once more confronted by this great problem, upon which depends not merely the peace and tranquillity of Ireland, but I must almost say the very existence of the remnant of the Irish race. Let me ask at the outset what is the reason for this extraordinary failure? Why is it that all the greatest and wisest of your statesmen belonging to both parties have during thirty years failed in their efforts to deal successfully with this question? Is the problem insoluble? Does the fault rest with the Irish representatives or the Irish people? No, Sir. The answer is perfectly simple. It is that upon that Irish land question this Parliament has never allowed itself to be guided or influenced by Irish ideas or Irish opinions. You have insisted time and again in forcing

upon Ireland measures dealing with this question which the great majority of the Irish representatives told you were inadequate and unsuitable. The programme of

the Land League in the year 1879; namely, the immediate creation of an occupying proprietary; was denounced by both the parties in the State as a scheme of robbery and confiscation; and, instead of it, this Parliament forced upon Ireland a system of dual ownership; a system of State interference, of the State fixing rents; in spite of our protests; a system which Ireland did not ask for and which we warned them could not settle the question; a system which was in itself illogical, absurd, and unsound in principle, and which I assert to-day, by the common consent of all parties and all classes in Ireland, has completely broken down. I desire at the outset to make it plain that Ireland was in no sense responsible for the Land Act of 1881. I was myself a Member of the House at the time, and I well remember that Mr. Parnell and the Irish representatives of that day refused to vote in favour of the Second Reading of that Bill; and when the Second Reading division was called the entire body of the Irish representatives walked out of the House and took no part in it, and we solemnly warned Mr. Gladstone and this Parliament that that measure could not provide a settlement of this question. Well, Irish opinion was overborne and a measure was in that year forced upon Ireland which we did not want and whose failure we predicted. I say that the history of this Irish land question and the fact that it is once more casting its shadow over Ireland and thundering at the doors of Parliament, constitutes the most striking conceivable proof of the impossibility of governing Ireland, and of the impossibility of dealing successfully with great Irish problems without having some regard to the opinions and advice of the Irish representatives and of the Irish people.

I say that the present land system of Ireland has absolutely and completely broken down. Is there anyone in this House, belonging to any party, either from Ireland or Great Britain, who can controvert that statement? Let me apply to it perhaps the most simple test possible. Every class in Ireland is dissatisfied with the present system. It is not merely the tenantry of Ireland, or even their representatives, who, seeing that under the working of this system the property of the people in the soil is being confiscated, demand its abolition. It is not merely the landlords who come here and also declare that their property is being confiscated and equally demand the abolition of the system. On this question there is an absolute unanimity of opinion between all classes in Ireland; and between landlord and tenant; who join in declaring that the present land system, forced on Ireland in 1881, has broken down, and are asking for its abolition. The administration of the present system, likewise, does not command the confidence of any class in Ireland. I assert, without fear of contradiction, that the Irish Land Commission has absolutely no friends in Ireland. The landlords on the one side, and the tenants on the other, equally proclaim their want of confidence in the administration.

A more striking example of this could not possibly be found than what occurred in this House last year, when the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Armagh, as representing the landlords, voted in the same lobby with us, as representing the tenants, against the estimates for the administration of this system. Both the landlords and the tenants are united in declaring their want of confidence in the administration of the present system, and both declare



that the Land Commission is partial and inefficient. It could not be otherwise; the task committed to the Commission was an impossible one. The system was an inefficient one, and it was utterly impossible that it could end in anything else than the confessed and admitted failure that has overtaken it.

Let me ask the House to consider what the cost of that administration has been. In the debate upon this subject in the last Parliament the Attorney General spoke of the cost of the Land Commission as being about £100,000 a year. I tried to verify those figures, but I have been unable to do so; but I find the estimate for the administration of the Commission in 1891 was £136,000, and that the salaries, which are charged upon the Consolidated Fund, but which must be

added to that sum, amount to about £16,000, making the estimate for that one year £152,000. If you deduct from that the amount of £20,000, on account of land purchases, it still leaves the cost at about £132,000. That is to say, the cost of the administration has for the last twenty years been considerably over £2,500,000; but that, after all, has only been a small part of the cost. In the last Official Returns upon this subject it is recorded that there were 328,720 fair rents fixed since 1881 upon first term applications; and upon second term applications, up to last March, 52,396, and there were over 60,000 appeals. Without adding anything for the years that have elapsed since then, and making due allowance for the cases settled out of court, there have been no less than 400,000 law suits tried out in Ireland. Now, making a very modest and moderate estimate of the costs incurred on both sides in each of those cases, and taking the figure, after having consulted some of the best authorities upon the subject; most of whom told me that, if anything, that estimate was too low; taking £4 as the figure for costs incurred on each side, there has been £3,500,000 spent in law costs. That is to say, there has been spent in twenty years over £6,000,000 of money in carrying out this system. For what? The rentals of Ireland have been reduced by a million and a half or two millions, but in its effect upon the country, in its effect upon the prosperity of the classes concerned, what have you gained by the expenditure of over £6,000,000 of money upon this system? Here we are to day with the admitted fact that both landlord and tenant are both worse off than they were before. After twenty years of this game of beggar-my-neighbour going on in Ireland we have both the landlord and tenant declaring that they have no confidence in the system, and that it must be swept away. But apart from what both sides in Ireland believe, the partial administration of this system; and apart from its ridiculous and ruinous cost; I say the system itself has absolutely broken down.

There are three points of view from which it can be looked at. Let me take first the point of view; my own point of view; of the tenant farmers in Ireland.

I say that this system, which was forced on Ireland in opposition to our advice in 1881, has not alleviated materially the condition of the tenant farmers of Ireland. It is true that the rental of Ireland has been reduced; but everyone knows that during these years the fall in price of agricultural produce has been so great in Ireland; just as it has been in England; that it is true, I believe, to assert at this moment that the tenant farmer of Ireland who has had his rent

reduced under the operation of the present land system is no better off than he was twenty years ago, when he was paying a higher rent, but before the fall in the price of agricultural produce. Under the operation of this system we who speak in the name of the tenant farmers assert that, though the rent is reduced, they are still paying rent on their own property and their own improvements, and that during all these years there has been hanging over the head of every tenant farmer in the country the menace of a lawsuit. The periodical revision of rent at comparatively frequent periods must naturally have had the effect of interfering materially with good cultivation of the country. Of course, hon. Gentle men will say that for the tenant farmer not to put his best efforts into the land for fear that his rent may be raised is very wrong and perhaps dishonest: but, after all, we are dealing with human nature, which in this matter is not very different in Ireland from human nature in other countries, We know perfectly well that when the tenant is coming within a few years of the period when this tribunal in which he has no confidence whatever is to come again to value his land and to assess his rent, we know very well that he will not put his heart into the work of getting as much out of the land as the land is capable of producing, and in that way the result to the country generally must be bad.

From the landlord's point of view how has this system worked? We had the other day a sentence written by an Irish landlord describing what he conceived to be the present condition of one of his class. He said, "I am a nondescript rent-charger hovering about in a state of suspended animation." The real fact of the matter is that under the operation of this land system the landlords of Ireland are being

slowly but surely squeezed out of existence. In those cases in which second-term rents have been fixed the reductions have been on the average more than 40 percent. of the rents as they stood in 1881. Everyone knows the difference in the condition of the Irish and English landlords. Whereas English landlords were able to bear those large reductions of rent which, without the expenditure of six millions of money on a Land Commission, were brought about on their estates, their brethren in Ireland are unable to bear those reductions, and they have brought ruin to many landlords of Ireland. I say that it is beyond doubt or question that the third revision of rents, with the probability; nay, certainty; which we have that, owing to the changed condition of the world and the means of transit in the world, the price of agricultural commodities will not rise, the absolute certainty is, in my opinion, that the third revision of judicial rents will mean for the overwhelming majority of the smaller landlords complete and hopeless ruin. From the point of view of the country generally I believe the working of this system has been absolutely disastrous. Let me ask, What country in the world could possibly prosper which was subject to this system of periodical litigation? What country in the world could prosper when the one great industry which must be the basis, after all, of the national prosperity is subjected to this ordeal of constant litigation and remains insecure and uncertain? The cultivation of Ireland has not been as good as it ought to have been under a proper system, and it is impossible to keep out of

one's consideration, in dealing with this question, the horrible and heartbreaking emigration statistics of the last twenty years.

Mr. Gladstone in eloquent words told the Irish representatives in this House that the Land Act of 1881 would end this chapter of Irish history. He told them that it would enable Irishmen to live and prosper on their own land; and after twenty years working of this system what do we find? During these years more than a million and a half of the Irish people have emigrated from the country. That has been a constant and steady drain. I succeeded in getting, the other day, emigration statistics for the year 1900, and it is indeed a disquieting fact that emigration in Ireland has commenced to rise again. For the years 1898, 1899, and 1900 there has been a steady and distinct rise. This one fact alone, that this system, instead of enabling the people to live and prosper in Ireland, has certainly not checked emigration; it has gone on as badly as ever in proportion to the reduced population; is, in my view, sufficient in itself to condemn the system. English Members sometimes take an entirely erroneous view on this question of emigration. There are portions of Ireland in the congested districts where the population has been, owing to the barrenness of the soil, greater than that poor soil could support in comfort. Yes; but it is not from those districts that emigration has gone on. Emigration has gone on from the whole of the country generally; and it is an interesting fact which will interest hon. Members from Ulster and other members of the House, that, while Belfast has increased in population, the population in the agricultural districts of Ireland during the last twenty years has steadily diminished. This emigration has been of the most deadly kind. Those who have emigrated from Ireland have been people in the prime of life, and surely it is a heart-breaking thing for us Irishmen to consider that the proportion of old people and of little children is greater in Ireland to-day than in any country in Europe. The position in Ireland has been all during these twenty years that one class of the population have been flying away from the shores of Ireland, or else remaining not contented, but in many cases in increasing poverty, and that the other class of our countrymen; the landlords; have been all during this time slowly but surely being ruined. Apart altogether from every other consideration affecting this question, in my view the emigration statistics alone are proof conclusive of the absolute failure of the system and of its injurious effects on the condition of the country generally. Therefore from that point of view this system has failed. Its administration possesses the confidence of no party and of no class. Its administration has been absurdly and ruinously costly and extravagant. It has been partial and inefficient according to universal opinion. It has not benefited the tenants. They to-day call out for its abolition. It has admittedly ruined the Irish landlords, and they also cry out against its continued existence. It has kept Ireland all during these years in a state of unrest and poverty, and under its operation immigration has gone on steadily, and for the last three years has commenced once again to rise. Now, surely no prediction was ever so completely justified by experience as that of Mr. Parnell when in 1881 he declared to Mr. Gladstone that the Act of that year could not possibly settle the Irish question, and that it was based upon wrong lines and

unsound principle.

In what I have said I have been dealing with matters about which there is no difference of opinion at all. Let me come now to the remedy which we have been advocating for well over twenty years. There, again, I am in the fortunate position that in principle there is no difference between Irish landlords and tenants. All classes in Ireland, landlords and tenants alike, demand abolition of this system of dual ownership and State regulation of rents, and ask for the substitution for it of a system of occupying proprietary. The only portion of the Irish land system which is working any good in Ireland at all is that which is comprised in the Irish Land Purchase Acts, I desire to say that in my opinion in principle, and indeed in intention, these Acts were admirable. But our case is that the operation of these Acts has been partial and so slow that a settlement of the; question cannot be looked for from their operation. After fifteen years working I under these Voluntary Land Purchase Acts, roughly speaking, about 50,000 sales have been effected, or, in other words, it would take about 150 years by the operation of these Acts to settle the Irish Land question upon the lines which we all desire to see it settled upon. And it is remarkable that the Fry Commission, which sat quite recently, reported that the slowness in the working of the Land Commission in this purchase department increases rather than diminishes as time goes on. Into the precise causes of the delay in the working of these Acts I do not intend at this moment to enter at any length, but I must say this, that in my opinion a large measure of responsibility rests upon the Irish Land Commission. I believe that the spirit in which they proceed to the administration of these Acts is altogether wrong. Instead of regarding their duty as that of carrying out a great national state policy of reconstruction and reconciliation, they act apparently in all these cases in the hard and grinding spirit of the moneylender. They devote all their attention to the safeguarding of the interests of the British Treasury, which was never for a single moment in any jeopardy. I remember that my hon. friend the Member for the St. Patrick's division of Dublin asked a question in this House a couple of years ago on this point, and was told in reply that there were 5,500 cases where actually the landlord and the tenant had agreed as to the price to be paid, but where the sale was blocked by the Land Commission, and they refused to allow it to be carried out.

But while maintaining that the spirit of the Land Commission is probably one of the reasons for the slow administration of these Acts, I must with perfect candour recognise that it is not the real reason. We know perfectly well that the real reason is that there is a large class of Irish landlords who cannot afford to sell under these Irish Land Purchase Acts. They are men who are living on a very small margin of their rents, and although these men know perfectly well that a third revision of judicial rents will sweep that margin away altogether, still they prefer putting off to the last possible moment facing the situation, and they refuse to sell their estates to their tenants.

Therefore I make the point that no Voluntary Land Purchase system can possibly settle the Irish Land question. The success of these Acts where they have been

put in operation has been enormous and most gratifying. The price paid by the Irish tenants in those cases of sale has been on the average something like seventeen years and a half purchase. That is the price at which the landlords have sold their estates. They apparently were satisfied with that price, because there was no compulsion to sell if they did not choose to do so. The tenants no doubt have reaped enormous benefits, because at that price the tenants have been called upon to pay, by way of instalments and to pay the interest on the purchase money, some 25 or 30 per cent. less than the reduced judicial rent which they were paying, and the State; and this, after all, is a matter of vital importance in the question; the State has suffered nothing. I believe that the amount of money advanced has been something like eighteen millions, and there have been, speaking broadly, no arrears. The arrears on the eighteen millions are a mere bagatelle; so small that they do not count at all.

But the extraordinary part of the situation is this, that the success of these Acts makes it absolutely impossible for you to stop there. The very success of these Acts makes it essential for you to introduce a general scheme affecting the whole country. It is unnecessary for me to illustrate that statement. For example, take any parish in Ireland. You may find in the centre of that parish an estate where the landlord has consented to sell to his tenants, and under the operation of these Acts he has been changed from a tenant paying a judicial rent into an owning occupier paying instalments for a certain number of years, and the instalment he is paying is 30 per cent. less than the rent, and all around him his next-door neighbours are tenants, on other estates where the landlords have refused to sell, and where the tenants must continue to pay 25 or 30 per cent. more. The very existence of that state of things prevents the possibility of tranquillity, rest, and contentment in Ireland; and although it seems paradoxical to say so, it is absolutely true that the greater the success that has attended these Voluntary Acts the greater the necessity that there should be a complete system of land purchase which would spread all over the country. The Government, I notice, have declared in the King's Speech that they are going to introduce some Bill dealing with these Voluntary Acts. Now let me say at once; and possibly the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant will not be greatly surprised when he hears the statement; in our opinion, the time has absolutely passed for tinkering with this subject. We will not favour or tolerate, so far as we can, any further tinkering with this question. There has been twenty years experience of fixing of fair rents, there has been fifteen years experience of these Land Purchase Acts, and we say that the only solution which can settle, or which can give us any hope of settling the question must be a great, bold, and statesmanlike scheme, such as there are precedents for in many countries in Europe, for the general compulsory sale of the land by the landlords to the tenants upon terms which will not only be just to the tenants, but which, so far as we are concerned, will be absolutely just to the Irish landlords. I know that in proposing to Parliament a scheme of compulsion directed at any class of the community, it is necessary to show that that class will not be unjustly treated. I do not deal with the general

principle which is to be found up and down all through the legislation of this country, namely, that the interest of one particular set of men must give way to the general interest of the community. I know that in all cases where that principle has been put in operation the Legislature has most properly been very tender to the interests of the injured class, or the class which might think itself injured, and has taken every precaution to prevent injustice being done to it. But in the case of the Irish landlords the outcry which I hear about the enormity of compulsory sale is ridiculous. Why, the principle has already been applied to the Irish landlords. What did the Act of 1881 do? It took the rents of the Irish landlords and compulsorily reduced them. That is to say, in 1881 the Legislature stepped in and compulsorily regulated and reduced the income of the Irish landlords, and declared what was to be the rent-charge on the land; and it certainly does not seem to me to be a very extravagant or unreasonable extension of that principle to say that, having regulated and decided what a man's income is to be, you should be allowed also to say that the income is to be derived no longer from the rent-charge, but as interest on land stock created by purchase.

The real question I feel that it is necessary to grapple with on this point is, Can this system of compulsion be applied to the Irish landlords without absolutely ruining them? I believe it can, and I know it can; and I know that very many of the wisest and more far-seeing of the Irish landlords not only believe that it can be done, but believe that it is the only way to save their class. I would respectfully submit to the consideration of the Irish landlords this fact; every year that passes the value of their property is going down. In 1879 the "robbers and confiscators" of the Irish Land League offered the landlords twenty years' purchase of Griffith's valuation. In 1886 Mr. Gladstone also made a proposal, which was also denounced as robbery and confiscation, under which the landlords were to get as a minimum twenty years' purchase of the then judicial rents which were lower than the valuation. To-day, when this question comes to be settled Irish landlords themselves in the operation of the Voluntary Purchase Acts admit that they consider a little over seventeen years purchase of the judicial rents quite fair. I respectfully submit to Irish landlords that the longer this question remains unsettled the less property they will have to sell, and from the point of view of their own safety and interest I say to them that they are unwise in not coming in as a body and joining hands with us, and seeking to have a great measure of compulsory purchase passed upon terms just to them as well as to the Irish tenants. The Irish party are constantly taunted with operating on this question not for the purpose of benefitting the tenants or the country, but for the purpose of ruining and exterminating the Irish landlords.

Why, Sir, if we cared nothing for the general interests of the tenant farmers and of Ireland, and wished only to exterminate the Irish landlords, all we would have to do would be to wait for a few years longer for a third-term fixing of the judicial rents, and I believe by that process the class of Irish landlords would be absolutely ruined in Ireland. I repudiate absolutely any such unpatriotic and absurd desire on the part of Irish Members of this House. We

look at this question in a broader and a more just spirit from the point of view of the general welfare and prosperity of our own people and country generally. I say that we are not working for the extermination and ruin of the Irish landlords, and I have no hesitation in saying that if in the operation necessary to carry out this great scheme the British Treasury choose out of that accumulation of money due to Ireland over the financial relations to make the operation easy for the Irish landlords, the Irish tenants certainly will not be found to raise any serious objection. We do not desire to exterminate any class of our countrymen, no matter what the history of their forefathers may have been; and I may be allowed personally to express my own belief and hope that, if a great scheme such as I have been indicating is carried into effect, a very large proportion indeed of the Irish landlords who have been expropriated will be glad to retain their houses and homes and continue to live in the country and bear their share in promoting its prosperity in the future.

I feel that it is necessary to show not merely that a scheme such as this will not be unjust to the Irish landlords and that we have no such desire or intention, but I feel that it is necessary also to say something on the question whether a measure of this kind would be just to the British taxpayer. Not that, in view of the past history of the financial relations between the two countries, I am very tender about the interests of the British taxpayer, but because I desire to be practical, and I know that that is a question which I must address myself to if I am to make this scheme acceptable to Parliament. Is it just that the British taxpayer should be called upon to make a fairly large expenditure of public money for this purpose? I will not be guilty of the impropriety of attempting to discuss the war in South Africa on this question, but I may, in passing, be allowed to say that if the British taxpayer is willing to go on paying something like £2,000,000 a week to carry on a work of ruin, devastation and desolation in one country, they ought to be willing to make a far more moderate expenditure of public money in Ireland on a great work of peace, reconstruction and reconciliation. In this matter England is under a deep obligation to Ireland generally, and I will say in a particular way to Irish landlords. I remember very well, in speaking on this question in this House in 1886, Mr. Gladstone used

these memorable words which I take the liberty of quoting to the House. He said; "We cannot wash ourselves clean and clear of responsibility for the Irish land system. The Irish landlords were our garrisons in Ireland. We planted them there and we replanted them there. In 1641 and 1688 and 1798 we re-conquered the country for them. The landlords were our garrison, our representatives, and we have relied upon them as they have relied upon us. We cannot wash our hands of responsibility for their doings or the consequences of their doings."

I believe, Sir, that that is an accurate statement of historical fact, and I believe that it will be impossible for this country, with justice, to complain of her responsibility or of any burden that may be necessary in order to undo the wrongs of the past. And may I take this from another point of view. What risks are we asking the British exchequer to undertake? For my own part I

believe absolutely none. The working of the existing Voluntary Acts goes to some extent, at any rate, to prove my point. As have stated before, of the £18,000,000 advanced under those Acts, many of these tenants have paid up practically to the last farthing, although the price at which they bought is greater than the price they would have to pay now on rents which have again been reduced. This policy of repudiation that we have heard of as likely to come if Ireland was made subject to the operation of a great scheme such as I have indicated is the merest moonshine. Anyone who knows anything at all of the Irish peasant knows that what is true of the peasantry in other countries is true in a particular way of them. The master passion in the life of an Irish peasant is his love for the land. This has driven him often into doing deeds quite foreign to his nature; and it has driven him into kinds of contests which no other possible motives could have urged him to. It is the master passion of a peasant's life to get possession of the land. Once a tenant buys under a system of this kind he ceases to be a tenant and becomes an owner and ceases to pay rent, and every instalment he pays is increasing his property in the land, making it more impossible year by year that he can ever lose it, and making it more certain year by year that he will be able to hand it down to his children afterwards. To anyone who is at all acquainted with the peasantry of Ireland it is the merest moonshine to suppose that if they get this great boon they would belie their history by adopting a policy of repudiation. All that is wanted is a moderate use of Imperial credit, and for the reasons I have shortly given that Imperial credit ought and could be lent to Ireland with the greatest possible safety and security.

Let me draw attention in a few brief sentences to the state of public opinion in Ireland upon this question. I say that, practically speaking, Ireland is unanimous. I am aware it has been stated; I do not know upon what authority; that the hon. Members for the city of Belfast, the Member for the city of Derry, and the Members for Dublin University are not favourable to such a scheme as I have indicated, and I am aware also that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Armagh; while I believe he entirely agrees with me that the present system is wrong, and desires to see it swept away, and occupying proprietors put in its place; does not go the length of saying that there ought to be a compulsory system. But there is no one else. That means that 95 per cent. of the Irish Members constitutionally elected are in favour of this proposal. I believe I am right in saying that the hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh is the only Member for an agricultural constituency in Ulster who is opposed to us. All the rest, I understand, pledged themselves in their election addresses in favour of our proposal. I may be allowed to say that Irish Members representing Nationalist constituencies have viewed with the greatest possible gratification and hope that great movement which has sprung up in the province of Ulster, and which is led with such courage and ability by the hon. Member for South Tyrone. The demand made by the whole agricultural province of Ulster is precisely the demand which I desire to put before the House. Let me be precise in this matter. I have here a resolution passed at a meeting of Unionist tenant farmers in the



county of Tyrone. It says;

"Inasmuch as the substitute of single ownership for dual ownership has been declared to be the keystone of Unionist policy in regard to land in Ireland, we hereby appeal to the Unionist Government to carry out that policy in its completeness without further delay, which, in the present state of discontent, may be dangerous, and thus restore tranquillity and contentment in Ireland by passing a scheme of compulsory land purchase, compelling the landlords to transfer the share of the joint property in the soil to the occupiers and tenants; a provision which will enable the landlords to hold their mansions and demesne lands and to reside in Ireland."

That is the demand put forward by the whole province of Ulster, with the exception of the hon. and gallant Gentleman to whom I have already adverted, and supported here to-night by the entire other three provinces. For the first time, since the Union, at any rate, there has been a joining of hands upon a great principle between North and South. I regard that with the utmost satisfaction; for I have always been one of those who hope to live to see the day when for all Irish purposes there might be a union between North and South, and I pray with all earnestness that the fight for this great principle into which we are now going as friends and comrades in arms, and the victory which as comrades we are going to win for this principle may tend to blot out the memories of a bitter past, and may be the harbinger of a happy day when North and South, Catholic and Protestant, and Presbyterian may form one united people working for the prosperity and liberty of their countrymen. And how does this matter stand? By universal consent the present system has broken down. We now make a demand, moderate and reasonable in itself, which has many precedents in the land systems of other countries in Europe. We put forward that demand peaceably, and by the methods provided by the Constitution. We present it to you here to-night with the authority of a united Ireland; North, South, Catholic, Protestant, Presbyterian, Unionist, and Nationalists. What clinches the whole case is; this. We put our claim forward in this House on the authority of 95 per cent. of the Irish representatives. In any constitutionally-governed country in the world such a demand, so put forward, would be certain of an easy and an early triumph. What would happen in the case of a demand of a similarly reasonable character put forward in this House in the same way and by the same proportion of English Members? But, unfortunately, in the past constitutional government has been for the mass of the Irish people but an empty name; and the union of Irish Members in this House in favour of any particular policy, and especially of any policy on this land question, has always been a certain forerunner of its defeat. The whole history of your rule in Ireland has been one of concessions made too late, and made to violence after having been denied to constitutional agitation. We now tonight; 95 per cent. of the Irish Members ;make this demand. What will be the result?

The Prime Minister, in his letter to the Member for South Tyrone, said that the Government were not in favour of this scheme under existing circumstances. Sir, what are the "existing circumstances"? Ireland to-day, beyond all record in recent times, is peaceful and crimeless. Is that one of the existing

circumstances? We cannot forget the facts of history. We know that notwithstanding the Report of the Devon Commission, notwithstanding the appeals made decade after decade in this House by Irish representatives, no redress was attempted of the grievance of the Irish tenants until 1870; and the Act of that year was only passed, as Mr. Gladstone said, after the chapel bell had been rung at Clerkenwell. We know that during the ten years which followed; from 1870 to 1880; the demands made here time and time again by the majority of the Irish Members fell upon deaf ears, and that nothing was done till 1881, when the Land Act of that year was passed after what I may justly call the Revolution of the Land League. We make this demand to-night. As sure as to-morrow's sun will rise it will be granted, and in all sincerity I pray of you to grant it now, when it is put forward, as we have put it forward, under the happy circumstances of peace and tranquillity in Ireland, and not to wait until it is wrung from you, as every concession to Ireland has been in the past. This Government and this Parliament have now got the opportunity of closing this chapter of Irish history. And what a blessed thing the closing of it would be! The history of this Irish land question is full of shame for this country and full of heart-break and of maddening memories for Ireland. It is a story of a fair and fertile land depopulated, of a brave and gentle race driven, generation after generation, by an almost inhuman persecution, to deeds of violence absolutely foreign to their nature. It is a story of a people expatriated, scattered through the world, and taking with them into every land and every clime the burning memory of their lost and, ruined homes, and the most deadly hatred of your rule. Wise, indeed, in my opinion, will be the statesmanship, aye, and blessed will be the name of the man who puts an end once and for ever to this record of human wrong and human suffering. For the reasons that I have stated to the House, I beg leave to move the Amendment standing in my name.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): All those Members who remember the relations between myself and the party opposite during the ten years of bitter strife and conflict that took place between 1886 and 1895 will doubtless feel surprised that I should rise to second an Amendment to the Address proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite. I never rose with a greater sense of responsibility, with a stronger sense of duty, or with a more certain conviction that I was doing what was right, that I was asking the House to do the right thing, and that I am supported by an absolutely united Ireland upon this question. I hope the House will allow me before I proceed with any argument to brush away a matter more or less personal to myself. I notice that some of my friends have taken the trouble to go scavenging in the dust-bin of my old speeches, and have published for the edification of the House five or six speeches that I have made at different times during the last fifteen years to my constituents in South Tyrone. I am one of the few Ulster Members who ever take the trouble to speak to their constituents, and I think it would give anyone a great deal of trouble to find five or six speeches even in fifteen years from any other Ulster Member that would bear publication. I do not seek to conceal from this House, and I have not sought to conceal from

the country, that I have been engaged? during the last ten or twelve years in trying to hold back my own constituents and those people in Ulster who listen to me. I have not been endeavouring to push them forward on this issue; I have done my best to restrain them, to hold them back. This is a great issue, but I never thought until now that the time had come to press it. I always had great doubts about the magnitude of the proposal and what was involved in it. I am here to-night, if you like, a convert. Ireland has changed, and I have changed with it, and it will do nobody any good to bring up speeches of the past in which I have not so much spoken against this as I have endeavoured to hold the people back and to get them not to press it urgently.

I desire to place before the House a clear record of what has precipitated this question, and made it the dominant issue in Irish politics. My conviction at the moment is that the real reason is the utter and irretrievable breakdown of the present system of dual ownership in the land which was legalised by the Act of 1881, due to the maladministration of the Land Court. That is a grave statement to make, and I have no right, and certainly no desire, to make any such statement without placing the House in possession of the facts upon which I base it.

There are four things which have brought this question irresistibly to the front in Ireland; first, the treatment by the Courts of appeals on value; secondly, the treatment by the Courts of tenants' improvements; thirdly, the conspiracy among landlords and land agents in Ulster absolutely to destroy the Ulster custom under which the Ulster tenant is being robbed of his property every day; and, fourthly, the very success of the Purchase Act itself, to which the hon. and learned Member for Waterford referred, necessitates the House facing this question. I take first of all the treatment of appeals on value. I was a member of the Committee which sat in 1894, and that Committee found that there had been during the fifteen years that had elapsed something like 30,000 appeals on value. Those appeals had cost more than £1,000,000, and the result had been that a quarter per cent. had been added to the rental. All that has now ceased, and the appeals have been made a matter of reality. Let me illustrate the procedure of this Court of Appeal, and I ask the House to try to consider the position of the tenants who go into that Court. I will give two or three concrete cases; I have a score of them here; I have the official records, and I am not going to quote anything which cannot be borne out by the documents I hold in my hand. I give first of all the case of a tenant in county Antrim, named McCluggage. The landlady was Mrs. Deakin. She served the originating notice to have a fair rent fixed. Two Assistant Commissioners, who are paid £800 a year each and are experts in land values, proceeded to inspect and value the holding. These two experts fixed the fair rent at £10 10s. An appeal was taken. Two Court valuers were sent down by the Chief Land Commission to inspect the holding and to value it afresh. They found that the Sub-Commissioners were accurate in their definitions, and they fixed the rent at £10 7s.; 3s. less. Now here we have four expert valuers, paid £800 a year each by the votes of this House, agreeing upon a fair rent for this holding. The Chief Land Commission sits and rehears the case. Not a single member of the

Commission knew anything about the land; they had not inspected it; they had never seen it; it would have been no service if they had seen it. Without receiving any further evidence over and except the evidence of the landlady's and tenant's valuers, the Court, absolutely ignorant of the value of the land, overruled its four experts and raised the rent by 20 per cent., and it gave the tenant no reason for its decision whatever. That was a final verdict; there can be no further appeal on questions of value. That is a sample case of thousands in which this Court, absolutely ignorant of land values, overrides its own experts and raises the rent by 20, 25, and 30 per cent. without giving the slightest reason for it. I submit that the House cannot expect a free people to consent to be treated in this way. This Court must either give reasons for its decisions or the tenants will have to leave the Court alone. Those of us who advise the tenant farmers will have to tell them plainly that this is not a place where

they can get justice; that they had better leave the Chief Court and the Land Commission altogether to the evidence of the landlords, and let them do what they like; they cannot do worse than they are doing. That is one case out of twenty that I have in my possession to-night, and it is typical of hundreds, if not thousands. I ask the House to believe that this is not a procedure to be tolerated in a free country.

Now let me show the House how the question of tenants' improvements is dealt with; and here again I only quote from the actual official documents. The House has heard for very many years of the famous Adams and Dunseath case; everybody has heard of it. I am not going to review the first Adams and Dunseath case, but the second. Let me point out what has taken place on this holding. It is most interesting to show how the best intentions of an Act of Parliament passed by this House are ruined the moment the Act goes over to Ireland to be administered. Here is a small farmer near Ballymena, in the county of Antrim, who had his rent fixed in 1881, and a tremendous fight arose about the title to the improvements. David Adams went on paying for fifteen years the rent fixed in 1881. In due course of time he came up to have his rent fixed a second time; that is, for a second period. In the meantime the Act of 1896 had been passed, and the rent of the house, which he had had to pay for fifteen years under the decision of the Court of Appeal, was at once eliminated, because the Act of 1896 reversed that decision and made a return to honesty possible. David Adams had reclaimed a bog of 16 acres, and the Sub-Commission went on to the holding and after inspection filled in the form under the Act, stating that the original value of the 16 acres of bog land was 3s. per acre, and as reclaimed 12s. per acre. They allowed David Adams five per cent. for his expenditure in capital and labour upon the work of reclamation. When that had been allowed there was still a surplus of increased letting value to be disposed of. Now what did the Sub-Commission do? They acted on the hint given in the Morley Committee upstairs by Lord Justice FitzGibbon, and divided that surplus value between the landlord and tenant, and a fair rent was fixed on this basis. That decision was appealed to the Chief Court of the Land Commission, which treated Lord Justice Fitz-Gibbon just as if he were a noisy land agitator.

What did the Chief Land Commission Court care for the evidence of Lord Justice Fitz-Gibbon here or anywhere else? They decided that the whole of the increased letting value apart from five per cent. was to go to the landlord, who had never expended a farthing upon it. But David Adams was one of those dour Antrim tenants who are not easily disposed of. He trudged up once more to the Court of Appeal, which reversed the decision of the Chief Court of the Land Commission, and sent it back to the Land Commission to fix the rent and to sit judicially on the surplus. What did the Land Commission Court do? They allowed the tenant 12s., and the landlord 32s. That was bad enough, but there was worse. I make this charge, and I ask the Government of Ireland to meet it. Here was a decision of the highest Court of Appeal, which held whenever a surplus arose the Land Commission Court must sit on it judicially and divide the surplus. I make this charge on the authority of the schedule I hold in my hand; that the Land Commission have so altered the method of filling up the pink schedule that no surplus can ever arise in future. What has the Land Commission done? The Sub-Commission on the form which they filled in gave the original value of the bog as 3s. per acre, and of the value of the bog as reclaimed as 12s. per acre, and the surplus value which arose they divided between the landlord and tenant after allowing 5 per cent. to the tenant for his expenditure on capital and labour. But what does the pink schedule now bear? It simply states that so many acres of bog have been reclaimed; that 5 per cent. is allowed to the tenant for his expenditure in capital and labour; nothing is said about the original value or the new value. The decision of the Court of Appeal has been, in fact, set aside by a trick. These are the things which have driven the Ulster tenants to desperation, and which the Ulster tenants are not going to tolerate; and no cry of trafficking with traitors; no bogey of Home Rule will turn the Ulster tenants from the path they have entered upon to-day; and they will have justice or know the reason why.

Let me go on to the Ulster custom, and let us see how that has been treated by the Land Commission. Now, it is under the Ulster custom that the whole property of the Ulster tenants rests; destroy that custom, and you destroy the basis of their whole property. Why do I say that? You may tell me that it rests under the Land Act; but under the Act of 1870 the presumption of ownership of improvements is given to the tenant, and the Ulster tenant is excluded from it. And why? Because he had this presumption of ownership already by the Ulster custom. I repeat it most solemnly to the House, that, if this custom is destroyed, the Ulster tenant has little further protection under the Land Acts. But the most outrageous state of affairs that has ever happened has followed upon the action of the Land Commission. For the advantage of English Members, I may say that the Ulster custom is the unwritten code which differentiates the tenants in Ulster from the tenants in other parts of Ireland. It has come down from the days of the old Plantation, and was legalised in 1870; and never till within the last few years has any attempt been made to touch it. Indeed, this House has always been so cautious in dealing with it that when passing Acts of Parliament relating to Irish land we have invariably inserted a provision to the effect that nothing in these Acts should interfere with the Ulster custom. What has

been done? I am bound to say that a great many of these questions have been settled in the south of Ireland. The landlords dare to do things in Ulster which they have been cured of doing in the south of Ireland. [An HON. MEMBER: Disgraceful.] Disgraceful; What the landlords have done in Ulster is disgraceful, and not my recital of it. Under the Land Act of 1881 the tenant is entitled to sell his holding, and to give notice of his intention to the landlord. The landlord has the right to exercise pre-emption. What has taken place? Does anyone imagine that when Parliament conferred that right of pre-emption on the landlord it intended that he should carry on a traffic in farms? Nothing of the kind. The right of pre-emption was conferred for the specific purpose of guarding the property of the landlord. What is taking place every day? The tenant desires to sell, and he gives notice to the landlord. Notice is at once served on the Land Court by the landlord that he wants to pre-empt. Now what happens? The landlord buys at the pre-emption price, which is one-third less than the price the tenant could get in the open market. Then the landlord sells in the open market, and puts into his pocket that which is morally the tenant's property. But that is not all. What does the landlord further do? The purchaser is declared a future tenant under the Land Act, with no rights whatever, and is entirely shut out from the Land Courts. Now, that is not occurring once a week, but every day, under the Land Act of 1881. Let us go back to the Ulster custom. According to that custom the landlord has no right of pre-emption at all, and he does not assert that he has. We had the other day a very typical case of what is going on. It occurred in the county of Armagh; I am not going into the details, but will state sufficient to show what these landlords are capable of doing. A poor woman has three acres of land, and you can picture what a living she is likely to make of that; The estate upon which she lives is under the Ulster custom. She desires to sell, and gets an offer from a neighbouring tenant of £20 an acre for her interest. She accepts it, and goes to the estate office, where she meets the agent. He takes down a map of the estate and sees how the one farm lies into the other. Then he talks about another offer he has had for her farm; and in the end he tells her to serve notice, whereas under the Ulster custom no notice is necessary. Knowing nothing about the law, this poor woman serves a notice under the Act of 1881, and the moment he receives it the agent gives notice of pre-emption, and attempts to put the difference between £10 an acre under pre-emption and £20 offered to the woman by her neighbour into the pocket of the landlord. [HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh] I will give my authority. One of the greatest Masters of the Rolls Ireland ever had, Sir Edward Sullivan, one of the ablest lawyers who ever sat on the Irish Bench, said; "Speaking for myself, it seems to me that the important essentials of the custom are the right to sell; to have the incoming tenant, if there is no reasonable objection to him, recognised by the landlord; and to have a sum of money handed over for interest and the tenancy transferred."

And Sir Edmund Bewley said before the Commission in 1898 that the two attributes of the unrestricted custom are the right to hold continuously at a fair rent, and the right to sell the holding with its improvements to an unobjectionable

purchaser. That is the unwritten code. Very well, this poor woman goes to the office, and says she desires to sell her holding, and had received an offer of £;20 an acre from a neighbouring tenant, which she had accepted. The agent took down the map of the estate, and saw how one farm ran into the other, and he spoke about another offer, and finally told her to give notice, although under the Ulster custom no notice is necessary. What does this poor woman know about the law; she is only a poor ignorant peasant woman, so instead of going to a lawyer she goes to a stationer, and obtains a notice under the Act of 1881, which she serves. What happens? The moment the notice is served the agent pre-empt, and he attempts to put the difference between the pre-emption price of £;10 an acre and the £;20 per acre which this woman has been offered into the pockets of the landlord. But, happily, the county court was too much for him. The county court judge cancelled all these transactions, and characterised the conduct of this man as grossly unjust. Now this man is not the agent of an outcast like Lord Clanricarde. He is the agent of Lord Gosford, the Lord Lieutenant of the county of Armagh; and if a man like Lord Gosford will allow his agent to do things like that, what can we expect from the ruck and run of Irish landlords? These are the things that in Ulster have produced a feeling that will not very easily be allayed, and the feeling that has been roused and the temper to which the people have been brought is entirely justified. You cannot set Humpty Dumpty upon his legs again. The whole thing has hopelessly and irretrievably broken down. It is

not a disgraceful thing for me to say so, but it is a disgraceful thing to the Irish landlords who have been mean enough to bring it about.

Let me come now to what I am bound to admit is a much brighter aspect of this question. Let me come to the position of the Purchase Acts. My hon. and learned friend opposite said the very success of the Purchase Acts had made further progress essential. I entirely associate myself with those remarks. What has happened? During the last twenty years we have sanctioned £;45,000,000 cash and credit for this beneficent work, and no one has done more in regard to that than the Leader of the House. Already £;17,000,000 have been expended, and we have created some 50,000 occupying owners out of possibly 350,000 tenants. Let us see what the result of legislation has been. Acts of Parliament for Ireland with regard to the land question have invariably had drawbacks. There has been no drawback in the case of the Land Purchase Acts save in their administration. The whole result has been entirely satisfactory. Commencing with the Church Act in 1869, we have had in thirty years seven statutes dealing with this phase of the land question. One and all have been satisfactory; no one denies that.

Mr. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet) here made an observation which did not reach the gallery, which was replied to in a similar manner by Mr. T. W. RUSSELL.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): May we be allowed to hear this dialogue.

\*MR. T. W. RUSSELL: My position with regard to the question of the Land Purchase Acts is that, with the exception of the administration, those Acts have been an unqualified success. The people who bought are satisfied, and the landlords who sold are satisfied, and peace has taken the place of turbulence in the districts where these Acts have been applied. England has lost nothing, the Guarantee Fund

has not been called upon, and you have made a great experiment which will enable you if you choose to go forward. But, while that is true, there is one result which will certainly cause great difficulty. My hon. friend referred to the differentiation which takes place between the men who have purchased and the tenants paying the judicial rent. Take my own particular constituency, where a large number of farms have been purchased. You find there that men who bought under the Voluntary Purchase Acts at once got 6s. in the £; reduction, which is the same thing as if they paid 6s. less than the judicial rent which they had been paying ;that is a very great boon in itself; but the Act of 1896, passed by the late Chief Secretary for Ireland, enabled those purchasers to extend the term from forty-nine to seventy-nine years, and they get a 10 per cent. reduction every decade. Many purchasers have got the reduction, on their first instalment, of 10 per cent., and therefore they are paying 8s. an acre less than they did under the system of judicial rents, and in a further ten years they will get a reduction of 2s. more. So that in ten years they will be paying 10s. for what the judicial tenant is paying 20s. It is quite impossible to expect peace, progress, and prosperity in Ireland under such conditions as those. You will find that day by day, as your Voluntary Land Purchase Acts proceed successfully, you are creating a difficulty which will overwhelm you. You will not get a man to pay 20s. to a landlord for a thing that another man only pays the State 10s. for. There is only one thing certain in Ireland, and that is bad weather. Seasons will fail to a certainty, crops will be destroyed, and the cry of distress will go up, and then you will find that the next plan of campaign will take the extremely logical form that the judicial rents shall be reduced to the level of the terminable annuities. That is the question you will have to face. Let me put it even more strongly. The purchaser in many cases has been a turbulent tenant to whom the landlord was willing and anxious to sell, in order to get rid of the trouble and annoyance; but to the honest tenant who steadily pays his rent the landlord has no inducement to sell. Imagine a loyal tenant in Ulster looking over his hedge and seeing his turbulent and disloyal neighbour;a loyal constituent of my own, say;who sees his neighbour, who he

believes to be a double-dyed traitor, enjoying the reward of turbulence and disloyalty &#x0021; Such a system as that cannot be allowed to continue. The very success of land purchase invites progress. We cannot stand where we are; we cannot go back; we must go forward.

I noticed in the gracious Speech from the Throne a paragraph which hints that if there is time a Bill is to be introduced to regulate and develop the system of voluntary purchase;a Bill, that is to say, to further accentuate the situation which I have described. I am too old a Parliamentary hand to say, and I am not going to say, what I shall do with regard to that Bill until I see it; but I feel bound to tell my hon. friend that I fear he is embarking on a rather hopeless enterprise. I believe the intentions of the Government in these measures of land purchase are of the best, and that the House has honestly tried to do right; but what happens is this, that the moment a Bill is passed, and obtains the Royal Assent, it is sent over to Ireland and placed at once into the



hands, for administration, of people who hate the whole policy, and who believe it spells robbery in every line, and who therefore do not try to do justice to it with any enthusiasm. That is what will happen to my hon. friend's Bill to a certainty. Take the Bill of 1896; I will give the House a sample of how land Bills are administered in Ireland. I asked for some information with regard to the Land Judges Court. I hope I did not ask for anything against the public interest or it would have been as bad as a supplementary question, but the information was refused me, and I have had to pick my way in the dark as well as I can. That Court was established for the purpose of selling bankrupt estates, but the Court has developed into a huge rent office for the collection of landlords' rents by the State.

In my endeavour to get some information in regard to the working of the Court, I have been driven back on the Fry Commission. The Fry Commission did get some information about this Court. I find in the admirable statement of Mr. Franks, secretary of the Land Commission, one of the ablest and most efficient of the land officials in

Ireland, that this Court, which was appointed to sell bankrupt estates, is drawing a rental of £634,000 per annum, which is being collected by an army of receivers in every part of the country. Now a receiver is either a land agent of great ability or a barnacle who is incapable of doing anything but collect rents. I remember well when the Act of 1896 was passed. I do not think the clause with reference to this matter was in the Bill as introduced, and, if I remember right, the moment my right hon. friend proposed to apply the principle of compulsory sale to these estates the landlords in both Houses of Parliament stood to attention. [Laughter.] Oh, yes, let me say that there was something in it, because I well remember when we moved for a committee to inquire into certain matters the Land Judges' Court was in the reference, and it was struck out because the Secretary of State for War objected to it. My suspicions were aroused at the time. Mr. Franks says the property amounts to £17,000,000. The 40th section of the Act directed the judges to sell these bankrupt estates; or such of them as were subject to the clause for compulsory sale. Here again I am driven back for figures up to the 31st of March last, for the simple reason that I have been refused them up to the present day. What progress do you think they have made since 1896? They have sold the magnificent sum of £269,000. When do you think the bankrupt estates will be disposed of at that rate of progress? I remember forty or fifty years ago hearing of the famous suit of Jarndyce v. Jarndyce, which had come down from remote antiquity. Why, it was nothing compared with the procedure in the Land Court. Here is a letter which I am authorised to read to the House;

"Baltinglass,

"14th February, 1901.

"DEAR SIR,; I will mention a case of the agony one undergoes in the Landed Estates Court. In 1877, my wife's uncle (Mr. Young) put the family property at Coravockan, co. Cavan, into Court for sale. The solicitor having the carriage of the sale was the late Dr. William G. Toomey, of Dublin. He carried on the proceedings for twelve or thirteen years, when Mr. Young, senior, died, and his

son employed Mr. Henry B. Burton, solicitor, to stir up Dr. Toomey. Attempts to sell were made but fell through, owing to some legal technicalities about schedules not being lodged. Mr. Young, junior, then employed Mr. H. R. E. Disney, solicitor, to go for Toomey and Burton, and after over twenty years the property was sold to the tenants in 1898 for 16½ years purchase, a moderate figure, as the valuation was £200 odd, and the judicial rents £150 a year. But though the bargain was made three years ago, the owners have not yet got one penny. But a bill of costs amounting to £888 was furnished against them off which Mr. Young got £90 taken on taxation. It has taken nearly a generation to effect this sale, at enormous cost, and surely a quicker and more inexpensive procedure should be devised. Hoping these cases may be of use to you,

"I am, dear sir,

"Yours faithfully,

"J. R. DAGG,"

But, though the bargain was made three years since, they have not got a penny of the money. All they have got is a bill of costs for £388. I am told now that the right hon. Gentleman actually believes that Mr. Justice Boss is so hard-worked that it is impossible for him to get on any quicker. We all know Mr. Justice Boss, who is an old friend of my own. But if he is hard-worked there are plenty of other judges with nothing to do at all; and if it is found that he is unable to carry out the intentions of Parliament in a reasonable time, why is; not another of the judges turned on to help? I am not blaming Mr. Justice Boss, but the system. The Land Purchase Commission is not much better. In 1891 my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury passed a Bill placing £33,000,000 of Imperial credit at the disposal of the Irish tenants for the purchase of their holdings. But a great Department of State, fully manned, has in ten years only issued between £7,000,000 and £8,000,000 of land stock under that Act. When will the land of Ireland be sold at such a rate of progress?

Certainly not in our day.

I say in all earnestness that the Government ought to take instant steps in regard to this Purchase Department. In this country the rule is for Civil servants to retire at the age of sixty-five, and Sir Hugh Owen, with whom I have had the privilege of serving at the Local Government Board, retired at sixty-two, when he was quite fit for his work. But what is the case in Ireland? At the head of the Purchase Department there is a man of over seventy years of age, a man who

was a clerk in Sadler's swindling bank in the fifties, and who introduced a system of motions and procedure that has hung round the Land Commission like a clog, and prevented its operation. The other Purchase Commissioner, an able and competent man, is engaged with the Congested District Board, of which he is a member, and has had to take journeys to the West with my right hon. friend in order to show him everything. So the Purchase Department has been left to take care of itself with this old man of over seventy. It is not creditable to the country that a great Department of State should be in such a condition, a Department which requires the attention of the ablest and most vigorous minds that can be got.

I may be asked what right has the House to apply the principle of compulsion to Irish land any more than to any other form of property. My answer is that there is an enormous difference between the English and the Irish landowner. The English landowner is a real owner of property, and lets to a tenant a fully-equipped going concern; he gets rent, but gives much of that rent back to the property. The Irish landlord is only a part owner. The tenant provides the plant, the labour, the capital to work the farm; the landlord draws the rent, but he gives nothing back. The Irish landlord has never in the history of the land question done much for the land, but since 1881 he has done nothing at all, and his real position at this moment is that of a sleeping partner in this business. He draws out of the partnership money that it cannot afford. He is really a rent-charger and nothing else. In 1881 the House said to the Irish landlord that he should only have what the tribunals chose to give. That was a great step. It was not, after that, a big step to say that the Irish landlord, instead of getting that income in the shape of a precarious judicial rent, should get it by fixed dividend warrant. That is not a great step. The serious step was taken in 1881. But let us face what I venture to call the real difficulty of the situation. If you ask an Irish landlord why he does not sell under the Voluntary Act you will get one of two answers. He will say either that he cannot afford to do it, or that he is afraid of the delays of the Land Commissioners.

I submit that they are both excellent reasons. It is not enough to say that Irish landlords have taken seventeen years' purchase on the average and they are satisfied. The Irish landlord's reply would be that it is only those who could afford to sell that have sold at that price, and there are thousands who would be ruined by selling on those terms. We do not get rid of the difficulty by passing it over in that way.

I have made proposals in Ulster. The tenants declare that they have paid for the fee-simple in excessive rents over and over again, but what I have told the Ulster tenants at every meeting I have addressed is, "You must consent to pay the highest market value for the land that may be fixed by a tribunal appointed for the purpose. You have no right to ask for compulsion unless you are prepared to pay a bonus for it." I say; I speak for the Ulster tenants alone; let them give the full market value of the land, plus a bonus of a year's purchase for compulsion, and the tenants will have done all that can be asked of them. But still the landlord says he cannot afford to sell at that rate. His property is mortgaged and charged in every direction, and if he sold even at that price he would be ruined and have nothing to live on. I have never desired to escape the difficulty of a situation like that. What I have respectfully to say to this House and to the Irish landlords is that if they want more than the value of the land plus a bonus for compulsion they must make their case to this House; it is not for the tenant to make it for them. They have in another place year by year been claiming compensation for fanciful wrongs, and they have been annually defeating the Government as a mere matter of amusement in a House which has not the control of a cent of public money. They must make their case to this House. But let me in all sincerity say this: Englishmen ought never to forget that it

was England that introduced this system of land tenure into Ireland. They introduced the principle of landlord and tenant, but they were unable to introduce its conditions as they exist in England. Since the day they performed that act this land system has been the stupendous curse of our country. There has never since been a day's peace, contentment, or hope. And with that system of land tenure you planted the Irish landlord. He came with power; he came in the time of the Tudor, he came with Cromwell and William; but in all cases it was the same. He was sent by England; he has acted as England's garrison; he has done much dirty work for England. Through all the centuries since he came the story has been one of rapine and ruin. Why should England refuse to listen to these gentlemen? Why should England refuse to succour her special friends in their day of evil? We are spending, I suppose, £100,000,000; chucking it away; because we deem it our duty to stand by British citizens in the Transvaal. I do not object, but I do say that, good as the claim of the Uitlanders may be, the claim of the Irish landlord upon England is infinitely stronger and better. What did we see in the year 1898? The Government recognised that claim in a way that cannot be gone beyond. They passed the Local Government Act, The landlords objected, of course; they saw what it meant; they convinced the Government what it meant; and the Government, seeing that the Irish landlords might be hardly dealt with by the new rating authority, relieved them from their share of the poor rate, amounting to between £300,000 and £400,000 a year; or, capitalised at twenty years purchase, they gave the Irish landlords £6,000,000 in order that local government might have a chance in Ireland. They admitted the principle that these gentlemen had a claim. If it were worth the while of England to give £6,000,000 in order to secure the due working of local government, what would it not be worth while to give to put an end to this land trouble? Why are we beaten in our own markets by the foreigner? Why do we hear so much of foreign competition? The farmers of Normandy, Brittany, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland are better educated, if you like; they are more economical; they may have smaller families; but the real truth is that 80 per cent. of them are occupying owners. We simply stand alone in maintaining this antiquated system.

I tell the Government that from this day forward they have a new Ireland to deal with. My hon. and learned friend is quite right. Ireland is unanimous for once, and Ireland will remain unanimous. My hon. and learned friend proceeds with this motion perhaps from a standpoint different from mine. He thinks that this scheme will make Ireland independent and her people better Nationalists. I do not object, I think that by this we should not only buy out the fee-simple of Irish land, but we should also buy out the fee-simple of Irish disaffection; we should end the Irish trouble. [Nationalist cries of dissent,] We should end 80 per cent. of the Irish trouble in achieving this great object. That is the reason I am here to-night. During the last few months I have touched the heart of Ulster. I know how in every hamlet and townland of Ulster the pulse of the Irish tenant is beating on this question. The Ulster farmers to-night are looking to this House, and they are waiting and watching for what the Government are going to say. I know

what they are going to say very well. I know the Address must be carried and the Amendment defeated. No one who has been in this House for fifteen years, as have, has any doubt about that. But this debate and this movement will live after to-night, and the actions of men will be watched and scanned and noted. I have no doubt as to what will be said, simply and solely because I have studied Irish history of the last century. What has that history been? Take it from the start. We destroyed the Irish Parliament, When we did that we promised Catholic Emancipation, if not concurrently, to follow almost immediately. We shamefully broke our pledge, and it was not until the Duke of Wellington bravely told the King that he must either give way or face civil war in Ireland that the Catholic was allowed to cross the Bar of the House and sit on these benches. We gave Catholic Emancipation because we were not prepared to risk civil war in Ireland. Go on a few years more. We had a church in Ireland; it was the church of the rich and well-to-do, but it was supported out of the poverty of the poor. Yet we refused to reform that church; we refused to amend even the procedure under which the tithe was collected, until the soil of large parts of the country was reddened with blood in the tithe war. Nothing could be done until blood was shed. Then take the land system. During the forties Sharman Crawford pleaded on these benches for a Bill of moderation in every line, but Parliament and the landlords scouted it as they have scouted or tried to scout every Bill since. Sir Joseph Napier, afterwards Lord Chancellor of Ireland, from these very benches tried to get that Parliament of landlords to be reasonable. But no; they had the votes and they threw the measure out. They refused the moderation of a Bill which was milk and water to what has been passed since. You passed the Land Act of 1887 and disestablished the Irish Church; why? Mr. Gladstone himself said that he never faced the Irish problem fairly until an Irishman attempted to blow up a London gaol. Take the Fair Rent Act of 1881. The Duke of Argyll has told us that when he joined the Cabinet in 1880 no further land legislation was intended by the Government. But the bad season came, crops wholly failed, there was distress throughout the whole land. Then a bugle blast was sounded in county Mayo; that bugle blast reverberated throughout the United States; the whole of the country outside Ulster was covered with an organisation, and we had the tale of Land League horrors. It was no easy task for some of us south of the Boyne to try prisoners as I had to do in those days; and then after this murder and outrage had run its course you passed the Land Act of 1881. And coming still later down, to the Land Act of 1887, Parliament at first refused to pass it, and what happened? Bad seasons came along and the crops failed, and the Plan of Campaign compelled the very men who said they would never enfranchise the lease-holders and who declared that they would never touch judicial rents to do both by passing the Act, because of the pressure from Ireland of this illegal action. Aye, and we have got now in Ireland local government, and we have had a Parnell's Purge of Irish landlords from local bodies, And why? Simply because of the pressure of the Home Rule agitation.

I have come here to-day to empty my whole soul, and I have a mandate from the people of Ulster to do it. This

country has tried to do many things in Ireland, but it has done right things wrongly in almost every case. I know we shall get the same answer to-night that we always get. We shall get a Parliamentary "Never" and a Treasury Bench "No." Have not these Parliamentary "Nevers" and these Treasury Bench "Noes" rung down the centuries? But they have always had to take them back. I second this Amendment to-night with all my heart and with all my soul. I see a new Ireland rising up that will stand together for great public needs and great public purposes. Those Gentlemen opposite may remain Nationalists and I shall continue a Unionist, but that will not prevent me standing behind them in all their constitutional endeavours for the benefit of Ireland. I leave this question to-night telling the House plainly that I know what will happen. I pray to God that what must be passing in some people's minds may not happen. I pray to God that Englishmen will not be deaf to a constitutional demand, and not wait, as they have waited in the past, for those methods and those measures which many of us have gone a long way to combat in the past, and which no one who knows Ireland can look forward to with anything but horror in the future. I ask this great assembly to look at this question and to think it out, and I am certain that the more statesmen consider it and the more politicians look into it they will see that it is the only fair, rational, and reasonable way. Try for once, I beg of you, to get to the heart of the Irish people.

Amendment proposed;

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that the administration of the Irish Land Acts is not satisfactory to any class of Your Majesty's subjects in Ireland, and that the only permanent solution of the Irish Land Question must be found in a measure providing for the general and immediate creation of an occupying proprietary by the establishment of a system of compulsory sale and purchase.'";(Mr. John Redmond.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The duty of replying in this debate,

so far as this bench is concerned, will I necessarily and properly fall on the Chief Secretary for Ireland; but I suppose the House will expect, after the two long, able, and eloquent speeches to which the House has listened, that somebody should immediately rise and express the views of the Government upon the Amendment before us.

My hon. friend who has just sat down began his speech by making a defence of himself against attacks which, I suppose, he anticipated that we were going to level at him. He seemed to think we should rake up his old speeches to find in his past utterances arguments against his present convictions. My hon. friend need have no fear as far as I am concerned. I am perfectly certain my hon. friend in every word he has said is animated by a perfectly sincere and single-minded desire to benefit his constituents and the country of his adoption; and not a single syllable that may fall from me will impute, directly or indirectly, any motive to my hon. friend of which he need be ashamed. I may be allowed to say, however, that I could have wished my hon. friend had used less of that particular kind of rhetoric which seems almost inseparable. I regret to say,

from the discussion of Irish questions by Irishmen. Eloquence we are sure to have; ability is seldom wanting: but I do confess that when I hear history ransacked, and the truth of history violated, in order to press in favour of some course which seems practicable to hon. Gentlemen, and the old bitternesses revived, going back I know not how many centuries to find some charge against this country, I am too much accustomed to the methods of hon. Gentlemen opposite to complain of it, but I am sorry that my hon. friend, while he has conscientiously joined himself with them on this occasion for one particular purpose, has so far followed their familiar style and metaphor.

I would only choose out of the historical or quasi-historical tales of my hon. friend two illustrations of my meaning. He talked of the injury inflicted upon Ireland by the introduction of the land system in Ireland. He really spoke as if before the English immigration Ireland was some kind of agricultural and rural; paradise, with an admirable system of land tenure, in which landlord never quarrelled with tenant nor tenant with landlord, and which he persuaded himself was a country entirely occupied by a happy peasantry. If my hon. friend will look back on the tribal system which preceded the English invasion and immigration into Ireland I think he will see that whatever romantic colours that system may possess, it was not a system of land tenure of which we may say that it was more perfect than the system which succeeded it. After all, the land system in Ireland has, as everybody admits, been a bad system. Probably it never had a fair chance. A system founded upon confiscation and recon-fiscation does not often have a good chance. That, unhappily, has been the Irish system. But do not let us imagine a past which had no existence, or suppose that, before the affairs of Ireland were meddled in by this country Ireland was in a happier condition than she has subsequently been. I skip over the centuries rapidly. The last charge my hon. friend made against this House was that we, his own colleagues, the Government of which he was a member, brought forward a Bill which they subsequently passed for local government in Ireland. Did my hon. friend blame his colleagues for that course? Did he suppose for a moment that we could be animated by any other desire than to fulfil pledges over and over again given by the party to which he and I belong, animated by a desire to see Ireland on an equality with England and Scotland, in an important element in national life? Did he give us credit for that? Not a bit of it. We were animated by fear and by fear alone. I tell him, so far as I am concerned;

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: My right hon. friend has unintentionally misrepresented me. My point was simply this: that the Government of the day during the bitterness of the Home Rule strife did give undertakings on every platform in England with regard to local government that, in my belief, they would not have given but for the extraordinary pressure of the Home Rule movement; and most assuredly that is the ground taken when we explain things in Ireland.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think the House will recognise that my hon. friend's explanation shows that the version I gave of his words does not misrepresent him. I say that for my part ;I cannot speak with the same absolute assurance for the motives of all my colleagues, but I believe for all my colleagues the one object we had was to introduce, under conditions applicable

to the case of Ireland, similar local liberty to that which we had given in the case of England and Scotland. That is my answer to the rhetorical part of my hon. friend's speech.

I confess, too, I listened with the profoundest regret to my hon. friend's attacks on the administration of the courts of law in Ireland. I am sorry my hon. friend lent himself to this method of Parliamentary controversy. He has, by his important example, given strength to a method of attack which I think this House ought to be quick to resent. Those who are entrusted with the difficult, the almost impossible task of adjudicating or umpiring between landlord and tenant in Ireland surely ought not to have that task made more difficult by the violent diatribes indulged in by my hon. friend. My hon. friend mentioned a case in which the verdict of the Sub-Commissioners and the Court valuers had been set aside by the Court of Appeal. I have no doubt there have been such cases. Are there not to be such cases?

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The Morley Committee found that there have been hundreds of cases.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary, who of course knows the facts better than do, believes that the average variations between the rents fixed by the Court of Appeal and those fixed by the Sub-Commissioners may amount to about 10 per cent. I suppose the Court of Appeal exists for the purpose of revising certain findings of the lower Courts. If it does not exist for that purpose I know not for what purpose it exists. Surely it is not a condemnation of the Court of Appeal that they have made this variation of 10 per cent., but a high tribute to the action of the valuers and the Sub-Commissioners that the amount of the variation which the Court of Appeal has made is not more than 10 per cent. But I do not wish to press that part of the case further; it will be dealt with by my right hon. friend. I mention it in order to deprecate a method of controversy which I am sure is not in the public interest, which may do little harm in this House, but which, if carried by my hon. friend into the more inflammable fields of Ulster, will do collateral injury both to Ulster and to the whole community, which I think he may have some cause ultimately to regret.

As I do not wish to detain the House long, I will pass over what I will call the similar rhetoric or parallel rhetoric of the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment. My hon. friend, like him, was not content to argue the question of compulsory purchase in Ireland without a long and animated passage upon the subject of Irish emigration. I confess I see no connection between the two subjects. I know that Irish emigration is a familiar topic with hon. Gentlemen opposite, but I hope that when they use it they will use it fairly. If they put it down to the British Government as a crime that, under the rule of this House and of Parliament, since 1845 the Irish population has very largely diminished, we should get credit for the fact that in the previous fifty years it had very largely increased. [Cries from the Nationalist benches of "No."] Why not? The truth is the Irish population is now incomparably more prosperous, more wealthy, and better off than it was at the time of the Union. The population is roughly about the same, and the diminution of the population which occurred in the



second half of the century just closed has only done away with the effects of the increase of population which took place before 1845; and therefore I would suggest, in the interest of logic if not of rhetoric, that we should be given credit for the increase of population if we are to be saddled with the discredit of the decrease of population. I pass from these subsidiary themes, which occupied a very considerable part of the two speeches to which we have listened, to what I understand to be their fundamental essence. Both hon. Gentlemen said you must have some great scheme of compulsory purchase, because the Land Act of 1881 has proved to be a total and disastrous failure.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: The administration.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman opposite went much further than that. He said that the Land Act of 1881 was essentially false in principle, and was forced upon the Irish people against their will by Mr. Gladstone. The hon. Gentleman boasted that he and his friends went out and did not vote for the Bill. I did better, because I stayed in and voted against it. I have never been, and am not now, an advocate of that measure. I believe that in principle it is indefensible, and in practice impossible to carry-out effectually; and if you had angels from heaven as Sub-Commissioners, and archangels for your head Commissioners, it is inconceivable that you would be able to satisfy both parties to the suit; tenants who want their rents reduced and landlords who want those rents maintained. It cannot be done. The system, undoubtedly, is a system from which friction is inseparable, and, administer it as you will, it never will lead to a final or satisfactory result; that at least is the opinion I have always held, which I have never concealed, and which I have acted upon whenever the opportunity occurred to me. My hon. friend said that all the Acts which pass for Ireland are ruined by mal-administration in Ireland. When he brings that forward as a reason for his proposed Land Purchase Bill, how does he propose that his Bill is going to be administered? Is there not going to be Irish administration? Will there not be the same difficulties as surrounded the Land Acts? Will it not be destroyed by the same sinister influences of which he speaks in regard to other Acts? I am afraid that if Irish administration ruins every Irish Act, that is a good argument against us passing any scheme at all; we ought to despair, and abandon all legislation. I do not agree with my hon. friend. It is perfectly true, and it has never been denied, that there is a natural tendency in all Courts of law to fence round their proceedings with very technical and very subtle safeguards; they think more of abstract equity than of rapidity of business and convenience of suitors. My hon. friend was perfectly right when he declined to pass a verdict as to what improvements could be introduced into this Land Commission administration until he saw a scheme brought forward by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. Now what is the next stage of the argument brought forward? It is this; that, just as the Land Act of 1881 has been a total, complete, and disastrous failure, so the very success of the Purchase Acts is a reason for carrying them further by compulsory operation. The failure of the Land Act, and the success of the Purchase Acts, are the two pillars on which the mover and seconder of the Amendment rest the whole of their case. I wonder how far we are to accept that

statement. My hon. friend says that at one end of an estate there may be a tenant who has purchased his holding, and one who has got his rent lowered, and at the other end of the estate a tenant who wishes to purchase, but who is not allowed to, and whose rent remains the same. How, he asks, can those men remain side by side without there being discontent? That surely is a reason against this House ever trying to give anything to any class in Ireland. My hon. friend seems to think that all would be put right if you passed a Compulsory Land Purchase Act, because all the tenants would be on an equality. What is going to happen to the labourers? Precisely the same class of argument would be brought forward.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: No; they are not dual owners.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend argues that you should spend £140,000,000 to put all the landholders on an equality.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: No; £100,000,000 would do it.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: We will not quarrel about the sum; we will split the difference and call it £120,000,000. He now proposes to give £120,000,000 of English credit; ; [NATIONALIST MEMBERS: Not English credit.] Well, British credit. [HON. MEMBERS: Irish credit.]

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I do not understand the phrase "British credit."

MR. BALFOUR: I do not know how much of the advantages universally admitted to belong to English credit may be due to the contribution of Ireland. That is a point which can hardly be tested until Ireland goes to the market and borrows for itself. I am not sure that the result would be financially satisfactory. But we need not go into that bypath of the argument. What I am trying to point out is that my hon. friend proposes to spend £120,000,000 of British credit for the benefit of a particular class in Ireland. On his own showing other classes will gain nothing from that large expenditure. The labourers will lose heavily by the expropriation of the landlords. [HON. MEMBERS on Irish Benches: No, no:] Well, in my opinion they will lose heavily, and they will come to us and say, "Does British credit exist only for the Irish tenant? Are we to have nothing out of it?" And my hon. friend, for anything I know, when that day comes, may stump Ulster from one end to the other, as he has been recently stumping it, and he may use his great gifts to agitate the passions of another class.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I have not agitated the passions of any class. The right hon. Gentleman has given, in the last twenty years, £45,000,000, and never mentioned the labourers.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is the point. We think that it is possible, practicable, that it is not unjust and impolitic, when we can, to benefit certain members of a class without necessarily saying that every member of that class is to have the same benefit. We have not done that in England, but no doubt it is perfectly true that in Ireland the benefits of our land purchase system went to some and not to others of the same class. We think that is fair. We think that all should have these opportunities, and if we cannot give them to all why should we not give them to some rather than none? My hon. friend says that is a wrong system. I say the same argument would be put forward by him or his successors if we were to benefit the whole of Ireland except the labouring class; born of the

same parents; if we were to deprive them of all these benefits. But my hon. friend is not consistent in the policy he proposes, for that policy, if logically carried out, would go much farther than he supposes. I ask the House to observe what has taken place in Ireland. Both hon. Gentlemen have admitted that the Land Purchase Acts are working well. That was one of their arguments against the Acts, though it might sound rather paradoxical to say so. But the fact is true. I believe my hon. friend has understated the actual amount which has been expended under those Purchase Acts.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: You would not give me the Return.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not get this information from the Chief Secretary, and he must not be held responsible for it; but I am informed that, roughly speaking, 2½ million acres of land have been transferred from the owners to the occupiers up to the present day; that is, about a tenth of the whole soil of Ireland. I also believe that the value of the owners' interests transferred; which I ought to mention is somewhat different from the amount advanced for land purchase; is somewhere about 24 millions sterling; and that the number of proprietors actually created is between 58,000 and 60,000. I call these very great results, and they are results which have taken place under the system of voluntary purchase. Has anybody thought out in his own mind what would be the result of a compulsory system? Has any country ever tried to expropriate at the cost of £120,000,000 a whole class? [A VOICE: Prussia.] No; Prussia did nothing of the kind. Such an experiment in legislation has never been tried in any part of the world; and I think it would be a most difficult and dangerous experiment for any Government or any country, however powerful or rich, to try, and it would not be the rapid coup de gr&#x00E2;ce to the landlord system which the hon. Gentleman supposes. You cannot take a sponge and wipe out a class like that. Questions of title, questions of value for the whole of Ireland, would have to be settled before the operation would be completed; and I am not aware that there is any ground for supposing that these questions of title or value would be more easily or rapidly settled when we are dealing with compulsory purchase than they are settled when we are dealing with voluntary purchase or the fixing of fair rents.

But that is not all. We have brandished in our faces the fact that for once Ireland is agreed; that righteousness and peace have kissed each other in the persons of the hon. Gentleman the Member for South Tyrone and the hon. Member for Waterford. But for what object have they joined? They have joined for an object which may be, and in my view land purchase is, a very estimable object so far as Ireland is concerned; and which is, in fact, a demand upon Great Britain by Ireland of a perfectly unexampled magnitude. They are asking us to do that which Ireland herself could not and would not dream of doing. [An IRISH MEMBER: You have got our money; pay it back.] We are told that, though Britain lends her credit, she gives nothing more; she runs no risk; the money is there to be paid, and the mover of the Amendment said that we might be absolutely confident that no peasant proprietor in any part of the world would be so reckless of his status as to risk it by not paying the instalments; and that what was true of peasant proprietors in every part of the world was especially true of peasant

proprietors in Ireland. I fully admit that peasant proprietors in Ireland have paid admirably. I had vaguely in my mind the old debates of the Land Purchase Bill which I introduced in 1891; and I asked for Hansard, and though I have not been able to look over the three days discussion of the Bill. I have looked through enough of it to see that this view of the Irish tenant is entirely new on the benches opposite. The Front Opposition Bench unanimously opposed even the modest scheme of land purchase which I then introduced. Hon. Members below the gangway also opposed it; and they not only opposed it, but gave their reasons; and among the reasons by which they endeavoured to convert the then House of Commons against land purchase was that practically at the word of their leaders the Irish purchasers would refuse to pay their instalments, and that the task of this country in enforcing these payments would be an absolutely impossible task. There are many extracts which I might quote; but I will read only one. It is from the speech of the hon. Member for East Mayo. The hon. Member asked;

"How can the Government, having made an advance to 100,000 tenants in Ireland, propose to face a plan of campaign against the payment of it, backed by a universal system of boycotting farms; how could you evict 40,000 or 50,000 tenants, and where would you get fresh tenants? The man who would take an evicted farm would have to face the accumulated hatred now divided between the land-grabber and the Irish informer."

And so on; and so on. The whole point of the Member for East Mayo in that speech was that even our humble and moderate proposals, with special securities, nevertheless carried with them so great a danger to the British taxpayer that this House of Commons would be mad if they accepted the Bill. Who has changed since then? Is it the Irish peasant, or the Irish Leader? Somebody must have changed before the hon. Member who moved the Amendment could find it in his heart to say that the idea of repudiation of their obligations by the Irish tenants was an impossible contingency. My own view is this, that the Irish purchaser is essentially and fundamentally anxious to be honest. I fully believe that, and I think experience has shown it to be so. But if this country pledged its credit to the extent of £;120,000,000 or £;130,000,000 for the Irish tenants all over the country, and if it then suited the Irish Leaders to take up the line suggested by the hon. Member for Mayo eight years ago, the question whether in the face of what would be presented to him as the cause of patriotism and country you could then trust the Irish peasant never to repudiate his engagements, offers a subject for very grave reflection if the time should ever come when a Government in this House contemplated calling upon the people of this country to make so great a sacrifice.

For these and many other reasons, which I will not weary the House by recounting, I think the course which we have embarked upon is the course we ought to pursue. That is to say, purchase ought to be encouraged and facilitated in every way, but it should be voluntary. The trammels and difficulties which undoubtedly exist in the present system we may remove by judicious legislation. But let us not be precipitate; let us not plunge into wild, chimerical schemes unexampled in the history of the world, carrying in

their train, it may be, evils which we cannot foresee. I do not suppose, as my hon. friend said, that this debate will close this chapter of the Irish land question, but I think the dangers I have signalled will always rise menacingly before the eyes of any Administration which endeavours to grapple with this great problem on the lines of my hon. friend. We have fresh in our mind the lesson of 1891. We know that then the same Opposition which we have before us now, anxious, I believe, then as they are probably now to promote land purchase, nevertheless could not make up their minds to accept even the humble instalment of £33,000,000 which I then proposed. If they had then the country behind them in opposing such a measure as that, fearing that it would imperil our credit, even in a prosperous time when no great strain existed upon the country's finances; if that be so in ordinary times, what chance has such a proposal at the present time, when a great and costly war is being waged beyond the seas, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer has problems presented to him of far greater difficulty and complexity than, happily, a British Chancellor of the Exchequer in ordinary times has to face? Nay, I cannot imagine a contingency under which the people of this country would willingly use their credit as my hon. friend proposes. I am certain we should be regarded as lunatics at large if we made any such proposal under the existing circumstances; and, that being so, I think I may appeal with confidence to all those on this side of the House who range themselves among the followers of the present Government, on what is equivalent to a vote of confidence at the very beginning of the first session of this Parliament, not to show that they have so little appreciation of the essential and proper conduct of Parliamentary affairs, even at such a time when we are carrying on the gigantic task which we have taken in hand, as that we failed to obtain their

confidence. I believe that the support I ask for will be given by the great majority of this House, not simply on the ground that this is a vote of confidence, but because the vast and imaginative schemes advocated by my hon. friend carry with them dangers so great and so obvious that no wise Administration could be conceived as adopting such chimerical legislation. I trust that my hon. friend will feel that, when I say this, I have not a word to say against the general principle of land purchase. I have always believed in it as the true solution of the land question. I believed in it in 1881, in 1885, in 1891, and again in 1896, and I believe in it still as firmly as ever; but let us aim at that great end by means which are in themselves practical and just, and which do not carry in their train the manifold dangers which any alternatives necessarily possess

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I have occupied a seat in this House for close upon fifteen years, and I have never heard the right hon. Gentleman in what is familiarly called worse Parliamentary form, because, in my opinion, he has made no case whatever in reply to the powerful and cogent arguments which came from both sides of the House. If proof were wanting of that allegation, I find it in the almost pathetic manner in which he turned round to the Ulster Members, who ordinarily support the Government, and begged of them to treat this question not upon its merits, and not upon the interests of the Irish tenants, but as a vote

of confidence in the Government.

There are but one or two observations with which I will detain the House after the speeches made by the Chairman of the Irish party and the hon. Member for South Tyrone. With regard to the hon. Member for South Tyrone, we have nothing to say, except that we cordially welcome him as a champion of the Irish tenants' cause, and that he has at last realised the insincerity of the landlords for whom he so often pleaded. We have, however, to enter our protest against the utterly uncalled for way in which the hon. Member denounced the tenants of the south and west of Ireland as dishonest. The tenantry there were dishonest because they agitated and forced the landlords of other portions of Ireland to grant those measures of justice and fair play which the Members for Ulster had not the courage or the straightforwardness to go for. This charge of dishonesty, whether it comes now from the hon. Member for South Tyrone, or as it came twelve or fifteen years ago, is uncalled for, unjust, and mendacious. The tenants in those portions of Ireland where there has been agitation have always discharged their obligations as honestly as the tenants the hon. Member took under his patronage. What attitude are the Ulster Members going to take with regard to this important question? That, to my mind, is the crux of the question. Are they going to shelter themselves behind the appeal of the First Lord of the Treasury that this is a vote, of want of confidence? They may perfectly well support the motion, if they are in earnest. The Government will still have a sufficient majority. The plea that by doing so they would embarrass the Government will not avail them with their constituents, for the embarrassments and difficulties of Governments are of no concern to the struggling tenant farmer who has been unfairly treated by his landlord.

The hon. Member for South Tyrone made a statement in the course of his excellent speech with regard to the amount of tenant right in Ireland, and with regard to the general conditions of land tenure there, but he did not go quite far enough, for with regard to the question of improvements made on the soil, houses built, lands fenced and drained, and general improvements, beyond all doubt if justice were done the value the landlord would get would be prairie value, as John Bright said in a memorable speech many years ago. I think it is permissible to call attention to a remarkable statement made by a Member of the Unionist Government on the question of the relative share of the property in the soil owned by the landlord and the tenant. Lord Cowper spoke on this question in the other House some years ago, and when defending a measure said that, with one or two exceptions, until recently the landlords did not make improvements on the land, and that when the tenants made them the rents were immediately raised. He attributed the present condition of Ireland to the fact that the landlord class in Ireland, who were in other respects admirable; I have no doubt they are admirable politically; had in many instances been bad landlords. When Lord Cowper made that statement I thought it a remarkable statement. It is one which fully justifies the attitude taken up by the tenants' advocates on these benches, and that is, that, taking the average valuation of Irish land at 11s. 6d. per acre; good, bad, and indifferent; 6d. per acre represents the capital sunk

by the landlord on the land. I can speak from experience as to what has resulted from land purchase in large portions of Munster and Connaught. Tenants who formerly had a struggle to maintain themselves on rough and sometimes mountainous land had their rents reduced as the result of agitation, and eventually the landlords sold. The tenants bought the land, and when I revisited the districts the other day, after five or six years absence, I found comfortable homesteads, well drained and well fenced land, and every evidence of prosperity and of a desire to improve the land to which the Irish peasant is so much attached. So it would be in other parts. In the south and west of Ireland, as in the north, the tenant farmers will not consent to a condition of things under which, after eight or ten Land Acts, all improvements of the soil can still become the property of the landlords. I was very much struck with the feebleness of the First Lord's argument about tenants and labour. A friend behind me said, "Surely the right hon. Gentleman's talents and great Parliamentary ability are not in their decadence?" "No," I said, "but he is dealing with a feeble case, and he has advanced feeble arguments which are unworthy of his reputation."

I desire to enter my protest against the charges and imputations of dishonesty which have been made against the most honest class of peasantry on the face of the earth. We are anxious to have a truce to this method of controversy. Upon the Government lies the onus of proving that the time is not ripe for this great reform. The most familiar argument of the most malignant of the political enemies of the Irish cause; the right hon. Member for West Birmingham; has been that the Irish cry for Home Rule and other reforms is insincere, and that the one question with regard to which the Irish people are deeply and genuinely concerned is that of the land. Now is the time to prove whether or not that view is correct. The Government and the country generally have a unique opportunity to once for all test the question as between the agitators, as we are called, and the so-called reformers on the other side. The right hon. Gentleman has again and again insisted that if you settle the land question; as you can settle it by land purchase; you can at once dismiss the cry of the agitator, you can pacify the country, and the Irish people will dismiss from their minds all ideas of Home Rule. Here is your opportunity to test it. This is a far more favourable experiment for strengthening your Empire than that of devastating South Africa. We shall press this demand by all legitimate means in our power, but upon those who, with the Ulster Members, pretend to support a Conservative and Unionist policy rests the responsibility as to whether in our day and generation this great reform should be brought about, or whether the Irish people shall once again be disappointed.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): As an Ulster Member I feel that I should be wanting in my duty to my constituency if I did not take this opportunity of expressing their views and their wishes in regard to this most important question. My constituency is almost entirely an agricultural community; honest, God-fearing farmers who have never wavered in their truth and loyalty to the Throne, and who have always obeyed and respected the laws of their country whatever turmoil and lawlessness may have existed in other parts of the country. At all events, it

cannot be said that in the county of Armagh they have had any sympathy with such proceedings, but throughout all this time the farmers, in common with those in other parts of Ireland, have been suffering, and in some respects are actually suffering now from the various

causes that have been so fully and ably referred to by the hon. Gentlemen who proposed and seconded this Amendment. The increase of foreign competition, the low prices, the want of proper railway facilities, must always have a disastrous effect upon those who have to live by tilling the soil; but in Ireland all these have been accentuated and have been increased immeasurably by the constant irritation of the almost continuous litigation which has existed between the landlord and tenant. It is true that Land Act after Land Act has been passed by this House with the object of improving the tenants' position, but either through the imperfect construction or the imperfect administration of those Acts the situation has become impossible, and in my opinion there can be no rest, no content, and no genuine prosperity in Ireland until the tenants have become the owners of the soil. It appears to me absolutely certain that in the interests of both landlords and tenants the present system of dual ownership cannot and should not continue. The whole of the farmers of Ireland are unanimous in this regard, that a scheme or Act of compulsory sale and purchase should be granted. We neither ask for nor do we want to give to the landlord opportunities which are not given to the tenant. We wish to treat the landlord and the tenant alike, or, in other words, give them both an opportunity to make an equitable arrangement. I earnestly hope that the Government will see fit to introduce a measure of compulsory sale and purchase on fair terms. From what the First Lord of the Treasury said to-night I fear there is no reason for expecting it during this session, but in the session that will follow, when I hope peace will return and the Government have more time to attend to this matter, I hope they will see their way to introduce a Bill for the compulsory sale of land in Ireland.

\*MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I congratulate the hon. Member for South Tyrone on having brought the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down to his present frame of mind. The hon. Gentleman said he represented a constituency of God-fearing farmers,

and I must protest against such a line of argument being taken upon this question, because the hon. Gentleman by implication would attribute to the farmers we on these benches represent other qualities than those God-fearing qualities he so ably represents in this House. I think we may take it that the crusade instituted by the hon. Member for South Tyrone, in favour of compulsory land purchase, is having some effect, at least so far as hon. Gentlemen like the last speaker is concerned. It may not apply to all Ulster Members, but the hon. Gentleman has succeeded so far that he has compelled Ulster Members to pay more attention to this question than they have hitherto honoured it with, and for that we thank him.

We cannot regard the speech of the Leader of the House as an answer to the who speeches delivered from this and the opposite side of the House upon this important subject. In my opinion, the right hon. Gentleman completely broke down in his attempt to make a case against the Amendment. The speech of the right



hon. Gentleman, if it means anything at all, means that given sufficient pressure; sufficient stimulus to this movement, the Government will be prepared to deal with compulsory purchase. He has taken up a position which could not be described as a non possumus. The Irish land question goes to the root of the whole system of government in Ireland, it is the vital existence of the Irish nation. It is essentially an agricultural country, dependent for its subsistence on the produce of the land, and we who have made representations for Home Rule and the management of our own internal affairs have been told by the Government over and over again that where there is a just cause; a just necessity for a settlement of any question except Home Rule, the Unionist party are quite competent and willing to do all that is necessary for the wants of Ireland. It would ill become me to occupy the time of the House in further demonstrating what has been so ably demonstrated already by the Leader of the Irish party and the hon. Member for South Tyrone, which is that the Land Commission as at present constituted has hopelessly broken down in its attempts to administer the land laws entrusted to it. Why, it takes two years and more to get a fair rent fixed. There have been suits passing through the land courts for purchase for six or seven years where both parties are united and have done all they could to facilitate the purchase. That shows there is something radically wrong with the constitution of the Commission. In order to arrive at the same end we take a different view to the right hon. Member for South Tyrone and those other Ulster Members who are prepared to support us. For our part we think this Land Commission is to a very large extent rigged by landlords or their agents or people connected with them, and one has only to look at the names of the Commissioners who are sent out to assess the values and fix fair rents to arrive at the conclusion. I could not attempt to argue that it would be altogether right to have people solely representing the tenants on the Commission, or people too much connected with the question of agitating tenants' grievances. But from one end of Ireland to the other there are a number of respectable farmers or well-to-do people who could be selected to discharge the duties of land valuers and lay commissioners, and who would not be under the stigma of having learned their business in a rent office. It is, however, idle to expect that we should get that class of people appointed or that we should be satisfied with those appointed by the Government. The confidence of the people is wanting in the tribunal you have erected. Whilst we gladly accept the support of the hon. Gentleman and welcome his adoption of the views he at present holds, and while we will cordially co-operate with him, we will also claim the right of going to our own people and organising them against the citadel of entrenched landlordism in Ireland. I do not wish in any way to offend the tender susceptibilities of the hon. Member for South Tyrone, but he must, of course, know that the work that has been done for the Irish tenant farmers as a whole has been done mainly by the agitation among the Nationalist farmers, while to a great extent the God-fearing Unionist farmers whom he represents have stood on one side in the course of the trouble, but taken care, when a legislative enactment was effected, to come into court and get the benefit of the law. I do not grudge

them that benefit. Why should they not take any advantage of the law in their behalf? But, apart from the attitude that these God-fearing farmers may take, we, the Nationalist members, will pursue a course which may not be quite as palatable to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House as he could wish. He has for ten years had an exceptionally peaceful time, and he has been warned to-night that if the necessity docs arise, and if the people of Ireland are to be denied the just claim which has been put forward in a moderate and peaceful manner, he may find his pleasant dreams disturbed, and that he will have helped to evoke a storm among the people of Ireland, who are now better organised and prepared for the fray than they have been during the last ten years, that he may not find it easy to subdue. If this Unionist Government, whose chief doctrine is that if you come to the House of Commons you will get all you need, withstand the constitutional demands made by 95 per cent. of the representatives of the people, on their heads be the responsibility for the results which may ensue.

\*MR. JOHN GORDON (Londonderry, S.): I represent what may be described as an agricultural constituency in the north of Ireland. It is largely composed, at all events, of tenant farmers and people who are deeply interested in everything in connection with the occupancy of land, and, therefore, I think it is my duty to say what I believe to be the feelings of the people there, and what I think in this matter.

I regret that this matter has been brought before the House in a manner and on an occasion which makes it impossible for me as a supporter of the Government to go into the lobby and vote for the Amendment. I believe that the true remedy for all the ills of Ireland is to make the tillers of the soil, the men who occupy the farms, the owners of the farms. If that can be brought about by facilitating the system of voluntary purchase I shall be well pleased; but that process may be a slow one, and everyone who knows anything of the state of feeling in Ireland is anxious that this land question should be settled.

I cannot speak for hon. Members on the other side of the House, but I think those on this side would be happy to see a settlement of this question. It is of very great importance, not only for the landlords and tenants of Ireland, but also for the people of England and Scotland, that Ireland should cease to be discontented. I therefore urge upon the Government, and the House, not to cast this matter aside as a mere impossibility, but to give it careful consideration.

I know perfectly well that there are very great difficulties and prejudices in the way of a matter of this kind being accepted. Above all, at the present moment, there is the situation of the country with reference to the war, which naturally is uppermost in the minds of the English people. I think one of the strongest prejudices against this proposal is not well founded. It is based on the idea that compulsory purchase in any form would be the introduction of a new principle of dealing with land in Ireland. I agree with the hon. Member who introduced the Amendment that compulsion has already been introduced. Under the Land Act of 1881 an owner of land is compelled to allow a tenant to remain in possession of his farm, at a rent which the landlord himself cannot fix, and therefore compulsory purchase applied in the suggested way will not mean the introduction of an absolutely novel principle in reference to land in Ireland.

It is only a step onward to say that the landlords must sell at a fair and reasonable price. In connection with the fixing and refixing of rents there is great dissatisfaction on both sides. It is hardly to be expected that a landlord would be satisfied with a rent fixed below what he thought he should get, or that a tenant would be satisfied with a rent fixed higher than he thought he should pay. Then there were bills of costs and expenses, and the bitterness engendered between litigants with reference to all these matters.

There are good grounds for trying to get something done to amend this state of affairs. It is a curious thing that one of the most beneficent pieces of legislation, the Voluntary Purchase Act, should have made this matter a burning question in the north of Ireland. These matters have already been dealt with, but I simply call

attention to them to say that they show the necessity for something being done, and I am happy to find from the Leader of the House that something; whether exactly what we ask for or not; is going to be done. I know there are difficulties in the way. There is the difficulty of finance. But we do not ask for this money as a gift; we ask it as a loan for which there will be ample security, or rather that the State should, as it were, become a surety for its repayment. I do not fear the general strike against the payment of instalments which the hon. Member for South Tyrone at one time so greatly feared must exist. At the present time voluntary purchase has been going on for fifteen years, and every man who has been paying for that period has acquired a valuable interest in his holding, and every year his interest will become greater. A compulsory Bill if passed tomorrow could not work out for years. It would be a very considerable time before all the tenants became owners of their holdings, and by the time they did those who got in first would have paid off a large proportion of their instalments. You would therefore have spread over the country a large number of farmers who would be not merely deeply interested in preserving their own holdings, but who would be desirous of seeing that their neighbours paid off their instalments also. From the experience of the past, everyone knows that the tenants who purchase their holdings pay their instalments punctually. At the same time I cannot conceal from myself that it is one thing for a private member to express views in reference to a matter of this kind, but it is another thing for a responsible Minister of the Crown to ask the country to advance its money unless he is quite satisfied that what we suggest will be carried out, and that there will be no serious danger of loss. However this may be, I am quite satisfied, dealing with the matter from a logical standpoint, that whatever measures of voluntary purchase we may get, and however well they may work out, the ultimate mode of settling the question will be by some system of compulsory purchase.

Then I come to the matter of the Amendment. I am a supporter of the present Government. The electors who sent me here are supporters of that Government, and they sent me here as their representative to uphold that Government. I know what an Amendment to the Address means. I know that the hon. Member for South Tyrone recently stated that he knew what it involved, but that he had made up his mind to bring the matter

forward on the Address. I know that one of the reasons he suggested was that if he did not bring it forward someone else might, and that he also said he knew he would be badly beaten. I hope the hon. Member will not understand me as making any attack upon him: I only wish to make my position clear. The hon. Member was himself returned as a supporter of the Government, of which he was at the time a member. All I can say is that I cannot view my position in the same light that he does his. As a supporter of the Government I cannot support the Amendment. The result of doing so, if it were carried to its logical conclusion, would be that the Government I was sent here to support would lose its position altogether. It may be that there is no chance of the Amendment being carried, but I do not believe in taking up such an attitude. I may know that a friend of mine is strong and vigorous, and that if I gave him a blow in the face it would not do him any harm. But I do not believe that to be any justification for giving him a blow, or that I should do so because if I do not some enemy of his may. The hon. Member who moved the Amendment and his party have always been the opponents of the Government, and we expect such a blow from them, but we do not expect it from friends. When one knows that an attack upon a friend will not merely do him no harm, but may have the effect of causing irritation and annoyance which may lead to something very different from what one expects and wishes and hopes for, I think to make that attack is a very unwise course to adopt. We know that a strong Government like the present, if they set their minds to this question and think it right to do something on the lines we have suggested, are able to do it, and we do not want to do anything which would in any way prevent them doing whatever they can to improve the position of the tenants in Ireland. For the reasons I have named, I think, under the circumstances, I am bound, no matter what my views are, to support the Government on this Amendment.

MR. BARRY (Cork, S.): I think the position taken up by the hon. Member is illogical in the extreme. He is drawn in two directions diametrically opposite. He sympathises with the Amendment, but, as a loyal supporter of the Government, he is bound to vote against it. We in the South of Ireland are not going to take up so illogical a position. We believe in the Amendment, and are going to support it. I am in the position of gentlemen who have preceded me of having nothing to add to the argumentative and exhaustive speeches of the mover and seconder of the Amendment, but as representing a constituency with a deep and abiding interest in this question, I cannot take up a passive attitude in regard to the matter. We who have met our constituents on United Irish League platforms, and also at the two great conventions at Dublin, know the importance which the Irish people attach to this question of compulsory purchase. So great is that importance that the question has been placed second in the national programme, Home Rule, of course, being placed first. As far as I know the feeling of the Irish people, nothing will ever satisfy them but a system of short and compulsory purchase. Everybody in Ireland, landlords and tenants alike, are in favour of the abolition of dual ownership. It ought not to be very difficult to grant a divorce between two parties when each is so anxious to be separated from the other. The only gentlemen in favour of the continuance of the

present system are the Land Commissioners, who are drawing such large salaries in their present positions. Perhaps this English Parliament could not have foreseen the failure of their attempts at legislation, but the whole system has been tried and found wanting.

Without going into statistical details I will say as one who has had some experience of the administration of the Land Acts in Ireland that from beginning to end the whole system is defective and rotten. Several attempts have been made from time to time to pass legislation to give the benefit of improvements to the tenants,

but I assert, with the practical experience of a farmer myself, that that system is violated in every single Land Commission that has been held all over the country. Take the case of a man whose rent is £20, and take a man in the immediate neighbourhood whose land may have been of the same value originally. My experience is that in the case of tenants who may have been delicate or the tenant may have been a widow there is very often a good and ample reduction in the rent given, and more especially in the case of tenants who have not improved their land of late years. The tenant who has improved his holding by the sweat of himself and children, and who may have gone to the trouble of removing boulders, gets no reduction, whilst the tenant who has not made any improvements gets a substantial reduction. The result is that the improving tenant gets no reduction because the land appears to be worth the money, and the land has been valued after he has improved it himself. That is one of the greatest blots in the administration of the Act. The present rents are impossible rents, and must be reduced. Twenty years ago in my constituency barley and wheat could have been grown successfully, but they cannot be grown at the present time, for the only crop that can be raised now is oats, which is not so profitable. In the case of young stock, on account of the severity of the winter and other causes, they are much more difficult to rear, and the mortality in stock is increasing from year to year in alarming proportion. All these things must be taken into account in fixing the rents of Ireland. I know there are other causes. Foreign competition is very keen, and Texas and Canada are brought within near reach of our markets at the present time, owing to improvements in shipping of late years. In the case of the Land Commissioners I say that, taking their valuations all round, the reductions are ridiculously inadequate. Even the labour question, which must be included as an element in the consideration of rents, is ignored. Labourers have been flocking from our shores, and they cannot be kept in the country unless the farmer has some margin of profit to pay them. It is extremely difficult for the farmer to pay labour, and the land is going out of cultivation in consequence. Taking the whole situation into account, the condition of labour and the manner in which the farmer is robbed of his improvements, and the vicious system under which the Act is applied, I say that it is absolutely necessary that the whole system must be swept away root and branch in order to settle the Irish land question, and I should not regard any system with favour which is calculated to perpetuate the present order of things in Ireland.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): I have listened with great attention to the two

long speeches which have been made to-night, one by the hon. Member for Waterford and the other by the hon. Member for South Tyrone. Speaking for myself; and I think I can speak for the Irish landlords, whom I more or less represent; I say that if we had to choose one of those two hon. Members to decide our destinies and fix the final arrangements in regard to land in Ireland I and they would unhesitatingly choose the hon. Member for Waterford.

I take it that this is one of the greatest demands which has ever been made upon a legislative assembly. It is proposed to ask this House to advance an uncertain sum of money; perhaps £100,000,000 or £120,000,000; for the purpose of suddenly obliterating one class of landlords in Ireland and replacing them by another class. I believe that has never been attempted before by any other country. But this House is a businesslike assembly, and I am sure when it is asked for such a tremendous concession as this to Ireland it will ask what is to be the quid pro quo. We are asked to advance this enormous sum of money, and we want to know what we shall gain by it. I acknowledge the great eloquence and ability displayed in the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford, but the great weakness of his position is that he has nothing to offer. Speaking, as he is supposed to do, for many of his colleagues, if he could have said in the House of Commons, "I can answer for my colleagues and for the constituencies which they represent, and say honestly to the best of my belief that if Parliament consents to advance this great sum to the Irish people we shall forget old memories and Ireland will be loyal," then they would be offering something. But the hon. Member for Waterford and

his colleagues are perfectly honest and straightforward, both in this House and in their own country, and the hon. Member for Waterford never attempted to say that, speaking for his colleagues and the people he represents, the advance of this £120,000,000 or £150,000,000 would have the slightest effect in altering the present condition of the Irish mind, or would cause Ireland to become what she certainly is not in three out of the four divisions; a loyal community. That is the weakness of his position. I do not think that England or Great Britain or the Parliament of Great Britain would ever consent to this tremendous political manœuvre unless Parliament thought it would be some great gain to the nation if it were carried into effect.

I leave the very able and eloquent speech of the hon. Member for Waterford, and I will now turn to the other speech, delivered by the hon. Member for South Tyrone. When I came to try and forecast the sort of speech I thought my hon. friend would deliver, I must say that I was entirely mistaken. I thought the hon. Member for South Tyrone would have been strictly moderate, and that he would have placed his views before the House without any acerbity and certainly without any venom; but I think both these qualities have characterised his speech. I must compliment my hon. friend on what I look upon as a most dexterous piece of political strategy. Apparently he was determined to go hammer and tongs for the Irish landlords, and in order to do that he has determined to cover his rear and prevent any assault in that direction by pointing out that it was perfectly useless for anyone in this House to quote any speech he made in former times in order to show that he had changed his mind. I have had the honour of

the acquaintance of the hon. Member for South Tyrone for many years, and I am certain that he is perfectly conscientious in the stand he has taken. I believe my hon. friend possesses the fatal gift of a dangerous conscience; that is to say, he is a man who can conscientiously believe one day that a thing is black and the next day he can conscientiously believe that it is white. Really, I do not think I should have alluded to this matter at all were it not for the fact that he has brought me into the question. He has changed his mind; but what made him change his mind? Not by suddenly becoming aware of the great necessity for compulsory sale for Ireland; but he was converted by four words that I uttered in the House of Commons.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: No.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: He said so himself. He said that when Colonel Saunderson was cornered in the House of Commons, in answer to a challenge across the floor of the House as to what remedy he could suggest, he replied, "Try the Fry Commission," and that then, knowing that the knell of Irish landlordism had then sounded, he changed his opinion. I am glad to think that these few words of mine had the tremendous effect of converting the hon. Gentleman; but I hope hon. Members opposite will restrain themselves in future and forbear to ask me any questions, for there is no knowing, if my words have such effect, whom I may next convert. The hon. Member for South Tyrone did not quote his views in the immediate past, but as he proposes to convert the House of Commons and the country I would suggest to him that the real difficulty he has to front is the very celebrated gentleman Mr. T. W. Russell. I do not suppose he expects to convert the House of Commons all at once, even if he does expect to excite great enthusiasm in England on this question when he goes down to the country. But how about his speeches in 1890? At Fivemiletown, in 1890, the hon. Member for South Tyrone said;

"Mr. Chamberlain; and at least I know his views; is not in favour of universal compulsion. Neither is Mr. Balfour. Rant of this kind is more worthy of the platform of a Kerry moonlighter than of a sober Ulster man."

;How could he be sober, being a teetotaler?;

"But if I liked I could imitate these reckless orators. I could pledge myself to compulsion. I could extol it as a heaven-born principle. I could tell you that, with it passed, the Golden Age would return. I could promise it next year, as O'Connell was wont to promise Repeal, and as the Parnellites now promise Home Rule. I absolutely refuse to adopt this course. Whether it makes for or against my political future, I will not stoop to tell you lies, to tell you that a thing is possible when I know it to be impossible; to tell you that a thing is rising on the horizon of politics when I know that it is outside the scope of all reasonable or practicable politics. This, I hope, is plain speaking."

Very &#x0021; But then, after his conversion following my unfortunate remark, the hon. Member for South Tyrone said;

"My view is that every acre of agricultural land in Ireland not in the occupation of the landlord, ought to be sold to the tenant. This, of course, excludes all demesne lands and land farmed by the landlord. But, apart from these two exceptions, I should like to see the whole land of Ireland pass from

owner to occupier. The rental of the land upon which a fair rental has been fixed amounts to close upon £;7,000,000. To this must be added, for my purposes, all land held under future tenancies, and under agreements not subject to the Land Acts. It is not easy to form an estimate of the amount of money that would be required for such a huge transaction; but solely for the purposes of discussion I shall put it at £;120,000,000 sterling."

Then the hon. Gentleman eleven years ago said;

"Irish landlords, if compelled to sell, have certainly a right not only to get the fair value of their property, they are entitled either to be paid out in cash or to get the best security. I say at once that I do not believe the security of the Kerry or Clare County Councils would be such as I could ask them to accept. I believe any such scheme would amount in its working out to simple robbing. I believe payment would in due course be repudiated, and, with this belief, I have no right to profess any faith in its practicability."

Then the hon. Gentleman at the end of last year, in a speech at Clogher. said; "We have, happily, now a recognised public authority in each county; the county council. I don't think these bodies ought to be burdened with the duty of carrying out a land purchase scheme. But as Ireland is to all intents and purposes an agricultural country, and as the great mass of the people live by the land, I see no reason why the county council should not guarantee the advance required for each county."

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Perhaps I may be allowed to say that by the Act of 1891 the county guarantee was attached.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I do not see how that can affect the case.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: It has this effect: that the Government evidently believed that although the guarantee of the tenant was not sufficient, that of the county was.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: Speaking landlord, I think we should look to the guarantee of the county council as very poor security indeed; and all I can say is that I hope that I shall never have to prove it. My hon. friend now appears in the House tremendous leader in the land agitation. From my knowledge of Ireland, I know that if a man is gifted with oratorical powers there is nothing easier than for him to get up an agitation there in favour of a scheme which consists in the taking property of one class of Irishmen and giving it to another. I am perfectly well aware that all the tenants in all the divisions and counties of Ireland are in favour of the compulsory purchase of land; but they would be still more in favour of a Bill giving them the land for nothing. But what I hope the Government and the House will decide upon is this: whether the proposition is right or just, quite irrespective of these spurious agitations, and quite irrespective of the violent threats which have been uttered on both sides of the House. A man may exaggerate his own importance. I may be wrong, but my hon. friend evidently believes that not only the Ulster tenants, but the whole British public are hungering and thirsting after news of this great agitation. In his speech at Killyleagh, a couple of weeks ago, he said, in his most perfervid style;

"Gentlemen, I am speaking to a wider audience than is here. This question has



caught on. To-morrow morning the people of Dublin, Belfast, and Cork will read our proceedings. In London, in Liverpool, in Glasgow, and in Edinburgh the readers of the great English and Scotch newspapers will learn as they eat their breakfast that this great meeting has been held."

My hon. friend believed that England, Scotland, and Wales would breakfast next morning on muffins and T. W. Russell &#x0021; I think my hon. friend was wrong. He has great experience in working up an audience to a state of enthusiasm. He has told the people of Ulster that he intended to stump this country and rouse the feeling of the people to boiling point. Fancy rousing the enthusiasm of John Bull by asking him to fork out £120,000,000 &#x0021; Before my hon. friend undertakes that, in order to test his powers of rousing enthusiasm, I advise him to get an audience of brewers and publicans to pass a vote in favour of total abstinence &#x0021; I think that he has over-rated and over-valued the enthusiasm with which this agitation

will be regarded. I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. Gentleman speaks in favour of Ulster, but the mistake he has made, and it is an unfortunate one, is that he has undoubtedly persuaded the Ulster tenants that this is a movement which is bound to rouse England, and that all he had got to do was to come over here and make a great speech, as he has done to-night, and then to go about the country proclaiming in favour of compulsory purchase. He should remember that his scheme differs very much from the gifts given to Ireland in former times, when the gift was the gift of the property of one Irishman to another Irishman. But this is to be a great gift given by the British people. [Cries from the Nationalist benches: No &#x0021;] Well, a loan, then. If anyone will give me a loan of £20,000 I should be very glad. It would not be called a gift, but it would be next door to it. As an Irish landlord, I believe that four or five years hence the Ulster tenants will find that neither in the House of Commons nor in the country has this proposal for compulsory purchase made any giant strides, and I am afraid that the grand promises that the hon. Gentleman has made and the magnificent future which he has so brilliantly portrayed before the Irish people will never be realised.

I do not intend to deal with these particular cases; I only want to point out their extreme unfairness. A case occurred the other day on the Gosford Estate, and I do not think there is a man on either side of the House who will attempt to palliate or condone it: but the right hon. Gentleman said that that was the way in which the ruck and run of the Irish landlords deal with tenants. Would it not be unfair, if I had been cheated in an Irish hotel, to say all Irish hotels were kept by swindlers? The county court judge described it as a scandalous shame, and I think every one will agree with that. I say I think my friend was wrong when he said there were hundreds and thousands of these cases.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I do not think the hon. Gentleman has any right to say I dealt with one particular case. I took that one as an instance, but I could have instanced half a dozen other cases in Antrim where a similar thing has occurred.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: That shows what an unfortunate thing it is to make these outrageous and scandalous assertions against a whole class. I remember not so many years ago the hon. Member for South Tyrone used to get up in this House and

say it was a scandal and a shame to brand the whole of the Irish landlords because there was such a scoundrel as Lord Clan-ricarde in Ireland. Now we find, since his conversion, he has adopted exactly the same methods. It is wonderful to think that he has been so strongly converted that he now singles out one case, which no doubt is a disgraceful one, and seeks to saddle it upon the class to which I belong. I leave the matter there to the mind of this House.

The hon. Members for Waterford and South Tyrone advocate compulsory purchase, but it would be a fatal mistake for this House to make to imagine that compulsory purchase would suddenly remove the present garrison, as it is called, from Ireland. No scheme of compulsory purchase that this House is likely to allow to pass would enable the landlords to leave their own land suddenly. And even if it did it would simply replace them with another set of landlords. It is the duty of the country to ask itself what have the landlords done to engender this distrust, for I venture to say whatever is done in the future in the direction of land purchase being still more largely extended to the tenants, will depend on the attitude taken up by the Irish people. What is the attitude now that ought to justify Parliament in removing the present set of landlords and substituting a new set? Outside Ulster, in every constituency represented by hon. Gentlemen opposite meetings have been held over and over again at which the people have openly proclaimed their hostility to this country and desired that the enemies of the Empire might be successful. [Nationalist cheers.] Hon.

Members opposite accept that as the present attitude of a large portion of the Irish people. Can we conceive that the House would be so insane as, uninvited, to deliberately wipe out a class which at

any rate is loyal, and has always been loyal, and which has been called the British garrison, and put into its place a class which openly professes, after all that has been done for it, an undying hatred of the hand that has fed it?

No. The paying of rent is not a popular institution in Ireland, where people are imbued with Nationalist principles, and it requires very little effort to persuade an Irish tenant not to pay. Can anyone conceive what would happen if Parliament became the great absentee landlord of all the land in Ireland?

Parliament would place in the hands of the Nationalist party a weapon which they could never effectually combat. The hon. Member for Mayo on the 4th of April, 1890, on the Land Purchase Act, said that there was no analogy between the present condition of things and the conditions that might prevail if the leaders of the future should proclaim to the people that they would be acting

justifiably and patriotically in refusing to pay a single penny to the Government. Of course that would be the case. That would be the most popular cry ever raised in Ireland. It would make a sort of Irish paradise. It would appeal to the feelings of the Irish race in a manner no language could describe.

I ask the House to consider before granting this compulsory purchase whether a danger of that sort is to be thought of. Now I have been asked if I have a solution. I have always been in favour of a purchase scheme which would gradually place the Irish tenants in the position of being the owners of their land, and that a large amount of money should be set aside for buying out the landlords; that is the best and ultimate solution, which I have advocated not

only in this House, but in my constituency. I believe the scheme ought to be a gradual one, and it ought to be of a generous nature, but, above all, if you want a scheme to work you must take away the impediments which undoubtedly stand in its way. It may be against the interests of the class to which I belong, but I believe it would be to the best interests of Ireland and the country at large. I belong to an unpopular and falling class. We have been called the "British garrison." That has been used as a term of reproach, but it is a name of which we are proud. The hon. Member for South Tyrone said in one of his speeches, "the English garrison in Ireland has done its work, and dirty work too." We have been loyal to this country. We have helped to keep the British flag afloat in Ireland, and I think this House and the country should not forget that all the great Irishmen who have helped to build up the Empire, to make it strong, and to preserve its safety on land and sea, came from the British garrison in Ireland. I would remind hon. Gentlemen opposite that we gave you Grattan and Burke; we gave you Wellington and Palmerston, and in later years we have given you Wolseley, Roberts, and a host of others. That is the garrison you propose now to destroy. Like other classes, we may disappear from the country we love as well as hon. Gentlemen opposite, but, at any rate, we will carry away with us the proud memory that all through these past years, through good report and evil report, in fair weather and in foul, we have been loyal to Parliament and to the British Crown.

\*DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): I feel sure that the House with its usual indulgence will deal leniently and perhaps a little sympathetically with a new Member when he first attempts to place his views before it. I need not say that I labour under extraordinary difficulty in following as I do one of the best and most capable debaters in the House.

We have listened to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for North Armagh telling the House and the country that the Gentlemen who sit here are not loyal to the Empire. I say you have a very easy way in which to make all the Members from Ireland loyal to the British Empire, and that is by giving them what they want; Home Rule. I believe that if Parliament gave Irishmen the right to manage their own affairs all this agitation, which is so distracting to England and detrimental to Ireland, would disappear. I was until recently a Unionist, but became a convert to the other side, and, looking to the attitude assumed by the hon. Member for South Tyrone, I believe he will soon come over here too.

There can be no doubt whatever that the people of the north of Ireland are unanimously in favour of land purchase. I have a good many landlord friends, and I would be very sorry indeed to lose one of them. I would also be very sorry to do anything to injure them, but if the present condition of things goes on for ten years, where will their property be? I fully believe that if a great measure of land purchase is to be passed the landlords' and all interests affected must be fairly and generously compensated. Not very long ago the Governments of England and Russia guaranteed a loan to Greece at 2½ per cent. The Government of this country could borrow in the money markets of the world money for land purchase, repaying principle and interest, at 3 per cent. Suppose they charged the tenants 3½ per cent. instead of 4 per cent., that would be a

great relief. Suppose the tenant's previous rent had been £20, and that the Government gave a bonus of one year's purchase of the rent to both landlord and tenant, then the sum advanced to the tenant would amount to £380, and this if lent to him at 3½ per cent. would reduce his annual payments from £20 to £13 6s., equal to an immediate reduction of 33½ per cent. The landlord at the same time would get twenty-one years purchase of the rent, and the money the Government would get from the tenant at 3½ per cent. would repay the principle and interest on the sum of £420, so that the Government would be the gainers by 14s. a year; sufficient to pay the cost of collection and any other incidental expenses necessary for the carrying out of a plan of this kind. There can be no question that England is indebted to Ireland in a very large sum of money. If you accept the debt that Great Britain owes to Ireland; and it has not been proved that she does not owe it; as 2½ millions of money accumulated for the last fifty years, that would be an amount sufficient to buy out the landlords completely, and leave a considerable surplus to apply towards the future development of our country.

I trust the Government when they bring forward their proposals will do something at all events to improve the condition of things which exists as far as concerns the administration of the Land Laws; something to simplify the law and benefit the condition of the

Irish people. As a doctor, knowing the people thoroughly, I can tell the House that the condition of Ireland is not improving. Even if the British people were to lose money they would gain a great deal by settling the Irish land question. There can be no doubt of the serious danger involved in the present state of affairs. We all, look with great interest to the Bill which the Government are going to introduce, and we hope it will do a great deal to improve the proceedings of the Land Commission. We urge this great reform with all the strength of a sincere conviction, and feel certain, if satisfactorily arranged, the result cannot fail to be beneficial not only to Ireland, but to the Empire at large.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I am sorry to intervene between the House and any speaker whom we are anxious to hear, but my apology must be that earlier in the evening the Leader of the House stated that I should reply in some detail to the matters of detail which were advanced by the mover and seconder of the Amendment. I feel that those two eloquent and closely reasoned speeches demand and, indeed, exact a reply. My task is made easier by the fact that they in their speeches followed very closely on the terms of the Amendment.

What is there in the Amendment? It holds up an object; namely, the immediate and general creation of a peasant proprietary in Ireland. It advances a reason for that object; namely, the maladministration of the existing Land Acts. It suggests a method for achieving that object; namely, the application of compulsion to the Purchase Acts in Ireland. I think I can economise time by passing quickly over so much of the Amendment and speeches as raises no dispute between those hon. Members and the Government. First of all, as to the object. The words "general and immediate creation of a peasant proprietary" are too wide, I think, to be

really practical; but if the object is to extend widely and to accelerate the introduction of the system of peasant proprietary in Ireland, I can discover no point of difference between the mover and seconder on the one hand and the Government on the other. Even

the right hon. and gallant Member for Armagh gave to the development of the system of peasant proprietary in Ireland his approbation. The differences begin when the maladministration of the land system is urged. If those who spoke in support of the Amendment merely said that the land system of Ireland in respect of fair rents was unsatisfactory to all parties concerned, I think I should be prepared to agree with them. Indeed, as my right hon. friend said, when the Irish Members walked out of the House in 1881, the Conservative party recorded a unanimous vote against the Land Act of 1881. I therefore distinguish between the Fair Rent Acts and their administration; and upon their administration I should come into sharp collision with the hon. Member for South Tyrone. Of course, the Fair Rent Acts are unsatisfactory. What do they mean? They mean that litigation, which is always expensive, dilatory, and precarious, is in Ireland applied generally and universally to the normal transactions of Ireland's chief industry. The fact that land is Ireland's chief industry is very pertinent to this debate. In Scotland there are but 14 per cent. of the population engaged in agriculture; but in Ireland there are 43 per cent., so that this system of perpetual litigation is applied to almost half the people living out of towns. One precaution has been piled upon another; many of them, I may say, at the instance of the hon. Member for South Tyrone—Are these precautions justifiable? I think so; justifiable and necessary. Of course, the system has been unsatisfactory to all parties. Well, perhaps there is one exception. I believe the solicitors in Ireland; and I have been at pains to ascertain the figures; have increased by 30 per cent. since the Act of 1881 was placed upon the Statute-book. The effect of that Act is even more far-reaching than has been brought out to-night. It ceases to be any landlord's interest to develop or improve his property. And, even if it could be held to be his interest, it is no longer within his power. Any act which he takes is viewed with suspicion. The hon. Member for South Tyrone admitted that this is not to be a charge against the Irish landlord. It cannot be a charge against the Irish landlord. Before that Act was

passed Irish landlords did a great deal to improve the land. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] I beg the hon. Member's pardon. Since 1847 Irish landlords borrowed from the Board of Works over seven millions sterling;

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): And made the tenants pay for it.

MR. WYNDHAM: Besides any moneys of their own which they expended. Supposing the hon. Member's interruption is true; I do not think it is; in Ireland, as in every other country, when a landlord puts capital into the land, he expects some return for his investment, just as an employer of labour expects some return if he puts capital into his industry. Supposing, for the sake of argument, the interruption is quite justifiable, even then it was somebody's interest somehow to get some money to improve and develop Irish land, whereas now, since the Act of 1881, it is nobody's interest. And although I think the interruption unfair

and unjustifiable by the history of the century, still, if it were true, I should maintain that the Act of 1881 had paralysed the power of the landlord or the tenant to engage in any large scheme for improving value of the land of Ireland.

The Land Acts, it is admitted, are unsatisfactory, and, as regards fair rent, it is admitted that they are expensive. The Land Commission has cost; I cannot arrive at quite the figures which the hon. Member for Waterford gave; according to my own calculation, £2,000,000 sterling. [An HON. MEMBER: More.] Possibly more. Of that £2,000,000, £1,500,000 may be credited to the operations in respect of fixing fair rents; or, in other words, £1,500,000 to paralyse the chief industry of Ireland. When the Act of 1881 was passed, a prominent member of the Government of that day stated that it was only a *modus vivendi* which was to be observed until purchase could be gradually extended. The Conservative party of that day were intent upon schemes of purchase. If anybody is sufficiently curious to refer to the report of the important Commission which sat in 1879, he will find that the Conservative party was then considering the possibility of extending purchase. But then came the electoral clash of 1880. Although the leader of the Conservative party, Lord Beaconsfield, warned the country that the land question of Ireland was the question of the time, that warning was dismissed as an electoral dodge, and the question was shelved. We were too much concerned in the affairs of the Turkish Empire to pay any heed to the concerns of our own Empire; and a new Government came in, not intending to deal with Irish land, and then they precipitately introduced in a panic-stricken manner this Act of 1881, for which no member of the House has lifted up his voice this evening. I am not concerned to argue that that Act was a worse evil than the evil it was intended to remedy. It may have been a lesser evil; but that it was an evil was felt by both parties. Nobody, however litigious, can be expected to embrace with enthusiastic admiration the necessity of litigation to decide all his ordinary business transactions. But when it comes to the charges which have been levelled against the administration of the Fair Rent Acts, I take issue with my hon. friend the Member for South Tyrone. It is a very wrong and dangerous thing, after you erect a ladder of litigation and set a whole nation to climb its different rungs, and you find the process is costly and disappointing, to turn round and accuse the judges of neglecting their work and defeating the intentions of Parliament. That is the charge which the hon. Member brought against the judges. I am not going to enter into the hon. Member's past. I think it fair, however, to say that he is almost driven to take up that position. It is only two years ago that he blessed the whole land system of Ireland, and said that after generations of struggle substantial justice has now been done. Then he went on to say: "If things go wrong now the fault is more in the administration of the Act than in the legislation itself." Yes, but that was said in 1898. Is it the contention of the hon. Member for Waterford and the whole of the Irish party that all this disappointment has occurred within two and a half years? No; if the Acts were right in 1898, I think he has himself knocked the ground from under his feet in imputing the

whole of the disappointment to those charged with the administration of the Acts. He attacks the judges. He attacks Mr. Justice Meredith. I had intended to quote an attack made by the hon. Member against Mr. Justice Meredith which was published in a letter in the public press, but I have no need to trouble the House with any quotations. I think those who have listened to my hon. friend to-night will agree that he did prefer an attack against that judge in terms which could only be justified if he intends to impute to that judge either moral perversity or mental aberration; charges which, if proved, will blast a man's reputation; charges which are preferred against a man holding a high official position of great importance to the public; charges of such a nature, levelled at such a person which are not supported by adequate proof, can only be properly described as scandalous. It may be that my hon. friend does not himself impute such laches to Mr. Justice Meredith, but he will be held, as he has been held, throughout Ulster to have imputed such laches. Mr. Justice Meredith has the high qualifications of unchallenged integrity and of recognised acumen, and he has applied himself to the colossal task which we have in this House thrown upon him with great knowledge and with an assiduity which has threatened his health; and it is not right that a judge of such standing should be attacked in such a manner, unless ample proof is forthcoming. Apart altogether from any desire of hon. Members to see the charges widely extended, apart from any desire to see compulsion applied to purchase in Ireland, I say that the hon. Member who votes for this Amendment will not only support a want of confidence in the Government, but he will attack the judiciary and will encroach on the first safeguards of civilised society.

I should not be justified in speaking as I have unless I were prepared to attempt, at any rate, an answer to the specific charges which the hon. Member for South Tyrone has levelled against Mr. Justice Meredith. These charges have been reduced to two this evening. Before I argue these two cases I wish to say that it is with great reluctance that I seem to make this House a Court of Appeal above the High Court of Appeal and the other Courts of Ireland. I do not think the hon. Member for South Tyrone is entitled to assist, as he has assisted, in framing this legislation, to set the judges to interpret it, to see their decisions appealed against and affirmed or reversed; and then to come and ask the House of Commons to sit as a higher Court of Appeal above the High Court of Appeal to judge of questions of interpretation without knowledge of law, and questions of fact without any evidence.

The first test applied is the number of appeals. I suppose 3,000 cases in each year come before the Land Commission as appeals from the decision of the Sub-Commissioners. I know that since Judge Meredith was appointed in 1898 he has had to decide over 400 cases in which points of law were involved and in which there might have been an appeal from him to the highest Court. How many appeals have there been? Forty-five. Ten of those appeals were made by landlords who thought that the judge had dealt too hardly by them. In five cases his decision was confirmed and in five cases it was reversed or varied. The balance of thirty-five appeals were at the instance of tenants who thought that he had dealt unfairly by them. In nine cases the decision was reversed and in twenty-six

cases it was confirmed by the Court of Appeal. So that out of 3,000 cases which came before Mr. Justice Meredith in over 400 an appeal could have been taken on points of law, but in only forty-five was an appeal taken, and in only nine did the High Court of Appeal declare that he had not rightly interpreted the Act. I submit that this is a complete answer to the only charge which would justify the Amendment or the language used to support it. If you take one case here or one there you may hold a different view from the judge. Any intelligent man is entitled to entertain such an opinion. I read the other day in the newspapers; a report of an interesting case which dealt with tapestry; whether tapestry which was nailed to the wall was a fixture or not. Thousands of pounds were involved, but if you agree with one judge you are not entitled to say that the other has a bias which defeats the intention of Parliament. You cannot have it both ways.

I will come now to the particular cases which the hon. Member for South Tyrone has put before us in order to illustrate what I will not call his recklessness but his impetuosity. Only two cases were advanced to-night, but during the campaign which the hon. Member has waged week by week for four months; MR. T. W. RUSSELL: And still going on.

MR. WYNDHAM: Having all those cases to review he has selected five. Three of those cases have disappeared tonight, and of course I will not trouble the House with them, but I am not surprised that they have disappeared. In one of them, although the hon. Member made Ulster ring with it (the case of Lindsay), Mr. Justice Meredith was following the decision given by Chief Baron Palles, whose name is held in the highest honour and respect. In another case there was no appeal; in the third he was unanimously upheld by the Court of Appeal in Ireland. I am not surprised that these three cases do not appear to-night, and that out of the five which were good enough for Ulster only two are good enough for the House of Commons. What was the first case? The first case was in some senses an old friend; Adams v. Dunseath. On that the hon. Member has declared that the pink schedule has been altered.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: No. What I said was that in the original schedule, which went to the Court of Appeal, the Sub-Commissioners entered the value of the land as bog and the value of the reclaimed land; and that by that way, and by that way alone, the surplus letting value of the land could be discovered. The Court of Appeal decided against Mr. Justice Meredith, and now the schedules are filled up; I have them in my hand, and can produce them; without either the original value of the land as bog or the value of the reclaimed land, so that no surplus value can arise.

MR. WYNDHAM: I think I ought to deal in some detail with this case. It is the last of the old guard. In the first place, the hon. Member says that Mr. Justice Meredith was reversed by the Court of Appeal. He said that to-night, and he has said it many nights. So he was reversed: but does not the hon. Member think it would have been right and proper to say that he was reversed by a majority of one, that four judges in the High Court of Appeal were against him, and that three; the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, the Master of the Rolls, and Mr. Justice Holmes; agreed with him in his interpretation of the law? Is it to be



said when such men of repute in the law agree with a judge that he is to be attacked in this House as if he were idle and perverse in the discharge of his duty? Then the hon. Member declares that some change has been made in the schedule. The Act lays down that there shall be specified "the annual sum of the improvements made, wholly or partly, by the tenant, and with respect to each such improvement the nature, character, and present capital value thereof, and the increased letting value due thereto." That is all that there is in the Act. Under that Act there is a schedule drawn up. That schedule has not in form been changed, though I understood the hon. Member to say that it had.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Oh, no.

MR. WYNDHAM: It has been changed to meet the requirements of the Local Government Act, but not as far as it relates to this section of the Act of 1891. The hon. Member maintains that that form has been filled in in a different manner. When was the last hearing of this case of Adams v. Dunseath? It was in 1899. The hon. Member alleges that after that a change was made; so that this change, if it be a change, is not of sufficient duration to account for all the evils which he has urged against the land system. It is a question, only of a few months. In this case of Adams v. Dunseath the Court found, as the law directs, that the present capital value of Adams's improvement was £144, and that the increased letting value was £7 4s. Of that they allowed the tenant £6, and they divided the £1 4s. But the case which followed that, and on which the hon. Member

rested the whole of his argument, was a case in which the present capital value was £30, and the increased letting value £1 10s., and the whole of that was given to the tenant. Let me tell the House that this is the merest piece of academic logomachy. Anyone who knows Ireland knows that the cases where a tenant can add more than 5 per cent. to the letting value of the holding can be counted on the fingers of one hand. It is an academic case, and the hon. Member admits it. Immediately after the Morley Commission had sat, the hon. Member returned to Ireland, was interviewed, and on this very point of Adams v. Dunseath he used words to the effect that the question was purely academic. Mr. Justice Bewley, who appeared before the Morley Commission, used the very same phrase. Even in the richer counties of Ireland the cases are rare where a tenant can add more than 5 per cent. to the letting value of his holding. The hon. Member has said that in Ulster there have been twelve years of wrongdoing, because this academic point has been decided first one way and then the other, and ultimately, by a majority of one, against Mr. Justice Meredith. Well, that was one case that I was bound, dealing with the speech of the hon. Member, to reply to, but in replying to it I fear I have made; I have been driven to make; a great demand on the patience of the House.

Next, the hon. Member; I am taking the cases in reverse order; dealt with a case which, as it seemed to the House, appeared to be the best instance at his disposal; it was the best arrow in his quiver. It was the case of McCluggage. Let me put it plainly to the House in as few words as need be. The case was this: The tenant paid for his farm, before a fair rent was fixed, a rent of £27. After the first fair rent was fixed, that sum of £27 was reduced to £18.

When the period of revision came round again, this sum of £;18 was further reduced to £;10 10s. a year by the Sub-Commissioners. The result of all this was a reduction in the rent of over 61 per cent. On that the landlord appealed; well, after all, we have given him the right to appeal; and the result of the appeal was that the rent was raised to £;12 10s. Was it right to say on such a case as this that

the whole intention of Parliament has been defeated; that the Land Courts are a delusion and a snare? And all because a man who originally paid £;27 a year;

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: Being robbed.

MR. WYNDHAM: This man was offered a very large sum for his tenant right, and now we are told because his rent, formerly £;27, was raised on appeal from £;10 10s.

to £;12 10s., the whole object of the Act was defeated. Will the hon. Member;

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: That is not my point at all. The hon. Gentleman must not misrepresent me. My point was an entirely different one. I said that four expert land valuers had examined the land, and that their valuation was over ridden by people who knew nothing about land, and the rent increased 20 percent.

MR. WYNDHAM: Then if we follow that argument to its logical conclusion there is no need for a Court of Appeal. We spent £;130,000 for the express purpose of dealing with these cases only a few years ago, and we have only succeeded in creating tribunals which have no value. I leave that case on which the hon.

Member so much relied to the fair judgment of the House. I ask whether in this country, whether in any country in the world, there are not many men who go to law who would consider themselves very lucky if they gained a reduction of from £;27 to £;12, the cost of the litigation being paid by the taxpayers at large?

The hon. Member spoke of Mr. Justice Ross, but perhaps I ought to pass over his attack on that judge. [An IRISH MEMBER: Say a few words upon it.] I will accept your invitation. The hon. Member for South Tyrone made an attack upon this judge, but;

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I withdrew that.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes; but I think when a judge is attacked and the attack withdrawn the House should know the facts. Only in December last the hon. Member charged Mr. Justice Ross; [An IRISH MEMBER: He withdrew that.] I have said he withdrew it, but I think that the House, who listened to a charge made by the hon. Member on another learned judge this afternoon which has not been withdrawn, should know that he levelled another charge at another judge; a charge levelled by the hon. Member, who claims with a great deal of justice to be well versed in the whole system of land legislation; and that he withdrew it a week afterwards.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: I made a mistake.

MR. WYNDHAM: The charge was that the judge had declared a certain section; [Interruption from the Irish benches.] I hope hon. Members from Ireland will not think I am urging this as a charge against the hon. Member for South Tyrone. I am urging it because I think that an hon. Member who brings a charge against a judge and withdraws it in a week, when he comes to this House and brings a charge against another judge, should have his words discounted to a certain extent. It is clear that his impetuosity in this matter has carried him very far. I know that he is sincere, I know that he wishes to benefit the Ulster

tenants and the tenants of Ireland, but in that wish he has been carried a great deal further than perhaps he himself imagines.

I leave that part of the Amendment; the attack on the administration of the Land Acts and the Fair Rent Acts.

What is the plan suggested? With all this experience of what compulsion means; because it has been pointed out that the Fair Rent Acts are compulsory ;we are now asked to make purchase compulsory also. Many of the hon. Members who have addressed the House have said that the Fair Rent Acts have worked badly, but that the Purchase Acts have worked well. I wondered that nobody paused to consider that there was a great difference between the Fair Rent Acts and the Purchase Acts; namely, that the one is compulsory and that the other is voluntary. If you make the Purchase Acts compulsory, you will have to safeguard them in the same elaborate way as you have had to safeguard the Fair Rent Acts. If you cannot allow a man's income, or the annual rent which a man has to pay, to be assessed without giving the right of appeal and spending a million and a half of money on seeing that every possible legal point may be raised, what safeguard do you not think you will have to apply when you propose to place the capital value of the whole of Ireland into the Land Court? Knowing how mischievous the Land Act of 1881 was, the Unionist party fifteen years ago adopted purchase as its policy. It did it for two reasons; in order, as the hon. Member who moved the Amendment desires, to create a proprietary peasantry, but also, as I think, to find an exit out of this limbo of litigation into which the land of Ireland had been plunged by the Act of 1881. That Act drove political economy out of the door, and it was very soon found that you had to open a window to let it back. You cannot conduct the chief industry of any country if you do not allow one man to sell for a price which he can afford to accept, and if you do not allow another man to buy for a price which he can afford to pay. If we apply compulsion to purchase, which, so far, has succeeded, we shall exclude that element; each man's willingness or unwillingness to buy or sell, each man's knowledge of his own interest and resources will be eliminated, and, in place of that, we must substitute a system of inspection, of value and of appeal, which will be more costly, more dilatory, and more precarious than the very system which the mover and the seconder of this Amendment challenged to-night.

The hon. Member for South Tyrone objects to the quotation of his earlier speeches, and if I do it now it is only because he has put my argument far better than I could put it myself. He referred to the compulsory purchase, as it is called, which was carried out in Prussia. It was a compulsion far simpler than that we are now invited to undertake, but, as the hon. Member himself pointed out, that system was adopted in 1807, and it was not completed until 1850. The hon. Member then pointed out that we must begin somewhere, and that the claim on the part of the poorer part of Ireland would be urged with such insistence that it would be impossible to deal with richer Ulster until you had dealt with impoverished Mayo and impoverished Con-naught. I pass by the rest of the hon. Member's speech, but the end of it I must ask the House to listen to. The hon. Member says: "We must prove our case;

we must not consider its utility we must prove that it is practicable, that it can be worked out." Has the hon. Member advanced that proof either this evening or during the whole course of his campaign? I pass by the difficulty of the 120, 130, or 150 millions of rent. I pass by the difficulty of the proof of title, and I come down to where the hon. Member says that all land is to be sold except town parks and demesne land. Why is a man not to sell his demesne land if he wishes? Then the hon. Member says that all holdings of 100 acres or under are to be sold to the tenant.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: When did I say that?

MR. WYNDHAM: At Clogher.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: No, I did not say that. I am perfectly certain I said all tenanted land except demesne land and town parks. And I also exempted the western area, which requires special treatment.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have the hon. Member's speech here. He said, "All holdings over 100 acres were to be sold at prices fixed by the Land Commission at the actual value of the land."

MR. T. W. RUSSELL: That is a misquotation.

MR. WYNDHAM: Then I will not pursue that further. He dealt only with tenanted land. He put forward no proposal as to land that was not tenanted. He did not attempt, I think, to deal with this question. In fact, he wished to sell the existing holdings to the existing tenants. Is it worth while hypothecating £120,000,000 for that purpose? There are in Ireland, not only in the congested districts, small holdings, impoverished holdings, and, therefore, squalid holdings, each with a family upon it of five or eight persons, and with not one of which can any of those families hope to rise to an ampler or a higher life. If you are going to risk £120,000,000, if you are going to work compulsion for twenty-five years; and

I defy you to do it at a greater pace than £5,000,000 a year; is it worth risking that sum, and the labour involved, in order to leave Ireland in precisely the position she is in at this moment? The hon. Member waved that problem away. He said probably the western area would have to be dealt with by the Congested Districts Board, and might involve special treatment. Yes, Sir, but the hon. Member has not looked too closely into his own problem. Out of 486,000 holdings in Ireland there are 127,000 holdings of an annual value of £4 and under. But they are not all in the congested districts. In the western counties, in Donegal, Mayo, and Galway there are 45,425 of these holdings. But in Ulster itself, excluding Donegal, there are 21,700 holdings of less annual value than £4, and in the rest of Ireland, excluding Ulster and the congested districts, there are 66,900 of these holdings. I ask the House to consider; is it a question of rent? The average rent of these 127,000 holdings, each, I suppose, supporting some five persons; the average rent of a quarter of a million of people; is £3 a year for a family. That is 1s. 2d. a week, 2d. a day, lodging money paid by a family for a miserable holding, I agree. You cannot neglect this side of the problem. If you are to risk £120,000,000, and to plunge the whole land of Ireland into the limbo of litigation, are you to leave that problem untouched? If you abolish all rent, what becomes of the main plea put forward by

the hon. Member in regard to the jealousy of the man on one side of the wall for the man on the other side of the wall? Suppose one of these families succeed in purchasing their holding at fifteen years' purchase, what is the difference? The man over the wall is paying 2d. a day, and they are paying five farthings. It is ludicrous. It is: insane to ask this country to undertake such a heavy monetary charge, apart from all precedent, to plunge Ireland into fresh years of litigation, and then not to touch what, in my opinion, is the sore which must be healed if ever we are to settle the Irish land question.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): On one point I notice that the Chief Secretary has found himself in entire agree-

ment with the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House. Both of them have felt the difficulty of the situation with which they are face to face. When you have over 90 per cent. of the representatives of a country asking for a remedy for what they allege to be a great grievance you are in a difficult position, and I do not wonder that not only the Chief Secretary but the right hon. Gentleman himself made an almost passionate appeal to the supporters who sit behind them to treat this as a vote of want of confidence.

I admit at once that the problem with which the Government finds itself confronted is a difficult one. I am quite aware of the force there is in what was said by the Chief Secretary, that legislation of this kind must inevitably lead to a sea of litigation and to many difficulties. But these difficulties you will have to face if you are to grapple with the question of Irish land at all.

I observed that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House and the Chief Secretary both passed criticisms of a scathing order upon the Land Act of 1881; but what is the record of the right hon. Gentlemen opposite upon this matter? Who was it who brought the leaseholders, whom Mr. Gladstone excluded, within its provisions, and thereby affirmed once more the necessity of referring to some principle such as that to solve the great difficulty with which the administration was confronted?

Then the right hon. Gentleman went on to say that the Government had been driven by the principle of the Act of 1881 to the further principle of purchase. I am not surprised at that. I do not wonder that they felt that the position established, first by the Act of 1870 and then by the subsequent Act of eleven years later, marked the transition period and inevitably had to lead to something of a more far-reaching character; and to-day we find that hon. Members from Ireland are almost tumbling over each other in their anxiety to vindicate themselves, and the Government which some of them support, from the plea of being indifferent to this question of purchase as an absolute necessity for the situation. When I see 90 per cent. of the Irish Members taking a particular view I cannot avoid the conclusion that there is some deep-seated reason for it. I have always been

a strong supporter of land purchase. I have always felt that a system of dual ownership was a system on which you could not rest, and which must inevitably lead you to take a further step. How do we stand at this moment? We are told that it is the decision of a majority of the people who elect this Parliament that you cannot give a system of government to Ireland under which the people

of Ireland may settle their own affairs. If that is so, it seems to me you are under a greater obligation to try to mould your Irish legislation to the ideas of the people, and, in particular, that land legislation which perhaps more than any other affects their well-being. If you will not allow the Irish to manage their own concerns, you might at least avoid preferring the interests of the minority to the interests of the majority.

That is the issue at stake. Let us admit frankly that the land legislation of 1881 and the subsequent legislation extending it has not proved wholly a success. Let us admit, what has been proved up to the hilt by the speeches of the hon. and learned Member for Waterford and the hon. Member for South Tyrone, that we must take some step forward. What step? Certainly not a perpetuation of dual ownership; and if you come to the conclusion that dual ownership will not do, then you must look to the principle already adopted by the Government themselves. I do not propose to impugn the conduct of judges. Judge Meredith is no doubt a very able judge, Judge Boss; I know personally, and both are high-minded men. But I think the evidence is almost conclusive that the system of administering these dual ownership Acts has practically broken down. Take the Ashbourne Act. What has it done? It has put the power of selling land in the option not of the tenant, but of the landlord. The landlord is preferred, and he is told that if he chooses to sell his land he shall have the assistance of the State. What has been the consequence? The Act has been in operation for many years. There are no arrears worth calling arrears under it, it has practically proved a success, and it has shown that if you govern your conduct carefully you can use the credit of this country to convert dual into single ownership in Ireland. If that were done for the sake of getting rid of the ownership of land in favour of the worst class of tenant, it should also be done for the benefit of the best class of tenant. Let me explain. When you gave the option to the landlord to sell his land, who was he likely to pick out? Of course the tenant that was troublesome, and from whom he had difficulty in getting his rent. You thought it sufficient to protect the people of this country that you should take measures to enable the landlord to sell to the tenant whom he was most ready to be quit of, and yet you now refuse to interpose the credit of this country in the interests of the good tenants. I maintain that the distinction between these two cases is illogical, and cannot be upheld. I do not advocate land purchase on the footing of any belief that it will involve any considerable sacrifice to this country to bring it about, but if there were to be a sacrifice it would be worth making for the prospect of a more peaceful and contented Ireland. The experience we have had under the Ashbourne Act has proved almost conclusively that if we take proper steps we may interpose the credit of this country without any substantial risk of loss to the Exchequer. It is all very well to talk of liabilities, but what would be said of the banker who refused to increase a loan when he had assets on the other side, and we all know that in this matter the State has a good safe asset. If that be the general principle, it seems to me we ought to do what we can to give effect to it. It is not enough to take up the attitude of the Chief Secretary and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House. I listened to their speeches, and

I did not hear from them that anything substantial was to be done to get rid of the impossible condition of things existing in Ireland. I did not hear the Chief Secretary announce any measure.

MR. WYNDHAM: A measure is mentioned in the King's Speech.

MR. HALDANE: The King's Speech is an extremely vague document, and it is singularly barren of promise of legislation for Ireland. We know nothing of the measure to which the Speech referred.

MR. WYNDHAM: When I move for leave to bring in the Bill will be the proper occasion for describing the intentions of the Government.

MR. HALDANE: Then the right hon. Gentleman asks us to act on faith. But what are the prospects? The right hon. Gentleman made no attempt to get rid of this Amendment by telling the Irish Members that he was going to propose something substantial. They cannot be expected to take things on trust. One of their most pressing grievances is the Irish University question, and there was no hint or indication in the King's Speech that the Government are going to follow up the policy which the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House identified himself very warmly with some time ago. How, therefore, can you expect them to accept the promises you give them in the matter of land legislation?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman has made a personal reference to myself which is perfectly astounding. He knows perfectly well that every word I said on the Irish University question, and to which I adhere, was not said by me as a member of the Government at all.

MR. HALDANE: Yes, on the Irish University question the right hon. Gentleman carefully stated that he spoke for himself, but we all hoped until recently that his party were about to accept his opinion, and if that hope had not been entertained a great deal more would have been heard of the question. We are told that the King's Speech contains a promise for the redress of this land grievance, and we are asked to hold our hands. That is too vague. We are face to face in Ireland with a state of affairs which, unless some definite steps are taken, will result in a standstill. It is plain that the machinery provided by the Act of 1881 is not enough. That is shown conclusively.

We have in Ireland two classes diametrically opposed to one another. One class consists of the vast majority of the people; the other is a small class. I have always believed that Irish landlords should not be made scapegoats, but that they should have justice done to them. I am aware that the business of governing Ireland from Westminster

must continue to be a very difficult one. Why make it more difficult by refusing to deal with a grievance such as this? There are two obstacles worth considering in the way of a measure of this kind. One is that a large number of the Irish landlords are mortgagors, and it is said that if you reduce their income by giving them Consols they will be in an intolerable position. I think that would be so, but I assume this motion means that you are going to pay out the mortgages, and make a clean sweep of the matter, and if you do that I do not see any difficulty in dealing with the Irish landlords who are mortgagors. They will get the value of the equity of redemption, and they are entitled to claim nothing else. Then it is said that a considerable amount of land in Ireland is

untenanted. That is quite true, and I should hope that those landlords who have no tenants would more and more become one, politically and socially, with the people among whom they live, with a view to bringing about contentment in Ireland. I have never been sanguine of the possibility of making Ireland a rich, prosperous, and contented country, because the causes of its present condition are of long standing, but this I do think, that when, short of Home Rule, which this House has elected to decide against, you have a practical proposition upon which a very large number of the people of Ireland are agreed; a larger number than had previously been in agreement; I feel that it is an opportunity that should not be lost. If the Government cannot go further, they can at least take steps towards dealing with a grievance which is felt throughout Ireland, which is protested against by Members from Ulster as well as by Members from the other provinces of Ireland, and which is ripe for solution. I, for my part, while recognising the difficulties of the Government in attempting a solution of this matter, feel that the balance of the merits of the case are with those who have brought forward this proposal.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I should have sought an opportunity of speaking earlier had I not believed that the debate on this most important matter would have gone over more than one night.

Of all the points that have been urged on the House to-night, that which most strikes me as governing the whole situation is one which was very forcibly put in the two brilliant speeches with which the debate opened, but of which we have heard very little since. It is the very simple fact that this represents the desire of 95 per cent. of the Irish Members. Now, I have always been one of those who have supported the desire expressed by the large majority of the Irish Members that they should be endowed with the power of managing their own domestic affairs; I have always put that fact in the very forefront as the strongest reason why their demand should have received greater consideration than it did in the past. If the representation of these people is to be of any value, when we have such a remarkable consensus of opinion, when we find men in the country and Members in this House who have hitherto been accustomed to act in diametrical opposition to each other agreed upon this question, surely that is the very strongest argument for the favourable consideration of this motion by the House. There is one case, and one case only, in which that could be set aside, but I will come to that later.

On the merits of the case, and passing over the administration of previous Acts, and coming to the existing situation in Ireland, a very singular point strikes me. We have already passed several Purchase Bills enabling the tenant to buy from his landlord, if he is willing to sell, on certain terms. Those terms are such that the annual payment that the tenant has to make is less than the fixed rent which he was before paying. So that you have this position. Two tenants are living alongside of each other, and the landlord of one has been able and willing to sell, and after the arrangement has been made this tenant pays, we are told tonight, only 12s. in the pound of the rental that he formerly paid and of the rent that his neighbour pays, and not only so, but he pays it for a definite term of years, and at the end of that term the land becomes his for



ever. His neighbour, however, goes on paying the 20s. in the pound of his fixed rent, and no number of years that may pass over his head alters his position. I maintain that that is a position of things which cannot conduce either to the contentment, peace, or prosperity of Ireland. I think that is a better argument than all the technical pleas that have been urged, and having begun with this process of land purchase, therefore, having induced Parliament to pass measures involving stress, no doubt, on the Imperial Exchequer and other sources, to create this anomalous state of things, you must go on with it, and go on with it as rapidly as possible, and in such a way and degree as to put an end to this anomaly. I do not mean to say; the point was raised by the Chief Secretary; in regard to very small holdings, where something is paid in some cases that may be called a rent which is not a rent at all, but rather a sort of fine that is imposed on the attachment of a man and his family to the place where they live, that that class of property might not be dealt with exceptionally; but the great mass of tenants surely are entitled, whatever the position of their landlord, to have the same advantage the one as the other. That being the policy, and in view of the condition of the Irish people and the contentment of Ireland, what is there to be said against it? There is this to be said against it, and this only: that there may be danger of loss of money to the Imperial Exchequer. There is, I have said, one case in which the ascertained, constitutionally expressed, moderately preferred desire of the Irish people might be set aside. That would be the case where it involved something beyond the limits of Ireland, and something bringing general danger or loss. It be may so here; it is quite possible, as the Leader of the House said, that if a large step forward is taken in this direction there may be no longer the same immunity from loss that we have seen in the past, but if it be so I answer that you are committed to it already. You should have thought of that before. There is nothing now to do except to go through with it and establish something like prosperity among the Irish people. For these reasons; and that is my object, that is the personal view I take of it; I shall for my part vote for the Amendment, because it is only in this way that the great object which we desire can be attained.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I have listened with very great care to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, and I must confess I am entirely in the dark at the present moment as to his position, or whether he means that he himself or his party have made a considerable advance on the question of land purchase in Ireland since the last occasion on which he addressed the House on the subject, in 1892. I think he has left myself and many other hon. Members near me in doubt as to whether his speech was merely a declamatory expression of his views, not to be followed by any action by him or his party if they came into power. What I wish to ask, and what I am sure the House would like to know from some other right hon. Gentleman opposite, is, if the fortune of party turns, has the right hon. Gentleman to-night pledged his party to immediately carry into effect the policy which underlies the Amendment of the hon. Member for Waterford, and which has been expounded in Ulster by the hon. Member for South Tyrone. That policy has been placed with absolute

distinctness and clearness by the hon. Member for South Tyrone before the farmers of Ulster and of Ireland. He says that a condition of things exists in Ireland which makes it absolutely necessary that there must be not only purchase but compulsory purchase, and not only compulsory purchase but immediate compulsory purchase. We have heard to-night the answer of the Government. We have heard the speech of the right hon Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, but I do not think that anyone yet understands whether he has pledged himself or his party, if they come into power, to carry out immediately a policy of compulsory purchase in Ireland involving a sum of over one hundred million sterling. The policy which has been propounded in Ulster by the hon. Member for South Tyrone is not merely an enlargement of the Voluntary Purchase Acts, it is that compulsion is necessary. [Several HON. MEMBERS: Divide, divide &#x0021;] Hon. Members themselves state that this matter is of the greatest possible importance, and I am going to take advantage of this opportunity to express my opinion on it;

MR. T. W. RUSSELL rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E

Doogan, P. C.

King, Sir Henry Seymour

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Dorington, Sir John Edward

Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Knowles, Lees

Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)

Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.

Ambrose, Robert

Duffy, William J.

Lawson, John Grant

Anstruther, H. T.

Duncan, James H.

Layland-Barratt, Francis

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Dyke, Rt.Hn.Sir William Hart

Leamy, Edmund

Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.

Edwards Frank

Lee, Capt. A H. (Hants, Fareh'm

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton

Leighton, Stanley

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Balfour, Rt.Hn. A.J.(Manch'r  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S  
Ballour, Rt. Hon. G.W. (Leeds)  
Fenwick, Charles  
Lough, Thomas  
Banbury, Fredrick George  
Ferguson R. C Munro (Leith)  
Lowe, Francis William  
Barlow, John Emmott  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r  
Lucas, Col. F. (Lowestoft)  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Ffrench, Peter  
Lucas, Reginald J, (Portsmouth  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Field William  
Lundon, W.  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Beach,Rt. Hn. Sir M.H. (Bristol  
Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Bell, Richard  
Fisher, William Hayes  
MacIver, David (Liverpool)  
Bignold, A.  
Fitzmaurice Lord Edmond  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Bill, Charles  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
M'Arthur, Wm. (Cornwall)  
Blake, Edward  
Fletcher Sir Henry  
M'Cann, James  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Flynn, James Christopher  
M'Fadden, Edward  
Bowland, John  
Forster, Henry William  
M'Govern, T.  
Bowles, Capt. H.F. (Middlesex  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

M'Hugh, Patrick A.  
Bowles T. Gibson (King's Lynn  
Gilhooly James  
M'Kiliop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Boyle James  
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Brassey, Albert  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W.F.  
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.  
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'y)  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Greene, Sir E.W. (Bury S Edm  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Bull, William James  
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)  
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Groves, James Grimble  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Minch, Matthew  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Hain, Edward  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Caine, William Sproston  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
Montagu, Hn. J.Scott (Hants  
Caldwell, James  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Mooney, John J.  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld G. (Midd'x  
More, Rbt. Jasper (Shropshire)  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Hammond, John  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd  
Mount, William Arthur

Causton, Richard Knight  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Murnaghan, George  
Cavendish, V.C.W (Derbyshire  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Murphy, J.  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J (Birm.  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.  
Claney, John Joseph  
Helder, Augustus  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Holland, William Henry  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Hope, J.F (Sheffield, Brightside  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid  
Colville, John  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
O'Brien, Patrick, (Kilkenny)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
O'Brien, William (Cork)  
Crean, Eugene  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
O'Doherty, William  
Cullinan, J.  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo S.)  
Daly, James

Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Dowd, John  
Delany, William  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Dillon, John  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.  
O'Malley, William  
Question put, "That the Question be now put."  
The House divided::Ayes, 251; Noes, 132. (Division List No. 5.)  
O'Mara, James  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Tomkinson, Henry James  
O'Shee, James John  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Palmer, Geo. W. (Reading)  
Shaw-Stewart, M H (Renfrew  
Tally, Jasper  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Sinclair, Cant. J. (Forfarshire  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Partington, Oswald  
Smith, H. C. (North'mb Tyneside  
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir. William H.  
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
White, Luke (York, E.R.)  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Spear, John Ward  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne  
Pretymann, Ernest George

Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Rasch, Major Frederick Carne  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Rea, Russell  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald  
Reddy, M.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford  
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Ox. Univ.  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Tennant, Harold John  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Ridley, Samuel F. (Bethnal Gr'n  
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.  
Thomas, J. A. (Glamorgan, Gow'r  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Roche, John  
Thompson, E. C. Monaghan, N.  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Rutherford, John  
Thornton, Percy M.  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Mr. T. W. Russell and Captain Donelan.  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-

Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst W.  
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry J.  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Hall, Edward Marshall  
Moulton, John Fletcher  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Hamilton, Marq. of (Londond'y  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Bousfield, William Robert  
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemo'h  
Norman, Henry  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens.  
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Butcher, John George  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Carlile, William Walter  
Henderson, Alexander  
Peel, Hon. William Robert W.  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Hermon-Hodge, Robt Trotter  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Hoare, Ed. Brodie (Hampstead)  
Penn, John  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)  
Percy, Earl  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Pilkington, Richard



Channing, Francis Allston  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Pryce-Jones, Lt-Col. Edward  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Hoult, Joseph  
Purvis, Robert  
Chapman, Edward  
Howard, Capt J. (Kent, Faversh.  
Radcliffe, R. F.  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Remnant, James Farquharson.  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Keswick, William  
Sandys, Lieut.-Cl. Thos. Myles  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North  
Kimber, Henry  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Cl. Edw. J.  
Cremer, William Randall  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Lawrence, William F.  
Shipman, Dr. John  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Lecky, Rt. Hon. William Ed. H.  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets, SGeo.  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.  
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Stanley, Lord (Lanes)  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore

Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent  
 Sullivan, Donal  
 Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
 Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
 Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
 Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
 Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
 Tufnell, Col. Edward  
 Evans, Samuel T.  
 Maconochie, A. W.  
 Valentia, Viscount  
 Faber, George Denison  
 M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
 Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
 Fardell, Sir T. George  
 M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.  
 Wanklyn, James Leslie  
 Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
 M'Iver, Sir Lewis Edinburgh W  
 Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
 Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
 M'Kenna, Reginald  
 Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
 Finch, George H.  
 M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
 Wilson Henry J. (York, W. R.)  
 Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
 Majendie, James A. H.  
 Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
 Garfit, William  
 Manners, Lord Cecil  
 Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)  
 Gordon Hn. J.E. (Elgin & Nairn  
 Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.  
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
 Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
 Milton, Viscount  
 Mr. Macartney and Mr. Rentoul.  
 Gordon, Maj Evans. (T'rH'mlet  
 Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
 Question put accordingly, "That those words be there added."  
 AYES.  
 Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.  
 Flynn, James Christopher  
 O'Brien, William (Cork)  
 Allan, William (Gateshead)

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)  
Allen, Charles P (Glouce., Stroud  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert, J.  
O'Doherty, William  
Asquith, Rt. Hon Herbert Henry  
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Harlow, John Emmott  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Hammond, John  
O'Dowd, John  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Hardie, J. Keir (Mertbyr Tydvil  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Bell, Richard  
Harmsworth, K. Leicester  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N.  
Blake, Edward  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Malley, William  
Boland, John  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale  
O'Mara, James  
Boyle, James  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
O'Shee, James John  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Holland, William Henry  
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)  
Caine, William Sproston  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
Partington, Oswald.  
Caldwell, James  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace

Rea, Russell  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh'e  
Reddy, M.  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Jordon, Jeremiah  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Joyce, Michael  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Kinloch, Sir John G. Smyth  
Roche, John  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Colville, John  
Leamy, Edmund  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Shipman, Dr. John  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Lough, Thomas  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
Crean, Eugene  
Lundon, W.  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Cremer, William Randal  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Cullinan, J.  
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Daly, James  
M'Cann, James  
Tennant, Harold John  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
M'Fadden, Edward  
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)

Delany, William  
M'Govern, T.  
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr  
Dillon, John  
M'Hugh, Patrick A.  
Thomas, J. A. (Glamorgan G.)  
Doogan, P. C.  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan N.  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Tompkinson, James  
Dully, William J.  
Minch, Matthew  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Duncan, James H.  
Mooney, John J.  
Tally, Jasper  
Edwards, Frank  
Morris, Hon. M. Henry F.  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Evans, Samuel T.  
Murnaghan, George  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Murphy, J.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Fenwick, Charles  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.  
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex  
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Field, William  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Mr. T. W. Russell and Captain Donelan.  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Bartley, George C. T.

Bull, William James

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Beach, Rt. Hon. Sir M. H. (Bristol)

Bullard, Sir Harry

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bignold, A.

Burdett-Coutts, W.

Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden

Bill, Charles

Butcher, John George

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Carlile, William Walter

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bousfield, William Robert

Cautley, Henry Strother

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)

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

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)

Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Brand, Hon. Arthur G.

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Brassey, Albert

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

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

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)

Balfour, Rt. Hon. Gerald W. (Leeds)

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.)

Banbury, Frederick George

Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry

The House divided:; Ayes, 140; Noes, 235. (Division List No. 6.)

Chapman, Edward

Howard, Capt. J. (Kent, Fav'sh.)

Penn, John

Churchill, Winston Spencer

Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil

Percy, Earl  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Pilkington, Richard  
Col lings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Jessel,CaptainHerhertMorton  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop)  
Purvis, Robert  
Gust, Henry John C.  
Keswick, William  
Quitter, Sir Cuthbert  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Kimber, Henry  
Radcliffe, R. E.  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Dewar,T.B.(T'rH'ml'ts,S.Geo.  
Knowles, Lees  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Lambton, Hon.Frederick Wm.  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Lawrence, William F.  
Ridley,Hn.M.W.(Stalybridge  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Lawson, John Grant  
Ridley,Samuel F.(BethnalGr'n  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Lecky,Rt. Hn. William EdwH.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.

Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Lee, Capt. A. H. (Hants Fareham)  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Carrie  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.  
Leighton, Stanley  
Rutherford, John  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Faber, George Denison  
Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.)  
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Lowe, Francis William  
Saunderson, Rt. Hon. Col. E. J.  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Lowther, C. (Cumb. Eskdale)  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Fergusson, Rt. Hon. Sir J. (Manc'r)  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Simeon, Sir Harrington  
Finch, George H.  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)  
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tyneside)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Smith, James Farker (Lanarks.)  
Fison, Frederick William  
Macdonald, John Gumming  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
MacIver, David (Liverpool)  
Spear, John Ward  
Fletcher, Sir Henry



Maconochie, A. W.  
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)  
Forster, Henry William  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Stanley, Lord (Lanes)  
Garfit, William  
M'Calmont.Col.J. (Antrim,E.  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
Godson,Sir Augustus Frederick  
M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Gordon,Hn.J.E.(Elgin&Nairn  
M'Killop, James(Stirlingshire  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry,South  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Gordon,Maj Evans- (T'rH'ml'ts  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Talbot,Rt. Hn.J.G.(Oxf'd Univ.  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Gorst, Rt. Hon.Sir John Eldon  
Massey-Mainwaring,Hn. W. F.  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Maxwell, W.J.H.(Dumfriessh.  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Greene,Sir E.W.(B'ryS. Edm'ds  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Tufnell, Col. Edward  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Milner, Rt. Hn.Sir Fredrick G.  
Valentia, Viscount  
Groves, James Grimble  
Milton, Viscount  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis

Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Hain, Edward  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)  
Hall, Edward Marshall  
Montagu, Hn. J. Scott (Hants)  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.)  
Hambro, Charles Erie  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G. (Mid' x  
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'donderry)  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford)  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)  
Moulton, John Fletcher  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Mount, William Arthur  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Heath, James (Staffords., N.W.)  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Helder, Augustus  
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)  
Henderson, Alexander  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Hermon-Hodge, Rbt. Trotter  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead)  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)

Parkes, Ebenezer

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Hogg, Lindsay

Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)

Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.

Hope, J.F. (Sheffield Brightside

Peel, Hon. Wm. R. Wellesley

Hoult, Joseph

Pemberton, John S. G.

Main Question again proposed.

Debate arising; and, it being after midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at Twenty-five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 22nd February, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petitions for the following Bills, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:

Cambrian Railway Bill.

Scarborough Electric Tramways Bill.

South Yorkshire Electric, Power Bill.

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

PRIVATE BILLS [Lords].

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in respect of the Bills comprised in the List reported by the Chairman of Ways and Means as intended to originate in the House of Lords, they have certified that the Standing Orders have been complied with in the following cases, viz.:

Aire and Oalder Navigation.

Albion Steam Coal Company.

Alfreton Gas.

Arlesey Gas.

Aspatria, Silloth, and District Water.

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation.

Bath Gas Light and Coke.

Belfast Harbour.

Bethlem Hospital.

Bideford and Clovelly Railway (Abandonment).

Bideford and Clovelly Railway (Extension of Time, etc.).

Bolton Corporation.

Bournemouth Corporation.

Bridewell Hospital.

Bristol, Clifton, and West of England Zoological Society.

Bristol Corporation Cemetery.  
Bristol Corporation (Docks and Railways, etc.).  
Broadstairs and St. Peter's Water and Improvement.  
Cardiff Railway.  
Central London Railway.  
Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway (No. 1).  
Charing Cross, Euston, and Hampstead Railway (No. 2).  
Charing Cross, Hammersmith, and District Electric Railway.  
Chesterfield Improvement.  
Chester Gas.  
Christ's Hospital (London).  
City and Brixton Railway.  
City and North East Suburban Electric Railway.  
City and South London Railway.  
Cork, Blackrock, and Passage Railway.  
Doncaster Tithe Trust.  
Dover Corporation.  
Dover Gas.  
Dover Harbour.  
Easton and Church Hope Railway.  
Elland Gas.  
Faversham Water.  
Folkestone Corporation.  
Freshwater, Yarmouth, and Newport Railway.  
Great Southern and Western Railway.  
Handsworth Urban District Council.  
Harpendeu District Gas.  
Harrogate Water.  
Henry Diaper and Company (Delivery Warrants).  
Hey wood and Middleton Water Board.  
Islington and Euston Railway  
King's Norton and Northfield Urban District Tramways.  
King's Road Railway.  
Leeds Churches.  
Leeds Corporation (General Powers).  
Leeds Corporation Water.  
Llanelly and Mynydd Mawr Railway.  
Llanelly Harbour.  
London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway.  
London (City) School for Orphans of Freeman.  
Lowestoft Corporation.  
Lynton and Barnstaple Railway.  
Manchester and Liverpool Electric Express Railway.  
Manchester Corporation.  
Manchester (Market Street Area) Improvements.  
Mersey Docks and Harbour Board.

Milford Docks.  
Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Gateshead Gas.  
Newport (Isle of Wight) Gas.  
New Swindon Gas.  
Nitrate Railways Company.  
North East London Railway. Nottingham Corporation.  
Oakham Water.  
Omagh Gas.  
Otley Gas.  
Piccadilly and City Railway.  
Portmadoc, Beddgelert, and South Snowdon Railway.  
Poulton-le-Fylde Gas.  
Prostaytn Water.  
Rhymney and Aber Valleys Gas and Water.  
Ripon Corporation.  
Royal Exchange Assurance.  
Rugby Water and Improvement.  
St. Bartholomew's Hospital.  
Salford Corporation.  
Sheffield Corporation.  
Sheffield District Railway.  
Shields Bridge.  
Shrewsbury Gas.  
Smethwick Corporation.  
South Eastern and London, Chatham, and Dover Railways.  
South Essex Water.  
Southport Water (Transfer).  
South Western and Isle of Wight Junction Railway.  
Stockport Corporation Water.  
Stratton and Bude Gas.  
Stratton and Bude Improvement.  
Warkworth Harbour.  
Weston-super-Mare Gas.  
Wisbech Water.

And that they have certified that the Standing Orders have not been complied with in the following cases, viz.:

Birmingham (City) Tramways.  
Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway.  
Cowes Ferry.  
Harrogate Corporation.  
Mersey Docks and Harbour Board (Canada Dock Works, etc.).  
Sutton-in-Ashfield Urban District (Water).  
Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads.  
West and South London Junction Railway.  
PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS [Lords] (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).  
Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions

for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petitions for the following Bills, originating in the Lords, the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.;

Birmingham (City) Tramways Bill [Lords].

Brompton and Piccadilly Circus Railway Bill [Lords].

Cowes Ferry Bill [Lords].

Harrogate Corporation Bill [Lords].

Mersey Docks and Harbour Board (Canada Dock Works, etc.) Bill [Lords]

Sutton-in-Ashfield Urban District (Water) Bill [Lords].

Tyneside Tramways and Tramroads Bill [Lords].

West and South London Junction Railway Bill [Lords].

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

ALDEBURGH CORPORATION (WATER).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Pretyman and Mr. Stevenson.

ALDERSHOT GAS AND WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bramston Beach and Mr. Jeffreys.

ALEXANDRA (NEWPORT AND SOUTH WALES) DOCKS AND RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. M'Kenna and Mr. Alfred Thomas.

BINGLEY URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Duncan and Mr. Alfred Hutton.

BLACKBURN CORPORATION.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir William Hornby and Sir William Coddington.

BLACKPOOL IMPROVEMENT.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Taylor and Mr. Helme.

BRADFORD CORPORATION.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Captain Greville, Mr. Wanklyn, and Mr. Flower.

BRIGHTON CORPORATION.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Loder, Mr. Wentworth, and Sir Henry Fletcher.

BRITISH GAS LIGHT COMPANY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir James Joicey and Mr. Skewes Cox.

BRITISH WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC AND MANUFACTURING COMPANY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. W. F. D. Smith and Mr. Carvill.

BURGESS HILL WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Henry Fletcher and Mr. Goschen.

BURTON-UPON-TRENT CORPORATION.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Gretton and Mr. Radcliffe.

BURY CORPORATION.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. James Kenyon, Mr. Mather, and

Mr. Cawley.

**BURY CORPORATION TRAMWAYS.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. James Kenyon, Mr. Mather, and Mr. Cawley.

**CALEDONIAN ELECTRIC POWER.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Herbert Maxwell, Mr. Renshaw, Mr. Baird, Sir William Arrol, and Mr. Colville.

**CALEDONIAN RAILWAY.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Renshaw and Mr. Hozier.

**CARDIFF CORPORATION.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Edward Reed and Mr. Alfred Thomas.

**CITY OF LONDON (SPITALFIELDS MARKET).**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Alban Gibbs, Sir Horatio Davies, and Sir Joseph Dimsdale.

**CLEVELAND AND DURHAM COUNTY ELECTRIC POWER.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Pike Pease, Sir Christopher Furness, Mr. John Wilson (Durham), and Mr. Lambton.

**CLYDE VALLEY ELECTRICAL POWER.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir John Stirling-Maxwell, Mr. Colville, Mr. John Baird, and Mr. Shaw-Stewart.

**COLWYN BAY AND COLWYN URBAN DISTRICT CAS.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. George Kenyon and Mr. Herbert Roberts.

**CRAWLEY CAS.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hoywood Johnstone, Sir John Brunner, and Mr. HumphreysOwen.

**CROMER WATER.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir William Gurdon and Mr. Price.

**DERBY CORPORATION.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Thomas Roe, Mr. Boll, Mr. Victor Cavendish, Mr. Thomas Bayley, Mr. Jacoby, and Mr. T. D. Bolton.

**DERBYSHIRE AND NOTTINGHAMSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER,**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir John Rolleston and Mr. T. D. Bolton.

**DERWENT VALLEY WATER BOARD.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Thomas Roe, Mr. Broadhurst, Lord Henry Bentinck, and Mr. Stuart-Wortley.

**DEVONPORT CORPORATION (GAS).**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Kearley and Mr. E. J. C. Morton.

**DEVONPORT GAS AND COKE.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. E. J. C. Morton and Mr. Fletcher Moulton.

**DISTRICT MESSENGER AND THEATRE TICKET COMPANY.**

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. W. E. U. Smith, Colonel Lock-

wood, Mr. Boulnois, Mr. Channing, Mr. Frederick Wilson, and Sir Thomas Esmonde.  
DORKING GAS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Skewes-Cox and Mr. Leigh-Bennett.

DUBLIN CORPORATION (MARKETS,&c.)

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Clancy, Mr. M'Cann, and Mr. Nannetti.

DUBLIN (EQUALISATION OF RATES).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Clancy, Mr. Field, Mr. M'Cann, Mr. Mooney, and Mr. Nannetti.

DUBLIN ST. JAMES' GATE BREWERY TRAMWAYS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Harrington, Mr. Nannetti, and Mr. M'Cann.

ECCLES CORPORATION.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Clare and Mr. Knowles.

FAIRFORD AND CIRENCESTER RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice and Sir John Aird.

GAS LIGHT AND COKE COMPANY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir John Aird and Mr. Boulnois.

GATESHEAD AND DISTRICT TEAMWAYS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Atherley-Jones, and Mr. Lyttleton.

GLASGOW AND RENFREW DISTRICT RAILWAY TRANSFER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Renshaw and Mr. Parker Smith.

GLASGOW AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Herbert Maxwell, Mr. Baird, and Sir William Arrol.

GOLBOENE GAS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Lord Balcarres and Mr. Tomlinson.

GRAVESEND GAS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Alexander Brown and Captain Howard.

GREAT CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Henderson and Mr. Chapman.

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Colonel Lockwood and Mr. Perm.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Jackson and Mr. Fison.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought by Mr. David M'Iver and Mr. Brassey.

HARTLEPOOLS GAS AND WATER TRANSFER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Christopher Furness and Mr. Lambton.

HECKMONDWIKE GAS (TRANSFER).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Whittaker and Mr. Oldroyd.



HONLEY URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (GAS).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir James Kitson and Sir James Woodhouse.

HORLEY DISTRICT GAS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Alban Gibbs and Sir Joseph Dimsdale.

HULL, BARNSELY, AND WEST RIDING JUNCTION RAILWAY AND DOCK.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Seymour King, Mr. Firbank, Mr. Charles Wilson, and Sir James Woodhouse.

HUMBER COMMERCIAL RAILWAY AND DOCK.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Lord Willoughby de Eresby and Mr. Doughty.

ILKESTON AND HEANOR WATER BOARD.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Walter Foster and Mr. Victor Cavendish.

IRISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir James Haslett, Mr. Wolff, and Mr. John Gordon.

KETTERING URBAN DISTRICT WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Colonel Sackville and Mr. Channing.

KINGSCOURT, KEADY, AND ARMAGH RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir James Haslett and Mr. John Gordon.

KINGSTON-UPON-HULL CORPORATION.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Firbank, Sir Henry Seymour King, Mr. Charles Wilson, and Sir James Woodhouse.

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY (DEARNE VALLEY JUNCTION RAILWAYS).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir William Hornby and Mr. Fielden.

LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY (VARIOUS POWERS).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir William Hornby and Mr. Fielden.

LEATHERHEAD GAS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. St. John Brodrick, Mr. Keswick, and Mr. Skewes-Cox.

LLANDRINDOD WELLS URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Edwards, Lieutenant Colonel Pryce-Jones, and Mr. Charles Morley.

LLANDRINDOD WELLS WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bull and Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggee.

LONDON AND INDIA DOCKS (NEW WORKS).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Joseph Dimsdale and Mr. Keswick.

LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir William Houldsworth, Colonel Lockwood, and Mr. Macartney.

#### LONDON BRIDGE WIDENING.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Alban Gibbs, Sir Horatio Davies, and Sir Joseph Dimsdale.

#### LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bond, Mr. Bull, and Colonel Legge.

#### LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (SPITAL-FIELDS MARKET).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Lough and Mr. John Burns.

#### LONDON RIVERSIDE FISH MARKET

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Alban Gibbs, Sir Horatio Davies, and Sir Joseph Dimsdale.

#### LONDON, TILBURY, AND SOUTHEM RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Round and Mr. Courtenay Warner.

#### LONDON WATER (PURCHASE).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Lough and Mr. John Burns.

#### LONG EATON GAS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bond and Mr. Gretton.

#### MANSFIELD CORPORATION.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Markham, Lord Henry Bentinck, Sir Frederick Milner, and Mr. Thomas Bayley.

#### METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir John Aird and Sir Charles Dalrymple.

#### METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC SUPPLY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Frederick Harris and Sir Fortescue Flannery.

#### METROPOLITAN RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Nussey and Mr. M'Laren.

#### METROPOLITAN WATER COMPANIES (AMENDMENT OF ACTS).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Lough and Mr. John Burns.

#### MIDLAND RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Frederick Mappin and Sir William Coddington.

#### MOND GAS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Robinson, Mr. Walford Green, and Colonel Webb.

#### NEATH HARBOUR.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Brynmor Jones and Mr. Samuel Evans.

#### NEWRY PORT AND HARBOUR TRUST.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Colonel Saunderson, Mr. Macartney, Mr. Archdale, Mr. M'Cann, and Mr. Carvill.

#### NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by the Earl of Dalkeith and Mr. Anstruther.

#### NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Joseph Pease, Sir James Kitson, and Mr. Wharton.

#### NOTTING HILL ELECTRIC LIGHTING.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Stuart Samuel and Mr. Sinclair.

#### PAISLEY POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir William Dunn, Sir William Arrol, Mr. James M'Killop, and Mr. Wallace.

#### PEMBROKE URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (COUNTY OF DUBLIN).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Gordon and Mr. M'Cann.

#### PETERSFIELD AND SELSEY GAS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Joseph Leese and Mr. Goulding.

#### RHYL BRIDGE.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Bull, Mr. Rutherford, and Mr. Skewes-Cox.

#### RHYL IMPROVEMENT.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Samuel Smith and Mr. Herbert Lewis.

#### RICHMOND GAS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Barrington Simeon and Mr. Thornton.

#### RICKMANSWORTH AND UXBRIDGE VALLEY WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir John Aird and Mr. Alban Gibbs.

#### SHANNON WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Harrington, Mr. T. M. Healy, Mr. William Johnston, and Mr. John Gordon.

#### SHIPLEY IMPROYEMENT.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Forteseue Flannery and Mr. Duncan.

#### SHIREOAKS, LAUGHTON, AND MALTBY RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Holland and Mr. Langley.

#### SOUTHAMPTON AND WINCHESTER GREAT WESTERN JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Mount and Mr. Arthur Morton.

#### SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Banbury and Mr. Kimber.

#### STALYBRIDGE, HYDE, MOSSLEY, AND DUKINFIELD TRAMWAYS AND ELECTRICITY BOARD.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. White Ridley, Mr. Cawley, Sir James Kitson, and Platt-Higgins.

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

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Joseph Dimsdale and Colonel

Milward.

STROUD GAS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir John Dorington and Mr. Agg-Gardner.

SWANAGE GAS AND WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Sturt and Mr. James Bailey.

SWANSEA HARBOUR.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir George Newnes, Mr. Brynmor Jones, and Mr. Aeron Thomas.

TAFF VALE RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Edward Reed and Mr. D. A. Thomas.

TEES VALLEY WATER BOARD.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Colonel Sadler and Colonel Ropner.

TENDRING HUNDRKD WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Round and Mr. Alexander Brown.

THAMES DEEP WATER DOCK.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Louis Sinclair and Mr. Fletcher Moulton.

THAMES LIGHTERMEN.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Alban Gibbs and Mr. Charles Wilson.

THAMES PIERS AND RIVER SERVICE.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. John Burns, Mr. Lough, and Mr. Whitmore.

TORRINGTON AND OKEHAMPTON RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Lambert and Mr. Soares.

TOTTENHAM AND HAMPSTEAD JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Frederick Mappin and Mr. Penn.

WALLASEY IMPROVEMENT.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Hoult and Mr. Charles M'Arthur.

WELLS CORPORATION WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Henry Hobhouse and Mr. Dickinson.

WELLS WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Alexander Acland-Hood, Mr. Dickinson, and Mr. Henry Hobhouse.

WEST CUMBERLAND ELECTRIC TRAMWAYS.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Helder, Colonel Bain, and Mr. Handles.

WEST SURREY WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Seale-Hayne and Mr. Brassey.

#### WOLVERHAMPTON AND CANNOCK CHASE RAILWAY.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Charles Shaw and Mr. Walford Green.

#### WOLVERHAMPTON CORPORATION WATER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Sir Henry Fowler, Sir Alfred Hickman, and Mr. Norman.

#### YORKSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER.

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Fison, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Beckett.

#### CAMBRIAN RAILWAYS.

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

#### SCARBOROUGH ELECTRIC TRAMWAYS.

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

#### SOUTH YORKSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER

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

#### STANDING ORDERS.

Ordered, That the Select Committee on Standing Orders do consist of thirteen Members; Sir John Brunner, Sir William Coddington, Mr. John Edward Ellis, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. Halsey, Mr. Humphreys-Owen, Mr. James Lowther, Sir James Rankin, Mr. William Redmond, Sir Mark M'Taggart Stewart, Mr. Whitmore, and Mr. Wodehouse were accordingly nominated Members of the Committee.; (Mr. Halsey.)

#### PETITIONS.

##### BEER BILL.

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

#### ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Weston-super-Mare; Goole; Merthyr Tydfil; Folkestone; and Long Eaton; to lie upon the Table.

#### POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Salford; and Folkestone; to lie upon the Table.

#### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

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

#### JOHN ARMSTRONG AND OTHERS V. JOHN SCURRAH RANOLLES.

A Petition of Thomas Wootton, Solicitor, for leave to the proper Officer of the House to attend a trial and produce documents and give evidence in the High Court of Justice.

Leave to the proper officer to attend accordingly.

#### RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

#### CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Return ordered, "of the Shorthand Writers' Notes of the Evidence which has been or may be taken at the trial of Election Petitions under the Acts relating thereto since the last General Election and during the present Session of Parliament; together with a Copy of the Shorthand Writers' Notes of the Judgments delivered by the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, in pursuance of the said Acts; and Copies of Special Cases Reserved and of all

Election Petitions.";(Mr. Attorney General.)

ARMY (MILITARY FORCES IN SOUTH AFRICA).

Copy presented, of Return of Military Forces in South Africa [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (SOUTH AFRICA) (CORRESPONDENCE.)

Copy presented, of Correspondence between Field Marshal Lord Roberts, Commanding-in-Chief South African Field Force, and Acting-Commandant-General Botha, dated 12th, 13th, 14th, and 15th June, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ROYAL NIGER COMPANY.

Account presented, of the Money expended and borrowed and the Securities created under the Royal Niger Company Act, 1899, during the year ended 31st March, 1900, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon' [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 39.]

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Copy presented, of Report by the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and the Chairman of Ways and Means in the House of Commons under the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

PAPER LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK ASSISTANT.

Controverted Elections.;Return relative thereto [ordered 22nd February; Mr. Attorney General.]

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;RECRUITING IN AUSTRALIA FOR SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE FORCES.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has any information to the effect that Mr. Houlder, Premier of South Australia, objects to agents recruiting police for General Baden-Powell's Constabulary, and that he also stated that the other Governments are also unfavourable to agents recruiting for the South African Police Force.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I have no information as to Mr. Houlder raising objection. So far my information is that on 26th December he telegraphed to the Agent General in London inquiring whether men desiring to join could do so at Adelaide. I received a telegram from Sir A. Milner last night stating that he had inquired by telegraph whether an officer might be sent to recruit in Australia and New Zealand. Queensland and Tasmania agreed to recruiting, but New South Wales objected to men being permanently withdrawn from that colony, and New Zealand did not consider recruiting for the Constabulary desirable, as the colony is at present despatching a further contingent of troops to South Africa. I was asked, in reference to that, on a previous occasion whether Sir Alfred Milner's proceedings had my approval. I wish to say that Sir Alfred Milner's proceedings seem to have been confined to sending a confidential inquiry to the Governor of the Commonwealth, and that I entirely approve of that.

AN HON. MEMBER: You always do.

CIVIL APPOINTMENTS AT THE CAPE.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of

State for the Colonies whether any communication has been made to Sir Alfred Milner in respect of the appointments mentioned by the hon. Member for the Mansfield Division on 13th December, 1900,\* as having been made to certain civil posts in the Transvaal; and whether the persons whose names were then given have discharged any of the duties of their positions or still retain them.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: In reply to the first question, I have to say that no communication was made to Sir A. Milner in consequence of the speech referred to, as he was not responsible for the appointments which had been made by Lord Roberts as a temporary measure, and which I knew that Sir A. Milner intended to consider afresh when he became responsible. As to the second question, I have not the information necessary to enable me to answer the second part of the question, but doubtless Sir A. Milner will report fully upon the question of permanent appointments as soon as circumstances admit of his entering upon his duties as Administrator.

BOER MURDER OF ESAU AT CALVINIA.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can communicate to the House any official information as to the treatment of Esau by the Boers at Calvinia.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Yes, Sir. I have had a telegram from Sir Alfred Milner in confirmation of reports from various quarters which had previously reached me. The High Commissioner states that the name of the district surgeon who reported the maltreatment of the coloured man Esau is Smuts. He has been in the service ten years. Sir A. Milner adds, "There is absolutely no doubt about the murder of Esau."

MR. DILLON: Will the right hon. Gentleman lay Sir Alfred Milner's telegram on the Table?

MR. BRODRICK: I have read it verbatim. I trust that that is sufficient.

MR. DILLON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he has any

\*See The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxviii., page 735.

objection to that? The reason I ask that is because it makes no reference to the lashing of the man and the protruding of the bowels.

MR. BRODRICK: I have read it out word for word.

MR. DILLON: Why not lay it on the Table, then?

MR. BRODRICK: I will lay it on the Table.

GENERAL COLVILE'S RECALL.

\*MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether General Colvile was tried twice for the same offence; whether he was exonerated on the first occasion and reinstated in his command at Gibraltar; whether afterwards fresh evidence was adduced; and whether General Colvile was again tried in his absence and without an opportunity being given him of rebutting such new evidence.

MR. BRODRICK: The statements in the question do not accurately represent the facts. General Colvile was sent home from South Africa by Lord Roberts for inefficiency in the field. He was never tried, and, although his case was considered on his return, and he was allowed to resume his command at Gibraltar, he was not exonerated from blame. His case was 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. I thought it right to consult Lord Roberts, who was cognisant of all the circumstances connected with General Colvile's failure in South Africa, and was in possession of his explanation, as to whether he could properly retain his command at Gibraltar. Lord Roberts advised that he should not retain his command, and, as the Acting Commander-in-Chief concurred in this view, I directed that action should be taken accordingly. I should add that, as I have received notice from two Members of their intention to bring General Colvile's case before the House on the earliest opportunity, I propose to defer making a full statement till that occasion, as the case is not one which can be conveniently discussed by question and answer across the floor of the House.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E): Arising out of the answer, may I inquire if it is not a fact that Lord Roberts specially commended the conduct of General Colvile, who in consequence is about to receive a special pension?

MR. BRODRICK: It is perfectly true that Lord Roberts specially commended General Colvile, but subsequent events occurred which made it necessary to remove him.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is he to receive a special pension?

[No answer was given.]

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): Will similar treatment be meted out to more highly placed generals who have made greater blunders?

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

PROHIBITION OF ENGLISH PAPERS IN CAPE COLONY.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Sir Alfred Milner has prohibited the circulation in Cape Colony of the following publications: Truth, Reynolds's Newspaper, the Review of Reviews, and Lloyd's.

MR. DILLON: I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Sir Alfred Milner has prohibited the circulation of the Dublin Weekly Freeman in Cape Colony; and, if so, on what ground that action has been taken; whether Sir Alfred Milner claims the right to forbid the circulation of any newspapers or periodicals in South Africa; and whether he claims a similar right as to sale or circulation of books or pamphlets; and, if so, on what law such claim is based.

MR. BRODRICK: The questions, as they refer to the action of the military authorities, should be addressed to me. I have nothing to add to what I said in answer to a question put yesterday by the hon. Member for Northampton. The Government will support Lord Kitchener in prohibiting the circulation of any newspapers in Cape Colony at the present moment which Lord Kitchener considers likely to have a bad effect, and to prejudice the early conclusion of the war.

MR. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered my question whether Lord Kitchener or Sir A. Milner ;Lord Kitchener, I presume;claims the right to prohibit the circulation of pamphlets and the sale of books. Further, I desire to ask, for the convenience of newspaper proprietors and booksellers in this country, whether the right hon. Gentleman will undertake to publish from week to week a list of publications prohibited from circulation in South



Africa;an Index expurgatorius, in fact, so that newspaper proprietors and booksellers may be saved the useless expenditure of sending out such publications.

MR. BRODRICK: What I said in regard to newspapers certainly applies to books and pamphlets; and, as to an Index expurgatorius, if any communication is made to me by Lord Kitchener with regard to any publication I have no objection to having that communication made known in this country; but I will not trouble Lord Kitchener, occupied as he is, with a variety of questions upon such restrictions as he may think it right to place on the circulation of literature.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Will an Act of Indemnity to provide for this have to be passed by the Imperial or the Colonial Legislature?

MR. FLAVIN: Is this done in order to secure "equal rights" for all in South Africa?

[No answer was returned.]

PAY OF SOLDIERS AT THE FRONT.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the War Office has considered the desirability of conceding the same terms as to pay and allowance to the regular soldiers who have served in South Africa for more than a year as are now offered to Imperial Yeomanry and Colonial Volunteers.

MR. BRODRICK: There is no intention of conceding to the Regular troops the rates of pay offered to the Imperial Yeomanry and Colonial Volunteers, the conditions being different and the engagement of the latter only temporary.

MR. DILLON: Then are we to understand that the Dublin Fusiliers, who made such a gallant charge at;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;

FARM BURNING.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can give any information as to the number of farms of loyalists burned by the Boer forces since they entered Cape Colony two months ago. I wish also to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the policy of farm burning was carried out by the troops under the command of Sir Redvers Buller.

MR. BRODRICK: I am not in a position to give any information about the burning of farms until I receive the information from Lord Kitchener which is now on its way home.

MR. DILLON: My question has reference to the burning of farms in Cape Colony by the Boer forces. Have the Government any reason to believe that the Boers have burnt any number of farms anywhere?

MR. BRODRICK: I have no information on the subject at present, but I have said I will put a further question to Lord Kitchener on the subject.

HOSPITAL COMMISSION;CASE OF CAPTAIN SHIPWITH, R.A.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Captain Shipwith, R.A., has been accused of giving evidence not in accordance with fact before the Hospital Commission; whether this and other charges had been made by the officer responsible for the condition of the camp against which Captain Shipwith gave evidence; whether the evidence given by him was absolutely true; and, if not, has objection been taken to any particular

statement; whether he has been ordered to resign his commission on 23rd February; and whether the Secretary of State for War would consider the possibility of suspending the order pending further investigation.

MR. BRODRICK: This officer was requested to resign his commission purely on grounds of discipline, his case having been most carefully considered by the Commander-in-Chief. I thought it my duty to satisfy myself that whatever evidence he gave before the Hospital Commission had nothing to do with the representations made against him; and I can assure the hon. Member that any case in which a witness before the Hospital Commission may be proved to have been in any way prejudiced will be dealt with in an exemplary manner.

MR. BURDETT-COUTTS (Westminster): I had wished before the right hon. Gentleman answered the question on the Paper to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he would not consider the advisability of postponing this case for a few days, in order that certain facts which have been brought to my notice may be brought before the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. BRODRICK: I am afraid it is too late to postpone the case. The case was most carefully considered by the Commander-in-Chief, and the noble Lord's recommendations were made to me about a fortnight ago.

STRENGTH OF THE BOER FORCES; NUMBER OF PRISONERS.

MR. ATHERLEY-JONES (Durham, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state what are the approximate or estimated number of Boers and colonials and foreigners cooperating with them now bearing arms against His Majesty's forces in South Africa, and what is the total number of Boers, colonials, and foreigners now prisoners of war.

MR. BRODRICK: The number of Boers and others in the field against His Majesty's forces in South Africa cannot be stated with any degree of accuracy. A recent estimate placed the figure at nineteen or twenty thousand. The prisoners amounted to over 16,000 in the middle of January, and this number has been recently increased.

COST OF THE WAR.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can say what is the total estimated cost up to the present date of the military operations in South Africa, and what is now the estimated average weekly cost of the war.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): It is impossible to give the cost until the accounts are finally made up; but the amount issued up to date to meet the expenditure for the war is about 81½ millions. The current weekly issues may be taken at from one to one and a quarter millions.

ARBITRATION; ALLEGED OFFER OF MEDIATION FROM THE GERMAN EMPEROR.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the German Emperor has offered his services to His Majesty's Government to arbitrate on the question of terminating the South African War.

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): No, Sir.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask, arising out of that answer, whether His

Majesty's Government will seriously consider the advisability of asking the German Emperor to mediate?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Considering that he sent a telegram encouraging the Boers, and wrote to Mr. Kruger, backing him up;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;

PURCHASES OF HORSES.

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can give the total number of horses despatched for military purposes to South Africa and purchased there since 1st October, 1899, including the horses of cavalry regiments and mounted infantry that went out with these regiments; whether he can also state how many of the horses came from each of the following countries, namely, Great Britain and Ireland, separately, if possible; Australia; Austria-Hungary; North America, distinguishing between the United States and Canada; the Argentine; other countries; and the number of horses acquired for military purposes in South Africa, including Cape Colony, Natal, and the Transvaal, and Orange River Colony; and whether he has any information to show the comparative cost and usefulness of the horses from the various countries mentioned, and the comparative wastage among these categories of horses.

\*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The follow-

ing is the information so far as I am able to give it. The total number of horses despatched to South Africa since the 31st October, 1899, is 145,671. The country of origin of horses which accompanied units to South Africa cannot be stated. Of the remainder about 24,400 came from Great Britain; about 7,200 from Ireland; 7,901 came from Australia; 7,999 from Hungary; 26,310 from the United States of America; 3,738 from Canada; 25,872 from Argentina. A report as to the number obtained in South Africa has been called for, but has not yet been received. As I stated in answer to a question on the 18th of this month, the English and Irish horses were considered best, the American and Canadian next best. It is not advisable to state prices, and the comparative wastage is not known. I may add that the Commander-in-Chief informed me to-day that it is not possible to get all the horses required from these sources, and that the intention is, as far as possible, to get horses from Great Britain, Ireland, and our colonies, and, at the same time, he has given instructions for more purchasers to be sent out into the country, so as to give private persons the same chance of selling as dealers.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): May I ask why the War Office declined to appoint agents to purchase horses in the south of Ireland?

\*LORD STANLEY: I did not know that was the case, but I think the last part of my question will give effect to the hon. Member's wishes.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): May I inquire if it costs 5s. a day more to feed Australian than Irish horses, in the same way that Australian soldiers cost more than Irish ones?

[No answer was given.]

COLONEL SANDYS (Lancashire, Bootle): While this question is under consideration will the authorities consider whether for this purpose an officer might be sent to the north-west province of Canada, where there is a good breed of horses not yet wholly exhausted?

MR. PHILIPPS (Pembrokeshire): Will the War Office take means to make it publicly known when buyers are going down into the country, so that farmers may have an opportunity of selling?

\*LORD STANLEY: I have not the slightest doubt that the military authorities will consider that question, as well as that of my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Bootle.

MR. PHILIPPS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that about 250 horses were collected last week at Aldridge's Repository, many of them coming from a distance, to be inspected by the Government buyers; that the buyers looked at about 150 and bought fourteen; and that the buyers then left after less than four hours work, leaving about 100 horses not looked at; and whether steps can be taken to avoid such inconvenience in future.

\*LORD STANLEY: The facts are as follows:;Messrs. Aldridge requested the purchasing officers to give them a day to show some horses. As the usual number shown is less than fifty the officers made an appointment with another dealer to see his horses at 3 p.m. of that day. They began work at 10 a.m. The numbers of horses produced were unprecedentedly great and unusually bad. The officers accordingly requested that only those likely to pass should be brought out. They actually saw 163 and purchased fifteen, one of which was afterwards rejected. They continued work to 3.30 p.m., and only reached the other dealer after 4 p.m. It is obvious that examinations for purchase must be thorough to be of any value. It would appear probable that the horses which were not shown were not likely to have passed.

PAGET'S HORSE;ARRANGEMENTS FOR RECRUITS AT ALDERSHOT.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that men who had just joined Paget's Horse, on being ordered to Aldershot found on arriving there that no arrangements had been made for them, and after vainly seeking directions and quarters had to take lodgings for themselves in the town; whether anyone is responsible for this; and whether he will take steps to prevent it in future.

\*LORD STANLEY: The matter is being thoroughly inquired into. I hope my hon. friend will therefore postpone the question.

GERMAN GUNS FOR THE ARMY.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state how many guns were recently imported from Germany, their calibre, and cost, in what manufactory they were made, and why they could not have been made at home.

\*LORD STANLEY: I have nothing to add to a statement made on this subject in reply to a question put on the 14th December last by my hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Central Division of Sheffield.

GERMAN SADDLES FOR THE ARMY.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether His Majesty's

Government have ordered or given a contract for 30,000 saddles, or any other number of saddles, for use in South Africa, to a German manufacturing company, or to any other foreign contractor: and, if so, will he state what were the conditions to be complied with, and whether home firms were asked to supply the saddles required.

\*LORD STANLEY: All supplies of saddles which can be obtained in this country have been ordered, where it is impossible to obtain necessary supplies within a given period from home makers, orders have been given elsewhere. I cannot give any details, but all saddles are carefully inspected, and no orders to the extent suggested by the hon. Member have been given.

MR. FLAVIN: How many more hundreds of thousands of saddles will be ordered before the war is over?

[No answer was given.]

BARRACK FURNITURE.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what steps have been taken to give effect to the undertaking of his predecessor to examine the question of the furnishing of the quarters in barracks of officers and married non-commissioned officers and privates, with a view to reducing the expenditure of those ranks, as also that of transport to the public, and further of increasing the mobility of regiments.

&#x2020; See The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxvii., page 826.

\*MR. BRODRICK: The question of furnishing the quarters in barracks of officers is one of many which is under consideration. In regard to the quarters of married non-commissioned officers and privates, these are furnished to a considerable extent, and I cannot find there was any undertaking to consider the question, as the existing furniture was held to be sufficient.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: May I remind the right hon. Gentleman that when the Transport Vote was under consideration last session&#x2020; the present Chief Secretary for Ireland gave the undertaking referred to.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I will refer to my right hon. friend's speech.

COMMITTEE ON YEOMANRY CAVALRY.

MR. W. F. D. SMITH (Strand): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is intended to lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Committee recently appointed to inquire into the constitution and training of the Yeomanry Cavalry.

\*MR. BRODRICK: There is no objection to laying the Report on the Table of the House.

THE WAR OFFICE AND INVENTIONS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can inform the House what is the method pursued in the War Office as regards new inventions in war material, guns, and all matters relating to the saving of life, the economising of the work of the soldier or his horse, and the destruction of the enemy and his material of war; and if inventors of small means and little influence have every opportunity of having their inventions patiently and impartially examined.

\*LORD STANLEY: The method pursued is laid down in a memorandum which is

forwarded to inventors for their guidance, and of which I shall be happy to supply a copy to my hon. and gallant friend. Inventors of small means and little influence have every opportunity of having their inventions patiently and impartially examined.

&#x2020; See The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxiv., page 449.

VOLUNTEER OFFICERS;SCHOOLS OF INSTRUCTION.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if schools of instruction have been or will be formed in the principal garrison towns and camps for officers of Volunteer corps, so as to make admission to the Metropolitan schools more easy to the officers of London regiments, who under present arrangements have to wait many months for a vacancy.

\*LORD STANLEY: The question of the instruction of officers of the Volunteers as well as of other officers is under consideration. I am not yet ready to make a statement.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION;COMPARATIVE COST OF CIVIL AND MILITARY WORK.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether he will consider the advisability of comparing the cost of the erection and maintenance of barracks and fortifications by the Royal Engineers with the prices which would be charged by civil engineers and builders if those works were performed by them instead of by the Inspector General and his staff.

\*LORD STANLEY: This question, among many others, has not been lost sight of, nor will it be; but I am not in a position to make any statement.

MILITARY BEER CONTRACTS IN DUBLIN.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can inform the House whether the military contracts for porter and ale in Dublin have been given to the Burton Brewery Company, and whether this company sent 1,000 barrels of ale gratis to South Africa for the use of the troops.

\*LORD STANLEY: Nothing is known of the matter to which the hon. Member alludes.

ARMY VEGETABLE CONTRACTS.

MR. FLAVIN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can inform the House if the Government have given an order, by contract or otherwise, to Seidel and Co., at M&#x00DC;nsterberg, Silesia, for 20,000 tins of dried vegetables containing 20,000 lb., or for any other quantity; and, if so, whether this order

was given by contract or otherwise, and what are the terms of the order; and were any home firms asked to tender for or supply the whole or part of the order.

\*LORD STANLEY: The reply to both questions is in the affirmative.

MR. FLAVIN: Did any advertisements appear in the public press of Great Britain and Ireland, so as to give home manufacturers a chance of tendering?

\*LORD STANLEY: I understand so.

MR. FLAVIN: Will the noble Lord say in what papers it appeared?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;

WATER-TUBE BOILERS;OCEAN TRIALS.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W.R., Shipley): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if it is the intention of the Admiralty to request the Water-tube

Boiler Committee to test the endurance of one of His Majesty's ships fitted with water-tube boilers by driving her at full speed for an ocean passage; say, from England to America or from England to the Suez Canal; and whether any such test has ever been made.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): It is not the intention of the Admiralty to request the Water-tube Boiler Committee to carry out a trial such as that referred to in the question, as they prefer to leave to the Committee the initiative in asking for such trials as it considers will afford the information which it requires. I have, however, reason to believe that the Water-tube Boiler Committee does propose to institute an ocean trial, provided that such a trial be found necessary, in order to enable it to come to a final decision upon the points referred to. In answer to the last paragraph of the question I have to say that an account of the special trials made by ships fitted with water-tube boilers is to be found in the Memorandum on boilers presented to the House.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: The hon. Gentleman has not answered the last part of the question; whether any such test has been made, for no such information is given in the Paper referred to.

MR ARNOLD-FORSTER: No test involving a passage to America or the Suez Canal has been made. All the trials that have been made are reported upon in the Reports and Memorandum referred to.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Has the endurance of the water-tube boilers been tested in an ocean passage?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Many tests are adopted in the trials of ships, but no experimental trials other than those mentioned in the Memorandum which has been presented to the House has been made.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Has any trial been made except for a few hours?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state how many boilers of the Belleville type have been supplied to the Navy, how many are on order to be supplied, where they have been constructed, the total cost of them to 31st December, 1900, and the amount still to be spent to complete the orders; and what amount has been given as royalties.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The number of Belleville boilers supplied to the Royal Navy is 584. The number on order to be supplied is 1,005. The boilers have been made, or are being made, by a variety of firms, fourteen in number, and in the Royal dockyards at Chatham and Devonport. I shall be happy to give the hon. Member the particulars of the firms in detail if he desires it. It is not possible to give the exact total cost of the boilers, as they are in all cases ordered with the machinery, and the price is not separately stated. It will, however, be possible to give an approximate estimate of the cost of the boilers as apart from the engines, and such a statement is being prepared. The amount of royalties paid in respect of the Belleville boilers up to the present date is £141,470.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): May I ask why it is that two years ago, when I put this question as to the amount of royalties paid, the figure was then given as £146,000? Now it is only £141,000.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The figure given on the occasion referred to by the hon. Member had reference to the amounts paid and the liabilities for the future. The figure I have now given is in reply to a question as to the amounts paid. Both are correct. If the hon. Member desires to know the outstanding liabilities I will undertake to get the information.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: Then have you not yet paid the royalties due to Belleville?

SIR JAMES JOICEY: Will the hon. Member supply me with the amount of royalties that will be paid on the 1,005 boilers?

MR. ARNOLD-FOESTER: Yes. I will supply that.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): How many water-tube boilers have been obtained from other sources than Belleville?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I will ascertain that.

NAVAL ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether any steps have been taken to carry out the undertaking given last year to the deputation which waited upon the First Lord in reference to the Roman Catholic chaplains for the Navy.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The Admiralty, in consultation with his Eminence Cardinal Vaughan, arranged last autumn for a priest to be sent to the China Station to minister to the Roman Catholics of the Fleet. This is in addition to the ministrations of local priests. The Admiralty will bear in mind the question of embarking a priest in any hospital ships employed in connection with naval operations, but no opportunity has yet occurred of taking action. An adequate supply of Roman Catholic prayer books has been arranged for. The various matters referred to by the deputation will continue to receive due consideration, and the Admiralty is in direct communication with Cardinal Vaughan, or his representative, in respect to matters concerning the Roman Catholics of the Fleet.

MR. DILLON: Have the Admiralty carried out their promise to place Roman Catholic chaplains in the Navy on the same footing as Protestant chaplains; as they are in the Army?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: If the hon. Member will give me notice I will inquire.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Has any decision yet been come to in regard to increasing the salary of the Roman Catholic chaplain at Queenstown?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I cannot answer that without notice.

WAGES IN GOVERNMENT DOCKYARDS.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Admiralty have come to any decision with regard to the petitions from the various trades employed in His Majesty's dockyards asking that their wages may be revised on a scale more in accordance with the rates prevailing in similar trades in outside employment; and whether it is the intention of the Admiralty to increase the pay of labourers from the present rate of 19s. per week.

\*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Captain PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): The petitions from all classes of workmen in the dockyards, including labourers, are now receiving consideration, and a decision will be communicated shortly.

NEW ADMIRALTY BUILDING.



MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works if he can state what has caused the delay in the erection of the colonnade designed for the southern side of the new Admiralty, and when it is proposed to proceed with its erection.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): It was never proposed to erect the colonnade until the building was finished. It is not now intended to proceed with it, for, owing to the increase of Naval work and of the Admiralty staff, it has become necessary to supplement the new building by an additional wing, which will be constructed facing the Horse Guards Parade. The design for this wing, in combination with the rest of the Admiralty buildings, has been for some time in the Tea Room, where hon. Members have had the opportunity of inspecting it.

THE WAIMA INCIDENT; APPOINTMENT OF ARBITRATOR,

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he can state what progress is being made with the Waima Arbitration.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: An agreement on the subject has been concluded with the French Government. Baron Lambert, Minister of State, and Secretary General of the Belgian Foreign Office, who undertook the Lamu Arbitration in 1889, has, with the approval of the Belgian Government, consented to act as arbitrator; and the cases of both Governments are in course of preparation and will shortly be submitted to him.

NORTH SEA FISHERIES; INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state what, if any, progress has been made in negotiating Conventions with foreign maritime States for the better protection of the North Sea Fisheries against the destruction of immature fish.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: A Provisional Committee consisting of experts was to have met in October last at Christiania to consider the question of organising the Central Bureau which was the outcome of the Stockholm International Conference. The meeting was, however, postponed at the request of the German Government. His Majesty's Government are awaiting a reply to an inquiry which was recently made of the Minister for Foreign Affairs at Stockholm as to when the Committee was likely to meet.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: What had the Central Bureau to do with the negotiations with Stockholm?

[No answer was given.]

VALUE OF PUBLICANS' LICENCES.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will consent to the Return of the valuations of publicans' licences, for the purposes of the death duties, which appears on the Paper to-day.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am afraid the Return cannot be given, because, in the first place, no separate record is kept in the Estate Duty Office of the values placed upon the estates of persons occupying licensed houses; and, even if the cases were extracted from the records at the expense of much cost and trouble, little or no light would be thrown on the particular point to which, I

gather, the hon. Member's question is directed, inasmuch as in valuing the estates of publicans the value of the possession of the licence is not so specifically separated in the records from the rest of the estate as to be capable of accurate statement in a Return.

#### CRUELTY IN CAPTURING SONG BIRDS.

MR. ALEXANDER CROSS (Glasgow, Camlachie): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the practice of capturing song birds in some parts of England by fishing hooks; and, if so, whether he can do anything to prevent it.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I have not had my attention specially called to this matter. I shall be glad, however, to consider any facts which the hon. Member may be able to bring before me, though I doubt whether I have any powers which would enable me to prevent the alleged practice. Until I am in possession of the facts it is not possible for me to say whether the offence would come within the provisions of the Wild Animals in Captivity Protection Act of 1900, which was passed for the purpose of preventing cruelty such as would seem to be involved in the practice referred to.

#### MILITARY AID TO THE CIVIL POWER ;LOCAL LIABILITY.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether the cost of catering troops when sent to maintain the peace in disaffected districts where riot has occurred or is apprehended is an Imperial or local charge; and if, in view of the losses sustained by Aberdare tradesmen in catering for troops in 1898 on terms arranged with the late stipendiary magistrate for the district, he will take steps to notify to tradesmen in other districts that neither the Home nor any other Department of the Government can be liable for agreements made for catering by local justices, and that the

courts of law have decided that county councils are not responsible; and whether, as a consequence of the decision of the Court of Appeal last year, any legislation is contemplated.

\*MR. RITCHIE: With reference to the decision in the case referred to it has always been considered that where the assistance of the military is requisitioned by the police authority the burden of their maintenance is a local charge, and this question was not decided in the case referred to. I cannot give any such notice as is suggested. I am in communication with my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War on the subject.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: But was not the decision that county councils were not liable?

\*MR. RITCHIE: It was held that where the justices called in the military authorities the county councils were not liable.

#### CAPITAL PUNISHMENT;CASE OF ROSE SUMNER.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he proposes to allow the death penalty to be inflicted in the case of Rose Sumner, aged 20, who was sentenced to death at Lewes on Wednesday last by Mr. Justice Channell for the murder of her illegitimate child.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I must decline to answer any question with regard to the advice

which it may be my duty to give His Majesty in capital cases.

#### BURIAL LAWS CONSOLIDATION.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether it is the intention of the Government to bring in, during the present session, a Bill for giving effect to the recommendation of the Select Committee on Burial Grounds, that the existing laws relating to burial be consolidated and simplified.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R. Thirsk): The Government do not propose to bring in a Bill on the subject referred to during the present session. A considerable transfer of jurisdiction under the Burial Acts

from the Home Office to the Local Government Board took place on 1st January last, and it is desirable that some experience should be obtained before further legislation is proposed.

#### ROYAL PARKS; COST OF MAINTENANCE.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he will 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 will 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.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I am making inquiries as to the possibility of giving the desired information, and I will communicate the result to the hon. Member as soon as possible.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I may mention that I have been making inquiries on this subject for the last twenty years.

#### ASSISTANTS OF EXCISE; AGE LIMIT.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether the Civil Service Commissioners, have given notice that on and after July next candidates for assistants of excise who are already in the service will not be allowed to add more than one year to the ordinary age limit, and that candidates for assistants of customs will only be allowed to add two years; whether he is aware that hitherto civil servants who have served for two years in continuous service have been allowed to add those two years, or any time up to five years they may have served, to the outside of age limit; and that numbers of young men have entered lower departments in order to come under this extension; and whether, seeing that by this sudden change they will be left in a lower position

than their knowledge and acquirements entitle them to, he will arrange that those who entered the service under the old regulations should be allowed to compete under them.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The facts are correctly stated in the first paragraph. More than a year's notice of the proposed change was given, so that anyone interested had ample time to make his arrangements. No vested interest in the old regulations can be recognised.

MAIDSTONE ELECTION PETITION.

MR. DISRAELI (Cheshire, Altrincham): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether his attention has been drawn to the result of the inquiry at Maidstone under the Corrupt Practices Act, and to the fact that three individuals, Levi Barker, Alfred Russell, and Henry Ward, were refused certificates of indemnity, and what steps he proposes to take; and whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the official evidence of the inquiry for the perusal of Members before a new writ is issued for that borough.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): My attention has been called to the result of the petition at Maidstone and to the refusal of certificates of indemnity in certain cases. The question of prosecution is under consideration. It has not been the practice of the House to delay the issue of a new writ till the evidence has been laid before the House, but to act upon the report of the election judges. I believe the proceedings were laid on the Table of the House this afternoon.

LIMERICK LUNATIC ASYLUM; RATE IN AID FOR PAUPER INMATES.

MR. LONDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the authorities having charge of His Majesty's Treasury have as yet paid over to the authorities who control the Limerick Lunatic Asylum the sum of £1,596 6s. 7d., the same being residue of rate in-aid for maintenance of patients in said lunatic asylum from the 1st January, 1899 to 31st March, 1899; and whether he will make inquiry as to the nature of the communication of the medical superintendent of the Limerick Lunatic Asylum of the 1st instant; and whether the answer on the 6th instant of the Lords Justices in connection with the payment of the above-mentioned sum was such as to give satisfaction to the committee of management of the Limerick Lunatic Asylum.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): An application on behalf of the committee of management of the Limerick Asylum was recently received from the resident medical superintendent on the subject of the grant in aid of the maintenance of pauper lunatics. To that communication a reply was sent by the Irish Government on the 6th instant, to which reply I have nothing to add. The committee of management at their meeting on the 13th instant passed a resolution expressing dissatisfaction with the reply of the Irish Government.

MR. LONDON: Are not similar sums being paid in other places for these lunatics?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not aware of that. I will investigate any cases the hon. Member may lay before me.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Has the money due to the Clare Asylum been paid?

MR. WYNDHAM: I must ask for notice of that.

INNISHOWEN DISTRICT COUNCIL; GRANT FOR LABOURERS' COTTAGES.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state how much of the £;40,000 voted by Parliament in 1890 stands at the present time to the credit of the Innishowen District Council in aid of liabilities incurred under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts, and if any other sum or sums stand to the credit or are payable to said district council under any other grants in connection with the Labourers Acts.

MR. WYNDHAM: The amount to the credit of the Innishowen Rural District out of the grant referred to is £;183 1s. 7d. In addition to this, a sum of about £;1,380 annually accrues to county Donegal, in which the rural district is situate, out of the Exchequer contribution provided by Section 5 of the Land Purchase Act of 1891. A sum of £;865 has been lying to the credit of the county since the last distribution took place in March, 1900.

MR. ODOHERTY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say how the sum of £;1,380 allocated to the county annually is distributed among the district councils?

MR. WYNDHAM: It is distributed in proportion to the efforts made by the various councils for providing cottages, and the reason for the non-payment of the sum is that the expenditure of the rural districts in which the cottages are being erected does not entitle them to the whole amount.

PORTNALING (CO. DONEGAL) FISHING INDUSTRY.

MR. ODOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether representations have been made to the Irish Government by the Congested Districts Board suggesting the construction of a pier and harbour at Portnaling, county Donegal; and whether the Irish Government intend carrying out the construction, or giving a grant towards the construction, of said pier and harbour.

MR. WYNDHAM: Representations have been made to the Irish Government by fishermen and others in favour of the project mentioned. These representations have been brought to the notice of the Congested Districts Board, who are at present considering the matter.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Congested Districts Board have informed me that they cannot approve this project, but that they propose to recommend the Irish Government to do something towards the erection of a pier at this point?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not aware of that. The question of aiding the fishing industry is a very large one, which I cannot discuss by way of question and answer.

ROMAN CATHOLIC MAGISTRATES.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that names of suitable Roman Catholic gentlemen have been recommended to the Lord Lieutenant of the county for the Commission of the Peace, and that he has refused to appoint them, the Irish Government will take steps to remedy this inequality, and have the vacancies recently caused by the death of three Roman Catholic magistrates in that district at least filled by the appointment of three more.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Lord Chancellor has no information as to the names of Roman

Catholic gentlemen submitted to the Lieutenant of the county for appointment to the Commission of the Peace in the Moville district, to which the question refers. As I have already stated, it is discretionary with the Lieutenant to make recommendations for such appointments to the Lord Chancellor, and it is not within the province of the Executive to intervene in the matter, as suggested.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Will the Lord Lieutenant recommend these gentlemen for appointment?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;

IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION; TEACHERS'SALARIES AND RESIDUAL GRANT.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state on what grounds have the Commissioners of National Education paid Mr. William O'Callaghan, of Churchtown National School, Buttevant, on the scale of £;64 per annum, while his predecessor's salary was £; 12 7 per annum; and whether if this provisional salary is increased at the final fixing of teachers' salaries, the difference will be refunded this teacher.

I beg also to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the money known as the Balance of

Residual Grant, which teachers in Irish national schools get before the 1st April each year, is meant for the financial year ended 31st March, or for the year ended 31st December.

MR. WYNDHAM: These matters will come before the Commissioners of National Education at their meeting next Tuesday, and I shall therefore not be in a position to answer these questions until after that.

JUDICIAL RENTS ON COUNTY MONAGHAN ESTATES.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that applications to have judicial rents fixed on the Shirley, Tennison, and Browlow estates in the county Monaghan are pending for the last two years, and if he can state the date when the Sub-Commissioners will sit at Carrickmacross to dispose of the cases referred to.

MR. WYNDHAM: There are only fifteen cases on the estates named that have not as yet been listed for hearing. None of these cases are pending for two years. In five of them the applications were only lodged a few days ago, while the earliest application was received on the 18th October, 1899. The hearing of the list of cases from Carrickmacross recently issued will be commenced on the 28th instant.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEEDS TO IRISH FARMERS.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what steps have been taken under the Agriculture and Technical Instruction (Ireland) Act, 1899, to improve the various agricultural seeds, and what arrangements have been made to distribute these improved strains of seeds amongst the Irish farmers.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department of Agriculture have issued a scheme for a series of agricultural experiments during the present year in order to afford reliable information to farmers on the influence of manures, and varieties and mixture of seeds, and on the suitability for Ireland of new varieties of crops which may be placed on the markets. The Depart-

ment are also promoting schemes with a view to testing certain varieties of seed potatoes, and to conducting experiments with oats and flax. The conditions under which these schemes are being promoted are fully detailed in leaflets issued by the Department and largely circulated amongst county councils, agricultural societies, farmers, and the press. I have forwarded copies of these leaflets to the hon. Member for his information.

#### NEWBRIDGE PORT, CO. DONEGAL.

MR. ODOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether representations have been received by the Congested Districts Board pointing out the immediate necessity for the construction of a boatslip and breakwater at Newbridge Port, county Donegal; if a report on the desirability and necessity for this work was made to the Board some years ago by their engineer and fishery expert; if the Rev. Mr. Green, one of the members of the Board lately inspected the site of the proposed works; whether he is aware that two fishermen from this port were recently drowned close by; and that the evidence at the inquest held on these men, and the rider added by the jury to their verdict, proved that if a boatslip and breakwater had been in existence these fishermen might not have been drowned; and whether immediate steps will be taken to have this work carried out.

MR. WYNDHAM: Applications have been made to the Congested Districts Board for the construction of a breakwater at Newbridge, in Lough Swilly. A report in reference to the matter was made to the Board by their engineer, and the place was also recently inspected by Mr. Green. I understand the facts are as stated in the fourth paragraph. The question of the construction of a breakwater is at present under the consideration of the Board.

#### INNISHOWEN COUNCIL AND COMPULSORY LAND PURCHASE.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to a meeting of the Innishowen District Council, at which a resolution, proposed by a tenant and seconded by a landlord, was unanimously passed calling upon the Government to pass a measure of compulsory purchase of the landlords in Ireland; and will the Government introduce, in the present Session, a compulsory and not a voluntary Land Purchase Bill.

MR. WYNDHAM: The policy of the Government in this matter has already been announced. Even the resolution of the Innishowen Council has not so far modified the opinions of the Government.

#### LABOURERS ACTS; DELAYS IN COMPLETING SCHEMES.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state how long it takes the Local Government Board to complete schemes under the Labourers Acts; and whether he will see that steps be taken to expedite such urgent matters henceforward.

MR. WYNDHAM: No fixed period can be assigned for the completion of the steps necessary to the confirmation of an improvement scheme under the Labourers Acts. The time taken depends to a great extent on the dimensions and nature of the scheme. In many instances schemes are submitted by the local authorities in an incomplete or imperfect manner, necessitating lengthy correspondence with the

promoters before the holding of a local inquiry. In other cases, as the result of the inquiry, it is found requisite to alter sites for cottages, and to arrange as to water supply, etc. There has been, I believe, no undue delay in confirming schemes in the past, and the Local Government Board will continue to expedite them in the future by every means in their power.

MR. CULLINAN: Is not the right hon. Gentleman aware; of his own experience; of the necessity for expediting the erection of these cottages, and can he say why it takes the Local Government Board four, and even five years, after full information has been supplied, to carry out their part of the work.

MR. WYNDHAM: My information leads me to believe and hope that the hon. Member is overstating the case. At any rate, I hope such delay will not occur again.

MR. CULLINAN: I may mention a case in the Tipperary Union.

#### LOANS TO IRISH FISHERMEN.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the practice of requiring fishermen in Ireland, who apply for loans for the purpose of purchasing gear and repairing boats, to supply sureties for advances; and whether, in view of the fact that such fishermen, on procuring sureties, could at any time obtain loans from banks or other sources, and that the boats and gear would of themselves be sufficient security, the practice or regulation referred to will be relaxed in cases in which the applicants cannot procure sureties but are of good character.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is the practice, in accordance with existing rules, to require applicants for loans for fishery purposes to furnish personal security. It is very doubtful if loans could be obtained from banks on such favourable terms as from the Fishery Fund. The repayment of advances from the latter is spread over a number of years, and the rate of interest charged is 2½ per cent. per annum. With regard to the suggestion that loans should be advanced on the security of the boats or gear purchased, it is to be borne in mind that a boat must be registered under the Merchant Shipping Act before a mortgage can be taken on it, and that the expense to be thereby incurred by the applicant would not be warranted unless in the case of a first-class vessel. The question, however, of the desirability of altering the existing rules so as to extend the advantages of the Fishery Fund to a larger number of fishermen is occupying the attention of the Department of Agriculture.

#### DAVID FINLAY'S ESTATE, CO. CAVAN.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how long the estate of David Finlay and others, situate in the barony of Tullyhan, county of Cavan, has been in the Landed Estates Court in the hands of a receiver; has a request under the 40th section of the Land Act been issued, and on what date; and can he explain the cause of the delay in completing the transfer of this estate to the tenants.

MR. WYNDHAM: An order for the sale of this estate was made in January, 1890, but the sale is not taking place under the 40th section of the Act of 1896. The solicitors having carriage of the proceedings state that the delay in the



completion of the sale has been caused by the arrangements for the distribution of turbary on the estate. It was also found necessary to obtain an order from the Land Judge overruling the claims for turbary made by some of the tenants.  
PROCLAIMED LEAGUE MEETING AT FOXFORD.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland on what grounds the meeting announced to be held at Foxford on the 1st January was proclaimed; who swore the information on which the proclamation was issued; and on what principle is it proposed to charge on the locality £5 for expenses of extra police used for suppressing the meeting.

MR. WYNDHAM: This meeting was called under the auspices of the local United Irish League. In July, 1899, as a result of a meeting of the same kind at the same place, the grazing of two farms in the locality was boycotted, and a resolution was also adopted on that occasion directed against men in the employment of a grazier, who is a shopkeeper in Foxford. The grazing of other meadows near Foxford was also boycotted in 1899, and again last year. The police were of opinion that the meeting convened for the 1st instant would lead to a renewal of boycotting, and the District Inspector made an information on oath, setting forth the facts and stating that he believed the object of the meeting was boycotting and intimidation, and that, if held, it would be an unlawful assembly. The Government thereupon directed the proposed meeting to be proclaimed. In answer to the third paragraph, the charge to local rates in this instance represents a moiety of the expenses of the force brought into Foxford from other counties, and is leviable under the authority of Section 6 of the 11 and 12 Vict. cap. 72, as amended by Section 13 of the 37 and 38 Vict. cap. 80. The expenses of the men assembled from within the county are defrayed from the Constabulary Vote.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Are we to understand that the right of public-meeting at Foxford and elsewhere depends on the caprice of the District Inspector?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

FAIR RENT APPLICATIONS; DELAYS.

MR. CULLINAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the delay in the hearing by the Land Commission of fair rent applications in cases where negotiations are pending; and whether he can press on the Commission the desirability of shortening these delays, with the view of lessening the inconvenience to the tenants concerned.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is, no doubt, some delay in the disposal of fair-rent applications, but delay is unavoidable, and the Commissioners are fully alive to the importance of dealing with all such applications as rapidly as the circumstances will admit.

MR. CULLINAN: The right hon. Gentleman has answered exactly opposite of what I wished, owing to the alteration made by the clerk. Shall I put a supplementary question now?

MR. WYNDHAM: Perhaps the hon. Member had better put his question on the Paper.

MR. CLANCY: Are all cases in which negotiations for sale are pending to be indefinitely postponed?

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no reason to believe that that is so. I understand the hon.

Member wants to give them priority.

MR. CLANCY: Yes, he wants to know whether as a matter of fact the Land Commissioners have arrived at the determination to postpone the hearing of all applications in cases where negotiations for sale are pending? Is such a decision, if made, legal or not?

MR. WYNDHAM: The difficulty is that none of us are clear as to the exact meaning of the question. The hon. Member had better put it in the form in which he wishes it.

MR. CULLINAN: I will, and I hope the clerk will not alter it.

TOBACCO CULTIVATION IN IRELAND.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the acreage under cultivation of tobacco in the various counties of Ireland last year, the average yield per acre, the cost of cultivation, the price obtained, and the net profit per acre.

MR. WYNDHAM: There has not been sufficient time to obtain a report on this question, which only appeared on the Paper this morning for the first time. Perhaps the hon. Member will repeat it.

GRANARD POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that all letters arriving from England or Dublin or Granard by midday train from Aghnacliffe and Lisryan are detained in Granard from 12 noon to 6 a.m. next morning, and that, as replies can only be posted that night in Aghnacliffe, several days elapse before any business communication can be completed; and that, although four rural messengers run from Aghnacliffe office, no wall boxes having been provided, their services are practically useless to many people; and whether, in place of a midday messenger now sent by the Department six miles from Edgeworthstown to Ballinalee and back to catch up the limited mail trains, he would arrange to send a car to Streete Crossing and have mails for Ballinalee, Aghnacliffe, and Lisryan there thrown out, so that a car could serve all this district and take the return letters from Aghnacliffe, Ballinalee, and Lisryan back to catch the up mail to Dublin each evening, thus saving correspondents at least two days; and whether he will cause wall boxes to be set at Smear Barracks, Molly Cross, Rathmore Cross, and Clonback Schoolhouse.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No complaint appears to have been received respecting the postal arrangements in the neighbourhood of Granard, Aghnacliffe, and Lisryan; but the Postmaster General will have inquiry made with the view of ascertaining whether it is practicable to provide the increased facilities asked for by the hon. Member, and the result shall be communicated to him.

NORTH TYRONE POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

\*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the inconvenience caused to the inhabitants of the district by the want of a post office at Curragh, in North Tyrone; and, if not, will he cause inquiry to be made into the matter.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The question of establishing a post office at Curragh,

in North Tyrone, has recently been inquired into, and the Postmaster General finds that the amount of correspondence for the locality is not nearly sufficient to justify the provision of a post office.

\*MR. HEMPILL: It is occasioning very great inconvenience indeed in this very remote locality.

FISH CULTURE;EXPERIMENTAL ESTABLISHMENT.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether a proposition was made by the Board of Trade to the Treasury to expend a small sum upon and experimental establishment for fish culture, and whether the proposition was accepted or declined.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The proposals of the Board of Trade are engaging the attention of His Majesty's Government, as part of the general question of the measures calculated to cultivate and develop the fishing grounds from which the markets of this country are supplied.

ARDAGH NATIONAL SCHOOL;BUILDING ESTIMATES.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the-Secretary to the Treasury whether any claim recently came before the Board of Works for a sum of £;68 15s., balance of a sum of £;103. 2s. 8d., the cost to the managers of building a national school at Ardagh, county Longford, over and above the estimate made in accordance with the plan of the Board of Works; whether he is aware that this plan was first devised and approved many years ago by the Board, and that, in consequence of the increase in price of labour and materials, the Board's estimate, which under this plan in 1887 was only £;474, was in 1890 raised to £;674, an increase in three years of nearly 50 per cent.; and whether, seeing that the Education Department passed all the managers' accounts, and that of the £;103 2s. 8d. excess claimed, recommended an increase from £;82 12s. to £;110 2s. in respect of one item, and in view of the fact that these schools have been admitted by the Board's inspector to be admirably constructed, and that since 1890, when the last increase in estimates for work under the Board's plan was sanctioned, materials and labour have advanced at least 30 per cent., especially in remote districts in Ireland, and as the local contribution was fully and freely paid for these schools, the Board of Works will now give their assent to the further payment of a supplemental grant of £;68 15s. being two-thirds of the sum in excess of the original estimate which the buildings cost.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Grants under the regulations of the National Education Commissioners are limited to two-thirds of the estimated cost of the work except in the case of school enclosures, and the managers of the schools in question have received the highest grant to which under these circumstances they are entitled. I ought to add that the original estimate for the school at Ardagh was £;530, not £;474, as stated in the question. It is possible that the scale of estimated cost embodied in the regulations above referred to may require to be revised in view of the rise of prices since it was originally fixed. This matter is now being investigated, but I do not think it would, in any case, be possible to make the alteration retrospective.

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in

deference to the wish of a large minority of the House of Commons, he will consent to withdraw the direction that the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs shall decline to reply to any supplementary questions.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I see no reason to change the practice, which has been found during the last two years very much in the public interest. Of course this practice does not exclude, and never has excluded, the possibility of asking for, and receiving, a small verbal explanation.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman request the Under Secretary to give the small verbal explanation I asked for just now?

THE ROYAL DECLARATION AGAINST ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if it was upon the advice of His Majesty's Privy Council that His Majesty made and subscribed the Declaration affecting the Roman Catholic religion mentioned in the Bill of Rights as to be taken upon His Majesty's first coming into Parliament whether his attention has been called to the fact that the said Declaration is stated in the Bill of Rights to be the Declaration mentioned in the Statute of 30 Charles 2, intituled, "An Act for disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament," and that so much of that Act as remained in force was wholly repealed by the Parliamentary Oaths Amendment Act, 1866; did His Majesty's Ministers tender any advice to His Majesty as to the effect of the Act of 1866 on the Declaration prescribed by the Bill of Rights; and will the Government include in the next Statute Law Revision Bill as spent or obsolete-that portion of the Bill of Rights relating to the repealed Declaration.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am advised that the Act of 1866 referred to by the hon. and learned Gentleman has no-effect upon the Declaration made by His Majesty. The Bill of Rights requires that Declaration to be made. This enactment is still in force and cannot possibly be repealed, or rendered obsolete, by the Statute Law Revision Act. The obligation does not depend on the repeal of the Statute 30 Charles 2, Section 2, but on the Bill of Rights, which incorporates, by reference, the Declaration which is in that statute. The subsequent repeal is, I understand, quite immaterial.

MR. T. M. HEALY: As this is a matter of considerable gravity and doubt, will the right hon. Gentleman consent to refer the matter to a small Committee, as has been done in some other cases of doubt, and receive a Report as to whether it is not a fit matter to be dealt with by the Statute Law?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am informed by my hon. and learned friend the Attorney General that there really can be no doubt of the legal validity of the action taken.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman appoint a small Committee to consider that question? I waive the legal question as to whether this is not a fit matter to refer to the Statute Law Revision Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have before said that I am no admirer of the terms of the Declaration, which is the point raised by the hon. and learned Gentleman, who has made a suggestion the basis of which surely must be that there is some doubt as to the legal validity of the action taken. If there is no doubt, then there

is surely no need for a Committee.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Then I beg to give notice that I shall oppose the passing of any further Statute Law Revision Bill until this matter has been dealt with.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: In view of the very strong feeling that exists, will the Government consider the advisability of introducing a short Act, which no doubt will unanimously pass, altering the Declaration?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think I dealt with that question on a previous day.\*

\*See page 320.

PENSIONS FOR THE AGED AND DESERVING POOR.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government intend to take any, and if so what action during the present session of Parliament with a view to ameliorating the condition of the aged and deserving poor.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no further statement to make as to the legislative projects of the Government during the present session.

COST OF THE CORONATION.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state what was the cost of the Coronation of His Majesty King William IV. and of Her Majesty Queen Victoria; if the cost of the coming Coronation is likely to exceed either of them; whether any portion of the expenses will have to be defrayed by Ireland; and whether any of the money is likely to be spent there.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I believe that in 1831 the Coronation cost £42,298 3s. 9d., and in 1838 £69,421 1s. 10d.

MR. J. CAMPBELL: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the concluding paragraph of my question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think I am bound to answer a question as to where the money is likely to be spent. I am no more gifted with the power of prophecy than the hon. Gentleman himself.

MR. FLAVIN: Will the Catholics of the United Kingdom be compelled to contribute to the price of the Coronation?

[No answer was given.]

NEW WRIT FOR THE BOROUGH OF MAIDSTONE.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a new writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Maidstone, in the room of John Barker, esquire, whose election has been declared to be void." (Mr. Herbert Gladstone.)

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I understand from the statement of the Attorney General that this evidence has been laid upon the Table of the House in manuscript, but this is not convenient for the general perusal of the Members of this House. Only a few minutes will be required to enable me to state the reason why I move this Amendment admit that it is quite within precedent that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Leeds should move this writ, but there are many reasons why it should not be issued, at present, at any rate. On many occasions the House has suspended writs for short periods for the printing of the evidence; for instance, there are the cases of Nottingham, in 1843, Harwich,

in 1848, Clitheroe, in 1853; but the best precedent is that of Norwich, in 1875. The case of Nottingham was on all fours with this. The judges reported that Mr. John Walter was, through his agents, guilty of bribery without his knowledge and consent, and that is precisely what has been reported of Mr. Barker at Maidstone. I want to show the House how similar this Nottingham case is to Maidstone. In the Nottingham case, in which the Earl of Lincoln gave notice of motion in precisely the same terms as mine, twenty-six persons were scheduled as guilty of bribery, and twenty-five persons were scheduled in Maidstone. In the case of Maidstone it is the third offence, for this is the third time that a Member for Maidstone has been unseated. In this case it is a member of the party to which I belong who has been unseated, but in the two previous cases it was a member belonging to the opposite party. In the Nottingham case, upon a division the writ was suspended for a week, and at the end of that time it was moved "that the writ do now issue"; and after an exhaustive debate on the printed report, in which sixteen Members took part, the writ was issued. In the case of Harwich, which was another first offence, the writ was moved, and a long debate resulted, and it was subsequently ordered that a copy of the evidence be laid on the Table of the House.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): What date was that?

MR. CAINE: In the year 1848. In the case of the Norwich Election Report there they unseated the Members for bribery and corruption. In this case a Royal Commission was instituted, and the writ was suspended for five years; until the following General Election; when it was issued along with the others. That, I think, was a very wholesome punishment, and it had a very whole-some effect upon subsequent elections. I believe that if some such course were taken in the case now under consideration, it would have a similar result, and would purify the constituency considerably. I do not want to go into any details, but I hold that this writ ought not to be issued at all. This borough is notoriously and incorrigibly corrupt. In the present case the bribery has been shameless and extensive, and this is the third time that the election has been declared void upon petition. Twenty-five persons are scheduled as bribed and eleven persons as guilty of bribery, and among these eleven three have been refused certificates of indemnity, and one of these is Mr. Levi Barker, the brother of the unseated Member. I hear that the unseated Member is also engaged canvassing in the constituency, although the evidence went to show that he had practically been guilty of bribery by giving large orders for goods to tradesmen in his constituency. One of the judges censured him severely, and told him that he had gone very near the mark indeed in the matter. Everyone admits that the bribery was widespread and general on both sides, for, although the unseated candidate only had a majority of thirty-eight, the seat was not claimed by his opponent. I have had a great number of letters from Maidstone itself imploring me not to go on with this motion, including one from one of the most influential leaders of the Liberal party there. He states that if there was any delay in the issuing of the writ it would give the Conservatives time to organise bribery in all the low public-houses. I therefore appeal to the House to delay the issuing of the writ until the House has time to examine the evidence, which I think will result

in the appointment of a Commission. I beg to propose the Amendment standing in my name.

\*MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): I am very glad to have the opportunity of seconding this Amendment, because I think the House should recognise that this is no party issue. There are Members on this side of the House who are quite as anxious for the purity of election as Members on the opposite side. I hope the House will regard this question upon somewhat broader grounds than those which have been advanced by the Attorney General in his answer to a question to-day. It is quite true that we have the Report of the election here, but it is a very short document, in which the judges answer certain questions put to them; and it does not give us any further information except the most important fact that has already been mentioned by my hon. friend, that as far as their inquiries have gone they have discovered twenty-five persons who have been bribed, and eleven persons who have acted as bribers. My hon. and learned friend the Attorney General said there was no precedent for the House interfering with the issue of the writ. I am told that in 1881 there was an instance (Gloucester) in which only three cases of bribery were actually proved, but the writ was suspended and an inquiry held. That is what we really ought to do here, because we already have from the newspapers the knowledge of the average man on this subject. I do not believe, whatever may be thought in this House, that outside they will think we have acted with due regard to our professions in our own constituencies of desiring purity of elections if we proceed with this somewhat indecent haste to issue a writ for this borough at the very earliest moment that it is possible to do so. We do not know whether what was stated in the press was true or not until these Papers have been printed and circulated. In order to give proper grounds to this motion, and to call the attention of the House to what was reported in the papers to have been said by the judges in the case, I will read some very strong expressions which Mr. Justice Kennedy is reported to have used. He said;

"As to corrupt practices, it would seem from the evidence that there existed among the voters in the borough a number of the lower class who always expected to receive some payment or reward for their votes; There seemed to be a more or less systematic provision made by some person for the satisfaction of the corrupt wants of those voters to whom he had referred. The proved cases of bribery extended through all the wards, and the uniformity of the payments pointed to a certain pre-arrangement on the part of some persons, the existence of something like a plan, something more than the casual and unpremeditated expenditure of some unscrupulous partisan."

I venture to think that those are very strong words, especially when coupled with the fact that no less than eleven persons are reported to have been guilty of bribery, and I think the inference might fairly be drawn that there were considerably more than twenty-five persons who might have been proved to have been bribed if further inquiry was made. I do not intend to find fault with our judges, but I do find some fault with another official, whose statutory duty has been made clear by the Corrupt Practices Act. By that Act it is clearly laid

down that the representative of the director of public prosecutions should be present at the trial, and, with or without directions, if it appeared to him that any person was able to give material evidence on the subject of the trial, he should call and examine such person as a witness. I am surprised that that course was not taken in this case, remembering what discussions ensued and the manner in which the case was presented. The petitioner stopped his evidence as soon as he had unseated the sitting member. The efforts of the defendant's counsel were entirely directed to show that he (Mr. Barker) had not been guilty of corrupt practices. And having done that, neither party had any interest in prolonging the inquiry. I may go further and say, both had considerable interest in stopping the inquiry. The state of the facts is clearly brought out by a curious remark of the judge. I do not know whether it is accurately reported, because we have not had the advantage of looking at the official record of the proceedings. Mr. Justice Channell said this: "Well, if no one will ask the question I must ask it." That remark proves pretty clearly that the inquiry in this case was not pursued in a thorough and proper manner, as it should have been, and we, therefore, have a right to have further evidence, and I think the House would be extremely unwise in not taking this opportunity of enforcing it. It is very well known, unhappily for the candidates, that there is a considerable amount of corruption in not a few constituencies, but it is very rarely that any of these cases come before the Courts because of the question of cost and the unpopularity involved, both candidates probably being equally guilty; all those things conduce to make an inquiry before the Election Courts very rare indeed. Therefore, having regard to the importance of the question, we ought to see that this writ should not be issued until further inquiry has been made, and the matter has received our careful consideration. If this House rejects this Amendment and the very reasonable request that is contained in it, it will make the cause of electoral purity still more hopeless than it is at present, and will give encouragement to practices which we all deplore and condemn.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out, all the words from the word 'That,' to the end of the Question, in order to add the words no new writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Maidstone ought to be issued until the House is in possession of the printed evidence and judgment taken by the deputies of the shorthand writer of the House of Commons.";(Mr. Caine.)

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

\*SIR F. DIXON-HARTLAND (Middlesex, Uxbridge): The last motion of this kind made in this House was made in respect of my own constituency in 1880. A petition was presented, and the same motion to delay the issue of the writ until the judges' notes were placed on the Table was made and agreed to. Eventually the writ was re-issued. What was the result? The result was that a new election was held, and another petition presented with regard to that election, but it was of a somewhat different character to this. In that case I claimed the seat, and after a trial extending over seventeen days the judges found forty-eight cases of



corruption on the same side where it existed before. It does seem important to me that in the case of a borough with the character which Maidstone possesses, the House ought to have an opportunity of seeing the notes upon the Table before they consent to issue a new writ.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): However corrupt Maidstone may be, there is a law to deal with it, and I think the attitude of the House upon this matter is opposed to the Constitution. This House surrendered its rights to deal with election matters in 1868, and relegated these questions to the judges. Subsequently, in 1883, it made further provisions. Now Maidstone is entitled by statute to a representative in this House, and the Act of 1883 put upon the judges the duty of stating whether corrupt practices prevail or not. I think this House made a most profound mistake in relegating this matter to the judges, and I think it is to be deplored that we parted for a moment with the power to investigate these cases; but are we now, after the judges have heard the witnesses and pronounced judgment, to take up the evidence and sit as a court of appeal, and find that the judges have failed in their duty, and the Public Prosecutor in his? Look at the case from an Irish point of view. Take the case of intimidation. Bribery is unknown in Ireland, but over and over again elections have been upset through intimidation. Take the case of the two Divisions of Meath, where intimidation was so rife seven or eight years ago. Is the House to punish a whole constituency because on one occasion intimidation upset the election? Either let us repeal all the provisions which remit these matters to the judges, or else leave them as they are, and not attempt to set ourselves up as an independent and irregular tribunal. If the tribunal as constituted is not satisfactory, and we are to go back to the system of other days, we must repeal the Acts of 1868 and 1883, a proceeding in which I shall be happy to assist.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he thought everyone would sympathise with the motives of the proposer and the seconder of the Amendment. They desired to do everything they could to promote the greater purity of elections, and he was sure that everyone in the House would gladly co-operate with them in carrying that idea into practice. But the House should be extremely careful that it did not run into a great evil; an evil for which there was no compensation. They had constituted a Court for the trial of election petitions, and the reports of the judges were sent to the House. Was it proposed that this House should have the evidence before it, should sit as a court of appeal from the decision of the judges, that every Member should read the evidence, and that they should debate upon the question of how far the House agreed or did not agree with the findings of the judges upon any election petition? He submitted that anything of the kind would be most mischievous. If they were dissatisfied with the trial of election petitions by judges, let them provide some tribunal which might be considered more appropriate. But he doubted whether there was any desire to return to the old system of Committees. On the whole, the present system of trial had given much more satisfaction than existed under the old system. The hon. Member who proposed the Amendment had alluded to a great many cases, but no useful purpose was served in quoting cases previous to the Act of 1868. In the present case, as the judges had not reported extensive corruption,

what possibility was there of the House overruling their finding without having had the opportunity which the judges had of seeing the witnesses and hearing the evidence? It was impossible to do so, and hon. Members would be rash in pronouncing an opinion whether the judges were right or wrong under such circumstances. The question was by no means a new one. A similar Amendment arose in the case of Rochester in 1893. In that case a new writ was moved for on 3rd February, 1893, and the Amendment was moved by the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool. The Amendment was debated at considerable length, and the late Lord Russell of Killowen, the present Lord Chief Justice, and Lord James of Hereford, all of whom were then Members of the House, expressed their views very strongly against any attempt to interfere with the present system. He submitted that the only proper and dignified course for the House to take was that recommended by the hon. and

learned Gentleman opposite. So long as there was this mode of trial the House should accept the judges' report, and act upon it.

MR. CAINE: What was the decision of the House with regard to the case referred to by the Attorney General?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: The Amendment was withdrawn.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I venture to say that we are at one in the opinion on both sides of the House that we should do everything in our power to promote purity of election. I am not quite agreed with the proposition, at any rate in the absolute terms in which it was expressed and put forward by my hon. and learned friend, that this House in delegating certain power to the judges has absolutely surrendered its own power. I do not think that is the case. What has happened? We have the report of the judges. They had the advantage of seeing the witnesses, watching their demeanour, living for some time in the atmosphere of this incriminated place. We have the report of the judges who enjoyed all these advantages, and although it was proved that corrupt practices were committed, it was not proved, nor have we reason to believe, that corrupt or illegal practices extensively prevailed. When the power to hear election petitions was delegated to the judges, of course it was supposed that by their trained faculties and their judicial experience they would be more competent to sit in a matter of this kind than a Committee selected from the various parties of this House. What are we asked to place against that but the suspicion; for it is nothing but a suspicion, or, to put the matter accurately, the possibility; that from the evidence, when it is printed and circulated, perhaps a majority of the Members of this House might arrive at a different conclusion, and might come to the belief, contrary to that which the judges expressed, that corrupt practices extensively prevailed? It has never been the practice of this House to refuse the issue of a writ unless there is ground to believe in the existence of extensive corruption. I venture to say that never since this jurisdiction was delegated to the judges; a period of thirty years; has the House acted in a matter of this kind in violation of the express and definite opinion given by the judges. I think the House would take a serious responsibility if it were to go back on that established practice. I hope the House will agree to the motion of my right hon. friend.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I hope the House will refuse the application made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Leeds, because I think if it does otherwise it will stultify itself, and the public will not unnaturally say, What was the use of spending all this time over the Corrupt Practices Act some time ago if a glaring case of this kind is to be condoned? There is a county of the name of Essex, which is known for the correctness and the purity of its elections, but we have boroughs which are rather flagrant examples the very opposite way, and yet I know that the Essex boroughs would stand aghast if they had the example of Maidstone before them. We know the case on the evidence given during the inquiry at Maidstone, but there was evidence which might have been produced and which was not given. There was any amount of evidence which would have been revealed if the case had not been withdrawn, and probably it would have sent some people to Maidstone Gaol if it had come to the surface. I think it is high time that the House put its foot down on this sort of proceeding. Bribery has increased, and is increasing, and should be abated in many constituencies. We all know what happens. It does not matter what colour a man wears before an election. A man goes down; God knows where he comes from; and sows the country with sovereigns and papers the place with £5 notes, and when the election is over everybody knows perfectly that the amount stated in the official return only represents one-half of what the candidate has spent. I think some attempt ought to be made to bell the cat. The House ought to put its foot down and make an example of this place.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I am very glad that this motion has been brought forward. This is not a matter in which the House can delegate to the judges of the realm its responsibility. I have discussed this matter outside the House with some of those who were concerned in the passing of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1868, and very grave doubt exists in certain quarters as to whether the House did a wise thing in delegating certain of its powers to the judges. I venture to say the Attorney General has given a most substantial illustration why this motion should be carried. It must be within the knowledge of everybody who has taken an interest in politics during the last fifteen or twenty years that the Corrupt Practices Act has very largely failed in many respects in producing the effects which its promoters expected. As I understand, all that the mover and seconder of the motion have asked is, that every Member of the House of Commons should, if he desires, be in possession of the evidence on which the decision of the judges was founded.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam): I am quite aware that this is a matter in which the House should proceed with great care, lest it should lay itself open to the charge of deviating from the usual form. This is one of the cases where the House has clearly, on the face of the Statute-book, reserved to itself full discretion. It was reserved to the House to say whether a constituency should be temporarily or permanently disfranchised. This is not a case in which the judges have in unqualified terms said that they did not consider that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed. On the contrary, they have shown considerable doubt and hesitation, and this case, moreover, is distinguished from other cases of the same kind. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East

Fife says the judges had the opportunity of hearing and seeing the witnesses. What we say is that there were probably other witnesses, in addition to those who tendered evidence, who might have been forthcoming had the trial proceeded, and whom the judges would have seen, but under the circumstances did not see. I suggest that there is another way out of the difficulty, and that is that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Leeds should not have chosen this particular day on which to move for the issue of the writ. I would ask him to deliver the House from its difficulty by withdrawing the motion, thus leaving further time to elapse, and enabling the House to show, in a case like this, that kind of hesitation which His Majesty's judges have themselves shown.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The House has had the advantage of having the law laid very clearly before it by gentlemen learned in the law, speaking with high authority on both sides, and I think it is quite clear that the precedents are in favour of the House proceeding with the issue of a new writ, unless there is a direct report from the judges which would induce the House to take a different course. The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down says that we should be guided, as I understand him, not by the evidence that was given, but by the evidence that might have been given before the judges. I think that is rather a curious position to take up; but the answer to it in this instance, I imagine, is that if the judges entertained any sort of suspicion that the further prosecution of the case would have disclosed a much more extensive and serious chain of bribery than had already been unfolded they would have insisted on the matter being proceeded with. If I remember rightly, at the time the announcement was made that the case was no longer to be defended, the judges took time to consider whether they should not go on listening to evidence notwithstanding the decision to which the defendant in the matter had come.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: That was so, and further evidence was given.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Therefore, it is quite clear that the judges whose duty it was to fully enlighten Parliament on the subject must have concluded that nothing more was to be gained, and no further knowledge to be obtained, by seeking further evidence. I am bound to say that when my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Chelmsford talks in the strongest terms of a town like Maidstone being practically corrupt, I think he says what he is hardly entitled to say, and for my part I must confess that when he talks about the corruption, degradation, and vitiation of elections, I am not so sure, after all, that the process he described; apparently with so intimate a knowledge; of the man who goes down

with a large sum of money and then disappears when he has accomplished the purpose for which he has come; I am not so sure that that is so bad as another system which prevails much more extensively, and which is degrading a much larger mass of the people of this country, namely, the nursing and practically bribing and obtaining the favour of constituencies by the squandering of money in the more open ways of charity, and the subvention of local beneficent objects. To come back to the point with which the House is dealing. Whatever our views may be on this particular case, as presented to us by the Report of the

judges so far as we have received it, we all have at all events a great desire to prevent these nefarious proceedings when they are detected; and, above all, we wish to proceed warily in the matter, and not to allow a state of things to continue which any action of ours could do something to prevent. Therefore, although I agree that the precedents in such a case as that in which we find ourselves are in favour of the issue of the writ, I still say that it might be advisable to postpone the issue for a few days until the fuller Report of the judges, which has been laid upon the Table only this afternoon, and from which the hon. and learned Gentleman read, is in the hands of Members, so that the House may be able to judge for themselves more fully than they can at present what the real attitude of the judges in their judgment was.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I listened to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition with feelings of considerable surprise and some dismay. I am perfectly aware, I am a sufficiently old Parliamentary hand to know, that the general feeling of the House I am now addressing is distinctly in favour of the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman opposite, and I presume it is the knowledge of that feeling which induced the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down to throw over his colleague on the left, and initiate a new practice, which I fear may have very serious consequences. I shall content myself with saying that I think the course which the right hon. Gentleman now suggests to the House is the wrong one. I am perfectly aware that I am not uttering a popular sentiment in saying that, but if the House will give me one moment I will explain to them why I hold that view. We are judging a general practice upon a particular instance, without in the least considering what effect upon the general practice our decision may have. That is a most dangerous practice for this House to indulge in. The Leader of the Opposition appears to think that he has saved his consistency by suggesting that the House should wait two or three days until it has in its hands the transcript of the evidence taken at Maidstone. The suggestion is, and indeed the only rational support for such a course must be, that when the evidence is in the hands of hon. Members they will read it, and in the light of that reading either endorse or reverse in their minds the decision of the judges, that they will come to the conclusion that the judges are right or that the judges are wrong, and that having come in foro conscientie to that private judicial opinion they will then proceed to act upon it in the House. Now observe what that means. One of two things: either that this House in its collective capacity, and not through the organ of a Committee of the House, is going to constitute itself a tribunal to revise judicial decisions and to re-try a case;

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: Not a decision, a Report to this House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: A Report to this House made by a judicial body. Does anybody in this House think that the House in its collective capacity; the 670 Gentlemen who compose the House; can transform themselves into a judge and jury at once to try questions of fact? I am certain that no man who hears me thinks that we are fitted for such duties, or that we ought to impose such duties upon ourselves. What is the alternative? The alternative is that if we think the evidence does

not bear out the decision of the judges, or the report of the judges, we should constitute a Committee of this House to re-examine the whole case. That is a return to the old system. To constitute a Committee of this House to re-try or to look into the case at Maidstone is to go back to the old system. It is to go back to the old, and I thought universally discredited system which this House voluntarily abandoned more than thirty years ago. ["No."] It has abandoned that practice for more than thirty years, and no responsible statesman on either side of the House, I do not care who he may be, has ever, so far as I know, suggested that this House should do, what, of course, it could do if it wished; namely, go back to the old method of having a Committee drawn up on party lines by the party managers to discuss the party questions which must inevitably come up before such a Committee. And observe: you cannot run these two systems of dealing with contested elections side by side. You cannot leave the judges to act in five cases out of six, and take away from the judges the sixth case. It would be an insult to the judiciary of the country. ["No."] Yes, it would be an insult to the judiciary of the country, and would make the whole of the system absolutely impossible. How can you go to the judges and say: "We put upon you these very difficult and delicate duties, duties somewhat apart from your ordinary judicial practice, which throw upon you very great responsibility, and which bring you almost into the vortex of political controversy; but if you do not happen to please us every time you give a decision we will revise what you do first in the whole House, and then in a Committee of the House; and if our Committee happens to disagree with you we shall publish the fact that the judges with evidence before them came to one decision, but the Committee of the House, reviewing the same evidence without seeing the witnesses, came to another decision." Is it possible? It may be true, as has been stated, that as men of the world, as men with some general knowledge of election matters, our view of what has taken place at Maidstone leads us to the suspicion that corrupt practices are more prevalent than the judges supposed. That may be our view, but is that a reason for upsetting in consequence of one instance this long-tried practice which, whatever may be its faults, certainly has saved this House from many a well deserved rebuke, from many a humiliating discussion, and from bringing itself into conflict with the best elements of public opinion? I am sure I am echoing the opinions of every man who has had to consider this question for more than a generation when I say that it would be most unwise to do that, even at the prompting of a generous and disinterested feeling; and I admit that all on either side are disinterested and generous, and that no element of party feeling has come into the discussion either on the part of the Gentlemen opposite or of any other Gentlemen. I am perfectly sure that at this moment the House is not a party machine, that it is animated solely in the action it is about to take by its desire for the purity of our elections. But, Sir, let us be careful not to upset a good general practice because we think that in one particular case it has not worked well. This is a subject upon which the Government are not the movers. The motion comes from the Front Bench opposite, and it is for them to carry their motion to a division and to appoint

tellers. If they go to a division, as I hope they will, I shall vote with them, and I earnestly hope that, putting aside all private interests and party affections, every Gentleman who can turn his mind from the particulars of this isolated case to the broad general principles which ought to guide our policy will also support the motion.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): I fully share the view of the Leader of the House that no greater mistake could be made by the House than in any way to endeavour to set up the old system which prevailed up to 1863. If the suggestion before us was that this House should constitute itself a body to overhaul the judgment of the judges at Maidstone I should certainly support my right hon. friend. But, with the right hon. Gentleman's permission, while I quite share his view that it would be mischievous of this House to set itself up as a court of appeal upon issues tried by judges, I would venture to draw his attention to a precedent already touched upon, though not fully developed, which I think has a direct bearing on the case before us. I refer to the Evesham case.

The writ was moved in this House on the 17th June, 1880,\* and an Amendment was moved that the issue of the writ be suspended until the shorthand writers' notes were printed and in the hands of Members. The then Attorney General (Sir Henry James) said;

"The judges, instead of reporting that there was no reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed, said that, from the evidence before them, and to which they had confined themselves, they had no reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed."

He ends by saying that;

"in the particular circumstances the Government would offer no objection to delay in the issue of the writ, but it must be understood that when the shorthand writers' notes of the evidence had been produced the motion for the issue of the writ would be almost immediately renewed."

And Mr. Gladstone at the conclusion said that;

"perhaps it would be better to withdraw the motion, if the hon. Gentleman would withdraw the Amendment, on the understanding that it would not be renewed until after the evidence and the report of the judges had been received."

All I want the House to understand is that what is now proposed, similarly to what was proposed in 1880, is not the overhauling of a case before the judges, not the reopening of the question, but simply to consider whether the House should direct a further inquiry to be made into a matter in regard to which obviously the judges had not pronounced in the statutory form "that the evidence before them did not justify such a conclusion." The case seems to me to be almost identical, and I think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife was hardly justified in saying that there was no precedent.

MR. ASQTJITH: What was the judges' report?

MR. JAMES LOWTHER: The judges reported that, although they had no reason to believe that corrupt practices extensively prevailed, they went by the evidence before them, and did not go outside it. Having taken some part in the discussion of the Corrupt Practices Act in 1868, and devoted some attention to the subject, I entirely concur with

\*See The Parliamentary Debates [Third Series], Vol. ccliii., page 203.

my right hon. friend that it would be a most dangerous thing for this House to set itself up in any way as a court of appeal to decide issues which have been remitted under statute to a duly constituted tribunal. But I do not understand that we are asked to do that. I should certainly vote against any idea of doing anything of the kind. I understand, however, that a wholly different proposal is made, and one which in the Evesham case was decided in the sense of adjourning the issue of the writ until the House had seen the evidence. Mr. Gladstone, as the Attorney General will see, said that it was not usual to print the evidence in each instance unless asked for. As it is, I beg to advise the House to adjourn the discussion.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I should like, with the leave of the House, to say one word. I desire to point out to the House that the Evesham case is different from the present one, because in the Maidstone case we have a finding of the judges in the form contemplated. There is a perfectly definite finding that the judges had no reason to believe that corrupt or illegal practices extensively prevailed. My right hon. friend read the paragraph, and by permission I will just read it again, and the House will at once see the difference between this finding and the finding in the Evesham case. I will read from what was said by the Attorney General, Sir Henry James;

"Prima facie, there ought to be no unnecessary delay in the issuing of a writ. A constituency was entitled to representation, and it was not desirable to prolong the electioneering contest. Unless there was some special circumstance upon which objection could be founded, there ought not to be undue delay. If the judges reported to the House that there was reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed, there was no discretion left, and a Commission must be appointed. Let him remind the House of the position it was placed in. By the Act of 1808 the House of Commons had delegated all authority for the trial of election petitions to a tribunal; but what could the House do in this case if it came to the conclusion that corrupt practices had prevailed? No provision was made for further inquiry."

Now comes the passage to which I call the attention of the House;

"In this case, however, the report of the judges was somewhat peculiar. Instead of reporting that there was no reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed, they said that, from the evidence before them, and to which they had confined themselves, they had no reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed."

And then the Attorney General goes on to say;

"The House could not properly act upon the suggestion made that there had been an arrangement by which persons had been kept out of the witness box, nor could it be influenced by the general description of a place as corrupt. The House must apply a general rule, apart from any particular character which hon. Members might choose to give to a place, and it must be careful not to suspend a writ without a good reason for doing so. If, however, an attempt were made in this case to prevent the reading of the evidence before the issue of the writ, it would be thought there was some reason in the background why the issue of the



writ was forced on. In the particular circumstances the Government would offer no objection to delay the issue of the writ; but it must be understood that when the shorthand writers' notes of the evidence had been produced, the motion for the issue of the writ would be almost immediately renewed."

Mr. Gladstone said at the close of the debate;

"There was already a rule that the short" hand writers notes in cases of this description should be laid on the Table; but it was not usual to print them, unless they were asked for on some special ground. This case appeared to be of a special character, and, as his hon. and learned friend had explained, the Government were willing to postpone the issue of the writ. Perhaps it would be better to withdraw the motion, if the hon. Gentleman would withdraw the Amendment, on the understanding that it would not be renewed until after the evidence and the report of the judges had been received."

Now I hope the House will see clearly that that was an absolutely different case from the present. It proceeded entirely on the fact that the finding of the judges was a peculiar and of a special kind. If a man says, "From the evidence before me, to which I am confined, I have no reason to believe that corrupt practices extensively prevailed," most men of the world would come to the conclusion that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed. But in the present case the finding is not in that form at all. It is a perfectly, absolutely clear finding that the judges had no reason to believe that corrupt practices had extensively prevailed. I therefore submit that the Evesham case has no bearing on the case now before the House.

\*MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.): I do not suppose that any hon. Member condemns the present system of trial of election petitions as inferior to a trial by a House Committee; nor do I suppose that there has been any such dissatisfaction with the judgment of the Court in any particular case as would induce the House to unseat a man who had been seated, or to seat a man who had been unseated by the Court. That would be absurd. I acknowledge that the House has considerable inherent powers notwithstanding the statute. But the House will act wisely in the spirit of accepting the decisions to which the judicial tribunal comes, so long as the tribunal keeps within the statute. The trouble in this case is not because the judges' finding is special, nor because it embraces very much of the so-called specialty referred to in the Evesham case; as to which I would like to know what it is to which you would desire to call the judges' attention. You do not expect that judges should decide on anything but the evidence before them; and therefore I attach no importance to the supererogatory words used in the finding of the judges in that case. That is not the real trouble. The fact is, the system under the present law is defective with reference to the question of the extensive prevalence of political corruption in a constituency. Apart from the evidence actually submitted, there is no proper provision for inquiry where the evidence is incomplete owing to the action of either of the parties to the petition. Twenty-five years ago, in another Parliament, I met that difficulty by inserting a provision for a special report by the judges, in which they should state whether the inquiry had been rendered incomplete by the action of either of the parties to the petition. That is what was wanted here. We all know it. We

all know that at a very early period of the prosecution the respondent admitted that he could not resist the fact that there had been bribery; thereon there was nothing more for the petitioner to do to win the battle, and no more witnesses were required to come forward for that purpose. But the petitioner did not venture to claim the seat after all. We know what that implies. Having regard to the jealousy which the country naturally feels in these matters, it is probably as well that the papers should come down before the writ is ordered. But after all it is inevitable that the judges' finding on the case before them should be accepted, no matter what our view of it may be, and that this constituency should not in the present state of the law be penalised by a refusal to issue the writ on what you will find in the papers. But what you ought to do is to alter the law in the direction I have indicated, and so provide for the future.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): The House is in a very strange situation. A right hon. Gentleman on the Front Opposition Bench has made a motion to which an hon. Member, also on that side of the House, has moved an Amendment which was seconded on this side of the House. The Leader of the Opposition is in favour of the Amendment, and says he thinks; it advisable that the delay asked for by the Amendment ought to be given. The Leader of the House is against the Amendment, seconded from his own side, and in favour of the motion moved by the hon. Gentleman opposite. Which way am I to vote? The First Lord of the Treasury has made a speech with the infallible brilliancy and poetic fervour which characterises him, and has raised some spectres, although he has failed to destroy them. They are, however, only spectres. It is not a question of our abandoning any practice now in vogue, or of reinstating any former practice. The question is whether, here and now, we are going to issue a writ. We cannot escape from that. We have got to vote whether there is to be a writ on a report, signed by one of His Majesty's judges, which we have not yet seen, and on evidence we have not yet perused. What was the purpose of the rule that a judge should make such a report? The object was that this House should decide whether the Report gives ground for the issue of the writ.

MR. T. M. HEALY: The Report was read by Mr. Speaker.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I am coming to that point. I should like to have the evidence before us. The Attorney

General has quoted the Evesham case, and has descanted on the differences between that and the present case. But he has omitted the most important. The Evesham case was fought out and this was not. We all know that when any two parties take part in a litigious battle, and both find it inconvenient to go on in a court of law, they make an arrangement by which the case is settled out of court. There is a vehement suspicion that that is the case here, and it behoves this House to pause before it proceeds to the extreme step of whitewashing the constituency of Maidstone and providing it with a new Member. I know not who the candidates are, but I will not be a party, without waiting to hear the evidence and without giving the House an opportunity of deciding whether there is a ground for issuing the writ, to sanctioning the motion that it should be issued? know there are Members who believe that this House has surrendered all its

powers to Ministers and all its honour to judges. The House has not surrendered all its powers in regard to elections, and this very motion has necessarily been made in the belief that the House has so retained its powers in order to have the opportunity of acting or withholding action in cases such as this. It is true that we have given over to His Majesty's judges a delegated power of deciding as to the validity of elections; and properly so given over. I believe it has been attended with the most excellent results, but whether you pause, or postpone the issue of the writ, that does not affect the delegation of your powers to the judges. The House must decide for itself whether it will issue or withhold the writ. It may withhold it, as in the case of Evesham; but if there is no ground for withholding it, we would not wish to deprive the constituency of the services of its representative for any longer or shorter period. I cannot regard this as a mere matter of form, or that we ought to be asked to issue this writ as a matter of course, after what has occurred.

\*MR. WALLACE (Perth): I will not detain the House for more than a minute. I want to understand why the House is asked to postpone the issue of this writ for a week. It is suggested that the object is that the evidence taken at the trial of the election petition may be in the hands of hon. Members first. The hon. Member says he has already read or heard read the report of the judges on the case, but that he wants to read for himself the evidence on which that report is based. What is the object of the hon. Member in reading the evidence? To ascertain the effect of it upon his own mind. And certainly if the hon. Member, after reading the evidence, comes to a different conclusion from that formed by the judges, he is going next week to come before the House as a court of appeal to alter the decision of the judges. I venture to say that there is only one safe course for this. House to adopt; and that is, to stand by the practice which it has followed for many years; and that is, that if His Majesty's judges have reported that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed, to withhold the writ and issue a commission of inquiry. Hitherto, if the report of the judges was to the contrary, the writ was issued as a matter of course. That prevented all political feeling, all discussion, all difference of opinion existing here as between the House and the judges. I trust that my hon. friend who moved the issue of the writ will persevere with his motion, and I, for one, will vote for it.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): It seems to me that we have discussed this matter too much from the legal point of view. I think there is an aspect of it which ought to be considered; I mean, what the man in the street will think of it. The question is whether the issue of the writ means that there has been prevalent bribery in the constituency of Maidstone or not. It seems to be admitted that there has been a considerable amount of bribery in this borough. It has been convicted of bribery on three occasions in modern times, and the man in the street will be likely to say, unless we take some action, that the House is not very particular as to corruption, seeing that it issued a new writ after the recent disclosures. The effect will be disastrous. It seems to me that we ought to strengthen the hands of those who wish to make elections purer, and I think that to issue the writ so hurriedly is to weaken that position. All

our legislation is very drastic in regard to bribery, but when we come to deal with it, and apply it in the way suggested by the present case, it would appear that we are apt to shrink from it. I think much more harm will be done by issuing the writ in haste than by postponing it for a few days until we have seen the evidence taken in the case before the judges. Altogether, I am convinced that a great deal of good will be done to the constituency if the issue of the writ is postponed for a few days.

SIR J. FERGHSSON (Manchester, N.E.): From the course which the discussion has taken, I believe that the House is liable to drop into one or two pitfalls. My hon. friend who has just spoken tells us what the man in the street will say.

That is a curious sort of doctrine to use in this House in regard to the case in hand. We are here to judge for ourselves; and we know a great deal better than the man in the street whether the light course is to act according to rule or precedent; and we need not consider what the man in the street will say after he reads his paper in the morning. That argument is singularly weak, and altogether unworthy of my hon. friend. The danger will be in following his example, which would constitute every man his own leader. My hon. friend the Member for King's Lynn says that he wants, in the plenitude of his industry, to study and review the finding of the judges; but what we have got to do is to carry out the finding of the judges, otherwise, what is the use of sending these judges down to investigate the facts? The judges have reported in explicit terms that in their opinion there is no evidence of extensive corruption in this constituency, and there the matter ought to end.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Bain, Col. James Robert

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

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

Bullard, Sir Harry

Aird, Sir John

Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds

Buxton, Sydney Charles

Allhusen, Aug. Henry Eden

Banbury, Frederick George

Caldwell, James

Allsopp, Hon. George

Barlow, John Emmott

Cameron, Robert

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol

Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.

Anstruther, H. T.

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Carlile, William Walter  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Bignold, A.  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Arkwright John Stanhope  
Bill, Charles  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Cavendish, V. C.W.(Derbysh)  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Asquith, Rt. Hon. H. Henry  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Bowles, Capt. H. E. (Middlesex)  
Chamberlain, Rt.Hn.J.(Birm.  
Austin, Sir John  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I quite recognise the great importance to the House and the country of this motion; but I cannot help regretting that it has come on this afternoon, and has cut so very materially into the very short time at the disposal of the Irish Members for the consideration of Irish questions. I will not be guilty of speaking, under these circumstances, more than one sentence. I intend to vote in favour of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Camborne, and I do so for this reason: I do not believe that the House of Commons has parted, or ever intended to part, with its power over election petition cases in the complete sense that some hon. Members suppose. And if, in consequence of the rinding of the election judges, this House is to be deprived of the power of suspending, even for one hour, or a day, or a week, the issue of a writ, then the power of the House of Commons to issue a writ should be taken away altogether. This is a very bad case. It is a case where, by his own action, the petitioner is afraid to claim the seat, and where the respondent by throwing up the sponge leads one to think that extensive bribery had prevailed. If the Member for Chelmsford is right in saying that this bribery is extensive, notwithstanding the Corrupt Practices Act, throughout Great Britain, then I say, in the interests of the people, and more especially in the interests of poor candidates, that a stand ought to be taken in this House in cases of this kind. And without any desire to penalise a constituency or permanently deprive it of its Member, I shall vote in favour of the temporary postponement of the issue of the writ.

Question put.

The House divided.;Ayes, 224; Noes, 157. (Division List No. 7.)

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry

Joicey, Sir James

Rolleston, Sir John F. L.

Chapman, Edward

Kearley, Hudson E.

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Charrington, Spencer

Kenyon,Hn. Geo.S. (Denbigh)

Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-

Clancy, John Joseph

Kenyon-Slaney,Col. W. (Salop)

Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse

Coddington, Sir William

Knowles, Lees

Seton-Karr, Henry

Compton, Lord Alwyne

Lambert, George

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Law, Andrew Bonar

Shaw-Stewart,M.H. (Renfrew)

Cranborne, Viscount

Lawson, John Grant

Shipman, Dr. John

Crombie, John William

Lee, Capt. A. H. (Hants, Fareh'm

Simeon, Sir Barrington

Cubitt, Hon. Henry

Leigh, Sir Joseph (Stockport)

Sinclair, Capt. Jn. (Forfarshire)

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Sinclair, Louis (Romford)

Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)

Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.

Smith,H.C.(North'mbTyneside

Dewar,T.R(T'rH'mlets,S.Geo.

Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.

Smith, James Parker(Lanarks.

Dickinson, Robert Edmond

Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)

Smith, Samuel (Flint.)

Dixon-Hartland,Sir F.Dixon

Long Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol,S

Spear, John Ward

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Spencer, Rt.Hn.C. R. (Northants  
Dunn, Sir William  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Spencer, Ernest(W.Bromwich)  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Lucas, Col. Francis(Lowestoft)  
Stanley,Hn. Arthur(Ormskirk  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart  
Lucas,Reginald J. (Portsmouth)  
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Elibank, Master of  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Evans, Samuel T.  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
Faber, George Denison  
M'Calmont,Col.J. (Antrim,E.)  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
M'Iver,SirLewis(Edinburgh W.  
Stroyan, John  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry N.  
Ferguson, R. C. Munro(Leith)  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Fergusson,Rt. Hn.Sir J.(Manc'r  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Talbot,Rt.Hn. J.G.(Oxf'dUniv.)  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Tennant, Harold John  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)  
FitzGerald, Sir R. Penrose  
Max well, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Thomas,F. Freeman-(Hastings  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William  
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower)  
Fitzroy, Hon. E. Algernon  
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fredk, G.  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Tufnell, Colonel Edward  
Flower, Ernest  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Forster, Henry William  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Foster, Sir M. (London Univ.)  
More, R. Jasper (Shropshire)  
Walker, Col William Hall  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Wallace, Robert  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir W. H.  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)  
Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Mount, William Arthur  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Gordon, Maj. Evans (T'rH'mlts)  
Murray, Rt. Hn. A Graham (Bute)  
Wason, E. (Clackmannan)  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)  
Wason, John C. (Orkney)  
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)  
Norman, Henry  
Webb, Col. William George  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A.C.E (Tauntn)  
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nd'rry)  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)



Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley  
Whitley, J. II. (Halifax)  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Percy, Earl  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Hayter Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)  
Helder, Augustus  
Purvis, Robert  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Henderson, Alexander  
Pym, C. Guy  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Hope, J. F. (Sheff'ld, Brightside  
Rea, Russell  
Wodehouse, Hon. A. (Essex)  
Howard, Capt. J. (Faversham)  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Hozier, Hon. James H. Cecil  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.  
Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. M'Arthur.  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)

Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)  
Colville, John  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Boyle, James  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Crean, Eugene  
Atherley-Jones, L.  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Cremer, William Randal  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Burns, John  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Burt, Thomas  
Cullinan, J.  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. H.  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Bell, Richard  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Blake, Edward  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Daly, James  
Boland, John  
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.  
Delany, William  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
O'Malley, William  
Dillon, John  
Laurie, Lieut. General  
O'Mara, James  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Lawrence, William F.  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Layland-Barratt, Francis

O'Shee, James John  
Doogan, P. C.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Palmer, George W. (Reading)  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)  
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.  
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Leighton, Stanley  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Duffy, William J.  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Ellis, John Edward  
Lloyd-George, David  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Emmott, Alfred  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Rasch, Major Frederic C.  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Lowther, Rt. Hon James (Kent)  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Fenwick, Charles  
London, W.  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Ffrench, Peter  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Field, William  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Richards, Henry Charles  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Roche, John  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
M'Cann, James  
Russell, T. W.  
F'lynn, James Christopher  
M'Fadden, Edward  
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. T. Myles  
Garfit, William  
M'Govern, T.  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.  
Gilhooly, James  
M'Hugh, Patrick A.  
Soares, Ernest J.

Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Strachey, Edward  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Sullivan, Donal  
Grant, Corrie  
Minch, Matthew  
Thompson, E.C.(Monaghan,N.  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Mooney, John J.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Tully, Jasper  
Hain, Edward  
Murnaghan, George  
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheffld)  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Murphy, J.  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Hammond, John  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.  
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.)  
O'Brien, Lt. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
O'Brien, William (Cork)  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C.B. Stuart-  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace

O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Jones, David B. (Swansea)  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)

Jordan, Jeremiah

O'Doherty, William

Yoxall, James Henry

Joyce, Michael

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Kennedy, Patrick James

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

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Kimber, Henry

O'Dowd, John

Mr. Caine and Mr. Henry Hobhouse.

Kinloch, Sir J. George Smyth

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Labouchere, Henry

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

Main Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a new writ for the electing of a Member to serve in this present Parliament for the Borough of Maidstone, in the room of John Barker, esquire, whose election has been declared to be void.

NEW BILLS.

OLD AGE PENSIONS (No. 4).

Bill to confer Pensions upon aged persons, ordered to be brought in by Sir Fortescue Flannery, Sir James Rankin, Sir Albert Rollit, Mr. Flower, Mr. Bousfield, Colonel Denny, Mr. Carlile, Mr. Rothschild, Mr. Sinclair, and Sir Howard Vincent.

OLD AGE PENSIONS (No. 4) BILL.

"To confer Pensions upon aged persons," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 57.]

MERCHANDISE MARKS ACT (1887) AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Merchandise Marks Act, 1887, ordered to be brought in by Sir Howard Vincent, Major Rasch, Colonel Brookfield, Mr. Field, and Mr. Seton-Karr.

MERCHANDISE MARKS ACT (1887) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Merchandise Marks Acts, 1887," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 7th March, and to be printed. [Bill 58.]

CONVEYANCE OF CYCLES.

Bill to provide greater facilities for the Conveyance of Cycles by Railway in the United Kingdom, ordered to be brought in by Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Herbert Gladstone, Sir Albert Rollit, and Major Evans-Gordon.

CONVEYANCE OF CYCLES BILL.

"To provide greater facilities for the Conveyance of Cycles by Railway in the

United Kingdom," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 7th March, and to be printed. [Bill 59.]

#### PUBLIC TRUSTEE AND EXECUTOR,

Bill for the prevention of fraud upon widows and orphans by the appointment of a Public Trustee and Executor, and the amendment of the Judicial Trustees Act, 1896, ordered to be brought in by Sir Howard Vincent, Mr. Henry David Greene, Mr. Howard, and Colonel Tufnell.

#### PUBLIC TRUSTEE AND EXECUTOR BILL.

"For the prevention of fraud upon widows and orphans by the appointment of a Public Trustee and Executor and the amendment of the Judicial Trustees Act, 1896," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Thursday, 7th March, and to be printed. [Bill 60.]

#### TEACHERS OF MUSIC (REGISTRATION).

Bill for the registration of Teachers of Music, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Brookfield, Mr. Agg-Gardner, Sir William Houldsworth, Mr. Alban Gibbs, Sir John Brunner, and Sir Thomas Roe.

#### TEACHERS OF MUSIC (REGISTRATION) BILL.

"For the registration of Teachers of Music," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 6th March, and to be printed. [Bill 61.]

#### BENEFICES.

Bill to amend the law relating to Ecclesiastical Benefices, ordered to be brought in by Major Rasch, Mr. Vicary Gibbs, Colonel Tufnell, and Mr. Banbury.

#### BENEFICES BILL.

"To amend the law relating to Ecclesiastical Benefices," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 27th March, and to be printed. [Bill 62.]

#### MEDICAL ACT (1858) EXTENSION.

Bill to extend the provisions of the Medical Act, 1858, ordered to be brought in by General Laurie, Mr. Rothschild, Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree, Colonel Wyndham Murray, Sir James Fergusson, and Mr. Middlemore.

#### MEDICAL ACT (1858) EXTENSION BILL.

"To extend the provisions of the Medical Act, 1858," presented, and read the first time; to be read the second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 63.]

#### COLONIAL MARRIAGES

Bill to legalise certain Colonial Marriages, ordered to be brought in by General Laurie, Sir William Dunn, Mr. Lyttelton, Sir Barrington Simeon, Mr. Paulton, Mr. Rothschild, and Captain Jessel.

#### COLONIAL MARRIAGES BILL.

"To legalise certain Colonial Marriages," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 64.]

#### WORKMEN'S HOUSES TENURE.

Bill to make provision with respect to the tenure of the Houses of Workmen in certain employments, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Colville, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Caldwell, and Mr. Bell.

#### WORKMEN'S HOUSES TENURE BILL.

"To make provision with respect to the Tenure of the Houses of Workmen in certain employments," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday next, and to be printed. [Bill 65.]

#### CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Bill to amend the Church Discipline Act, 1840, and the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Charles M'Arthur, Mr. David MacIver, Mr. Mellor, Mr. Seton-Karr, Mr. Brand, and Sir John Willox.

#### CHURCH DISCIPLINE BILL.

"To amend the Church Discipline Act, 1840, and the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 5th June, and to be printed. [Bill 66.]

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

#### [SEVENTH DAY'S DEBATE.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [14th February], "That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth::

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.";(Mr. Forster.)

Question again proposed.

#### IRISH GRIEVANCES.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN (Cork): I now wish to move the Amendment which stands in my name. What we charge by this Amendment is that there being no real crime in the country you are making crimes of things which are perfectly legitimate. You set off by thanking your stars that the people of Ireland have found a means of carrying into effect popular movements without any of those scenes of bloodshed of which we in this House have often heard, but instead of encouraging the people in exercising their rights by an open and bloodless combination, you are making more plain the principles by which you used to persecute the trade unions of England thirty or forty years ago, before they extorted from this House the recognition that their right of combination was a legitimate right in the eye of the law, and by trumping up charges of conspiracy and of Whiteboyism, you are goading the people into violence. I am quite aware that even in England the right of working men to combine against the selfishness of men of their own class is not yet altogether very secure, but the fact stands that so far as the right of English tradesmen, or even of Irish tradesmen, within the towns to organise a strike, to picket blacklegs, and stand together against them, to expostulate with them and bring their selfishness before their eyes, is now an indisputable right, and this House would no more think of taking anything from this right or of constituting it a crime than they would think of passing an Act against the organisation of working men. But what are you doing, Sir, in Ireland at the present moment; or rather not you, Sir, because you never do know what is going on in Ireland, unless murder is going on; but what is the Executive doing in Ireland?

I do not think it will be contended that the land-grabber in Ireland, who is what the blackleg is in this country, has suffered in life or in limb; or has suffered any greater pain of mind from public opinion than any non-unionist workman in England has to make up his mind to if he has determined to exercise his own selfish right unfairly. Although, instead of shooting landlords and land-grabbers, the farmers of Ireland, the most numerous body of workers in that kingdom, are now adopting a course which the law expressly sanctions in the case of the trade unions of England, that is being treated as a crime. You have meetings dispersed and Members of Parliament assaulted by the police for attempting to address their own constituents; you have enormous fines levied on a perfectly peaceful population by way of extra police charges; and you have these charges of Whiteboyism and conspiracy trumped up against men who are acting in lawful combination in the open light of day, and in order to obtain convictions you have the shameless and unnatural system of "jury packing," and you have men struck at and attempted to be struck down because they have had the courage to raise a public protest against this state of things. That fact, I venture to say, is now admitted, and I do not think that, broadly, the Chief Secretary will attempt to dispute it. If he does, I need not go further to answer him than to quote the charge delivered by his own Lord Chief Justice at the winter assizes for the province of Munster, in which he confesses that there is nothing illegal or criminal in the proceedings of the League which would justify the clamour of the landlords and The Times newspaper for its suppression. Members who sat in former Parliaments will not need to be told who the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland is. I can frankly say that Lord Peter O'Brien has earned a title that will be more enduring than his peerage by his ruthless conduct. Here is the Lord Chief Justice's deliberate verdict on this organisation;

"It has been said to me, 'Chief Justice, why is not the United Irish League proclaimed as an unlawful organisation.'"

Fancy the Lord Chief Justice of England being approached by colliery owners or railway directors and pressed to exercise his influence with the Government for the suppression of trade unionism; Lord O'Brien went on to say;

"Whatever the future may do";

and I emphasise that expression;

"I do not in the slightest degree hesitate in expressing my opinion that there has been no cause for the suppression of the United Irish League as an unlawful organisation."

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): May I ask the date of that?

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: The 6th of last December. Now here is an organisation that has been already in existence for a longer period than the Land League, so that it has been tested by time. It has branches in considerably more than 1,000 of the parishes of the country, in a state of constant activity on the land question, of all others; it has proved its power, I may be allowed to say without offence, at the General Election with a completeness which has never been paralleled. It has succeeded in rousing Ireland on this question and as regards the province of Ulster. I most gladly acknowledge that this has been



done mainly by the powerful advocacy of the hon. Member for South Tyrone. It has started and carried on a formidable and irresistible agitation for the abolition of landlordism, and I may say that it has elicited in the first King's Speech a promise, such as it is, of another Land Bill, although two years ago this House was assured that there was no longer an Irish land question, and that an Irish Land Bill would never trouble you more. Such is the magnitude of this organisation and its success; and yet the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, looking back over the past three years with no very friendly eye, with all the confidential information of Dublin Castle at his command, is forced to confess that he can discover no stain of bloodshed, or even of very much minor illegalities, to justify even the most ironclad official in suppressing the tenants' trade union at the demands of the landlords. I could go on to quote charge after charge ;Judge Andrew, Judge Johnstone, Judge Murphy, Lord Justice Walker, and several others at assizes after assizes in the county Mayo, which was and is

the hotbed of the agitation;and all of them testify to the peace of the country and to the disappearance of murder and outrage. The judges would certainly not be the least zealous to avail themselves of any materials for starting one of those great crusades against public liberty of which you have set art example. No amount of testimony could add very much to the weight of the testimony of the Lord Chief Justice. His testimony is, I think unanswerable. We are ready also to prove that at the beginning of this movement a diabolical attempt was made by certain subordinate officials of Dublin Castle;I will put it no higher than that;to seduce members of the League into proceedings of a criminal and murderous kind, and every attempt to bring those miscreants to justice has been to a great extent baffled by Dublin Castle. Notwithstanding the verdict of eleven out of twelve special jurors of Dublin, these miscreants are still in the public service and the public pay. If the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary has any doubts as to the true story of the Mulranny forgery, the crime in the West-port telegraph office, of the incendiarism at Murrisk, of the alleged shooting of Mr. Vesey Stoney, and other transactions of that kind, there is an easy way of testing it. Let him close with the demand for the full and searching investigation which the county councils and the district councils are making in every shape and form. Let him choose his own tribunal. Let him have a Select Committee of this House if he pleases, and let them probe and search into every circumstance connected with the origin and the conduct of this movement, the conduct of the people, the landlords, the land-grabbers, and the police officials.

Let us set at rest once for all on which side lies the criminality. The House will remember that a similar inquiry as to the Land League was thrust down our throats in this House at the time of the Parnell Commission, with results that perhaps were not calculated to encourage similar adventures on the part of the Government. We did not ask for the Parnell Commission. It was forced upon us by brute force. You thought your opportunity had come for dealing a deadly-blow at the Irish party. We demand an inquiry now. All the representative bodies in Ireland have been demanding it for the last eighteen months. I presume

that the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh will make himself heard presently. I should like to hear from him why his friends the landlords and The Times newspaper, who are crying out for the suppression of the League, will not submit their charges and allegations to such a test, and see whether they are going to fare better with the Mulranny forgery than with the Pigott forgery. We are eager for inquiry, and anxious that the tribunal should be as sweeping as possible. It is not granted, because both we and our opponents know perfectly well that the result would be such a flood of light on the necessity for the movement, upon its lawfulness, and upon the foulness of the weapons employed against it, that it would be impossible for landlordism or the police establishment of Ireland to survive the investigation. If the Chief Secretary shirks such an investigation as was forced upon us at the time of the 'Parnell Commission, I think everybody will know the reason for it. Apart altogether from the certificate passed by the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, I think we will be entitled to take it for granted that the opponents of the League have thrown up the sponge, and that there is no longer any possibility of imputing to the League anything illegal in its procedure. We hear charges of conspiracy, Whiteboyism, and intimidation. "Intimidation" is one of those meaningless, intangible terms that can never be denied because it can never be defined; and you have come to this pass in Ireland; that the ridiculous term "intimidation" now represents practically the only form of agrarian crime. The Chief Justice, in the speech in which he holds the legality of the League methods, told us there were 651 evicted farms in Minister, of which more than 150 were altogether derelict; that is, as he explained, abandoned by both landlord and tenant; the landlord is not able to stock them, apparently, and no person can be got to take them. The Lord Chief Justice shook his head, as if that was a very grave state of things. So it is for the rack-renting, evicting landlords, but so long as there is no crime, what business is it of the judge if evicting landlords cannot find

men to take their farms? Can you imagine a case of an English judge;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; I must remind the hon. Member that by the rules of this House disrespectful criticism of judges is not allowed.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I am quite willing to respect your ruling, Sir, though my respect does not extend in other directions. I am trying to speak, not of the conduct of the judges, but of the extra-judicial conduct of persons who happen to be judges. Beyond a doubt, there is an extensive and great combination in Ireland at present against the taking of evicted farms and the monopoly of grazing ranches. We do not in the least desire to shirk the fact; we glory in it. I ask you, if the League appeals, as I am glad to say it does appeal, and successfully, to the agricultural classes in Ireland for their own protection from extermination to combine against, and by every honest weapon to discountenance the taking of farms from which their poor comrades have been evicted in consequence of inability to pay acknowledged unjust and excessive rents; in God's name, where is the crime? What form of trade unionism can be more legitimate, or what right have Crown officials in Dublin Castle to espouse the cause of one particular side in any dispute? It is the old incorrigible idea

that is rooted in the mind of every Dublin Castle official, and which is at the root of all your misgovernment in Ireland; the idea that they are there not to preserve life or limb or to see fair play for the people, but to collect the landlords' rents for them, and to fight tooth and nail to encourage grabbers to take these evicted farms, and then to make heroes and gods of them. I think you will find that so powerful is that feeling among your officials that they actually believe that the situation is always far more difficult to deal with when there is no crime going on in Ireland; and they are puzzled and embarrassed and have a grievance when they find a great and powerful combination going on against land-grabbing just as bloodlessly and peacefully as any strike ever went on in England. For want of real crime they are trying to manufacture bogus crimes, and hence these charges. But if these prosecutions be got up for that purpose, and succeed in intimidating the people from holding their open meetings, passing their resolutions, and expressing public opinion honestly and manfully, before six months are over we shall be driven back to the days of old.

Let me give one or two instances of these artificially Castle - manufactured crimes in Ireland. The editor and proprietor of the Kilkenny People were prosecuted at the last assizes for Whiteboyism, and most desperate attempts were made to pack the jury. I do not know whether Gentlemen listening to me are aware that these Whiteboy Acts were passed to deal with a state of things generations ago when vast bodies of armed men clad in white shirts and with their faces blackened used to roam through the country at night, shooting, burning, cutting off men's ears, burying them alive up to their chins, and so on. One would have thought these two journalists had been caught red-handed in some desperate midnight fray, or at all events that there was a charge of physical violence; but their only crime was that in the ordinary way of business they published in their newspaper without a word of comment a resolution of the local branch of the League condemning a man who had taken an evicted farm, and appealing to his neighbours to give him no countenance in business as long as he retained that farm. It was not contended for one instant that the resolution had been the means of causing any violence or danger of violence, or that it caused even any greater pain of mind than, say, for instance, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Birmingham feels, or ought to feel, every morning when he opens any organ of public opinion from any part of the civilised world outside England. These two respectable journalists, who confined themselves to publishing a bona fide report of an important public body, whose legality the Government has never dared to question, would at the present moment have been undergoing the fate of Whiteboy marauders but for the fact that luckily the job was too much for even a selected jury. I venture to ask any Englishman in this House if there is a shadow of reality in the cry of equal rights between the two peoples? Can you imagine such a thing happening to an English newspaper? I venture to say that this was a case, not of journalistic Whiteboyism but of Dublin Castle blackguardism. Another case of these bogus crimes was in county Kerry, where nine respectable farmers were tried at the last assizes for conspiracy and for writing-threatening letters, and were

actually convicted by a packed jury and sentenced to two months imprisonment with hard labour. In the agrarian history of Kerry, what is always meant by a threatening letter was some dastardly communication ornamented with a coffin and a death's-head and crossbones, and threatening the man to whom it was sent with some cruel form of assassination. What are the facts on which these farmers are charged with that abominable crime? The learned judge who tried them complimented them in the dock as highly respectable farmers, and not of the class of moonlighters or murderers. During the years of disorganisation before the League was started a poor creature named Kangley had been evicted from a wretched tract of bog, and a neighbour named Seanlan had taken it. When the League was started, this poor man's case and the amount of parish disturbance it caused became a subject of discussion by the branch, and the poor man appealed to the branch of the League and stated his own side of the case; and the League in order to be perfectly fair and impartial, wrote a letter to the grabber acquainting him with the fact that they had been appealed to for an expression of opinion, and stating that they were quite ready to hear his side of the case before coming to any decision. Now listen to this terrible document;

"DEAR; SIR,;I have to inform you that a complaint has been lodged before the Lixnaw branch of the United Irish League in reference to some land which it is alleged you have taken, and I am directed by the members to request your attendance at a meeting to be held next Sunday so that inquiries may be made into the matter.;Yours truly, J. J. JOYCE, Hon. Secretary."

It was that civil and friendly letter;[Ministerial laughter and Irish cheers.]

Would not the hon. and gallant Member have supposed that that was really a mild kind of letter ten years ago? It was a perfectly civil letter. It was sent through the open post, signed by the officer of the branch, and that was the threatening letter for which these respectable farmers in Kerry were dragged before a packed jury. Remember this,

Mr. Speaker; it was proved at the trial that Scanlan had himself invoked the arbitration of the United Irish League. In his own evidence at the trial he stated that he would allow his case to come before the League, and have it settled there if it could be done. He did not suggest there was any threat used against him. His wife was a servant in the police barracks. That was the secret of the whole conspiracy. "Witness would never have rendered up the letter, but the sergeant came for it." In response to that letter, as a matter of fact, Scanlan turned up before the League. The whole thing was discussed. He made a certain offer, which was discussed, but the evicted tenant did not consider it sufficient, and there the matter ended. Scanlan did not become popular with his neighbours. I should like to know why he should? It is the insane greed of men like him that is the cause of all the follies of the landlords as well as all the miseries of the tenants. But it was not contended for a moment that the slightest violence was offered to him, or even that he fell out with the League because they failed to patch up this business. On the contrary, the very counsel for the Crown who opened the case actually warned the jury not to believe the sworn testimony of the grabber. He said Scanlan would now probably appear before them and rejoice in the League, and lick the hands that were lifted against him.

That is the statement of the Crown, whose particular witness this man is. Now, I again ask Englishmen, if this letter had been written by some secretary of a trade union in England, inviting a brother workman to discuss terms of settlement with his society, would it be tolerated for the officer of such a society to be called up and tried before a packed jury on this base and dishonourable charge of threatening-letter writing, for which charge there was infinitely less foundation than, if I am in order in saying it, Mr. Speaker, if the majority of this House at the present moment were indicted for wilful murder and highway robbery in South Africa. Well, notwithstanding that these nine men were complimented by the very judge who sentenced them, they are brought away from their own county to Cork, and in Cork, where there is a population of 396,000 Catholics to 35,000

Protestants, an exclusively Protestant and Unionist jury was empanelled to try them. Pray listen to the string of true blue Anglo-Saxon names that by some extraordinary necromancy got into the box in Catholic and Nationalist Cork; Thomas Upward, Francis Duke, Francis William De Vere, Robert Parkhill, Alfred C. Murphy, Hasker Moonhead. Now listen to the unfortunate Gaelic Nationalists in that city, where there are 396,000 Catholics to 35,000 Protestants. Listen to what happened, and hear the names of the Catholic Gaels who were ordered by the Crown to stand by as men unfit for credence; O'Shee, Morissey; [Ministerial laughter.] Yes, I hear a laugh from the other side. Does the hon. Member object to people with these strong names? It is easy to order Catholic Nationalists to stand by in the Cork jury box. You do not ask their Gaelic comrades to stand by in South Africa, where, unfortunately, they saved you from being driven into the sea. Let me go on and offend hon. Gentlemen still further for a moment, if they will permit me, with a few more of these offensive Gaelic names; Morissey, Callory, Moriarty, Murphy, Mahony, Hogan, O'Neil, etc. I do not wish to detain the House. Forty-three of these Gaelic Nationalists were ordered to stand aside. In a community in which the Catholics are 396,000 to 35,000 Protestants, a jury as exclusively Protestant and Unionist as if selected by the local branch of the Landlords' Union was empanelled. The result of these men's honest attempt to patch up this dangerous parish dispute was that they were sentenced to six months imprisonment with hard labour as threatening letter-writers. They attempted arbitration. You have as strong an objection to arbitration in Kerry as you have in South Africa. God forbid that the results should be equally bloody, but I tell you that if you had not the organisation and the power of the League to restrain the people, the result of such a lesson as that would be to teach hot-headed men that it is a safer and more effective course to address a volley of slugs to the land grabber than a simple letter. If that turned out to be the case I have no hesitation in saying it is the Government and Gentlemen on the other side who support it who would be the greater criminals of the two.

Now I mention the subject of jury packing in Cork and Kerry, and you would suppose that if ever there was a subject on which public opinion was entitled to make itself heard in Ireland it was this miserable juggling with the sacred right of trial. Under this system it is really no exaggeration to say that the

Crown official can get his twelve "reliables" to do his work with as absolute power as a military officer can pick out a firing party to carry out a military sentence. Unfortunately the Gaelic Catholic has no more chance against such a system than the Christians had against Nero's tigers in the Roman amphitheatre. I ask Englishmen again what would be their feelings; I ask the hon. Member for South Belfast what would be his feeling if the seven bishops were to be tried in London to-morrow morning by a jury composed exclusively of Irish Catholics, and if The Times newspaper was to be suppressed the following morning for daring to make a comment upon it.

Now do you think that we have no feelings? I tell you that parallel things are going on in Ireland at the present moment, and they are apt to make Irishmen's blood boil with shame. You are not content with stripping our poor people of arms, but we are to be disarmed even of the right of making a protest in the public press against the infamy of the present course of action of the Government. Let me give the latest case. It occurred in the county of Sligo, where there is a population of 90,000 Catholics and only 10,000 Protestants. A jury, as usual exclusively composed of Unionists and Protestants, was empannelled and sent two Catholic Nationalists to gaol for six months with hard labour for making speeches at a public meeting. My hon. friend the Member for North Leitrim, and who is also mayor for Sligo, is the proprietor of the principal newspaper in the district. He felt it his duty in common decency and in common manhood to write an article in his newspaper protesting against the foul methods by which his brother Catholics were excluded from juries; in strong terms, no doubt, but in scarcely more passionate terms than were employed by the Catholic bishop of the district, the Bishop of Elphin, who wrote in denunciation of

this intolerable insult to every man who has a drop of Catholic blood in his veins. My friend was instantly prosecuted. As usual, he was not tried at home, but was dragged away to Dublin, and by a grim stroke of Castle irony this gentleman, whose crime was that he had simply suggested the existence of jury-packing, was himself, in his own case, treated to a most striking exemplification of the reality and iniquity of that practice. Out of a couple of dozen jurors who were available, thirteen Catholics were, even in Dublin, ordered to stand by by the Crown. I am glad to say that the enlightened Protestants of Dublin are beginning to revolt against this outrageous insult of constituting them the executioners-in-ordinary of their own fellow-countrymen. It is too much for them, and but for their disagreement my friend would be now suffering imprisonment for suggesting that there was such a thing as jury-packing. The scandal did not stop there, though nobody ever dreamed that it would lead to a second trial. It was contrary to all precedent in cases of the kind. When the Land League leaders were tried under the same system in 1881 the jury disagreed, but nothing more was said about it. I was prosecuted myself in the Campaign time for conspiracy, and the jury disagreed, and of course the case was never heard of again. When the Freeman's Journal, the principal Nationalist paper in the country, published an article on the Sligo case protesting that jury-packing had been exemplified in that case, instantly the Crown turned their

attention to that journal, and to another great metropolitan newspaper, the Dublin Evening Telegraph. This time, however, they did not resort to trial by even a packed jury; they are beginning to be afraid of and distrust packed juries even in Dublin; but they resorted to that miserable, dishonest pretext, contempt of court, on the ground that comment had been made upon a case which was still sub judice. These two newspapers were attached by the Court, and Heaven only knows what penalties will follow. I ask you to remember for a moment the different links in this chain that is being coiled round public opinion in Ireland. First, the poor local men sent to gaol for six months; second, my hon. friend tried by a packed jury for stating that there was such a thing as a packed jury; and finally the two metropolitan journals committed under the arbitrary power of contempt of court because they had attempted to raise a public protest against the way in which their comrades of the provincial press were being persecuted and strangled in the performance of a public duty.

I have sometimes heard people talk of Irishmen being too passionate and violent. I think if there is any great fault; personally I admit that it is possible we have our faults; but if there is any striking fault in our national character, I am afraid it is that we bear too much, and bear it too tamely, and only that you have taken care to disarm us, as if we were a tribe of Hottentots, we would sometimes be inclined; I certainly would; to follow the example of those two little Republics in South Africa who have resisted and chastised your insolence and tyranny. It is of vital importance to remember that this kind of thing has been going on for years and years in Ireland, and it is necessary to bring a knowledge of the facts to the attention of this House. Then there was a case where the principal inhabitants of a peaceful little village were indicted for conspiracy because the local branch of the United Irish League took cognisance of a case of land grabbing. Why in Heaven's name not take cognisance of it, if Irish public opinion is to be allowed expression at all? Is there any pretence of crime here? There has not been a crime committed in the district for the last three years. Indeed, it will have to be admitted that in all these cases crime neither follows nor accompanies the proceedings of the League, with one or two exceptions, for which the League is not in the smallest degree responsible. Now, the grabber himself in his evidence said he came to Tallow as a poor friendless boy, and that he had made his wealth out of the small farmers, and also by gambling on the Stock Exchange. In all these grabbing cases, or almost all of them, the grabbers are either small shopkeepers who have made their money out of the peasants, or pensioners of the police who use the public money to plunder their neighbours. These are the men whose names it is deliberately held to be a crime even to whisper in public. Well, a respectable Protestant family on the estate of the Duke of Devonshire was evicted and the holding grabbed, and the local branch of the League very properly took up the case and attempted to bring public opinion to bear upon it.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The hon. Gentleman must be aware that the case he is now commenting upon is sub judice,

and that the men will be tried. It is unusual to comment on such cases in this House.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I will at once bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker, if you first hear me as to the point whether these men are really returned for trial at all; for I hold that they are not.

\*MR. SPEAKER: If it is correct, as the Attorney General says, that this matter is still sub judice, that is to say that legal proceedings upon it are pending, it is not desirable to comment upon it.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: What I want to point out is, that there were four magistrates on the bench, two paid and two unpaid; and that there was an even division as soon as the evidence was completed. According to all precedents-the prosecution ought to have failed, and therefore there would be no case of sub judice. These paid magistrates deliberately overrode the verdict of the two unpaid magistrates, and committed the men for trial.

\*MR. SPEAKER: The fact is that these men are now awaiting trial, and the hon. Member must not comment upon the case.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: I have nowhere else to speak; but I pass on to another phase of my argument. Why should not Irish peasants have the same right of combination that English and even Irish tradesmen have? I want to know, in the next place, what are these guilty practices that are carried on by these branches of the United Irish League which are not carried on under another name by trade unions all over the country? You may call it black-balling or picketing here in England, that which you are pleased to call boycotting in Ireland, but it is precisely the same thing. It is sheer cant and dishonesty. None of us like it, but every one of us practises- it; every trade union, profession, and club. It is human nature and will last as long as human nature. Members of the League in Ireland have suffered more than the Afrikanders' peace delegates, having been obliged to fly for their lives, and having been hunted from post to pillar, and even denied the shelter of their homes. The House will remember that the only observation that the First Lord of the Treasury' had to offer by way of comfort was that there really was a limit to human patience, but that is a remark which is equally applicable to Ireland; and I venture to say that the man who in the most sordid selfishness stands between a whole people and their country is the greatest tax on human patience that ever existed. We came here to serve you but we will yet be your destruction. I remember a few weeks ago the Chief Secretary, in response to a courteous invitation to speak at the trade union office, took a most sympathetic line as to their claim for the right of combination. Yet at the same moment, or very soon afterwards, his police in Ireland were guilty of making armed raids on the organised union of the country, and having men tried by packed juries because they exercised temperance in their language, and because they combine, as they have a right to do, and as they will do whether you like it or not, to obtain their lands on such conditions as will give them a living wage.

The Irish trade unions do not represent more than 20,000 men. This League represents 500,000 farmers and labourers, who, with their families, represent three-fourths of the population. And the objects which it seeks to obtain are



strictly fair and just. As to one of those objects, the abolition of landlordism in Ireland, you had last night a demonstration that that object is supported by nine-tenths of the representatives of Ireland in this House; even hon. Members sitting on the Government side. I venture to say that it is of greater consequence to the people than any reform ever submitted to this House. Again, as to the second object of the League; to which the Chief Secretary last night made an allusion, in regard to which I hope I make no mistake in believing it to be a friendly one; the object to parcel out the vast grazing lands among the people. Plenty of those

lands are lying derelict, whilst the poor starved cottagers huddle together on their confines hungering for them. This object is so great, so inevitable, that there is a department of the Government at the present moment engaged in carrying out the programme of the League, although at so miserable a snail's pace that it will take centuries to make any impression upon the mass of misery that has to be dealt with.

I think the Chief Secretary will admit that up to the present, for reasons which he will understand, he has met with more sympathetic consideration in Ireland than perhaps any Chief Secretary who has gone before him, with the exception of the right hon. Member for Montrose. But the time has come when he will have to make up his mind for good or ill what he is going to do. It will not do to tell us that Ireland is being governed under the ordinary laws; that is a sophistry and a fraud on England and Ireland alike. As evil and as arbitrary things as ever turned the constitution of England against its own Government are going on now in Ireland. You have not done anything yet except under compulsion, but you will hear of these things every week of your lives so long as the power of free speech is left to us. If the Chief Secretary has made up his mind to lapse into the old condition of things, of having concessions sandwiched with coercion, and allowing his adherents in Ireland to indulge in the noble pastime of harrying the people, what will be our procedure in this session and the sessions to come? It will be obstructive. If the right hon. Gentleman intends to go in for coercion, it will be manly for him to bring along his Coercion Act in all its atrocity, and then we can have the issue fairly and squarely discussed. If the Government persist in their present policy of suppression and attempting to drive discontent beneath the surface, there will be two courses open to the Irish Members. From the selfish point of view, the easiest course for all of us will be to abandon the field to the secret societies, and let the landlords and the land-grabbers take the consequences; that will probably be the easiest, and I am sorry to be obliged to say it would perhaps be the more effective course to arouse England to a knowledge of the desperate condition of the people; but I for one will not give up without a fight the position we have won for our people of doing everything which Englishmen have a right to do. The Chief Secretary can still give effect if he chooses to allowing the overpowering view of the people being known without bloodshed, without secrecy, or without anything else which would make honest men hang their heads with shame. And if open agitation in Ireland is to be preserved, it will have to be preserved not by putting our necks under the yoke of the men who are doing these things that

are going on in Ireland, but by resisting them and putting them down at no matter what cost of trouble or of liberty. We will not allow simple village people to be strangled and garrotted silently. We will hold no truce with these land-grabbers. We will not bend the knee to his Worship the Mayor; a new stage religion; to creatures whose trade no doubt is quite as strictly legal as that of the hangman, and which is equally repulsive. You will not succeed in muzzling the press in Ireland or in silencing the outcry against you, or if you have to do it, it will have to be pronounced by your judges. You will have to go very much further than suppressing an occasional meeting or making a dead set on some obscure village hamlet in some remote part. The right hon. Gentleman will have to bring his Coercion Act along if he means to persist in suppressing our national aspirations. It is the magistrates and the county councillors of Ireland that it would be wise for you to conciliate.

I do not know whether it will be made a new case of conspiracy and intimidation against us if we tell the right hon. Gentleman this plainly now. He is young and ardent, and, judging from his onslaught on the hon. Members for Waterford and South Tyrone last night, he rejoices at the scent of battle, and is ready to act the part of the strong man. He must take his own course, and we shall take ours. The Irish Members are fighting for the only remedy that can be suggested for the unnatural and accursed system by which the people of Ireland are being killed off, and we have only to look back on the history of any coercion struggle in Ireland to feel fairly confident that this House will yet acknowledge that we were right all

along, and will proceed to apply the remedy, as usual, too late. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

MR. BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): As an entirely new Member of this House, I should have preferred, under ordinary circumstances, to have found another time for speaking upon this subject, but I realise that we are not assembled here under ordinary circumstances. The Amendment proposed by my hon. friend the Member for Cork raises definitely this issue, that while you have already spent £100,000,000 on the South African War, and are continuing to spend at the rate of £1,500,000 per week; the war having arisen out of the questions of the franchise and local government; here, over the Channel, within a few hours journey of London, you have a part of His Majesty's Empire commonly called Ireland, where the most ordinary rights and liberties with which the people of England have been familiar for generations are practically at the mercy of the local resident magistrate or policeman who takes upon himself to deal with them. I feel all the more bound to associate myself with the protest raised by the hon. Member for Cork in view of the fact that I have had the honour of taking some active share in promoting the organisation for whose rights and liberties he has so eloquently pleaded to-night. I am in a position to speak with knowledge as to the progress and growth of the United Irish League movement. I have been north, east, south, and west, I saw the birth of the movement, I saw its rapid growth, and I saw its final triumph. I saw also some of the scenes of intolerable petty despotism and tyranny and bloodshed on the part of the police by which the progress of the movement was constantly marked. I would

respectfully point out to hon. Members opposite that there is one right which the English people are famous for being extremely jealous of; the right of public meeting. It is not many years ago that a London mob tore down the railings of the park that was closed against a reform meeting. Still fewer years ago is it that the career of the Commissioner of Police for London was virtually terminated by his interference with the right of meeting in Trafalgar Square. In that case the Commissioner was acting strictly within his technical rights. He was acting strictly within an Act of Parliament, and he was admittedly acting under considerable provocation, for after a previous meeting in Trafalgar Square a band of ruffians went looting shops right, left, and centre; but in spite of that the people of London did not recognise the proclamation of that meeting in Trafalgar Square, and you had a desperate riot for hours. You had the Riot Act read, and you had Sir Charles Warren's popularity in London gone for ever. He was hooted when he endeavoured to address a public meeting, he was lampooned on every music-hall stage in the metropolis, and he was forced to resign the high post which he held. But our case in the matter of the police is this. You have first of all the vice-regal proclamation of a public meeting, and then you have the proclamation signed by the resident magistrate. I think Ireland is the only part of the three kingdoms where the police barracks keep a stock of forms of proclamation with blank spaces left to fill in the dates and the names of the places. But, worse than that, there has been another development of this interference with public meeting, and there are hon. Members among my colleagues who have had personal experience of it. It is the case where a head constable, without even a proclamation or a warrant of any sort whatever, either from the Lord Lieutenant or the resident magistrate, takes on himself to draw a cordon of police across the highway, and to order men like the hon. Member for South Mayo off the streets like dogs, telling them that they have not got the right of public meeting even in their own constituencies. If I am not wearying the House. I should like to give a couple of cases in my own personal experience. I was announced to address a meeting at a place called Kerrygale, half an hour's drive outside Dunmore, Donegal. I was informed the night before by District Inspector Moore that the meeting was proclaimed. I need hardly say I did not pay the least attention to that. In fact I have reason to know that I narrowly escaped prosecution for my lack of respect for the law on that occasion. We were treated to every insolence and violence on that occasion. We were blocked right, left, and centre, wild hands were laid upon us by District Inspector Moore, and efforts were made to drag us from the car in which we were driving to address the meeting; but in the end we did address not one meeting but two or three into the bargain. This petty tyranny is not even consistent in its operation, because while it was proposed to prevent us addressing a meeting at Kerrygale, where there was an agrarian dispute, we were not allowed to address a meeting in the chapel yard at Dunmore, and yet, when I went down on another occasion, although the agitation was still going ahead, not the slightest interference was offered to our proceedings. I wish to say a few words from the trade union point of view. We contend that it is as lawful and as moral for an Irish Member, or any Irish leader of opinion,

whether newspaper editor or speaker from a public platform, to counsel the boycott of a farm from which a man has been evicted as it is for an English labour leader to advocate the boycotting of a job from which trade unionists have been expelled, and indeed, if we enter into comparisons at all, the comparison is in favour of what is called the "blackleg" or the "scab," as against what we call the "landgrabber." In England the "blackleg" or the "scab" may at least plead that he has a wife and children who are in want, and that to obtain food he is only taking up the job another man has deliberately laid down; whereas in Ireland, as has been properly pointed out in the course of the debate, the landgrabber is a man who in 99 cases out of 100 has no plea of want or necessity, but who, on the contrary, is a well-to-do man with money at the bank. He comes there for a money-making purpose, and enters himself as a thorn in the side of a peaceful community. But we shall hear no doubt in the course of this debate the stock argument used in Ireland when these meetings are proclaimed, that, in the words of the proclamation generally issued against them, they "will or may cause boycotting and intimidation." I respectfully submit that in the course of your cab strike in London you had more intimidation and violence; more brutal violence, too; than you have had in the whole of the years of the United

Irish League. I would like to know, if in the heat of the bitterest fight in England, any responsible labour leader were to go to address a meeting of strikers, even although the meeting were to be held at the gates of the dock or the factory where the strike was going on, public opinion in this country would tolerate armed interference with him; with, say the hon. Member for Battersea; on the plea that the meeting he was announced to address might or would lead to boycotting?

I think what has occurred is a striking illustration of the effectiveness with which the United Irish League is helping on the system of land purchase, even of voluntary land purchase, which is so highly commended as against compulsory land purchase by hon. Members on the other side of the House. For many months there raged a fierce agrarian dispute in the Abbeyfield district of county Limerick, but the United Irish League fought for the tenants' right to purchase their farms on equitable terms, and, as usual, the League won in the end. When the purchase was completed, a meeting was addressed by the parish priest: and what was the statement he made? He said that out of the 23,000 acres of land in the parish more than 16,000 had now been purchased, a distinction of which few parishes in Ireland could boast, and it came of the vigorous movement of the United Irish League in the district.

I do not propose, Sir, to abuse at any great length the indulgence extended to me as a new Member of this House. I wish to associate myself emphatically with the protest against what is called the system of jury-packing in Ireland. If the English people saw in assize after assize, and in case after case, every Wesleyan or every Baptist ordered to stand by, I think they would conclude that something like a very insidious insulting, and deadly religious, as well as political, persecution was being carried on. I speak myself as a Protestant: I was born one, and in all human probability I shall die one: but I hope I shall

die as I shall live, without labouring under the impression or pretending to believe that my Catholic neighbour is a born liar who is not fit to be trusted on his oath. This is no sentimental grievance. The facts brought before the House by

the hon. Member for Cork conclusively prove that there is a steadfast assumption by the Crown, whenever its law officers can make that assumption felt, that every Roman Catholic is ipso facto a man not to be trusted on his oath, who cannot be trusted to do justice between man and man, but who may fairly be subjected to the inconvenience of being compelled to attend on summons, under penalty of heavy fine, and to the ignominy of being told to stand by for the benefit of an exclusively Protestant and Unionist jury.

In conclusion, I would earnestly plead that it is, to say the least, an anachronism that when we see South Africa drenched in blood and tears, and laid waste with fire and sword, for a complaint about the alleged over taxation and under representation of a gold mining community; that while this is done under the plea of equal rights for all men and liberty for all subjects of the King, within a day's journey of this capital you have a part of His Majesty's dominions labouring under a tyranny and injustice that would make Radical to the backbone the most true-blue Tory county in England if it was practised on that county. I would further plead that Irishmen are not to be told that they are treacherous or unpatriotic because they cannot rejoice in the victories or mourn over the defeats of a Government which imposes upon them a code of law alien to the best traditions of the law that the English people enjoy, and which deprives them of those rights of combination, free speech, and public meeting by which alone the liberties of England itself have been secured and improved for generations. I beg to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed;

"At the end of the question to add the words. 'Humbly to represent to Your Majesty that this House has observed that a combination of the agricultural classes in Ireland has been formed, under the name of the United Irish League, with the object of accomplishing reforms which alone, in the opinion of nine-tenths of the constitutional representatives of Ireland, can arrest the continued depopulation of that country and the decay of its only great national industry. These reforms being, first, the creation of an occupying proprietary in substitution for the present unsettled and vexatious system of dual ownership of land; and, secondly, the utilisation of extensive tracts, at present lying practically waste in the congested districts, for the purpose of supplying holdings of sufficient extent to a

hard working and deserving population, who for want of land are compelled to live in a condition of chronic privation and even famine on the borders of those fertile depopulated areas; that the movement which has been carried on for the past three years for the promotion of these objects has been marked by the disappearance of those crimes of violence and secret conspiracies which were used to the discredit of all former agrarian combinations in Ireland, and the League, basing itself on the principle that its struggle is in the nature of a great economic industrial dispute between the tillers of the soil on the one

side and the rent-owners supported by a vast capital and territorial influence on the other, has relied for success upon those combinations for mutual protection and appeals to public opinion which the trades union laws have expressly authorised in the case of disputes between capital and labour of a non-agricultural character; that, nevertheless, this House has observed that the forces of the frown have been unconstitutionally employed, and public justice has been polluted in the interest of one of the parties to the dispute; that the right of public meeting has been capriciously suppressed; that prosecutions for conspiracy and Whiteboyism have been instituted in reference to open and advised appeals to public opinion and measures of mutual protection, which are indisputably within the right of trades unions in ordinary industrial struggles; that the power of contempt of court has been unconstitutionally and oppressively abused for the purpose of inflicting prolonged sentences of imprisonment without trial; that the right of trial by jury has been outraged by the systematic exclusion from the jury box of all jurors sharing the politics or creed of the accused, and the empannelling of juries composed exclusively of sympathisers with the territorial class; that the liberty of the press in Ireland has been assailed, and influential organs of opinion prosecuted in the endeavour to silence public comment on this iniquitous system; that grievous and vindictive fines have been exacted from districts obnoxious to the landlord interest by means of charges for extra police quartered upon peaceful populations, and that the people of Ireland have been subjected to divers others the like cruel oppressions and provocations. And humbly to represent to Your Majesty that it being of the highest constitutional import to encourage the Irish people to seek the redress of their grievances by the fullest freedom of speech and of combination which is warranted by the example of the trades unions of Great Britain, this House is of opinion that the attacks at present directed by the Executive against the rights of free speech and of combination in Ireland should cease, and that the legislation protecting the trades unions in the exercise of their rights of combination against capital and non-union labour should be extended to all agricultural combinations of a similar character in that country.";(Mr. William O'Brien.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

\*MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): After the two very able and eloquent speeches delivered from these benches in support of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork, I feel as if it would be beating the air for me to reiterate any of the arguments used by either of the hon. Gentlemen. Both of these Gentlemen spoke of their experience in jury-packing as practised in the provinces of Munster, Leinster, and Connaught. I intend to speak of jury-packing in the province with which the right hon. the Attorney-General for Ireland and myself are more intimately acquainted than we are with any of these other provinces. As one residing all my lifetime in or about the city of Londonderry, and having had a large and rather varied experience of the criminal courts in Ulster as at present constituted, I feel it my duty to give to this House, and especially hon. Members from England and Scotland, some of my experiences in jury-packing as it is practised in Ulster.

Attention called to the fact that forty Members were not present (Mr. JOHN CAMPBELL). House counted, and, forty Members being found present; \*MR. O'DOHERTY (continuing): I was referring to the fact that my experience of the maladministration of the law was confined practically to Ulster. Now, I do not intend to detain the House with statistics or with reports, true though they may be, which I have read in the columns of the daily press in Ireland with reference to the provinces other than Ulster. I will try to confine myself to my own experience on these two counts of jury-packing and maladministration of the law. The hon. Member for Cork referred to the fact that not a single Catholic was allowed to sit upon any jury in trials lately held in Connaught, Minister, or Leinster. That may be made an argument by the Treasury Bench that no Catholic sitting on a jury in these provinces would commit an Irishman charged with an offence which they believed did not lie under English laws, and an offence for which no man could be convicted in this country; but if this is the law in Minister, Leinster, and Connaught, why is it not the law in Ulster? In the case of a man tried there for an offence, do the Crown call upon any Orangemen to stand aside?

No; with the result that at a trial held some time ago in Londonderry, where one or two men were put into the dock, and where the charge was conclusively brought home, the Orangeman was acquitted by his brother Orangemen in the jury box. So glaring was the injustice that the worthy judge who presided at that trial said, "That may be your verdict, but you will not get twelve men in the whole of the United Kingdom to agree with you." After that instance of maladministration that goes on in Londonderry, in after years did the Crown, when Orangemen were being tried for party offences, order the Orangemen whose names appeared in the jury panel to stand aside? Certainly not Why? Because these Orange gentlemen are the leaders of Unionist public opinion in that constituency which is represented by the hon. Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland, and if the law was administered in Ulster as in the other provinces; the law for which he is responsible; this House would lose a brilliant ornament. Mere papists in Munster, Leinster, Connaught, and Ulster can never do any good at Parliamentary elections, and their feelings are accordingly never respected. Take the constituency which I have the honour to represent. North Donegal forms a portion of a county which was admitted, in answer to a question put by me a few nights ago to the Chief Secretary for Ireland, to be the most crimeless county in the three kingdoms. Yet the greater portion of the county is proclaimed under the Peace Preservation Act; but the remarkable fact is that that portion of the county which is not proclaimed is situated in East Donegal, a division in which the Unionists have the only chance whatever of capturing the seat, and the reason for it, to me, is as plain as a pikestaff. It is because there are a large number of Unionists inhabiting that district. Yet that portion which is not proclaimed has been proved to have far more crime in proportion to its population than the other seven-eighths of the county. The only conclusion we can form, therefore, is that the Government has not proclaimed this district in order to pander to the wishes of the Orange leaders. Going further towards the south, some months ago in the town of Portadown, in the constituency of North

Armagh, a defenceless body of Catholic youths, lead by their pastor, went to Bundoran on an excursion. After a short service in the church they started on their way to the railway station, and on their way they were set upon by the Orange roughs of the district, and some of them were butchered even nearly to death. Was a single man brought to justice for that outrage? Not one. No doubt a few were asked to appear before the magistrate sitting in petty sessions in that town, and show cause why they should not be bound over to keep the peace; but what was the result? They proved an alibi, although the most conclusive evidence was produced that they were guilty, and in that case not a single man was convicted beyond a few monetary fines. These facts were reported to Dublin Castle, and a demand was made by the Catholic people of that district that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into the maladministration of justice in that town, with the result that the gentlemen who animate Dublin Castle did not deign to send a reply to the people and the Catholic pastor of that town.

With reference to the United Irish League, the hon. Member for North Derry is probably aware of the fact that it has spread in his own constituency, as in every other, and I have no doubt whatever, after what has occurred this evening, and on other occasions, the League is bound to gain ground in Ulster, where Protestant and Orange farmers will join it, with the result that hon. Members opposite, who have always to do so, will have to obey the behest of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House, and vote for the Government against the wishes of their constituents. The First Lord of the Treasury might adopt with success the practice adopted in China, and send a silken rope to each of these gentlemen, with the request that they would commit political suicide. The Chief Secretary for Ireland, who is responsible for the government of that country to this House, boasted some weeks ago that he was half an Irishman. I would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to remember that his ancestors have sympathised with the

people, helped them in their troubles, and sympathised with their grievances, and I would appeal to him to embrace the opportunity now offered from these benches, in the present state of affairs in Ireland, to reform the maladministration of Dublin Castle of which we go much complain. By granting the claims of Ireland, he will put an end for ever to the interminable conflict that has gone on for the last century, and by administering the laws in Ireland in the way in which they are administered in England would do much to remove the complaints that arise from these benches. Hon. Members on these benches do not complain of the laws, but of the maladministration of the laws.

\*MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I agree with everything said by the hon. Member for Cork in his vigorous and pointed denunciation of the system of persecution which the Irish Nationalists who have identified themselves with the United Irish League are being subjected to. I desire particularly to associate myself with him because of the way we have been treated in the county Longford, one of the divisions of which I have the honour to represent in this House. It has been made the theatre of this persecuting system, Probably in the whole of the province of Leinster there is not a county which has had so fair a record



for perfect and absolute freedom from crime as Longford. The hon. Member for Cork has in his speech referred to the fact that, as regards the province of Munster, judge after judge at the assizes had congratulated its grand juries on the crimelessness and peacefulness of that province. I say that if the charges of the assize judges who have visited Longford from time to time are looked up by the representatives of the Government it will be found that for at least the past three years; I might say for the past ten years; absolutely no crime of any serious kind has prevailed in the county of Longford. So late as the March assizes of 1900 Mr. Justice Kenny, whose partiality to the League I think is not particularly admitted on these benches, a former Solicitor General in this House, congratulated the grand jury of the county of Longford on the peacefulness of the county. When the United Irish League was established in the county a few busybodies in the police force of that county took it into their heads to persecute the people because of the fact that they had once more joined themselves with their brother Nationalists in their fight for the redemption of their native land. An attempt was made first of all to intimidate the Nationalists from taking part in public meetings. Because the hon. Gentleman who so worthily represents South Mayo came into the district and organised the League, the police, who knew perfectly well that he was doing good work among the people, made a dead set on the hon. Gentleman without any cause whatever except a few references which he made in a speech. He was hauled before a bench of magistrates, and a prosecution was instituted by the Government, who sought to convict him and send him to gaol under the ancient statute of Edward III. He was represented as a person of ill fame whose committal to gaol was requisite in the interest of peace and good order in the community. I do not know whether it was with the cognisance of the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General, but as elaborate arrangements were made as if it was for a great State trial. A particularly offensive gentleman; I use the words advisedly in presence of the right hon. Gentleman; a particularly offensive Crown prosecutor was sent down to Longford to conduct the State trial. Mr. Morphy was despatched with an immense number of law books and a great deal of impudence and cheek to instruct the magistrates of county Longford in their duty. I wish to point out that not content with relying upon the ordinary administrators of the law and your own removable Tory magistrates, you imported a second resident magistrate, Mr. Jones, of Boyle, to assist in the conviction of my hon. friend, and by that means you were able to secure the sending of the hon. Gentleman for two months to Sligo gaol. Well, I do not think the Crown were well advised in the course they took, because, instead of allaying the process of insubordination to the law, you simply threw oil upon the fire, and I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that from that time forward, if there had been any hesitancy whatever in pushing forward the work of the League, it advanced by leaps and bounds in county Longford. That was only, as it were, the first step in the proceedings. The next were of a very much graver nature. My hon. friend the Member for Cork read a letter which was addressed by the secretary of a branch of the League in Kerry to a land-grabber to attend a meeting of the League for the purpose of having his case investigated. That letter was in my

opinion a perfectly civil invitation. [Laughter.] Gentlemen, of course, laugh at the statement that it was a civil invitation. Well, in the county Longford there was even less offence in a letter addressed to a grazier in the district asking him whether he intended to continue holding a grazing farm which he had been holding for some years past. That was seized upon by the Crown as another case under the Whiteboy Acts, and Mr. James Killeen was hauled up and arraigned before a tribunal for writing a threatening letter. It seems to me that the Crown have very little regard for the taxpayers of these kingdoms. They made most elaborate preparations to convict Mr. Killeen. It did not satisfy them to deal with him at petty sessions. They sent him for trial at the assizes. When all the elaborate preparations for the trial were complete, a frivolous excuse; I describe it as nothing else; was seized upon by the Crown for the purpose of postponing the trial and having him sent to where a packed jury could be found to convict him at the winter assizes. The pretence was that in a Catholic and Nationalist county like Longford a fair trial could not be had. This attempt to shift the case to the winter assizes was met by the counsel for the traverser, who said to the Crown;

"We will not challenge one single Protestant juror. We will leave you to empanel a whole jury of Protestants, and we will take them in order to show that we are not afraid to submit the justice of this case to a jury of our county-men."

But the Crown solicitor had his instructions, and he, in the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Attorney General, moved for the place of trial being changed. They brought the traverser to Wicklow in December last, and there exercised their right of challenge to the fullest extent. They tried him before Mr. Justice Burton and a jury mainly of Protestants of the county Wicklow. In the course of the trial Mr. Justice Burton, who was a member of the Government, acted; I am bound to give him credit and I feel pleasure in doing so; as a just and impartial judge between the traverser and the Crown, and the case for the Crown was absolutely scouted out of court. They arraigned Mr. Killeen on sixteen counts, but the Wicklow jury had common sense, and flung fifteen of these counts bodily out of court. I believe that when you come forward with the last leg on which you have to stand, the result will be the same.

Well, Sir, that did not finish these cases. Another case precisely similar occurred in the same county. One Sunday morning an innocent, harmless, and well-conducted young man, the secretary of the Dromard branch of the League, was found in broad daylight putting up a notice at the chapel gate. The notice stated that it was against the rules of the League to occupy land on the eleven months system. The young man when committing this act implicitly believed that the law allowed him to do so, but the county police inspector, bearing an honoured name, which he has dishonoured, in my opinion, started a persecution, and again you had the whole paraphernalia of a great state trial initiated at Ballinamuck. Sir, such conduct, as events proved, is absurd and ridiculous. What about the expense of all this? Of course, you do not care; you are quite satisfied, and would be if the expense was ten times as much. I implicitly and

honestly believe that the Crown officials are delighted to have these prosecutions, because of the big fees they are able to draw from them. This man was brought up at Ballinamuck, and from there you sent him to Wicklow, although his counsel offered to take a Protestant jury in county Longford, and not to challenge a single man. There you empanelled a jury, and endeavoured, as far as possible, to prejudice them by representing county Longford to be in a disturbed condition. They have a district inspector in Granard, an English importation named Rodwell, and this

gentleman was informed; he never saw them himself; that in certain places around the town of Granard iron spikes had been found in a meadow some time in July, and because iron spikes were found in a meadow at Granard after the posting of these notices the charges to your grand juries melted into thin air, and the whole county of Longford was in a state of revolution. What view did your Unionist jury of Wicklow take of that evidence and of the case as presented by a very eminent counsel at the Irish Bar? They simply kicked it out of court. They returned a verdict of not guilty, and Mr. Murtagh went home feeling greatly aggrieved that he had been troubled by the Crown exercising its big prerogative of indicting anybody it likes or anything it likes. What had occurred in the court of first instance in these cases? In the case of Murtagh, the magistrates, by three to two, discharged the prisoner. But they reckoned without the Attorney General. He was still in the background. I suppose Mr. Fleming, the Crown Prosecutor; I have a great respect for him, he once got me two months in jail for a speech; was of opinion that it was a slight upon his professional ability, and therefore he appealed to his friend the Attorney General, who, in the exercise of the powers vested in him, sent up a Bill before the grand jury of county Longford, some of whom were the very men who owned these farms. Talk about rigging a Bench; One of these grand jurors of county Longford actually told the judge from the jury-box that he was a witness for the Crown; Well, Mr. Speaker, at Wicklow the Crown were disappointed and Murtagh is at large to-day, and, if it is any consolation to the right hon. Gentleman to know it, he is just as little converted to the ways of landlords and Unionists as ever. We have the advantage in this House of being able to address questions direct to the Chief Secretary and the Attorney General on matters connected with this organisation, but I doubt whether it would have been possible to extract from them many of the facts which I have laid before the House. I think the Attorney General will not deny that I have substantially and correctly stated the two cases to which I have referred, but in spite of the breakdown at the winter assizes we are now told that one of these young men (Mr. J. J. Killeen) is to be still further persecuted by another arraignment at the coming March assizes.

Some people are so stupid that they never learn anything, and I suppose the Crown have learnt nothing by their experience of the two trials. Let them by all means pull ahead. They will find it utterly impossible before any rationally constituted tribunal in the land to convince any jury that the charges of the judges whom you send on circuit to Longford are untrue, and that county Longford is in a disturbed condition. We are organised from end to end, and, please God,

we will keep organised. I believe that the Chief Secretary, so far as his entourage will allow him is desirous of doing fairly what he can for the social good of the country. But such antics as these are merely bringing your Government in to deeper contempt in the minds of the people of Ireland. In the United Irish League there has not been for a moment a suggestion of crime or outrage. To my own knowledge, within the last few weeks, when statements were made which in the opinion of the executive of the organisation should not have been made regarding particular cases is county Longford the executive of the League did more by condemning such conduct to preserve peace and good order in the county than all the police you could import Sir it is time that this farce should cease. It is time that we should be allowed to go to our public meetings as free citizens in a free land. What occurs at present? A train cannot go to any humble village in Ireland at which there is not a policeman on the platform with his notebook in his pouch, prepared to take down the names of any hon. Member of this House or anybody else whom he suspects of not being a true-blue loyalist or Unionist. At our public meetings; and on this point I desire to appeal specially to the Chief Secretary; you have established a system of spying which, I believe is absolutely repugnant to the feelings of the police themselves. What was the evidence in one of these cases? In the case against the hon. Member for South Mayo four different policemen were called to give evidence. They went in couples to the meeting, and neither was told that the other was to take notes so that each would be a spy on the other. How did they take notes? One said he took notes with his notebook on his hand under his cape, and when he came to read his notes in court he could not decipher a single word. What happened then? The Crown Prosecutor said, "Give us your recollection of what was said." I am not surprised that the magistrates could not stand this humbug. Even the resident magistrate of Longford was compelled to call upon the Crown Prosecutor to cease from putting in such evidence. If you want to take notes of our meetings send properly qualified men. None of us are ashamed of what we say, or afraid of it being taken down, or, if you like, recorded by a phonograph and repeated for the delectation of the gentlemen at Dublin Castle; but for goodness sake do not take these poor policemen from their barracks and give them instructions to take mental notes. Just imagine an Irish policeman taking a mental note of the proceedings, and confounding and confusing even the magistrate himself when he comes to narrate what went on.

I feel bound to say, however, that is one reason why I do not very much wish this system of spying put down. In my opinion there is nothing that has so helped the United Irish League, or so convinced the people that it has the true ring about it, as the presence of your helmeted spies at our meetings. Keep sending them if you like, but for decency's sake, and for the sake of accuracy; upon which, I suppose, the right hon. Gentleman is very strong; let us not be subjected to this process of evidence from mental notes. We are a peaceful people, and the most bigoted and rabid administrator in this country cannot find a single act of the United Irish League which could in the slightest degree be interpreted as an act of Whiteboyism. We protest in the strongest

manner against the insult conveyed in these prosecutions towards our organisation and our people, and if the right hon. Gentleman is properly advised he will drop the process of instituting contempt of court motions and Whiteboy prosecutions on the mental notes of Irish policemen. I beg to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Cork City.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Before the right hon. Gentleman replies, I would ask him to allow me one or two brief minutes, because I desire to address one or two questions to him upon a particular case which has not been mentioned, and which I desire he should address his attention to in reply. It is not my intention to take part in the debate generally at this stage, and I would much prefer that some of my hon. friends and colleagues who have been actively engaged in the proceedings; before the House should speak on this occasion. The case to which I wish to draw attention is one of very great importance, because it concerns the freedom of the press in Ireland, and it is one in which I am personally interested in a particular way, because it concerns my own constituency. Amongst the cases mentioned by my hon. friend who introduced this motion was a prosecution in the county of Waterford, and it was pointed out that as the case may be considered still sub judice, he could not discuss the case. I have no intention of discussing the case, but I desire to call the attention of the Attorney General and the House to one particular incident that arose in the hearing before the magistrates which is now at an end. It is a case of conspiracy, and amongst other means taken to secure a conviction the Government subpoenaed the editor of the leading paper in the city of Waterford, and they asked him to give evidence of this character. It was not alleged that he had published anything in his paper which was in the least degree illegal, or no doubt he would have been prosecuted, as the proprietors of the Kilkenny papers were. There was no allegation that Mr. Redmond, the editor of this paper, had published anything illegal, but the Crown found themselves in a difficulty to prove conspiracy, and they subpoenaed Mr. Redmond to come forward to give evidence as to the handwriting of reports which had been supplied to him in his professional capacity as editor of the paper. I ask the Attorney General whether that is not a somewhat cruel position to place the editor of a newspaper in? Suppose he was mean enough to give evidence, it would mean his ruin; and if he does not give his evidence he is committed for contempt of court. There were four magistrates on the bench, but the editor of this paper refused to give evidence. He said that apart from politics, or what his own opinion might be, he considered that, as a journalist, he would be guilty of dishonourable conduct if he betrayed the confidence of his correspondents. It may be in the recollection of the Attorney General that a case of this kind was tried in the county of Limerick against a journalist who happened to be a Unionist. But he stood by his guns, and as a Unionist he said that he could not honourably give evidence, and I believe that he was committed for contempt of court. The Government, however, found the position so untenable that he was released in a very few days. Mr. Morphy, who represents the Crown, threatened the editor of this paper with a committal for contempt of court, but he was unable to carry out this threat because the opinion of the Bench was divided.

What I desire to call the Attorney General's attention to is that the Crown Prosecutor stated openly in court with reference to this editor, that he would summon him as a witness to the assizes before the judge, and he further added: "Then this gentleman will get short shrift." That phrase was reported in all the papers in Dublin and in the provinces. I have not risen to take part in the general debate, but I do press upon the Attorney General and the Government that this is a most contemptible way of attempting to get evidence of conspiracy. They have nothing against this editor, and they cannot put their finger upon a single sentence of an illegal character in his paper. They ask him to come forward and be guilty of a breach of his honourable confidence as a journalist, in order to secure the conviction of prisoners in a conspiracy prosecution. Possibly the Attorney General has never heard of this case of Mr. Redmond. I would ask him to have inquiries made, and to defend at the Table if he can this process. There was recently a meeting held in Dublin of the Irish Journalists Association, which is very largely made up of Unionists, and is not by any means a Nationalist organisation, and this association unanimously passed a resolution approving of the action of Mr. Redmond, and calling upon him for the honour of the journalistic profession to stand by his guns. I ask, is this gentleman going to be sent to prison for refusing to give evidence? I ask the Attorney General to give this his attention, and to give us some justification of the action which the Government have taken in the matter.

MR. ATKINSON (who was imperfectly heard) said that, in reply to the hon. and learned Member, he might state that he was not acquainted with the facts of the case which he had just mentioned, but he would have inquiries made, and, if it should be found possible, the evidence of the editor alluded to should be dispensed with. He quite appreciated the position. He did not, however, intend to follow the hon. Member for Cork through his discursive, vehement, and he might almost say venomous speech, or through all the different questions which the hon. Member had touched upon in his Amendment.

This Amendment was, he understood, unique in the history of the Parliamentary proceedings in this House. It was unique in its length and unique in the variety of subjects with which it dealt. There was room enough under Mr. Gladstone's umbrella for all the different sections of the Liberal party, and certainly there would be room enough under this Amendment for all the different sections of the Nationalist party which the hon. Member for Cork had succeeded in welding together. It was impossible for him to follow the hon. Member at such length, and he would only now deal with questions of a legal character, for which he was more especially responsible, and he would leave his right hon. friend the Chief Secretary to deal with the general questions of policy.

The hon. Member had said that the Lord Chief Justice at Cork said that as yet no facts had been disclosed to justify the Government in proclaiming the League as an illegal association. The League had not been proclaimed as an illegal association because there was no evidence forthcoming that it was an association for the purpose of promoting an illegal object. But that was far from saying that there had not been illegal methods resorted to by members of the League and advocated by the League. He had by him there, and, if necessary, he could quote

them, dozens of speeches delivered by different members of the Irish party, from the hon. Member for Cork downwards, in which, publicly, upon every platform, again and again boycotting was advocated. [Nationalist cheers.] He was glad that the hon. Member had the courage of his opinions, and did not shrink from the statements he had made. He had told men again and again that, because a man took land from which another man had been evicted, or because he took land which the League said he ought not to take, nobody was to speak to him, nobody was to buy from him, nobody was to sell to him, and that he should be treated as a pariah and incur a fate almost worse than death, and be subjected to social ostracism and financial ruin. [Nationalist cheers and cries of "Hear, hear."] He was glad that he did not misrepresent hon. Members. By this means intimidation and tyranny were to be executed on this man. That was a crime. [An HON. MEMBER: What is?] Intimidation was a crime by English law, although it was not a crime according to the law of the League. The Government were bound to administer English law. [An IRISH MEMBER: What is intimidation?] The hon. Member wished to administer the law of the League and degrade juries into instruments for administering the law of the League, and that was the cause of the outcry against what had been called "jury packing." [Hear, hear.] He was glad that there was no concealment by the hon. Member opposite, but it was a crime according to the law of the land to intimidate a man in such a way as to prevent him exercising his right to do what seemed to him the best thing if he kept within his legal rights.

The hon. Member had been vehement in his denunciation of grabbers. What was a grabber? [Several HON. MEMBERS: Robbers.] A "grabber" was a man who had a perfect right to the protection of the law of this country, and the Government were bound to administer the law in such a case. If this so-called grabber took a farm, the law of the League, which was based on mean and cowardly tyranny, at once declared that the man had committed a sin. The Administration was bound, as long as the law prevailed, to protect that grabber from intimidation.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: But not to force the public into a shop.

MR. ATKINSON said he would deal with that presently. In the meantime he wished to call attention to another well-known judgment by the late Lord Bramwell, who said that "liberty of thought and mind is the privilege of every Englishman, but still if any two or more men agree among themselves to coerce that liberty of thought and mind by constraint, they would be guilty of an offence." [An HON. MEMBER on the Irish benches: What about the pro-Boers?] The hon. Member had asked why should we force the public into a shop. He was perfectly correct in saying that any man in the community had an absolute right to go into another man's shop or to stay out of it, but no man had a right to counsel and procure a number of men to league themselves together for the purposes of ruining a particular tradesman by abstaining from entering his shop. That was a distinction which had been laid down again and again by judge after judge, but it was a distinction which hon. Members from Ireland opposite ignored, because they knew that if they observed it, it would paralyse their combination. [An HON. MEMBER from the Irish benches: You do it on the other side.] He would show that that was an ignorant and absurd contention. Take the well-known historic

case. Every person that went to a theatre could applaud whom he pleased when he was pleased. and he could hiss when displeased; but the Duke of Brunswick many years ago had a verdict returned against him because he banded together a number of persons to go to a theatre for the purpose of injuring a particular actor by hissing him off the stage. [An HON. MEMBER on the Irish benches: What about the Great Mogul case?]

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; I must appeal to hon. Members to extend more courtesy to the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. ATKINSON said he was quite familiar with the Great Mogul case against Macgregor, in which it was rightly held that traders in pursuit of their own interests might combine to promote that interest, although incidentally in the promotion of it they injured the interests of other people. That was quite true, but it was equally true that the Great Mogul case laid it down that when people combined together, not for the purpose of promoting their own trading interests, but for the purpose of injuring the property of some individual who was obnoxious to them, that was a crime. It was an idle pretence to take shelter behind such a contention, and he was astonished that hon. Gentlemen, who claimed for themselves such outspoken courage, were not ashamed in that House to do so, for they were not traders. The course they had pursued was that they had told the people of Ireland that the man who took an evicted farm was their enemy, that he deserved no quarter, no justice, no fair play; [Cries from the Irish benches of "Oh, oh;" and "No &#x0021;"]; that nobody was to speak to him, that nobody was to work for him, that nobody was to buy his beasts at a fair, and that they were to inflict upon him social ostracism and financial ruin. That was not fair. It was punishing a man because he did not agree with their views, because he would not forward their organisation, and because he would not obey their law, which was not the law of the country in which he lived. It had been said again and again that the League was like a trade union; but there was a wide difference. Trade unions were formerly illegal, that is, it was illegal for workmen to combine together, because it was said they formed a conspiracy in restraint of trade. The old law was abolished, and trade unions could now refuse to work for any man, they could combine not to work for anyone, they could support each other in this refusal to work, but they could not intimidate. [An IRISH MEMBER: Picketing;] This very question of picketing came up in the case of Lyons v. Wilkins. The union had picketed the hands in a particular employment, not for the bona fide purpose of obtaining information, but for the purpose of inducing them to leave their employment. Here was what Lord Justice Lindley said;

"Strikes and trade unions, which were formerly considered illegal, have now been legalised; at all events, so far as the doctrines as to restraint of trade are concerned; and a strike can be conducted up to a certain point with perfect legality. That is to say, persons can not only decline individually to work for a master except upon terms which the workmen desire, but they can combine to do that. They can combine to leave him; they can strike unless he will raise the wages up to what they desire, and trade unions, which assist them in withdrawing their own labour and declining to work, and which assist them in supporting



themselves during the strike, can legally do so." Now, Parliament has not yet conferred upon trade unions the power to coerce people, and to prevent them from working for whomsoever they like, upon any terms they like; and yet in the absence of such a power it is obvious a strike may not be effective and may not answer the purpose. Some strikes are perfectly effective by virtue of the strike, and other strikes are not effective unless the next step can be taken, and unless other people can be prevented from taking the place of the strikers. That is the pinch of the case in trade disputes; and until Parliament confers on trade unions the power of saying to other people, 'You shall not work for those who are desirous of employing you upon such terms as you may mutually agree upon,' trade unions exceed their power when they try to compel people not to work except on the terms fixed by the unions. I need hardly say that up to the present moment no such power as that exists. By the law of this country no one has ever, and no set of people have ever had that right or that power." Trade unions have now been recognised, up to a certain point, as organs for good. They are the only means by which workmen can protect themselves from tyranny on the part of those who employ them; but the moment that trade unions become tyrants, in their turn they are engines for evil; they have no right to prevent any man from working on such terms as he chooses." One cannot say, as an abstract proposition, that all picketing is unlawful, because if all that is done is attending at or near a house in order merely to obtain or communicate information, that is lawful. But it is easy to see how, under colour of so attending, a great deal may be done which is absolutely illegal. It would be wrong to post people about a place of business or a house under pretence of merely obtaining or communicating information, if the object and effect were to compel the person so picketed not to do that which he has a perfect right to do; and it is because this proviso is often abused and used for an illegal purpose that such disputes as these very often arise."

What became of the pretence that, when a wretched man came before the Land League and knew that unless he obeyed the behests of the League he would be boycotted, that was not worse than picketing? There was no analogy, as the hon. Member for Cork suggests, between trade unions and the League which he has inaugurated and promoted. And for this simple reason, that the League acts by intimidation, and the trade unions cannot act by intimidation. The exhortation had been delivered many times by the League over the country that if turbulence was maintained the Government must yield. Happily the advice had not been generally taken, although there had been some slight increase of crime since the League was inaugurated.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Where?

MR. ATKINSON: All over Ireland. He had not time to give the particulars, but it was crime almost entirely consisting of sending threatening letters, of boycotting, and intimidation. When the hon. Gentleman said that the League was crimeless he stated what was inaccurate. The hon. Member for Cork had drawn a picture of Ireland which, if true, would indicate that Ireland was in a parlous case; because, according to him, the forces of the Crown were unconstitutionally employed, justice was perverted, prosecutions were instituted without

justification, and the most grinding and cruel tyranny which existed anywhere prevailed in Ireland. And the hon. Member said that, notwithstanding all that, Ireland was in a state of peace, although he wondered it was so. There was no restraint of free speech for hon. Members in that House, and they said the same things in Ireland, so that it was preposterous to talk of their being muzzled. He defied any hon. Member to point to any prosecutions for sedition except one, or to any prosecutions for anything but conspiracy to tyrannise and intimidate. He did not understand what right the hon. Gentleman had to arrogate to himself the right, because some individual made himself objectionable to him, to make a public speech and to instigate the persons to whom he spoke to inflict upon that man temporal loss and perhaps temporal ruin. He had no right to do so. It was an arrogant assumption on his part, and if he resorted to it he off ended the law and must be brought to book by the law. He defied the hon. Gentleman to point to a single case during the time he had had the honour to hold a law office under the Crown in Ireland where a man had been prosecuted except for intimidating or boycotting. Men from time to time had, of course, been prosecuted, but only for those offences; but it was impossible for him at the present time to go into details. The hon. Member complained that there was no right of free speech in Ireland, but he thought if Members could make the same speeches in Ireland which they made in that House it was absurd to make such an allegation. We were also told there was no right of public meeting in Ireland. Out of 600 meetings only twenty-three had been interfered with.

Before passing away from the cases which the hon. Gentleman dealt with; he could not deal with them all and therefore he would refer to one. The hon. Member for Cork referred to the case of Sullivan. He was tried and acquitted. That case was made the subject of a debate in the previous year, and he really did not see why reference had been made again to the subject. He was tried and acquitted.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN said he was acquitted by a packed jury and was really convicted by eleven out of twelve, if the jury had been a free jury.

MR. ATKINSON said that was not true. He could not say how his friend professed to know the decision at which the jury arrived, he himself did not know it, and the hon. Gentleman, at all events, ought not to know it. However, Sullivan was tried and acquitted. He would have a word to say with regard to the jury a little later on. The hon. Member for Cork had referred to Lord O'Brien, but Lord O'Brien's charge; ought to be taken in its entirety, and if one half of his charge was quoted as being favourable to the League, he would be quite justified in referring to the other half. What was the charge? A wretched creature took a rood of land and held it for two years; the former tenant of the land thought he would like to get it back, and this wretched creature refused. He was summoned before the Lixnaw branch of the United Irish League, to which the complaint had been made that he refused to give up the land. Who made the complaint? [An IRISH MEMBER: The man who had been evicted.] He refused to give up this wretched rood of ground, but he offered £;2 to the other man; that was not satisfactory, and a proclamation was issued. He spoke from memory, and he believed the name of the man was Scanlan. A resolution was passed that, as John Scanlan

persisted in holding the plot of land in defiance of the wishes of the League, they called upon the people to mark their disapprobation in every constitutional way, and, if his memory did not deceive him, Scanlan was shortly afterwards found murdered on the high road. Lord O'Brien had said that the men in that ease were perfectly rightly convicted.

The only other case he would refer to was the case of the hon. Member for North Leitrim. That was also a pending case, and he had the greatest reluctance to indulge in any discussion at all upon the merits. He would just state what the crime was. A certain case was tried at Sligo and two men were convicted. A number of the jurors were set aside by the Crown when the jury was being sworn. Twenty-two men were set aside, and it subsequently turned out that seventeen out of the twenty-two were members of the League, and the two men who were tried were also members of the League, and objection had been made by the gentlemen representing the Crown, when the jury were being sworn, that it was undesirable that members of the League should serve upon the jury.

Now, the hon. Member for North Leitrim, according to the hon. Member for Cork, was charged with seditious libel merely for denouncing what he called the system of jury packing. [The right hon. Gentleman then read from the indictment in the case passages of the article charged as a seditious libel. The right hon.

Gentleman said he would make no comment upon that further than that it was what the hon. Member for Cork described as a moderate and temperate attack.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) asked whether there was anything in the article which would be called a crime in England.

MR. ATKINSON replied that he had already stated that he did not propose to discuss the case, but he would be surprised if an article of that kind on the administration of justice were not treated as a crime in England. He did not know whether hon. Members suggested that there should be no such thing on behalf of the Crown as conditional jurymen, that the Crown should not have power to set aside men. That was a

practice which had existed in both England and Ireland for 500 years. [Cries of "No" and "It has never been exercised."] It had been exercised.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where and when? MR. JOHN REDMOND: How long is it since the practice was exercised in this country?

MR. ATKINSON: The last case I am able to find is nine years ago. In 1876 in an Irish Act of Parliament this special right was preserved. I understand nobody has ever contended that this right could be dispensed with. It is the duty of the Crown solicitor to set aside a man when he has reason to believe that that man will not act fairly. This is a charge which has been made against every Government. I remember how the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Montrose Burghs was placarded through the streets of Dublin as the murderer of a man named Twist because under his rule twenty men were set aside at the trial of an almost professional assassin.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): The man was innocent of the crime.

MR. ATKINSON: We are acting under a circular put out by the right: hon. Gentleman.

\*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): Will the right hon. and learned Gentleman read that

circular?

MR. ATKINSON (after looking through his despatch-box): The circular expressly directs that no one is to be set aside; [Loud cries of "Read the circular."]; on account of his politics or religion; and no man has been set aside.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a damned lie.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; If I knew who the Member was who used that expression I should take very severe measures towards him.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast'S.): It was Mr. Bryn Roberts. [Interruption.]

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Will you please name the ruffian who said that? [Loud Nationalist cheers.]

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; Both hon. Members are to blame; the hon. Member for South Belfast, who, under a mistake, imputed offensive words to an hon. Gentleman who did not use them, and the hon. Member for the Eifion Division, who, instead of appealing to me to call upon that hon. Member to withdraw, took upon himself to use a violent expression. Both hon. Gentlemen are to blame, and I hope the incident is now at an end.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON: I beg to apologise for having mentioned the name of Mr. Bryn Roberts.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: I beg to withdraw the expression I used.

MR. ATKINSON said that no man had been set aside from acting on a jury on account of his religion. The hon. Member for North Cork, speaking with reference to the Cadogan case, asserted that the jurymen were set aside because they were Roman Catholics. That was a slander repeated day by day against the Crown. The officers of the Crown made no inquiry as to the religion of the men who served on juries; but, seeing the allegations, he caused inquiry to be made in Cadogan's case, with the result that he found that six of the men on the jury were Roman Catholics and six Protestants. The prisoner, moreover, challenged five Roman Catholic gentlemen of Cork as unfit to serve on the jury.

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: At the first trial, at which Justice Kennedy presided, there was not a single Catholic on the jury, and every man who was challenged was a Catholic.

MR. ATKINSON said he had not time to deal with the other matters which had been referred to; he would simply conclude by repeating that no man was set aside because of his religious or political faith, but in some cases where such issues were involved men who were strong partisans on either side were excluded from the jury.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland) congratulated the Attorney General on having given precisely the same answer as on previous occasions, and therefore his reply also would be practically the same. What were the admitted facts? In county Sligo there were 90,000 Catholics and 7,000 Protestants, and the right hon. Gentleman had the Parliamentary courage to declare that when a case came to be tried dealing with the great and permanent struggle between two classes in Ireland, to a certain extent between two races, and to a smaller extent between two creeds, having no regard whatever for religion or politics, it yet had come about that every one of the twelve men in the jury box was taken from

the 7,000 men of one creed, class, and political party. In county Cork the disparity between the two creeds was not quite so great, the figures being 390,000 Catholics and 35,000 Protestants, and here the right hon. Gentleman was able to give a case in which the jury consisted of six of one religion and six of the other, but he was not able to answer the statement or deny the fact that sixty-three men were ordered to stand by, every one of whom was a member of the Catholic majority. The right hon. Gentleman had apparently devised a system which infallibly, in a population in which the proportions of the two creeds were 90,000 against 7,000, brought out, purely by accident or coincidence, without any regard to religious or political convictions, twelve men of the faith and party represented by the minority of the population. If he could only devise a system which would have similar results in bringing out the winning numbers at Monte Carlo, there was not a newspaper in the country that would not give him the largest existing salary as the most successful tipster in the world. But was it not arguing a deeper depth of ignorance than even he (the speaker) could honestly attribute to the House of Commons that the right hon. Gentleman had the courage to say that a jury of such a character was not deliberately constituted with a view to packing the jury box with members of one religious creed and class and political party, so that the dice might be loaded and a verdict favourable to the Crown secured?

Since the opening of Parliament attention had been called to the Declaration which the Sovereign had to take. He was rather surprised that His Majesty's advisers had not felt it within their competence and power to advise the King not to repeat a form of Declaration which probably had gone out of use by mere lapse of time, and the words of which were offensive to millions of the subjects over whom he was called to reign. But if the Attorney General was justified in these proceedings in

Ireland, it was just the kind of Declaration the Sovereign of these realms ought to make. If it was true that a Catholic could not be trusted on his oath to give a true verdict in the jury-box, it was right that the Sovereign in the most solemn manner and at the first opportunity should denounce the religion which brought up its devotees to disregard the most solemn of oaths and the most sacred of duties. If the Government, however, wished to use the methods of autocracy in Ireland, let them do so openly, and not, under constitutional forms, endeavour by despotic methods to turn trial by jury into a farce and a falsehood.

He was glad the Attorney General had recognised the issue at stake. That issue was the United Irish League, and its methods and forms of combination. It was necessary for him to defend the aims and objects of that organisation, especially after the remarkable speech of the Chief Secretary for Ireland on the previous evening, which, in his opinion, was a very long step towards a system of compulsory purchase, and, coming from the Treasury Bench, would mark an epoch in the Irish land struggle. In a most striking passage in that speech the Chief Secretary objected to compulsory purchase because it would "freeze" Ireland, and gave a description of the 123,000 peasants with holdings of under £4 valuation and £3 average rental, or, as the right hon. Gentleman graphically put it, 14d.

a week, 2d. a day. "This," said the Chief Secretary, "is a part of the question which must not be lost sight of." Had the right hon. Gentleman been asleep during the last few months? That was exactly the part of the question that the United Irish League had not lost sight of. It was that very fact and factor of the land question that gave birth to the League. That organisation sprang to life in county Mayo, one of the counties in which this horrible system of miserable wretched patches of land obtained. It was the fact of these squalid patches of holdings existing side by side with splendid fertile lands, which for miles were unbroken by a single human face or habitation; it was the co-existence and juxtaposition of these two things that gave birth to the United Irish League, and the very

first plank in its platform was to bring about a state of feeling in Ireland and the House of Commons which would remedy that admitted evil by enlarging the small holdings and giving back to tillage and to man the land now given to sheep and oxen. He therefore claimed the Chief Secretary for Ireland, not as the first, but as one of the many illustrious converts which the United Irish League had already made. He claimed as another convert the right hon. Gentleman's predecessor in office, the present President of the Board of Trade, one of whose acts in office was the purchase of the Dillon Estate. That was an admirable act, and would be remembered to the honour of the right hon. Gentleman when other portions of his tenure of office were covered with blessed and kindly oblivion.

What was the object of that purchase? It was to do exactly that which the present Chief Secretary rightly said was one of the necessities of the land question, namely, to enlarge the small and squalid holdings which existed in that part of the country. The Dillon Estate was purchased for the purpose of enlarging the small and squalid holdings in that part of the country, and that was one of the very first fruits reaped by the people of Mayo from the agitation of his hon. friend. No doubt this point would receive the usual official answer, and the right hon. Gentleman would no doubt try to prove by some method of arithmetic that there was no connection whatever between the purchase of the Dillon Estate and the existence of the United Irish League. The right hon. Gentleman might be able to convince this House, but all the arguments and official facts which he could bring forward would not convince the people of Mayo, who believed that the purchase of the Dillon Estate was the result of the action of the United Irish League. He therefore claimed the present Chief Secretary for Ireland and the late Chief Secretary as devotees and worshippers of the United Irish League. He might very appropriately quote the famous gibe of Mr. Disraeli to Mr. Peel when he adopted Free Trade, that while his friends were out bathing they had stolen their clothes. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had found the members of the United Irish League

bathing, and he had stolen their clothes. He did not need to defend the legality of the United Irish League. The right hon. Gentleman's action had placed him in an extraordinary position. He got up prepared to defend the ethics, the legality, and the beneficence of the United Irish League against the attacks of the Government, who described the members of the League as marauders and robbers, and in the midst of his observations the Chief Secretary declared that

the only fault he had to find was that the League had stolen his thunder and that they were actually more loyal than the King.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I would remind the hon. Member that although our objects may be identical, yet the methods employed for achieving them may be diametrically opposite.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said he might be allowed to say that the right hon.

Gentleman's interruption did not strike him as being altogether relevant to the point, because the point he was making was the ends and not the means.

[Ministerial laughter.] He intended to deal with the means presently. He did not mean to shirk anything. He accepted to the full the challenge of the Attorney General, and he would defend both the methods and the means. It was not necessary for him to defend the legality of the League, because the Attorney General had admitted its legality. If the methods adopted by the League were illegal, why was it not proclaimed? If they were not legal, why was the League not prosecuted? The fact was that its legality was admitted. With regard to the means, he asked the attention of hon. Gentlemen opposite while he explained to them the historical and economic conditions which had produced such a form of combination in Ireland as the United Irish League. There was not anything in the combination of the League in Ireland which had not been gone through in England as well in the shape of combination. He challenged the right hon. and learned Gentleman's history with regard to trade unionism in England. Lord Justice Lindley said that trade unionists were not empowered by Parliament to use force for the purpose of getting others to work or to dissuade them from working. Parliament would never confer that power upon trade unionism, and no trade unionists would ask for that power. What they did claim as trade unionists, and what the League claimed in Ireland, was to use every method of argument, of persuasion, of approval, and of disapproval, to induce men either to work or not to work, on the ground that their action was not for the common good of the whole people. The right hon. and learned Gentleman did not seem to be aware even of the events of his own days. Some years ago the dockers struck for an increase of wages, and they got much sympathy, not only from Members sitting on the Opposition side of the House, but also from many of the hon. Gentlemen opposite. What did the hon. Member for Battersea do? He not only asked the dockers of London to abstain from work, but he went down to the docks whenever he heard that "blacklegs" were coming from Hull, Liverpool, or Glasgow, and he begged, persuaded, and appealed to them not, for their own petty interests, to break down the great struggle for the right of the men to receive better wages, and to maintain a better standard of living. Was he prosecuted? Did the Attorney General come down and declare that he was guilty of intimidation, violence, and coercion? Was the hon. Member for Battersea tried at the Old Bailey by a jury of shipowners? Was he tried by a jury of dock shareholders? No, he was allowed to go down there, his liberty was not assailed, and to-day he was one of the most honoured, and justly honoured, Members of that assembly, and the part he played in the strike was one of the best things he ever did in his career. At the beginning of this century, four or five compositors were sent to gaol because they formed a union to increase wages. In

the year 1834 seven agricultural labourers were sent beyond the seas because they wished to form an agricultural union in every county in England. To-day, in Ireland, they were fighting against prosecutions with packed juries and magistrates dependent upon the Executive for their appointment, their promotion, their pensions, and even for the food they ate, and all this which they were now passing through in Ireland was passed through in England half a century ago. In Ireland they were now fighting for the rights which Englishmen gained half a century ago. The United Irish League said that a "grabber" was an enemy of the tenantry of Ireland, and of the people of Ireland; and they put a "grabber" in Ireland in exactly the same category as the trade unionists of England put the "nobstick" or the "blackleg." One of the real secrets of the virulence of the land question, of the famine, and of many of the evils in Ireland during the first half of the nineteenth century, was the insane and mad competition between tenant and tenant for the possession of land. He could not blame the tenant. In Ireland they had not the same industries as they had in England or Scotland. With the exception of a portion of the north of Ireland they had practically only one industry and one kind of employment for the people. All around them was uncertainty and shifting sand. The land was the one solid and substantial thing in Ireland to which everybody clung, and for which everybody longed. It was exactly as if they had a shipwrecked vessel with four hundred or five hundred passengers all swimming about in mid ocean, with only some thirty or forty small logs of wood to cling to. They stood between destruction and death. In the first half of the last century life in Ireland was poisoned by the frenzied desire of the people to get the land at any price. Mr. Mill in his book gave an instance in which the competition for a farm worth £;50 a year rose to such an extent that a bidder was declared the tenant at £;450 a year; that was to say at £;400 a year more than the land could possibly bear. Under these circumstances the industry of the tenant could benefit no one but the landlord. Now, the landgrabber was the shopkeeper and the gombeen man. They heard a great deal about intimidation. If the Attorney General could prove that the United Irish League had led to crime he would have nothing further to say. But he held that the League had been proved to be a crimeless organisation, and that the only intimidation which it employed was the rule of every trade union. He was surprised at the right hon. Gentleman's vehemence against trade unions, for of all the trade unions in the country there was not one that had a severer code of professional etiquette than that to which the right hon. Gentleman, as a member of the Bar, himself belonged. The right hon. Gentleman had no fear of the legal landgrabber, because he knew perfectly well that the professional body of which he was a member would soon deal with that individual, and see that the right hon. Gentleman got the number of guineas on his brief which the league of the lawyers imposed. Then there was the medical profession. What trade unions had severer codes than the legal and medical professions? The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury the previous evening was courageous enough to speak of Ireland as being in a prosperous condition, and one of the reasons he gave was that the country had the same population now as at the beginning of the century. The contention of



the Irish representatives was that there was scarcely a field in Ireland that did not contain a living tomb in the shape of an evicted household, that did not speak of a sad and hideous domestic crisis; and they believed that in the United Irish League they had found a means, not only of saving the individual farmer, but of saving the nation from the ruin with which it was threatened.

He had one word to say in conclusion to the Chief Secretary. He had never said, and never should say, one word against him personally; he hoped to fight him politically, and politically only. He thought the position of the Chief Secretary was difficult, almost pathetic. He had in his veins the blood of one of the martyrs for Irish liberty, and he could not imagine for him a more glorious destiny than that he should complete the work which his ancestor began, to make Ireland free. But whatever his future might be, the United Irish League was too powerful now to be destroyed. Every blow he delivered at it would not weaken it, but strengthen it. Already it had won victories which entitled it to the gratitude of Irishmen. Those benches were proof of the fact that the Irish party were united, for the first time in ten years, in the bonds of discipline and loyalty one to the other. What brought them together? The United Irish League.

MR. WYNDHAM: Mr. Speaker, I feel bound to rise at this period of the debate and after the speech to which the House has just listened. But I must not be carried away by the rhetorical appeal which the hon. Member made. He gave a reason, with which everybody must be familiar by now, for expecting that I should at any rate do my best for Ireland while I occupy the position of Chief Secretary. But in my opinion the best thing that any Chief Secretary can do for Ireland is to keep a cool head and look at the problems which are presented to him with as much calm attention as he can command. What we are asked to look at tonight is mainly the United Irish League, its nature, its objects, and the methods it adopts to achieve those objects. I hope I shall be able to distinguish between the value of some of the objects which the League pursues and some of the methods which, in my opinion, should be reprehended and contemned by this House, and, when they are illegal, prosecuted by the law officers of the Crown.

We are debating to-night an Amendment to the Address in the body of which there are many stings, but the point of which is in the last paragraph ;whereas the United Irish League desires to effect certain objects, and, whereas the nefarious proceedings of the Government interfere with the means adopted by the League to achieve these objects, therefore;and here we come to the point;we ask His Majesty's Government to extend the legislative protection of the Trade Union Act to all agricultural combinations in Ireland. That really is the Amendment before the House. The proposition that we should extend the Trade Union Act to agricultural combinations in Ireland would not alarm me if it were practicable to regard the small farmers as in any sense either workmen or masters. But I very much doubt whether hon. Members if they had read the Trade Union Act would have moved this Amendment at all. There are two Acts;the Act of 1871 and the Act of 1875, which is described as the charter of the British artisan's liberty. What do they provide? In the first place, that any combination of seven persons

who agree together to become a trade union are to be registered, to keep accounts, to furnish those accounts to a public office, and to be responsible for certain acts. For that guarantee certain liberties are conceded ;namely, that they can combine for action in restraint of trade, which otherwise under ancient law would have been held to be a criminal conspiracy. But that liberty does not go as far as hon. Members opposite seem to imagine. It is hedged in and safeguarded at every point. In this Act of 1875 I would ask I hon. Members to consider Section 7. By that section every person who endeavours by certain means to compel any other person to abstain from doing or to do any act which he has a legal right to do or abstain from doing, is liable under this Act, which hon. Members ask us to apply to agricultural combinations in Ireland, either to pay a penalty not exceeding £20 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months, with or without hard labour. If the Government frankly adopted the Amendment of the hon. Member; supposing the practical difficulty as to the definition of what workman and master mean could be easily overcome; we should be denounced for having introduced a Coercion Act of a much more subtle and far-reaching character than any that has yet been passed by this House. The practical objection to accepting this Amendment is that the demand made upon Parliamentary time in order to overcome the opposition of every single Irish Nationalist Member to such a proceeding would be too great in a session when the programme is already very much in arrear. That is not an exaggerated statement of these Acts.

Now I come to what I called the sting in the body of the Amendment ;the charges that are made against the Government. The hon. Member for the City of Cork has asked me a very frank question. I hope I shall be equally frank in my reply. I identify myself wholly with the policy pursued by the present Viceroy, Lord Cadogan. I can- not make it too clear that it has been, and it is, the policy of the Irish Government to give protection to every man who is entitled to protection from the law. And what are some of these charges against us? They are that meetings have been capriciously suppressed. Some of the meetings which have been referred to took place before I was Chief Secretary, but I hold that every one of them was properly suppressed. Hon. Members are not to suppose that the Government is interfering capriciously with meetings here, there, and everywhere. The figures given by the Attorney General were below the mark. Since the United Irish League was started there have been 879 meetings, and twenty-eight have been prevented. Since I became Chief Secretary there have been ninety-nine meetings, and five have been prevented. I defend every one of those actions. The meeting at Armagh was proclaimed by the local magistrates because they knew it would result in a collision between Catholics and Orangemen at the place fixed for it. And they were perfectly right. It would bare resulted in a collision; and they behaved precisely as any magistrate would have behaved in this country, or in France, or in any other country in Europe. They said the meeting was not to be held where it would excite a riot; but of course they allowed persons to gather together beyond the limits where such a regrettable result was to be anticipated. That is the whole story. I assure hon. Members who are not familiar with this topic,

once so well known in this House, that that is what has always been done. The comment invariably is that the Government has been outwitted and that a triumphant meeting has been held. It is not the object of the Government to prevent meetings and free speech in Ireland. It is the object of the Government to prevent unlawful assemblies from taking place. Hon. Members will remember when another Government had to stop a meeting of trade unionists, and, an inquiry being held, it was found that the Government were right in stopping the meeting, that the soldiers were right also in firing on the mob, and that the Government, the magistrates, the officers the soldiers, and the police had only done their duty. I will not elaborate that point now, but I will on another occasion; and I am sure hon. Members from Ireland will give me many occasions; defend, if need be, every single action of the Executive in respect to these points. Let me tell the House that in respect of one of these meetings; the meeting at Achonry; the comment of authorities whom hon. Members opposite would respect has been entirely upon the side of the Government. That was a meeting which we prevented; we did not proclaim it. There was a farm there which had been boycotted, and the tenant had been intimidated. He was injured and was entitled to protection. When a large crowd, with a band and banners, marched in a threatening manner towards this man's farm, the police interposed and stopped them. The Bishop of Achonry, speaking on the subject within a few days, stated that the people had acted in a very foolish and wrong manner, and gave a "wiggling" to those who had instigated them. So that the action of the Government is, at any rate, not universally condemned in Ireland. I think the Attorney General has dealt, and dealt well with all the legal points which have been advanced as to jury-packing. If we are to be accused, we stand where Lord Spencer and Mr. Morley stood. Their words are known, and must be known, to the world and to any persons who administer the law of Ireland. It is necessary for those whose duty it is to see that justice is done to see that justice is not perverted. Let me come to the United Irish League and its objects, because I am afraid I must correct a part of the speech of the hon. Member for the Scotland Division of Liverpool. The first object stated here is the establishment of a peasant proprietary in Ireland. There is no mention of compulsion in this Amendment, so mild and reasonable are the objects of the League. So far I agree with the hon. Member, that the objects of the Government and of the League, as stated in this Amendment, are identical. We hope to have peasant ownership in Ireland, and the Government have put into the King's Speech an announcement to that effect. It is urged that the pace is too slow and the course is too heavy. The policy of the Government is to accelerate the one and to lighten the other. If we are to indulge in charges of plagiarism, I say in this case it is the League which has plagiarised the policy of the Government. After all, the League can claim to be only three years old, whereas the Conservative party has advocated this policy in effect for fifty years, and practically for twenty-one years. The next object of the League, as stated in this Amendment, is that extensive tracts in the West of Ireland should be used in order to relieve congestion. Let us examine that. My-right hon. friend the Leader of the House nine years ago passed an Act which

contained a provision that the Congested Districts Board was to purchase property in the congested districts in order that there should be migration. So again the League is plagiarising the policy of their Tory tyrants.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): You had better join the League.

MR. WYNDHAM: My suggestion is that the League should join the Government, and I will state why. If we are both to hoe the same patch we had better take the drills in the same direction and not at right angles. The hon. Gentleman has stated that the action of the League instigated the Congested Districts Board to buy the Dillon estate. I say it is not so. I say to the House and the country that the action of the League has retarded and is retarding the action of the Congested Districts Board.

MR. WILLIAM O'BRIEN: Would the right hon. Gentleman allow me to say that the first estate that was purchased in the west of Ireland by the Congested Districts Board was the Clare Island estate. Is it not a fact that that estate was purchased at my request and on the joint guarantee of the Archbishop of Tuam and myself for the rent for seven years?

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member deserves credit if he had any part in the purchase of Clare Island, but that estate was purchased three years before the United Irish League was started. If we were all agreed to pursue these objects by the same methods it would be a consummation most devoutly to be desired, but the Congested Districts Board never did, and never will as long as I am president of it, buy one acre or rood of land off which any man has been driven by illegality or even by illegitimate pressure.

This problem is not insoluble. Problems as difficult are solved every day by the simple process of paying a proper price for the thing desired, and if we devote our attention to what we consider beneficent public objects in Ireland the bone of contention between hon. Members on this side and the other will be removed.

Does this Amendment mean that the Irish Nationalist party have made up their minds to pursue a constitutional policy in this House, and to abandon altogether some of the courses they have pursued in Ireland? [An HON. MEMBER: No, certainly not.] May I not, then, submit to hon. Members from Ireland that they must not denounce Unionist Members; above all, Irish Unionist Members; if they look somewhat askance at such a proposal as that which stands first in this Amendment, especially when the hon. Member for Cork makes speeches such as his speech this evening, and speeches he made in Ireland, stating that land reform is to be but a stalking-horse for Home Rule. That may be a political programme, but is it one likely to commend itself to this House? Is it fair or reasonable for hon. Members to invite the attention of this House to what seem reasonable proposals of reform, and condemn this House as bigoted, narrow, and non-Irish because it does not accept them, and at the same time to declare that these reforms are merely stalking-horses for achieving a great political project?

I hope it may some day be possible that those who will fight for the Union, as we shall, to the end of time, and those who will fight on in the belief that a separate Parliament will bring great blessings to Ireland, may agree; perhaps I am too sanguine, but I think it possible ;to contend in this House

constitutionally, and that we may in almost friendly rivalry strive to increase the material prosperity of Ireland. That is a better plan than the plan of coming to; this House with proposals which would be entertained if coming from any other quarter of the House, and given that consideration which Parliament would give;

MR. DILLON: But not from Irish Members&#x0021;

MR. WYNDHAM: And why not from Irish Members? Because you put the jury against you. Because you say that when you wish to improve the land system in Ireland your land policy is only a stalking-horse for Home Rule. There have been other methods, which I do not attribute wholesale to the United Irish League. The League is Protean in its transformations. In tropical countries hon. Members who have been abroad may have observed small wind eddies that pick up everything in their path and again deposit these collections; and so it has been with the expansion and movement of the League during the past nine months. Coming to a place where what are called advanced men are found, the chairman, secretary, and treasurer are advanced men; but when the League comes to some quiet Arcadia where a priest exercises a benevolent despotism, then he is made chairman and summons a meeting, a shilling is collected all round, and the branch is adjourned sine die. That is why, though I understand some of the attacks levelled at the League as an organisation, I do not think it would be just to declare the League a criminal conspiracy. Its transformations are too rapid for that. It began, as this Amendment begins, with the object of acquiring grass lands in Mayo, but since then much else has been collected and distributed. It picks up a number of delegates and lands them in a convention in Dublin; it picks up a number of members and lands them here as once more a united, organised Irish party.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): We have as good a right to be here as you have.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has anticipated me. I am very glad that the Irish boycott of the House is over. I think by meeting here and discussing together political projects as they are discussed by English and Scotch Members we may do something, or at least we shall have a chance of doing something, greater than if we each stay in our own' island snarling and gibing at each other in newspapers read on one side of the Channel and not on the other. Let us meet here and have it out. Surely there are many questions in which Englishmen and Irishmen are equally interested, many questions besides the land question. There is the question of education in Ireland, the position of Youthful offenders in Ireland, the industries of Ireland, the question of industrial schools. These and many other matters we surely may discuss together as English, Scotch, and Welsh Members discuss, without making them stalking-horses for Home Rule.

MR. DILLON: What has Home Rule to do with it?

MR. WYNDHAM: The League has forged this united Irish party, and its members may command the attention of Parliament as Irishmen, by their ability and eloquence, have always commanded the attention of Parliament. Let us take' the proposal in the Amendment as a legitimate object, put forward constitutionally in this House; let us contend in such an arena, with Home Rule barred until it is practical; barred, I mean practically, for it is impossible to proceed with it

now or for some years to come. If we do that, each confident that his cause must win; we confident that the Union will never be even imperilled hon. Members opposite holding another view; one must win, the other must lose; and if we contend within such an arena as I have described, then both the winner and the vanquished may gain greater prizes than the stake they played for.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): The right hon. Gentleman stated that the United Irish League has deposited a united Irish party in this House. As a matter of fact it has deposited two parties, of which I am one. If the House will allow me, in the few minutes that remain, I should like to give my reasons for voting for the Amendment. My first reason is that I have not read it; my second reason is that, after listening to the speech of the mover, I agree with almost every word of what he said. I will put it to the House, to men who think that after the course of years you are gradually-acquiring some little hold on the minds and intellect of Ireland, what prospect have you for your Imperialism or of creating any permanent cohesion between, the two islands?

The right hon. Gentleman has made several appeals to us; some reasonable, some unreasonable. I have sometimes ventured to make appeals to that Bench in various times, but they have never prevailed. Why? Because while we address the Treasury Bench openly from these benches; and our speeches have to be made openly; vindicating the Irish position in Ireland, well we know that Ireland is not governed by reference to those speeches, but by reference to the back-door intrigues and the intrigues of landlords in Dublin Castle. One word behind your chair, Sir, from an

Orange Member is more potent with the Government than the united voice of the; eighty Members on this side; and the very reason for the Amendment has been the cause of the irregularity and illegality into which you have been stupidly and foolishly driven in Ireland by your bad advisers. Why is the Member for Dover Chief Secretary to-day? Why is not the President of the Board of Trade Chief Secretary? He was driven out of Ireland by landlord intrigue, because he passed the Land Act of '96 and the Local Government Act of 1898. Although he was a relative and all of the most powerful statesman of the Empire, he was thrown as a peace-offering to my Lord Ardilaun. What are we representatives of the peasants of the country to think, who know how potent are these forces which command the entire legislature across the hall, when we see a statesman who has devoted himself to the interest of our country in a small degree sacrificed with as little care for public opinion in Ireland as you would show to a dismissed policeman. The Government ask us to believe them. They talk about law and order; they say it is their business to maintain law and order. I say it is their business in Ireland to leave the people alone: that is what we want from you. You compare yourselves sometimes to the Romans of the great Roman Empire. You extract 9&#x00BC; millions out of our wretched people every year. That ought to be enough for you. You get regiment after regiment out of the country who show the utmost devotion in the field, while at the same time you evict their fathers and keep their children in the poorhouses. The Romans were satisfied with taxation and legionaries: but what must you do? You take the most miserable and shameful class; the land-grabbers; and devote the whole forces of the British

Empire to buttressing them up. Every land-grabber in the country can get ten, twelve, or twenty policemen, costing £2,000 or £3,000, to protect him, out of a country in which there are, as the right hon. Gentleman admitted, 150,000 people living on 2d. a day, all because these unfortunate people try to cling to their country. Oh, but the British Government must uphold law and order What is law and order I want to know? That is to say, it is law. A man who professes the Catholic faith is constantly brought long distances to the assizes, leaving his home and industry. If he does not attend on his summons he is fined £20; while if he attends, some wretched caitiff; a member of a Freemason lodge or an Orange lodge; the moment his name is mentioned, says, "You are unworthy of belief: out you go again; we do not want you." Day after day he is brought in and has the ignominy of being cast aside, why not pass an Act excluding all Catholics from the jury box? I remember the Attorney General's great essay to convict myself. I have often twitted him about it. He prosecuted me as a Whiteboy, or a highwayman; I forget exactly which. He advised me that my trial was fixed for eleven o'clock; but instead of taking it at that hour they first put on a horse-thief before me, and they put twelve of the strongest Catholic Nationalists on the jury and of course denuded my panel of jurors to that extent. That was twenty years ago; but what went on in 1880, and 1890, is going on in 1900, and I suppose will go on as long as the Union lasts. You prize the valour of your Catholic soldiers; you let them wear the shamrock on St. Patrick's day: you do everything so long as they are acting in the English service; but as soon as it is a question of affecting Ireland, they are absolutely boycotted. You are the boy-cotters. They are absolutely proscribed, as much proscribed as if the penal laws had never been repealed. The right hon. Gentleman has, of course, with his usual ability, attacked this motion on the ground that this is only a stalking-horse, as he says, for Home Rule. Well, that is a very easy thing to say. We might as well say of some of his actions that they are intended as stalking-horses for the Union. I say, take them at large, and the mass of Irishmen would rather remain in their rags than forfeit their hopes for the liberties of the country. For myself, having worn the stones of Westminster Hall for many a year; of course I am told from time to time that our cause is failing, and that our hopes are flagging; I do not believe at the present moment that in these twenty years; except some man who draws a salary; the English Government has made a single friend in Ireland outside of Dublin Castle. I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary meets any man outside Dublin Castle who is not a Home Ruler, who is not at all events anti-British and anti-English. As the days go on, outside of a very small section of the community there is not a single man in Ireland of any class or creed who has any faith in the

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

O'Brien, William (Cork)

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

Gilhooly, James

O'Connor, James(Wicklow,W.  
Ambrose, Robert  
Hammond, John  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Barlow, John Emmott  
Hardie,J. Keir(MerthyrTydvil  
O'Doherty, William  
Harry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Blake, Edward  
Hayne, Rt. Hon.CharlesSeale-  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Boland, John  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Dowd, John  
Boyle, James  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon.Charles H.  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
O'Malley, William  
Burt, Thomas  
Jones, William(Carnarvonsh.)  
O'Mara, James  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Caldwell, James  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Shee, James John  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Carvill,Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Kinloch, Sir J. George Smyth  
Rea, Russell  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Labouchere, Henry  
Reddy, M.  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Leaney, Edmund  
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)



Cogan, Denis J.  
Leigh, Sir Joseph (Stockport)  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Lloyd-George, David  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Crean, Eugene  
Lundon, W.  
Roche, John  
Cremer, William Randal  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Cullinan, J.  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Shipman, Dr. John  
Daly, James  
M'Cann, James  
Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Delany, William  
M'Fadden, Edward  
Sullivan, Donal  
Dewar, Jn. A. (Inverness-shire)  
M'Govern, T.  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Dillon, John  
M'Hugh, Patrick A.  
Thompson, E.C. (Monaghan, N.  
Doogan, P. C.  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, N.)  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Duffy, William J.  
Minch, Matthew  
Tully, Jasper  
Dunn, Sir William  
Mooney, John J.  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Elibank, Master of  
Murnaghan, George  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Emmott, Alfred  
Murphy, J.  
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk, Mid)  
Evans, Samuel T.

Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.  
Ffrench, Peter  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Field, William  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien,  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt Sir Alex, F.  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Chapman, Edward  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Bigwood, James  
Charrington, Spencer  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Bill, Charles  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Compton, Lord Alwyne  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Brodrick, Rt Hon. St. John  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Bull, William James  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Bailey, James (Walworth)

Butcher, John George  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Carlile, William Walter  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Dewar, T. R(T'rH' mlets, S. Geo.  
Balfour, Rt.Hon.A.J.(Manch'r  
Cavendish, V.C. W. (Derbysh.  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
Balfour.Rt.Hon.G.W. (Leeds)  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Chamberlain, J Austen(Worc'r  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart

British Government. That is what has brought about Amendments such as that which has been moved to-night; and if I vote for it I vote for it on the principle that it is against the English Government, and whatever is against the English Government I am in favour of.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 109;'Noes, 203. (Division List, No. 8.)

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Knowles, Lees  
Purvis, Robert  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Radcliffe, R. F.  
Faber, George Denison  
Lawson, John Grant  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Lecky, Rt. Hon.Wm.Edw. H.  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Lee, CaptA. H. (Hants,Fareh'm  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J(Manc'r  
Leigh Bennett, Henry Currie

Rentoul, James Alexander  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Richards, Henry Charles  
Finch, George H.  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Lowe, Francis William  
Russell, T. W.  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J  
Flower, Ernest  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Forster, Henry William  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Macdonald, John Cumming  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Gordon, Maj. Evans - (T'r H'ml'ts)  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Smith, H. C. (Northumb, Tyneside)  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks).

Graham, Henry Robert  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Spear, John Ward  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk  
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Stroyan, John  
Hall, Edward Marshall  
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Frederick G.  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Hamilton, Rt. Hon. Lord G. (M'd'x  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nd'rry  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. (Oxf'd Uni.  
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Tufnell, Col. Edward  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Valentia, Viscount  
Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N.W.  
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Helder, Augustus  
Mount, William Arthur  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Henderson, Alexander

Murray, Rt. Hn. A. Graham (Bute  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Webb, Colonel William George  
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Welby, Lt-Col A. C. E. (Taunton)  
Hobhouse, H. (Somerset, E.)  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Howard, Capt J. (Kent, Faversham)  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald  
Hosier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R.)  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestershire, N.)  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
Penn, John  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Percy, Earl  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)  
Plummer, Walter R.  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Keswick, William  
Pretyma, Ernest George  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Main Question again proposed  
Debate arising; and it being after midnight, the debate stood adjourned.  
Debate to be resumed upon Monday next.  
WIDOWS AND ORPHANS OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Resolved, That it is expedient that a Select Committee of Five Members of this House be appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords to consider the various charitable agencies now in operation, and the funds available, or which can properly be made available, for relieving Widows and Orphans of Soldiers and Sailors, with

a view to ensuring that the funds subscribed by local and private benevolence are applied to the best advantage in supplementing a scheme of Government pensions for Widows and Orphans of Soldiers and Sailors who have lost their lives in war.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.:(Sir William Walrond.)

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn till Monday next,",(Sir William Walrond);put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at ten minutes after Twelve of the o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 25th February, 1901.

POINT OF PRACTICE ; QUESTIONS AND NOTICES OF MOTION.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY (Yorkshire, W.R., Pudsey) asked the Speaker if in view of the fact that a question of which he had given notice appeared in the Papers as a notice of motion, he would be allowed to put the question.

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member handed in a question asking if a certain Minister would grant a Return in regard

to agricultural rates. In the question he set forth the Return asked for in full, and when a question is handed in in that way it is usually treated as a notice of motion for a Return. Of course there will be no objection to the hon. Member putting a question at the end of the other questions as to whether the Minister will grant the Return.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

ALDEBURGH CORPORATION (WATER) BILL.

"To enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Aldeburgh to acquire the undertaking of the Aldeburgh Waterworks Company, Limited; and to construct waterworks and supply water; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

ALDERSHOT GAS AND WATER BILL.

"To empower the Aldershot Gas and Water Company to enter into agreements for the acquisition of the undertaking of the York Town and Blackwater Gas and Coke Company, Limited; and to raise additional capital; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

ALEXANDRA (NEWPORT AND SOUTH WALES) DOCKS AND RAILWAY BILL.

"To empower the Alexandra (Newport and South Wales) Docks and Railway Company to extend their existing South Dock, and to construct an entrance lock basin, river walls, railways, and other works; for changing the name of the company; and for other purposes." read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

BINGLEY URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL.

"To authorise the Urban District Council of Bingley to purchase the undertaking

of the Cullingworth Gas Company, Limited; to make certain street works; and to make better provision for the health, local government, and improvement of the district; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### **BLACKBURN CORPORATION BILL.**

"For extending the boundaries of the Country Borough of Blackburn; and to authorise the Corporation of that Borough to reconstruct Tramways and to construct new Tramways in the Borough; to make street works; to enlarge the Town Hall and erect an Assembly Room; to erect a new Sessions House, Police, and Eire Brigade Stations; to borrow money; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### **BLACKPOOL IMPROVEMENT BILL.**

"To enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the Borough of Blackpool to construct additional Tramways and improvements in that borough; and to make further provisions for the improvement and good government of the said borough; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### **BRADFORD CORPORATION BILL.**

"To authorise the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of the city of Bradford, in the west riding of the county of York, to construct additional tramways, street improvements, and an outfall sewer, to acquire lands for sewage works, and to extend their gas works, to extend the city, and to make further provision for the health and good government of the city; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### **BRIGHTON CORPORATION BILL.**

"To empower the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the county borough of Brighton to purchase the Brighton Aquarium: and for other purposes." read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### **BRITISH GAS LIGHT COMPANY BILL**

"For empowering the British Gas Light Company, Limited, to enlarge their works and to expend further capita at Kingston-upon-Hull," read the first time: and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### **BRITISH WESTINGHOUSE ELECTRIC AND MANUFACTURING COMPANY BILL.**

"To facilitate the adaptation for working by electrical power of the railways of the Metropolitan Railway Company and the Metropolitan District Railway Company, and for that purpose to confer powers on those Companies and on the British Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Company, Limited; and for other purposes," read the first time: and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### **BURGESS HILL WATER BILL.**

"To authorise the Burgess Hill Water 'Company to construct additional waterworks, acquire lauds, and raise further moneys; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Hills.

#### **BURTON-UPON TRENT CORPORATION BILL.**

"To alter the numbers and boundaries of the wards of the boundaries of the borough of Burton-upon-Trent; and to enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses



of the said borough to construct tramways in the borough; and to make further provisions for the good government of the borough," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### BURY CORPORATION BILL.

"To authorise the Corporation of Bury to purchase and hold lands for the purposes of their sewage, gas, and other works, and to make further and better provision in relation to the Local Government of the Borough of Bury: and for other purposes," read the first time: to be read a second time.

#### BURY CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

"To authorise the Corporation of Bury to construct additional tramways within and adjacent to the borough; to make certain street works and improvements; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### CALEDONIAN ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Caledonian Electric Power Company." read the first time: to be read a second time.

#### CALEDONIAN RAILWAY BILL.

"To confer further powers on the Caledonian Railway Company in relation to their undertaking; to extend the periods for the completion of works by the Caledonian, the Callander and Oban, the Lanarkshire and Ayrshire, the Lochearnhead, St. Fillans, and Comrie, and the Paisley and Barrhead District Railway Companies; and for other purposes," read the first time: and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### CARDIFF CORPORATION BILL.

"To empower the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the county borough of Cardiff to construct new intercepting and other sewers; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### CITY OF LONDON (SPITALFIELDS MARKET) BILL.

"To empower the Corporation of the city of London to acquire Spitalfields Market, with power to extend and improve the same and to maintain the said market or sell or lease the same; and for other purposes in reference thereto." read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### CLEVELAND AND DURHAM COUNTY ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Cleveland and Durham County Electric Power Company," read the first time: to be read a second time.

#### CLYDE VALLEY ELECTRICAL POWER BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Clyde Valley Electrical Power Company," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### COLWYN BAY AND COLWYN URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL.

"To provide for the transfer of the undertaking of the Colwyn Bay and District Gas Company to the Colwyn Bay and Colwyn Urban District Council, and to authorise that Council to supply gas; and for other purposes." read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### CRAWLEY GAS BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Crawley Gas Company; and for other purposes." read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### CROMER WATER BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Cromer Water Company," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### DERBY CORPORATION BILL.

"To extend the boundaries of the borough of Derby and to empower the Corporation to construct tramways, additional waterworks, sewerage and sewage disposal works, street widenings, and improvements: to repeal Sections 43 to 46, both inclusive, of the Derby Corporation Act, 1877; and to confer further powers in regard to the health, local government, and improvement of the borough: and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### DERBYSHIRE AND NOTTINGHAMSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire Electric Power Company." read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### DERWENT VALLEY WATER BOARD BILL.

"To confer further powers on the Derwent Valley Water Board with respect to their water undertaking; and for other purposes." read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### DEVONPORT CORPORATION (GAS) BILL.

"To authorise the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Devon-port to purchase the undertaking of the Devonport Gas and Coke Company, and to supply gas within the borough of Devonport; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### DEVONPORT GAS AND COKE BILL.

"To authorise the Devonport Gas and Coke Company to raise additional capital, to define and extend their limits of supply, to extend their powers; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### DISTRICT MESSENGER AND THEATRE TICKET COMPANY BILL.

"To confer further powers upon the District Messenger and Theatre Ticket Company, Limited, with, respect to the telegraphic or telephonic communications and the conveyance of letters; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### DORKING GAS BILL.

"For conferring further powers on the Dorking Gas Company," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners, of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### DUBLIN CORPORATION (MARKETS, ETC.) BILL.

"To authorise the Municipal Corporation of the City of Dublin to establish and maintain a market for the sale of old clothes and other commodities in certain, market buildings to be, constructed and conveyed to them as a free gift by the Right Honourable Edward Cecil, Baron Iveagh, K.P.; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second, time.

#### DUBLIN (EQUALISATION OF RATES) BILL.

"To make provision for the equalisation of rates as between the City of Dublin and the urban districts of Rath-mines and Rathgar and of Pembroke adjoining the said city," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### DUBLIN ST. JAMES' GATE BREWERY TRAMWAYS BILL.

"To authorise Arthur Guinness, Son, and Company (Limited), to construct tramways in the City of Dublin in connection with St. James's Gate Brewery, and to work the same and their existing; tramways by mechanical or other power, to construct certain street improvements; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petition for Private Bills.

#### ECCLES CORPORATION BILL.

"To enable the Mayor, Aldermen, and Burgesses of the borough of Eccles to reconstruct their existing and to construct additional tramways; to make street improvements: to raise additional moneys by mortgage; and to make further provision for the good government of the borough." read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### FAIRFORD AND CIRENCESTER RAILWAY BILL.

"For incorporating the Fairford and Cirencester Railway Company; and authorising the construction of a railway from Fairford to Cirencester; and for other purposes." read the first time: to be read a second time.

#### GAS LIGHT AND COKE COMPANY BILL.

"To enable the Gas Light and Coke Company to raise additional moneys; and to purchase, take, and hold lands; and for other purposes." read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### GATESHEAD AND DISTRICT TRAMWAYS BILL.

"To enable the Gateshead and District Tramways Company to raise additional capital; and for other purposes, read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### GLASGOW AND RENFREW DISTRICT RAILWAY TRANSFER BILL.

"For transferring to and vesting in the Caledonian Railway Company and the Glasgow and South Western Railway Company jointly the undertaking of the Glasgow and Renfrew District Railway-Company: and for other purposes," read the first time: and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### GLASGOW AND SOUTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

"For conferring further powers on the Glasgow and South Western Railway Company; for the construction of works and the acquisition of lands, and for the purchase of Troon Harbour; for empowering them to raise additional capital: and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### GOLBORNE GAS BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Golborne Gas Company," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### GRAVESEND GAS BILL.

"To convert and consolidate the existing capital of the Gravesend and Milton Gaslight Company; to confer further powers upon that company; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### GREAT CENTRAL RAILWAY BILL.

"To enable the Great Central Railway Company to make new railways and other works; to acquire additional lands; to extend the time for the compulsory purchase of certain lands, for the completion of certain railways, and for the

sale of the superfluous lands of the Manchester, South Junction, and Altrincham Railway Company, and the Wrexham, Mold, and Connah's Quay Railway Company: to confer further powers upon the Nottingham Joint Station Committee: and for other purposes." read the first time: and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY BILL.

"To authorise the Great Eastern Railway Company to execute further works and to purchase additional lands; to sanction and confirm the purchase of certain lands; to confer further powers upon the Company and the Great Northern and Great Eastern Joint Committee; to extend the periods limited by former Acts for the purchase of land's and the construction of works by the Company; to provide for the consolidation of certain preference stocks of the Company; and for other purposes." read the first time: and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL.

"To confer further powers upon the Great Northern Railway Company," read the first time: and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY BILL

"For conferring further powers upon the Great Western Railway Company in respect of their own undertaking, and upon that Company and the London and North Western Railway Company in respect of undertakings in which they are jointly interested, and upon the Great Western and Great Central Railways Joint Committee in respect of their undertaking; for vesting the undertakings of the Devon and Somerset and the Bridport Railway Companies in the Great Western Railway Company; for transferring to that Company the powers of the Windsor and Ascot Railway Company and extending the time for the construction of the authorised railways of that Company: for empowering the Lambourn Valley Railway Company to raise further moneys; and for other purposes." read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### HARTLEPOOLS GAS AND WATER TRANSFER BILL.

"To authorise the sale of the undertakings of the Hartlepool Gas and Water Company to the Corporations of Hartlepool and West Hartlepool; and to empower those Corporations to supply gas and water within the boroughs of Hartlepool and West Hartlepool and places adjacent thereto." read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### HECKMONDWIKE GAS (TRANSFER) BILL.

"To constitute and incorporate a joint Board for the urban districts of Heckmondwike and Liversedge, in the West Riding of the county of York, and to transfer to and vest in such joint Board the undertaking of the Heckmondwike Gas Company: and for other purposes." read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### HONLEY URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (GAS) BILL.

"To transfer to and vest in the Honley Urban District Council the undertaking of the Honley Gas Company (Limited), and to confer upon that Council powers for the supply of gas; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### HORLEY DISTRICT GAS BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers upon the Horley District Gas Company; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### HULL, BARNSLEY, AND WEST RIDING JUNCTION RAILWAY AND DOCK BILL.

"To authorise the Hull, Barnsley, and West Riding Junction Railway and Dock Company to construct new railways; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### HUMBER COMMERCIAL RAILWAY AND DOCK BILL.

"For authorising the construction of a dock, sea walls, railways, and other works adjoining the existing docks at Grimsby, in the county of Lincoln, to be called the Humber Commercial Railway and dock: and for other purposes," read the first time: to be read a second time.

#### ILKESTON AND HEANOR WATER BOARD BILL.

"To constitute a Joint Board representative of the Corporation of Ilkeston and the Heanor Urban District Council with power to acquire the undertaking of the Meerbrook Sough Company, and to construct works for intercepting and distributing the waters of the Meerbrook Sough; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### IRISH PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH BILL.

"To extend the powers of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland in relation to the investment of money and the accepting, taking, and holding of property: and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### KETTERING URBAN DISTRICT WATER BILL.

"To empower the Urban District Council of Kettering to construct additional waterworks; and for other purposes." read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### KINGSCOURT, KEADY, AND ARMAGH RAILWAY BILL.

"To empower the Kingscourt, Ready, and Armagh Railway Company to construct a new railway in the county of Monaghan, and to abandon a portion of their authorised railways; to change the name of the Company; to authorise the Great Northern Railway Company (Ireland) to work the undertaking of the Company and to subscribe towards their capital; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### KINGSTON -UPON-HULL CORPORATION BILL.

"To empower the Corporation of Kingston-upon-Hull to make certain street works: to construct a bridge over the River Hull; to lay down tramways; and to confer further powers on the Corporation in regard to the water supply health, local government, and improvement of the city; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY (DEARNE VALLEY JUNCTION RAILWAYS) BILL.

"For conferring further powers on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company with respect to the construction of Railways, in the West Riding of the county of York; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY (VARIOUS POWERS) BILL.

"For conferring further powers on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company with relation to their own undertaking and upon that Company and the London and North Western Railway Company with relation to the Preston and Wyre Railway and the Great Northern Railway Company with relation to lands at Wakefield; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### LEATHERHEAD GAS BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Leatherhead Gas and Lighting Company," read the first time: and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### LLANDRINDOD WELLS URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL WATER BILL.

"To authorise the Urban District Council of Llandrindod Wells to purchase the undertaking of the Llandrindod Wells Water Company; and to authorise the Council to construct additional waterworks and to supply water within the district and adjoining places." read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### LLANDRINDOD WELLS WATER BILL.

"To extend the limits of supply of the-Llandrindod Wells Water Company and to authorise the Company to construct new works; to raise further money; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### LONDON AND INDIA DOCKS (NEW WORKS) BILL.

"To authorise the London and India Docks Company to construct a new dock and other works; and for other: purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills,

#### LONDON AND NORTH WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

"For empowering the London and North Western Railway Company to construct additional dock works at Garston; and for conferring further powers upon: that Company in relation to their own undertaking; and upon that Company and the Great Western Railway Company, and the Great Central Railway Company, in relation to their joint undertakings; and upon the Shropshire Union Railways and Canal Company in relation to their undertaking; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### LONDON BRIDGE WIDENING BILL.

"To empower the Corporation of the City of London- to- widen London Bridge; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (GENERAL POWERS) BILL.

"To empower the London County Council to make street improvements and works and to purchase lands in the administrative county of London; and for other purposes, "read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (SPITALFIELDS MARKET) BILL.

"To empower the London County Council to acquire Spitalfields Market, in the parish of Christchurch, Spitalfields; and to make various provisions with reference thereto," read the first time to be read a second time.

#### LONDON RIVERSIDE FISHMARKET BILL.

"To confirm and give effect to an agreement for the sale and transfer of the London Riverside Fishmarket to the Mayor and Commonalty and Citizens of the City

of London; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### LONDON, TILBURY, AND SOUTHEND RAILWAY BILL.

"To confer further powers upon the London, Tilbury, and Southend Railway Company; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### LONDON WATER (PURCHASE) BILL.

"To empower the London County Council to acquire the undertakings of the London Water Companies; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### LONG EATON GAS BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Long Eaton Gas Company," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### MANSFIELD CORPORATION BILL.

To empower the Corporation of Mansfield to make a street widening, to authorise the Corporation to acquire the undertaking of the Mansfield Wood-house Gas Light and Coke Company, Limited, to make further provisions with respect to their gas, water, and electrical undertakings, to confer further powers in regard to streets, buildings, and sewers, and the health, local government, and improvement of the; borough; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL.

"To empower the Metropolitan District Railway Company to provide for the conversion and adaptation of their railway for being worked by electric traction; to create a debenture stock with a first charge upon the undertaking of the company; to limit the dividend on their five per cent, preference stock; to apply existing capital; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC SUPPLY BILL.

"To confer further powers on the Metropolitan Electric Supply Company, Limited, with respect to the supply of electrical energy; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### METROPOLITAN RAILWAY BILL.

"To confer further powers upon the Metropolitan Railway Company in relation to their own undertaking, and upon that Company and the Harrow and Uxbridge Railway Company in relation to the Harrow and Uxbridge Railway; to revive and extend the powers for the purchase of land and the completion of certain authorised railways and works by the two Companies; and for other purposes." read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### METROPOLITAN WATER COMPANIES (AMENDMENT OF ACTS) BILL.

"To extend the provisions of the Staines Reservoirs Acts of 1896 and 1898 relating to the purchase of the undertakings of certain metropolitan water companies by any public body or trustees," read the first time: to be read a second time.

#### MIDLAND RAILWAY BILL.

"To confer additional powers upon the Midland Railway Company and upon the

Norfolk and Suffolk Joint Railways Committee, and upon the Midland and Great Northern Railways Joint Committee, for the construction of works and the acquisition of lands; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### MOND GAS BILL.

"To incorporate and confer powers on the South Staffordshire Mond Gas (Power and Heating) Company; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### NEATH HARBOUR BILL.

"To reduce and regulate the amount of the debt upon the Neath Harbour Undertaking; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### NEWRY PORT AND HARBOUR TRUST BILL.

"To incorporate trustees for the maintenance and improvement of the Port and Harbour of Newry, Newry River, and Newry Canal; to transfer to them the Undertaking of the Newry Navigation Company; to authorise the trustees to borrow money; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be, read a second time.

#### NORTH BRITISH RAILWAY BILL.

"To confer further powers on the North British Railway Company in connection with their undertaking; to authorise the widening of portions of their Monkland Railway and the construction of new railways; to authorise the said Company to acquire additional lands; to close and discontinue the Harbour of Leven; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### NORTH EASTERN RAILWAY BILL.

"To confer additional powers upon the North Eastern Railway Company for the construction of new railways and other works and the acquisition of additional lands, and upon that Company and the Midland and Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Companies in respect of their Normanton Station; and upon the Hull Joint Stock Committee for the execution of works and the acquisition of lands; and for vesting in the Company the Goole and Marshland Light Railway and the Isle of Axholme Light Railway; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### NOTTING HILL ELECTRIC LIGHTING BILL.

"To empower the Notting Hill Electric Lighting Company, Limited, to acquire lands and to erect and work generating stations; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### PAISLEY POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

"To confer further powers on the Corporation of Paisley, and to make further provision for the regulation of streets and buildings and the police and public health administration of the burgh; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### PEMBROKE URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (COUNTY OF DUBLIN) BILL.

"To confer powers on the urban district council of Pembroke in the county of Dublin with respect to sanitary matters, streets, buildings, and other matters



for the good government of their district, and to borrow moneys; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### PETERSFIELD AND SELSEY GAS BILL.

"For supplying with gas the urban district of Petersfield, the parish of Selsey, and other places in the counties of Southampton and Sussex," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### RHYL BRIDGE BILL.

"To authorise the reconstruction of the bridge over the River Clwyd constructed under the powers of the Rhyl Bridge Act, 1861; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### RHYL IMPROVEMENT BILL.

"To authorise the urban district council of Rhyl to construct additional waterworks and to make further provision in regard to the health, local government, improvement, and finance of the urban district; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### RICHMOND GAS BILL.

"To authorise the Richmond Gas Company to raise additional capital, to convert their existing capital, to enlarge their works, to amend their existing Acts; and for other purposes," read the first time and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### RICKMANS WORTH AND UXBRIDGE VALLEY WATER BILL.

"For extending the limits of supply of and conferring further powers upon the Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water Company; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### SHANNON WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Shannon Water and Electric Power Company; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### SHIPLEY IMPROVEMENT BILL.

"To confirm the purchase of the undertaking of the Shipley Gaslight Company by the Urban District Council of Shipley; to authorise the construction of tramways, cold air stores, and street improvements; to make further provision with regard to the water and electric light undertakings of the council and the health and local government of the district," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### SHIREOAKS, LAUGHTON, AND MALTBY RAILWAY BILL.

"For making a railway in the west riding of the county of York from the Great Central Railway at Shireoaks to Maltby; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### SOUTHAMPTON AND WINCHESTER GREAT WESTERN JUNCTION RAILWAY BILL.

"For making a railway between Winchester and Southampton to be called the Southampton and Winchester Great Western Junction Railway; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### SOUTH METROPOLITAN GAS BILL.

"To empower the South Metropolitan Gas Company to raise additional capital, and to purchase by agreement so much of the southern portion of the undertaking of

the Gas Light and Coke Company as is situate in the county of London south of the Thames; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### STALYBRIDGE, HYDE, MOSSLEY, AND DUKINFIELD, TRAMWAYS AND ELECTRICITY BOARD BILL.

"To constitute and incorporate a Joint Board consisting of representatives of the Corporations of Stalybridge, Hyde, Mossley, and Dukinfield; and to authorise the Board to construct and work Tramways and to supply electrical energy within the boroughs of Stalybridge, Hyde, Mossley, and Dukinfield; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

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

"To authorise the sale of the undertakings of the East and West Junction, the Evesham, Redditch, and Stratford-upon-Avon Junction, and the Stratford-upon-Avon, Towcester, and Midland Junction Railway Companies," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### STROUD GAS BILL.

"To authorise the Stroud Gas Light and Coke Company to convert their existing capital, to raise additional capital, to amend their existing Act; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### SWANAGE GAS AND WATER BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on a Company, to be called the Swanage Gas and Water Company, and to authorise the transfer to that Company of certain existing gasworks and waterworks and powers in the parish of Swanage, in the county of Dorset, and the construction of additional waterworks; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### SWANSEA HARBOUR BILL.

"To authorise the Swansea Harbour Trustees to make a new dock, enlarge and extend the half-tide basin of the south dock, and construct new railways, to extend the limits of the harbour; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### TAFF VALE RAILWAY BILL.

"To enlarge the powers of the Taff Vale Railway Company with reference to the acquisition of lands and the construction of works; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### TEES VALLEY WATER BOARD BILL.

"To confer further powers on the Tees Valley Water Board in relation to the supply of water," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### TENDRING HUNDRED WATER BILL.

"To extend the limits of supply of the Tendring Hundred Waterworks Company; to authorise that Company to construct new works; to raise further money; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### THAMES DEEP WATER DOCK BILL.

"To revive the powers and extend the periods for the compulsory purchase of

lands for and for the completion of the dock and works authorised by the Thames Deep Water Dock Act, 1881; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### THAMES LIGHTERMEN BILL.

"To make further provisions with reference to the working and navigating of lighters and barges in the Port of London and on the River Thames," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### THAMES PIERS AND RIVER SERVICE BILL.

"To provide for the transfer of certain piers and landing places on the River Thames, in the administrative county of London, to the London County Council, and to make provision for a service of boats for passengers and parcels; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### TORRINGTON AND OAKHAMPTON RAILWAY BILL.

"To extend the time for the compulsory purchase of lands for and completion of the railways authorised by the Torrington and Oakhampton Railway Act, 1895, and the Torrington and Oakhampton Railway Act, 1898, and to change the name of the Torrington and Oakhampton Railway Company; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### TOTTENHAM AND HAMPSTEAD JUNCTION RAILWAY BILL.

"For empowering the Tottenham and Hampstead Junction Railway Company to widen a portion of their railway; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### WALLASEY IMPROVEMENT BILL.

"To empower the Wallasey Urban District Council to construct a railway to their gasworks, and to make further provision in regard to the health, local government, and improvement of the district and the borrowing of money; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### WELLS CORPORATION WATER BILL.

"To authorise the Mayor, Aldermen and Citizens of the city of Wells to purchase the undertaking of the Wells Water Company, Limited, to construct additional waterworks; and to supply water within their city, and the neighbourhood thereof; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### WELLS WATER BILL.

"To incorporate and confer powers on the Wells Water Company," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### WEST CUMBERLAND ELECTRIC TRAMWAYS BILL.

"To incorporate the West Cumberland Electric Tramways Company; and to empower the Company to make tramways, tramroads, and street improvements, and to erect generating stations, and to supply electricity; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### WEST SURREY WATER BILL.

"For extending the limits of supply of the West Surrey Water Company and for authorising that Company to raise additional capital; and for other purposes," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

#### WOLVERHAMPTON AND CANNOCK CHASE RAILWAY BILL.

"For making a railway in the county of Stafford from Wolverhampton to Great Wyrley; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.  
WOLVERHAMPTON CORPORATION WATER BILL.

"To empower the Corporation of Wolverhampton to construct additional waterworks, to extend their limits for the supply of water, and to make further provision in regard to their water undertaking; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

YORKSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

"For incorporating and conferring powers on the Electric Power (Yorkshire) Company," read the first time; to be read a second time.

SELECTION (BY ORDER).

Ordered, That the Committee of Selection do consist of Eleven Members; Mr. Blake, Mr. Sydney Buxton, Sir John Dorington, Sir William Hart-Dyke, Dr. Farquharson, Mr. M'Kenna, Sir Edward Reed, Sir Mark M'Taggart Stewart, Mr. Wharton, Mr. Wodehouse, and the Chairman of the Select Committee, on Standing Orders were accordingly nominated Members of the Committee.;(Mr. Halsey.)  
COMMONS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to consider every Report made by the Board of Agriculture certifying the expediency of any Provisional Order for the enclosure or regulation of a common, and presented to the House during the last or present Sessions, before a Bill be brought in for the confirmation of such Order.

Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power in respect of each such Provisional Order to inquire and report to the House whether the same should be confirmed by Parliament; and, if so, whether with or without modification, and in the event of their being of opinion that the same should not be confirmed, except subject to modifications, to report such modifications accordingly with a view to such Provisional Order being remitted to the Board of Agriculture.

Ordered, That the Committee do consist of Twelve Members; Seven to be nominated by the House, and Five by the Committee of Selection.

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

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

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

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

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Tipton; Brighouse; Stratton St. Margaret; Walsall; and Sheffield: to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Egham; Strood; Easthampstead; Rochester; Sheffield; Shanklin; and Sandown; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Strood; Rochester (two); and Skelton and Stang how;: to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

#### INEBRIATE RETREATS (RULES FOR MANAGEMENT).

Copy presented, of Regulations made with the approval of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, for the Domestic Management of the Corn-greaves Hall Retreat, licensed as a retreat under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### MILK AND CREAM REGULATIONS.

Copy presented, of Report of the Departmental Committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture to inquire and report upon the desirability of Regulations, under Section 4 of the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1899, for Milk and Cream, with Copy of Minute appointing the Committee [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### ARMY (ORDNANCE FACTORIES) (APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT).

Appropriation Account presented, of the sums granted by Parliament for the expense of the Ordnance Factories, the cost of the productions of which have been charged to other Votes for the year ended 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. 40.]

#### COLONIAL STATISTICS.

Copy presented, of Statistical Tables relating to the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom. Part XXIII. for the years 1897&#x2013;8 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### ARMY (SOUTH AFRICA) (SUPPLEMENTARY DESPATCHES).

Copy presented, of Supplementary Despatches relating to the War in South Africa [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### SOUTH AFRICA.

Copy presented, of Telegram from Sir A. Milner to the Secretary of State for War relating to reported outrage on Esau at Calvinia [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### TREATY SERIES (No. 3, 1901).

Copy presented, of Accession of the Kingdom of Sweden to the Venice Sanitary Convention of 19th March, 1897, and to the Declaration additional thereto of 24th January, 1900; 9th December 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2558 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### ARMY ESTIMATES, 1901&#x2013;1902.

Copy presented, of Army Estimates of Effective and Non-Effective Services for the year ending 31st March, 1902 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 41.]

#### ARMY (ORDNANCE FACTORIES, 1901&#x2013;1902).

Copy presented, of the sum required for the year ending 31st March, 1902, to defray the Expense of the Ordnance Factories [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 42.]

#### PAPERS LAID UPON THE TABLE BY THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE.

1. Charitable Endowments (London). ;Further Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August, 1894; Mr. Francis Stevenson;] to be printed. [No. 43.]
2. Inquiry into Charities (County of Carnarvon).;Further Return relative thereto

[ordered 10th February, 1898; Mr. Grant Lawson;] to be printed. [No. 44.]

#### AMERICAN MAIL SERVICE.

Return ordered, "showing the number of days, hours, and minutes occupied in the transit of the Royal Mails both out ward and inward carried during the year 1900 by steamships between Queenstown and New York, and also between Southampton and New York; the Return to specify the names of the steamers, and to indicate by asterisks or otherwise those not carrying Mails under Contract."; (Sir John Leng.)

#### QUESTIONS.

##### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;BOER PRISONERS AT GRASPAN.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to a public statement, alleged to have been made on 18th December last, by a British officer recently returned from South Africa, to which publicity was given but no contradiction, that while in charge of some Boer prisoners at Graspán, a lot of innocent Dutchmen came in Cape carts to see their friends and relations, that he let them all come in but did not let any out, and that they went to St. Helena with the rest; and whether he will take steps publicly to contradict such a statement or otherwise deal with the alleged author of it.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): My attention was called to this statement a few days ago, and I at once asked for an explanation. The officer in question states that as a fact, when in charge of the Boer prisoners at Graspán, a Boer ambulance being near, a number of Boers, fully armed, came up, and seizing red cross badges put them on and said they were doctors. They were examined by the Provost-Marshall, and were found equally inaccurate in respect of their names and professions, they being in each particular contradicted by the true members of the ambulance. They were consequently retained as prisoners. The officer in question, in speaking of them as innocent, explains that he spoke ironically, and no doubt the fact that he spoke after dinner prevented his being over cautious in his choice of language. He has been warned to be more careful.

##### ALLEGED SHOOTING OF KAFFIRS AT KIMBERLEY.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the shooting of a number of indentured Kaffirs who were attempting to escape from the compound at the Wesselton Mine, at Kimberley, on 29th October last, resulting in the death of one Kaffir, Titsane, and the wounding of several others; whether he is aware that it appears from the evidence that the guards of the mines, and also fourteen men of the Royal Dublin Fusiliers under Sergeant Howard, and by the orders of Major W. Roper-Caldbeck, took part in the chase and shooting of the Kaffirs; whether he can state under what laws of Cape Colony or of this country guards of mines are empowered to shoot down men who are trying to escape from a civil contract; whether it is permissible under the Army Regulations for officers and men of His Majesty's Regular Army or other forces to aid in recapturing natives trying to escape from the mines and compounds; whether he will direct steps to be taken to secure the punishment of all whose

participation in this affair constituted an offence, and to make such action to enforce the civil contracts entered into by natives impossible.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I intend making inquiries, and will let the hon. Gentleman know the result.

MR. CHANNING: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when he is likely to get the particulars?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir.

COLONIAL CONTINGENTS;RATE OF PAY.

CAPTAIN LEE (Hampshire, Fareham): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state whether the rate of pay, namely, 5s. per diem, now drawn by colonial troops in South Africa, is less than the current rate of wages for the lowest class of white labour in such colonies.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Five shillings a day is undoubtedly less than the average rate of daily wages for unskilled white labour in the colonies from which these troops have been sent.

COLONIAL CONTINGENTS;ALLEGED INSUBORDINATION.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War which were the two Colonial Corps among whom Lord Kitchener, in his telegram of 21st January, stated there had been insubordination; what were the periods of service for which the men who refused to march had engaged; and what was the cause of the insubordination.

MR. BRODRICK: Lord Kitchener gave a full account in his telegram of 21st December of the insubordination which occurred in certain South African colonial corps owing to a mistake in carrying out their discharge. He also informed us of the way in which Lord Roberts dealt with it, and I think that quite sufficient notice has been taken of this matter, and I agree with Lord Kitchener's words;

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: I wish to know whether the rule of order which applies to questions;namely, that they must not involve matters of opinion; also applies to answers.

\*MR. SPEAKER: As the hon. Member stopped the right hon. Gentleman I did not hear the whole of what he was going to say.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: He said he agrees with something Lord Kitchener said. I never asked him that.

\*MR. SPEAKER: As I understand the right hon. Gentleman in his answer was adopting some words used by another person, that is not out of order.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: My point is, he is going further.

MR. BRODRICK: The words which I quote from Lord Kitchener are necessary in order to convey to the House the decision at which I have arrived. Lord Kitchener said, "It is considered a cruel thing to make public an incident which all regret and which subsequent brilliant services in the field of the South African force have entirely obliterated." I agree with those words, and I do not think it is in the public interest that I should ask the name of the corps.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the point;What was the cause of the insubordination?

MR. BRODRICK: The incident of the insubordination was a mistake in regard to the

discharge of the corps, and the matter was fully explained in Lord Kitchener's telegram. I confess I think that further reference to it is absolutely unnecessary.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: That is not the question. The right hon. Gentleman does not explain what I want to know. I am entitled as a Member of the House to an answer giving the information I ask for; namely, for what period of service were these men engaged?

MR. BRODRICK: I do not know the period of service, because I have not asked for the name of the corps. I may remind the House that the hon. Member brought this accusation against another corps which he named without any justification.

#### PAY OF SOLDIERS CAPTURED AT MAGERSFONTEIN.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether British soldiers who were taken prisoners at Magersfontein, and remained so until released in June, 1900, have yet received their pay for the time during which they were prisoners; and whether, seeing that according to the regulations pay is not allowed for the period during which soldiers have been prisoners until a court of inquiry has decided whether they were to blame or not, a court of inquiry has yet been held in the case of the Magersfontein prisoners; and, if so, whether, on their being found not to blame, their arrears of pay will be promptly paid.

MR. BRODRICK: Courts of enquiry are known to have been held on some of these prisoners, but I cannot say for certain whether on all. As the issues of pay would be in the hands of the General Officer Commanding, and as under regulations recently made the pay is not forfeited unless the man is proved to have been taken prisoner through his own neglect or misconduct, it is not likely that any men are still without their pay. If the hon. Member will give me any instances I will have them inquired into.

#### TRANSPORT ;TREATMENT OF WOUNDED VOLUNTEERS.

SIR BARRINGTON SIMEON (Southampton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, taking into consideration the reply which he gave to a question on 30th December, 1900, on the subject of transport for Volunteers returning from South Africa, a wounded Volunteer sent down to Capetown and discharged there, finding that no berth in a troopship returning home was available for six or seven weeks, was not justified in obtaining a trooper's passage home in the next ordinary steamer sailing after his discharge; and whether, considering the expense to which such Volunteer would have been put had he remained for six or seven weeks in enforced idleness at Capetown waiting for a troopship, the Secretary of State will give directions for the expenses of the journey of such Volunteer being refunded wholly or in part.

MR. BRODRICK: A report on the particular case referred to by my hon. friend has been called for.

#### "PEACE COMMISSIONERS";THE REV. ADRIAN HOFMEYER.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will inform himself, by cabling to South Africa, of the appointment of the Rev. Adrian Hofmeyer as Peace Commissioner to the Transvaal: and if he can state by what date he will be able to inform the House as to the particulars of the



appointment, this person's present whereabouts, and his antecedents.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I informed the hon. Member in reply to his previous question that I was cabling to Sir A Milner on the subject. I have now received his reply, and am informed that Mr. Hofmeyer was not sent to the Transvaal as Peace Commissioner or any similar capacity. He was, however, sent to Pretoria in January, where it was thought that his knowledge of the language and the people might be of service to the military authorities. The Commander-in-Chief found no occasion for his services, and he returned to Capetown some weeks ago.

MR. PIRIE: May I ask if Mr. Hofmeyer is the same Mr. Hofmeyer who was a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir.

THE NETHERLANDS RAILWAY.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can state the attitude of the British Government towards the Netherlands Railway Company, whose line runs from Delagoa Bay to Pretoria, and more especially whether it is looked upon as an asset of the British nation.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The position of the Netherlands Railway Company is being considered by the Transvaal Concessions Commission, and no statement can be made until their report has been made and considered.

PAY OF TROOPS AT THE FRONT.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state up to what date the troops in South Africa have been paid, and at what intervals pay is issued to troops in the field.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): I fear I cannot answer the hon. Member's question. Normally the soldiers' pay is issued weekly. When troops are in the field, the periodical settlement with the men must frequently be interfered with by the conditions of active service, but no avoidable delay is allowed.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY RECRUITS; PHYSICAL STANDARD.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any physical standard has been fixed for the recruits who are now being accepted for the Imperial Yeomanry; and, if so, will he state what it is; and are the physical measurements taken of those who have been enlisted, can he state what is the average chest measurement and height, and whether any qualification as to character or antecedents is required.

MR. BRODRICK: The physical standard and the qualifications of character are laid down in Army Order 40 of February, 1901. I am afraid I cannot give the average measurements without requiring an amount of computations and labour which it would be unreasonable to ask from a heavily worked Department at a moment of pressure.

SOLDIERS' WIVES IN IRISH UNIONS.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the event of women whose husbands are in the Army becoming inmates of poor law unions in Ireland, he will direct that any money which may accrue to them through their husbands, be sent in the first instance to the union of which they are inmates, so that such unions may be in a position to recoup the ratepayers

to some extent, as is the case with Army pensioners who become inmates.

LORD STANLEY: If the hon. Member is aware of any cases of wives of soldiers in the Army becoming inmates of unions, I shall be glad if he will bring them to the notice of the War Office.

MR. JOYCE: I will do so.

FARM BURNING, ETC.; OPERATIONS OF GENERAL BRUCE HAMILTON.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Major General Bruce Hamilton published a notice at Ventersburg, dated 1st November, 1900, that the town of Ventersburg had been cleared of supplies and partly burnt, and the farms in the vicinity destroyed, on account of the frequent attacks on the railway line in the neighbourhood; that the Boer 'women and children who were left behind should apply to the Boer commandants for food, who would supply them unless they wished to see them starved; and that no supplies would be sent from the railway to the town; whether the Boer women and children were deprived of all their food supplies, and then abandoned to starvation as threatened in the notice; whether there is any evidence that the attacks on the railway proceeded from the town; and whether he will inform Major General Bruce Hamilton that the Hague Convention recommended that there should be no infliction of any

general penalty on a population on account of the acts of individuals for which it cannot be regarded as collectively responsible.

MR. BRODRICK: As it became evident in October last that Ventersburg was being used by the enemy as a base for supplies, from which constant attacks on the railway were being carried out, the Commander-in-Chief directed that houses in Ventersburg and its vicinity belonging to Boers away fighting should be destroyed, and grain and stores removed. These orders were carried out. The wording of General Bruce Hamilton's notice, however, was not submitted to Lord Roberts, and was not approved by him. It was withdrawn at once. Care was taken that the women and children should not be abandoned to starvation. As regards the third and fourth paragraphs of the hon. Member's question, the general officer commanding on the spot was satisfied that the attacks in question proceeded from the town, and that those who suffered were responsible.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Is it the rule of the British Army that if the enemy occupy a town, and are driven out of it, the British Army are entitled to destroy the town and burn all the houses?

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Was the proclamation withdrawn before or after the houses had been burned?

MR. BRODRICK: The proclamation; was, I think, put out about the time the houses were burned. The houses were burned, and the proclamation with regard to the treatment of the Boers themselves; the women and children; was withdrawn at once.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): What was done with the women and children?

MR. BRODRICK: They were treated in the same way as women and children have been treated throughout the campaign. They were given rations from the Army stores.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Will this man be allowed to continue in command?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That does not arise upon the question.  
ARGENTINE HORSES.

MR. PHILIPPS (Pembrokeshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has official information to show that many of the Argentine horses that have been unfavourably reported on by the military authorities in South Africa were bought for less than £7 apiece.

LORD STANLEY: As I have already explained to the House, I cannot give any information as to the prices paid for horses while purchases are still being made.

#### CAMPS OF REFUGE.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can inform the House as to the number of the camps established by order of Lord Kitchener, where those whose homes have been destroyed and others are concentrated under guard; where the camps are situated; what is the approximate number of men, women, and children respectively therein; in whose hands the arrangements for the supply of provisions are placed; what is the nature of the shelter erected; whether relatives and others desiring to mitigate the situation and sufferings of those thus confined are allowed reasonable access to them; and are the persons in these camps held to be prisoners of war.

MR. BRODRICK: The numbers and situations of the camps, or the numbers of protected persons in each and the nature of the shelter provided have not been reported, but it is believed that about 15,000 are so accommodated. The arrangements for the supply of provisions have been in the hands of the local military authorities, but are being gradually transferred to civil contract. The husbands and sons of deserted women who desire to live peacefully can freely join them in their laagers, and arrangements have been made to distribute to them any gifts sent by others. The protected persons are not prisoners of war. A full report has been called for.

MR. DILLON: Will the right hon. Gentleman state whether the women and children in these laagers are at liberty to leave them? Are they prisoners or are they free?

MR. BRODRICK: They are not prisoners of war.

MR. DILLON: Are they free to leave the laagers, or are they guarded by sentries with bayonets?

MR. BRODRICK: They come to these laagers for protection.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: Will the right hon. Gentleman assure us that no persons are inside these camps who have not come there for protection; that they have not been driven there?

MR. BRODRICK: I have given the House all the information I can. These camps are voluntary camps formed for protection. Those who come may go.

MR. JOHN ELLIS, who on again rising was received with loud Ministerial cries of "Order," said: When the Speaker calls me to order I will sit down, and not before. This is a free Parliament. Will the right hon. Gentleman assure the House that, before we discuss] this matter in Committee of Supply; a discussion which, I am sure, he does not wish to burke; we shall have full information from South Africa on this subject?

MR. BRODRICK: I have already told the hon. Member that I have called for a

report, and I shall be glad to give it as soon as possible. It has, however, to come from South Africa, and I cannot control the exact time of its arrival here.  
BLOEMFONTEIN PROVOST MARSHAL.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, whether the post of chief clerk to the Provost Marshal at Bloemfontein has been or is held by a person going by the name of Sutherland; whether the real name of this person is Atherstone, and as such he was some years ago found guilty and condemned to death for shooting a native, whose grave he had previously dug; and whether he was reprieved by President Steyn, the death penalty being commuted to penal servitude for life, which sentence he was serving on the entry of the British troops into Bloem-

fontein, when he was released from the convict prison, and shortly after given the post above described.

MR. BRODRICK: Atherstone is an ex-Sergeant-Major of Royal Artillery, who was discharged in 1886. He was convicted of murder in the Free State in 1894 and his sentence was commuted to penal servitude by the late President Mr. Steyn. Considerable doubt, however, arose subsequently as to the reliability of the evidence on which this conviction was based, and on the British occupation of Bloemfontein it was found that the Executive Council had ordered his release to take place in November, 1900, and that Mr. Steyn had informed Atherstone that he would be released at an earlier date. Under these circumstances the Military Governor of the Orange River Colony, having after inquiry formed the opinion that the conviction could not be upheld, sanctioned the man's release in March, 1900. He was subsequently employed in the purely clerical work of making out returns in the Provost Marshal's office, but was in no sense that official's chief clerk.

MILITIA RESERVISTS ON SERVICE IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War are the Government empowered in the case of Militiamen who have not received reserve pay to keep them longer in the service than twelve months; and, if not, will they bring home from South Africa and discharge the men of the 5th Battalion of the Royal Munster Fusiliers who have not received reserve pay since 1889 and who are now serving in South Africa.

LORD STANLEY: The hon. Member's question is not quite clear. There are no Militia Reservists in this battalion called out for permanent service whose liability to serve expires before the 1st July, 1901. Reserve pay whether of Militia or Army Reserve ceases on their mobilisation.

ARMY MEAT AND FORAGE CONTRACTS.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to a meeting of the Innishowen District Council, county Donegal, at which a resolution was passed protesting against the action of the War Office in accepting a tender for the supply of foreign meat for the Army instead of the native article marketed by those who contribute towards the support and maintenance of the Army, and also protesting against the Army horses being fed on foreign forage, to the detriment of Irish tenant farmers; and will steps be taken to place all future contracts as far as

possible within the United Kingdom.

LORD STANLEY: My attention has been called to the resolution referred to. The whole question of supply of meat throughout the United Kingdom is being considered.

MR. M'FADDEN (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he has received a copy of a resolution passed at the last quarterly meeting of the county council of Londonderry protesting against the recent action of the War Office in accepting a tender for the supply of foreign meat in preference to the native article, and protesting against the supply of foreign forage to the horses in the Army to the loss of farmers and traders in Ireland, and asking that this policy should be changed; and will he state what steps (if any) the Government intend to take to remedy the matters complained of by this county council and other public bodies in Ireland.

LORD STANLEY: I have not received a copy of the resolution referred to. The whole question of the supply of meat in the United Kingdom is under consideration. As regards forage, I have already explained to the House that all the contracts but two are given to local dealers.

PAY OF RETIRED ARMY OFFICERS IN THE MILITIA.

LIEUT.-COLONEL PRYCE - JONES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that retired Army officers serving in the embodied Militia lose their pensions, and that, in consequence, such officers are to be found serving for less pay than that allotted to sergeant-majors, and whether he will take steps to put an end to this state of matters.

LORD STANLEY: It has been fully explained to the House on previous occasions that in pursuance of the Treasury's decision these officers cannot draw full pay and retired pay simultaneously.

VOLUNTEER OFFICERS' SONS AND MILITARY EDUCATION.

LIEUT.-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the services rendered by the Volunteers in the war in which the country is at present engaged, and the expenses entailed upon Volunteer officers in keeping up their corps, it can now be found practicable to place volunteer officers upon the same footing as officers of the line with respect to the admission of their sons to the Royal Military Academy at the reduced charge settled under Article 674 of the Royal Warrant for Pay, etc., 1897.

LORD STANLEY: I do not think that the valuable services rendered by the Volunteers in connection with the war would justify a departure from the general principle that the State does not contribute towards the expense of the education at Woolwich and Sandhurst of the sons of Volunteer officers. The cases of sons of officers who have seen active service in South Africa will be favourably considered.

ROYAL MUNSTER FUSILIERS.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that the commanding officer of the 5th battalion of the Royal Munster Fusiliers, who were camped at Lydd on St. Stephen's Day, when asking them to volunteer for service in Malta or Egypt, carried out the

requirements of the Militia Act, 1882, by explaining to every man in the battalion that the offer was purely voluntary on his part, and how many of the men volunteered; were the men of the battalion who were on furlough on St. Stephen's Day, on their return to the camp asked to serve in Malta or Egypt; and did they or any of them volunteer to do so; and will the Government see that the men who did volunteer are not deported beyond Malta or Egypt.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a number of men belonging to the 5th battalion of the Royal Munster Fusiliers, who did not volunteer for foreign service and whose period of service has expired, have applied for their discharge to the proper authorities but have not yet obtained it; if so, will directions be given for the discharge of these men without further delay.

LORD STANLEY: In reply to the two questions put by the hon. Member, I have no information to enable me to reply to the first two paragraphs. It is not, nor has it ever been proposed to order this battalion to perform any service abroad for which it has not volunteered. As to the reported applications for discharge, I am not aware that this is so.

#### GUN LICENCES FOR RIFLE CLUBS.

MR. MACONOCHE (Aberdeenshire, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether arrangements have been made to grant free gun licences to bona fide members of shooting clubs for the use of rifles.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Instructions were issued on the 21st June last exempting from gun licence duty members of rifle clubs affiliated to the National Rifle Association in respect of the rifles belonging to the club, on condition that the rifles used are the actual property of the club, and are used only at rifle ranges.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Will the privilege be extended to rifle clubs established in Ireland?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No, Sir. There is a special law as regards the possession of arms in Ireland.

#### ARMY PORTLAND CEMENT CONTRACTS.

COLONEL TUFNELL (Essex, S.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the War Office proposes to invite tenders from abroad for Portland cement; and whether he will endeavour, consistently with the public interest, to place orders with the manufacturers at home who have invested capital in their works on the Thames and on the Medway.

LORD STANLEY: The reply to the first question is in the negative. As regards the second question all manufacturers on our list in the United Kingdom would be invited to tender for the supplies required.

#### PRUSSIAN KNIGHTS OF ST. JOHN.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now lay before the House a report on the organisation of the Prussian Knights of St. John and the nature of the co-operation and division of duties between them and the Prussian Military authorities in time of war; or whether the Foreign Office have received from His Majesty's Embassy at Berlin the report on the subject called for in July last.

MR. BRODRICK: The report in question has been received, but it is a matter for further consideration whether it can properly be laid on the Table of the House.  
ARMY PENSIONERS AND OUT-DOOR RELIEF.

\*MR. DELANEY (Queen's CO., Ossory): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a man named William Miller applied to the Board of Guardians, Mountmellick, at the meeting on the 16th instant, for out-door relief, and that the Guardians, though willing to grant relief, were debarred from doing so in consequence of his being a pensioner in receipt of four-pence a day; and, whether he will therefore take steps to increase this old soldier's pension.

LORD STANLEY: It is not clear why the Board of Guardians felt themselves debarred from giving relief in the case referred to. If the hon. Member will cause me to be supplied with particulars of William Miller's corps, date of discharge and service, I shall be happy to have his case investigated.

LICHFIELD RIFLE RANGE.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what progress has been made in the last six months towards making the rifle range for Whittington Barracks, near Lichfield.

MR. BRODRICK: Steady progress is being made with the acquisition of the land. One owner has been arranged with and the arbitrators hope that terms with the others will shortly be settled.

NEW RIFLE RANGES.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can say what has been done towards making new rifle ranges during the last year; what is being done at present; and what steps he proposes to take for supplying adequate accommodation for rifle practice for the Regular Army, Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers.

MR. BRODRICK: I am afraid I cannot, within the limits of an answer, give the hon. Member the information he requires. As he is aware, a large sum was made available for the provision of rifle ranges under the Military Works Acts of 1897 and 1899, and fair progress has been made with its expenditure. Taking the sum provided for ranges and manœuvring grounds together, payments amounting to four-fifths of the total had been authorised by the end of the year 1900.

ARMY HORSE-SHOE NAILS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether, in view of the fact that the nails required for Army shoeing were until recently mainly obtained from the United Horse Shoe and Nail Company, of Cubitt Town, London, E., he will state whether any notice was given them that nails narrower and thinner in the shanks with larger heads were preferred by the Veterinary Department before placing the contract elsewhere; and whether he can inform the House if the contract has now been given mainly to foreign firms.

LORD STANLEY: It is not the case that the nails required for Army shoeing were until recently mainly obtained from the firm in question. For the three years ending 31st March, 1898, their orders amounted to about one-eighth of the total

orders placed, and represented about £;200 in value. In 1898 it was decided that the nails supplied by this firm were unsuitable for the service and the War Office discontinued the purchase of them. I am not aware that the firm made any representation to the War Office on the subject. They have during the war been given several opportunities of quoting for nails of the sizes required but have not done so.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Where are the nails now used made?

LORD STANLEY: I cannot say offhand.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Do you say that they are not made in Germany?

[No answer was given.]

#### NAVY PORTLAND CEMENT CONTRACTS.

\*COLONEL TUFNELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the Admiralty proposes to invite tenders from abroad for Portland cement and whether he will endeavour, consistently with the public interest, to place orders with the manufacturers at home, who have invested capital in their works on the Thames and Medway.

\*THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Captain PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): It is not the practice or intention of the Admiralty to invite tenders from abroad for Portland cement. The answer to the second question is in the affirmative, but no preference is given to manufacturers on the Thames and Medway over other home manufacturers.

#### EUROPEAN GENERAL HOSPITAL AT ADEN.

MR. MOON (St. Pancras, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state what arrangements have been made, in reference to the European General Hospital at Aden, between his Board and the Secretary of State for India for the provision of a nursing staff to assist the civil surgeon in charge, what payment the Board of Admiralty makes for the diet of sailors and officers in the hospital and what contribution towards the nursing staff, how many patients from the Royal Navy

were treated in the hospital last year, whether suitable accommodation has yet been constructed for nurses, and what contribution the Board has made towards such accommodation.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The provision of a nursing staff in the European General Hospital at Aden has been arranged by the Indian Government. Trained nurses are provided by the Roman Catholic Mission at Aden. The Admiralty pays for officers and seamen at the same rates as those charged for ordinary patients; namely, first class patients, four rupees per diem; second class patients, two rupees per diem. These payments cover the services of the nursing staff. In the course of last year, so far as shown by Returns received up to the 3rd November last, thirty-five patients have been received from the Royal Navy. A plan and estimate for the provision of suitable quarters for nurses was sanctioned early in 1898, and it is understood that the work has been carried out. A contribution of £;99 6s. 8d. was made by the Admiralty towards this object, this representing one-fifth of the estimated cost.

#### NAVAL CADETS' OVERCOATS; H.M.S. "BRITANNIA."



MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether naval cadets, whether on duty or on leave, in inclement weather are debarred by official regulations from wearing great-coats; and whether, as a consequence of recent exposure without great-coats, several cadets are now suffering from pulmonary disease.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: According to the present regulations cadets on H.M.S. "Britannia" are supplied with thick monkey jackets and mackintoshes. They are not debarred by the regulations from wearing either of these garments on official occasions, but the dress to be worn is always prescribed. Monkey jackets were worn on the occasion referred to by the hon. Member. The cadet who unhappily died a few days ago was not, in fact, present on the 2nd February. In reply to the last paragraph of the hon. Member's question, there is no reason to believe that the

cases of influenza accompanied by pneumonia, which have occurred on the "Britannia," are due to the fact of the cadets having been without greatcoats on the occasion referred to. The hon. Member will be glad to know that the question of supplying cadets with great-coats for use on special occasions is under the consideration of the Admiralty. For ordinary purposes the monkey jacket is found to be sufficient. I may add that the question of greatcoats is not unattended with difficulty, owing to the fact that cadets in the "Britannia" are in a stage when they grow very rapidly.

SUGAR BOUNTIES.

SIR JOHN LENG: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the British delegates at the Brussels Conference on Sugar in 1898 having reserved entire liberty of action to Her Majesty's Government, which the development of the sugar question may render necessary, it is open to Parliament to impose a duty on sugar at any time without notice to the Government which took part in that Conference.

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRAN-BORNE, Rochester): Yes, Sir.

CHINA;ALLEGED LOOTING AT PEKING.

MR. CHANNING: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether inquiry has been made, or will be made, into alleged acts of looting by British subjects in Peking after the relief of the Legations; and whether His Majesty's Government propose to follow the example set by France by taking steps to enforce the restitution of articles thus taken by British subjects.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I have been asked to answer this question. I do not know what the allegations are to which the hon. Gentleman refers; but General Gaselee informs me that the discipline and conduct of the British have been excellent. After the relief of the Legations the British troops were strictly forbidden to loot, and strong measures were taken by him to enforce this order. Articles of value, the property of the Chinese Government, which were left in the Summer Palace after its evacuation by the Russians are at present in the care of the British military authorities, and General Gaselee has been instructed to retain them with a view to restitution when peace is

restored.

#### RUSSIA AND MANCHURIA.

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD - BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government have any information confirming the alleged Russo-Chinese agreement regarding Manchuria between the representatives of Russia and China in Manchuria; whether the following constitute some of the conditions of that agreement: That the Russian troops in occupation of Manchurian towns and posts are to be lodged and fed by the Chinese authorities; that the Chinese General is to disband and disarm all his troops and hand over all munitions of war to the Russian military officials, and that all Chinese forts and defences not already occupied by the Russians are to be dismantled; that Niu-chwang and other places shall be administered by Russian officials until the Russian Government shall be completely satisfied as to the pacification of the country; that a Russian Resident, with full powers of control, be stationed at Mukden, and that the Chinese General must give him full information, and invite Russia to despatch reinforcements whenever emergency arises; that no resistance be offered to the construction of the Russian Trans-Siberian Railway through Manchuria, and that Russia is to purchase and hold the Northern Railway from Shan-hai-kwan to Niu-chwang; that all the Customs in Manchuria are to be under Russian control; and that no kind of commercial concession is to be given to any other Power in Manchuria; and whether the assurances said to have been given by the Russian Government to the British Government regarding Manchuria were given orally or by a formal communication in writing to His Majesty's Government.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: We have no official knowledge of the terms of this agreement, but our information is to the effect that it includes most of the provisions enumerated in the question, and that it is of a temporary and provisional character. The assurances of the Russian Government referred to by my hon. friend were given verbally to His Majesty's Ambassador at St. Petersburg.

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD - BARTLETT: Will the noble Lord have the assurances placed in a formal document?

[No answer was given.]

#### THE CYPRUS TRIBUTE.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state the amount of tribute paid by the people of Cyprus to the Turkish Government; and the mode by which it is raised; and whether he can by representation to the Turkish Government secure some relief from this tribute, which presses upon the industry of the residents of the island.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The Cyprus tribute was fixed on the average paid during the five years preceding the occupation at £92,799 11s. 3d., and is paid out of general revenue. Having regard to the arrangements entered into with the Porte in 1878 it would be useless to make representations as suggested by the hon. Member.

#### PLAGUE AT CAPETOWN.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the

Colonies whether he can give the House any information as to the plague at Capetown.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The only official information I have received so far is the report published in Saturday's newspapers notifying a total of twenty cases for the week ending 16th February: one European, nineteen coloured, three deaths, also 104 contacts, all coloured. A weekly bulletin will be published.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if his attention has been called to the Return concerning the operation of the Probation of First Offenders Act, 1887, presented in pursuance of the order of the House of 6th August, 1900, and to the fact thereby disclosed that although in the years 1897, 1898, and 1899 over 14,000 persons were discharged under the Act without imprisonment, and only a small percentage were called up to receive judgment and known to have been subsequently convicted of a fresh offence, some Metropolitan police courts and other courts of summary jurisdiction, beside assize and quarter sessions courts, never once made use of the Act, and if he will consider the advisability of re-issuing a circular on the lines of that of 25th April, 1892, of Mr. Secretary Matthews upon the subject, and pointing out that the powers of the Act are not so fully taken advantage of as they might be in the case of persons charged with offences of a trifling nature, or against whom no previous convictions have been proved.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): It appears from the Return referred to that of the convicted prisoners discharged without punishment in the years 1897, 1898, and 1899, only 14,512 out of 147,505 were dealt with under the Act of 1887. There seems no particular reason to urge courts to use this Act rather than other Acts when the practical effect is the same; and there is no ground for supposing that at the courts where this Act is not made use of, first offenders, are treated with greater severity than others.

DEFENCE OF POOR PRISONERS.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, as the Crown pays for the prosecution of prisoners, he will consider the question of providing for the defence of those who are unable through poverty to command legal assistance.

\*MR. RITCHIE: The hon. Member is in error in supposing that it is the general practice in England for the Crown to pallor the prosecution of prisoners.

CHILD INSURANCE; BRISTOL CASE.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has received a protest of the grand jury of Bristol against the practice of child insurance; and whether he intends to propose any measure dealing with this matter.

\*MR. RITCHIE: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative, and to the second in the negative.

TEMPTATIONS TO CRIME.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that judges have repeatedly condemned the practice of

certain tradespeople in exhibiting goods on the footways outside of their doors as a dangerous incentive to theft; and whether he will take any measures to abolish this practice.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I do not see my way to take any action in this matter.

#### VACCINATIONS IN LEICESTER AND GLOUCESTER.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-on-Trent): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether vaccination is now being generally practised in the towns of Leicester and Gloucester, and can he state the number of unvaccinated persons in each town, and of persons who have received certificates of exemption as conscientious objectors, and what steps are the Local Government Board taking to secure the due enforcement of the law with regard to vaccination.

\*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The reply to the first part of the question is in the negative. I cannot state the number of unvaccinated persons in Leicester and Gloucester, but from the latest returns it appears that in Leicester of the children born during the eighteen months ended 30th June last, 388 have been vaccinated, while certificates of conscientious objection have been obtained in respect of 534. The corresponding figures as regards Gloucester are 879 and 395. Medical inspectors of the Local Government Board visited both towns last year in connection with the performance of vaccination. As, however, the latest returns are not satisfactory, I have directed that further visits shall be paid by inspectors as early as possible with a

view of ascertaining in what manner the duties of the vaccination officers are now being carried out.

#### FOOD STANDARDS COMMITTEE.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can say when the Departmental Committee who were appointed to set up standards of purity in foods will report.

\*MR. WALTER LONG: I think the hon. Member refers to the Departmental Committee appointed by the Board of Agriculture with reference to the desirability of making regulations under Section 4 of the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1899, in the case of milk and cream. The Report of that Committee, with the relative minutes of evidence, etc., has been laid on the Table, and will, I hope, be printed and circulated without delay.

#### AGRICULTURAL RATING ACT.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if, in view of the necessity of renewing the Agricultural Rating Act at an early date, he will grant a Return showing the amount of the rates levied in the different unions in England and Wales on agricultural land and other property for the two years ending 31st March, 1896 and 1900, respectively.

\*MR. WALTER LONG: I regret that I am unable to comply with the request of my hon. friend. Great labour would be involved in obtaining from the overseers of the 15,000 parishes in England and Wales the facts necessary for the preparation of the Return desired, and it would not be practicable to do this in time for the Return to be issued during the present session.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE: Does the right hon. Gentleman propose to give no information as to the working of the Act before he asks the House to renew it?

\*MR. WALTER LONG: Yes, in general terms. But this specific Return could only be obtained by applying to 15,000 parish overseers, and could not be prepared in time for presentation this session. But I shall be able to give the House a general statement as to the effect of the Act.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY: Is it not possible, for the House, then, to have any figures before it before being asked to renew the Act?

\*MR. WALTER LONG: That is an extremely general question, which I do not think it is fair to ask me to reply to. If the hon. Member or anyone asks for information of a specific character, the Department will do its best to supply it.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: Could not the Department give the figures for some selected counties?

\*MR. WALTER LONG: I should like time to consider that question, as it involves some little responsibility on the part of the Department. I will see if it can be done.

WRECKS OFF NORTH CORNWALL.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he will lay upon the Table of the House a Return showing the number of vessels wrecked on the North Cornwall coast from Lands End to Lundy Island, with the number of lives lost, for each year from 1880, and stating the place where each vessel was wrecked.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The information desired by the hon. Member is contained in the Wreck Abstracts annually presented to Parliament. If he will refer to page 6l of the last Return he will see the division of the portions of the coast with regard to which numbers of casualties are given. If there is any further information desired by the hon. Member I shall be happy to obtain it for him, but I scarcely think it necessary to supplement the Return, which is general in its scope, by others which are merely partial

DISCIPLINE ON MERCHANT VESSELS ;PROSECUTION OF FIREMEN ON THE "BOHEMIAN."

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a case tried at Dale Street Police Court, Liverpool,

on 24th January, when fourteen firemen of the steamship "Bohemian" were sentenced to fourteen days hard labour without the option of a fine for disobeying orders on board ship; whether he is aware that Mr. S. Hough and Mr. C. F. Finney, two of the magistrates before whom the case was tried, are shipowners; and whether shipowners are empowered to try cases in which their interests are so much concerned.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I am not aware that the facts stated in the question constitute any legal disqualification of the magistrates who tried the case.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that at Dale Street Police Court, Liverpool, on 24th January, fourteen firemen of the steamship "Bohemian" were summoned by Mr. Cook, chief engineer, for refusing duty, and were sentenced to fourteen days hard labour without the

option of a fine; that the duty they refused was to wash paint in the engine-room over the working parts of the engine after their ordinary day's work was finished; and that the ship was rolling a good deal at the time, which would have made the performance of the work dangerous; whether he has any information showing such work to have been necessary for the safety or navigation of the ship; and whether he has any powers to protect men from being prosecuted for similar charges.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The conviction of fourteen firemen belonging to the steamship "Bohemian" for an offence under the Merchant Shipping Act was, as a matter of fact, brought to the notice of the Board of Trade, though the matter is not one coming within the Board's province. The Board of Trade had nothing to do with the prosecution, and they have no power to interfere with the ordinary course of justice.

#### SWANLEY JUNCTION RAILWAY ACCIDENT.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he has received the report of the inspecting officer who held the inquiry into the cause of the accident which occurred at Swanley Junction, South-Eastern and Chatham and Dover Railway, on 23rd November last, through failure of the automatic brake; if not, can he expedite it in any way, so that the engine-drivers concerned, who have been suspended since the date of the accident, and whose wages have been stopped, may learn their position without further delay.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; the report in question is now passing through the press, and will be issued in a day or two.

#### CHISWICK LEVEL-CROSSING ACCIDENT.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if his attention has been called to the accident at the railway level-crossing at Chiswick; and if he is prepared to enforce in future the provisions of 5 and 6 Vic. c. 55, ss. 9 and 10, and take steps for the enforcement of penalties against the person or persons responsible for this catastrophe.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir; and the Board of Trade have ordered an inquiry into the circumstances of the accident. In the meantime it would be improper for me to express an opinion upon the matter. I am assured by the company that the provisions of the section are complied with, though it is not certain that the section applies. Also that it is the practice that a bell is rung from the signal-box giving warning of the approach of a train.

#### SUNDAY CLOSING OF THE NATIONAL GALLERY.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the National Gallery is closed on Sundays during the winter months; and whether, in view of the dearth of rational recreation in London on Sundays, he will recommend that the present rule be reconsidered.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The question of opening the National Gallery on Sundays in winter was carefully considered by the Trustees in 1896. There are no means of lighting the gallery

artificially, and the Trustees decided that in view of the frequent deficiency of daylight on winter afternoons in London it was not expedient to open the Gallery on Sundays all the year round.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that the British Museum is open on Sundays all the year round?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes; but there are artificial means of lighting there.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Cannot artificial light be provided in the National Gallery?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I understand that the Trustees are of opinion that it is undesirable to put artificial light into the National Gallery.

WEST INDIAN MAIL DELAYS.

SIR J. FERGUSON (Manchester, N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the West Indian mail steamer arrived at Plymouth at 10 p.m. on the 13th instant, and whether the mails were to be forwarded by a goods train at 4 a.m., and could not have been delivered in London till the following afternoon; whether in fact the mails could have reached London earlier via Southampton had the steamer not been bound by contract to land them at Plymouth; whether on the occasion referred to the passengers who had landed procured a special train, making up the cost by private subscription, of which the post office authority availed himself, so that the mails arrived in London at 6.15 a.m. at the cost of private individuals, and without any contribution by the Post Office; and whether the recent practice of not forwarding the mails at any hour by special train, in cases where the mail steamer does not arrive before her contract time, and so misses the ordinary mail train, does not cause a delay of many hours and occasionally postpones the delivery of the letters beyond business hours in London.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The facts are substantially as stated in the first paragraph. If the mail had been landed at Southampton instead of at Plymouth, it would perhaps have reached London earlier than if forwarded from Plymouth by goods train, but later than it did by the means actually employed. It is the fact that the mails were brought to London by special train, but the hon. Member is under a misapprehension in supposing that this was done at the cost of private individuals. The Postmaster General pays for the haulage of the mail carriages, and this fact doubtless affected the price charged to the passengers. As has been more than once explained in this House in answer to similar questions, the principle governing the engagement by the Post Office of special trains for the conveyance from Plymouth of mails landed at that port is to engage them when, by such means and no other, an interval for reply by the next outgoing mail can be afforded. The present was not such a case.

SIR J. FERGUSON: Are the Post Office authorities indifferent whether the mails are delivered the following day?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: They would be delivered the following day in any case.

ANALYSIS OF IMPORTED FOOD.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he can state how many samples of consignments of imported food have been taken for

analysis by the Commissioners of Customs (under the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, 1899) during the year 1900, how many such samples have been found adulterated, and what was the nature of such adulterations; and whether any prosecutions have resulted.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The number of samples analysed was 1,590, of which twenty-six were reported against. In seven cases fines were recovered. In the remaining nineteen the circumstances were not such as in the opinion of the Commissioners of Customs would have warranted prosecution. Legal proceedings are now pending in four cases which have occurred since the beginning of the present year.

#### SCHOOL TEACHERS AND FIXITY OF TENURE.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he can now inform the House as to the future position of school teachers-with reference to fixity of tenure of office.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I am afraid I cannot yet make any addition to the statement which I made in the House last session. The matter, which is not free from legal difficulty, is still under consideration.

MAJOR RASCH: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the hon. Member for Accrington and myself put this question twice last session and received the same answer?

SIR J. GORST: That shows the veracity of the answer that I have given, to the hon. Gentleman.

MR. CAINE: When is the right hon. Gentleman likely to be able to give the information asked for?

SIR J. GORST: When the legal authorities have made up their minds.

#### CIGARETTE SMOKING BY BOYS.

COLONEL WALKER (Widnes): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the increase of cigarette smoking among young boys of all classes, he will take into consideration the advisability of imposing a special tax upon tobacco sold as cigarettes, or upon the paper used in their manufacture.

MR. GEORGE WHITELEY: Before-answering that question, I wish to know whether it has been brought to the right hon. Gentleman's notice that these cigarettes are sold in sweet-shops at the rate of ten for a penny, and recently have been offered at ten for a halfpenny.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I do not think that any amount of taxation would stop boys from smoking, especially if they are forbidden to do so; while, on the other hand, I am advised that the adoption of the hon. Member's suggestions would derange the whole system of the taxation of tobacco in this country, and cast an unfair burden upon the adult smoker of cigarettes. I fear therefore I cannot hold out any hopes that they will be adopted.

#### SCOTTISH SALMON FISHERIES; FISHMONGERS' COMPANY'S POWERS.

\*SIR WALTER THORBURN (Peebles and Selkirk): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate under what statute the Fishmongers' Company are empowered to send detective officers to railway stations in Scotland who open parcels, committed to the railway companies for transmission, in search for salmon in defiance of remonstrances by



railway officials; whether he is aware that several people have been charged before the Sheriff at Peebles for sending cuts of salmon to friends at a distance, although such salmon were killed by a legal lure and in the open season, because they were alleged to have been purchased at a period of the year when Tweed salmon cannot be exposed for sale: and whether he, is aware that the action of the Fishmongers' Company has aroused indignation among all classes of the community in Peeblesshire, and, if legal, is calculated to bring the administration of the law into Contempt.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): In answer to the first paragraph of the question I am informed that it is the fact that an officer of the Fishmongers' Company, who held a warrant as water bailiff of the Forth and also of the Tweed Commissioners, did on several occasions in conjunction with a detective officer of the Edinburgh police search parcels at the Waverley Station for salmon in transitu which were alleged to have been illegally taken. The statute relied on for the power is the Salmon Fisheries (Scotland) Act, 1868, Section 25. In answer to the second paragraph the result of nine prosecutions brought in respect of the fish so discovered was as follows: three pleas of guilty, two convictions, three not proven, and one not guilty. As regards the third paragraph it is open either to the consigner or consignee of a parcel and to the railway

company, if they are not satisfied as to the applicability of the section already mentioned, to try the question at law.

CAPTAIN SINCLAIR (Forfarshire): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been directed to the practice on the part of the Fishmongers' Company of London, a Corporation of great wealth, bringing complaints, laid under the Salmon Fisheries Acts, in Newcastle or elsewhere in England, against domiciled Scotsmen living in Scotland (possibly in remote parts of it), and under colour of certain English Acts of Parliament hailing Scotsmen to appear to submit to the jurisdiction of what is to them practically a foreign court; whether he will take all needful steps to put an end to these proceedings and leave Scotsmen to be judged in the courts of their own country for any alleged charge arising there, instead of having, as at present, under the proceedings complained of, and whether the charge made is with or without foundation, to go to England and take witnesses to defend them there at great and sometimes prohibitive expense.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am aware of the case referred to by the hon. Member, no other instance has been brought under my notice. I am satisfied that there is power under the Summary Jurisdiction Acts (England) to summon persons living in Scotland to attend to answer a charge of an offence committed in England. Such a power may or may not be oppressively used, but I should hesitate to condemn its existence. In the case in question I do not think the person charged would have been convicted had he not, acting under advice which I consider mistaken, pled guilty to the charge.

ASSAULT BY THE TWEED COMMISSIONERS' BAILIFFS.

SIR WALTER THORBURN: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if his attention has been drawn to a case tried in the Innerleithen Police Court recently, where two

bailiffs in the employment of the Tweed Commissioners were convicted of an aggravated assault upon Mr. Anderson, farmer, Pirn, Innerleithen, while he was walking through one of the fields upon his farm in pursuit of his calling; whether he is aware that these two bailiffs, while in a state of intoxication, charged Mr. Anderson, who is between 70 and 80 years of age, with poaching salmon in the Tweed, put a cleek into his pocket to support their charge against him, and told him, although he gave them his name and address, that he must go to the police office with them, and although Mr. Anderson promptly offered to accompany them to the police office insisted upon putting handcuff's upon him and dragged him through the High Street of Innerleithen to the police office; and whether he will make representations to the Tweed Commissioners to make strict inquiries as to the character of the men they employ as bailiff's, who while on duty are armed with practically all the powers of a police constable.

\*MR A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I have made inquiry into the regrettable circumstances mentioned by my hon. friend. The statements contained in the first and second paragraphs of the question are not, however, accurate in all particulars. The two bailiffs were charged with assault, but the magistrates while finding that both were intoxicated at the time of the assault convicted in one case only. Also it would not be proper that I should express an opinion as to the accuracy of the assertion in the question that those bailiffs "put a cleek into his (Mr. Anderson's) pocket to support their charge against him." No decision on this point was arrived at by the magistrates, who indeed refused to hear evidence for the defence in regard to it. I have satisfied myself that due care and diligence was used in the appointment of these two bailiffs. They came with good characters from their previous employment and were personally interviewed by trusted servants of the Commissioners. The men were dismissed from the service by the superintendent as soon as the facts were brought to his notice. I am disposed to think, however, that where possible it should be arranged that any two bailiffs appointed to work a strange beat on the river should not both be first-season men as in this case they were.

#### GLASGOW SMALL-POX EPIDEMIC.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he can state how many deaths have occurred in Glasgow from the small-pox epidemic.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Local Government Board informs me that during the period from 7th April, 1900, to 21st February, 1901, 1,086 cases and 122 deaths from small-pox were registered in Glasgow.

#### ALLOTMENTS IN SCOTLAND.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Ross): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he will grant a Return of all lands acquired in Scotland for allotments under The Allotments (Scotland) Act, 1892, and The Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, showing in how many cases requisitions by the parish council to the county council for the compulsory acquisition of land for allotments have been made and with what result.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Yes. Sir.

PETERSPONT PIER.

MR. JOHN DEWAR (Inverness-shire) I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether, the attention of the Secretary for Scotland has been called to the fact that the Peterspont Pier at Benbecula, constructed by the Congested Districts-Board, cannot be made use of until an access road has been formed: and, seeing that the inhabitants are too poor to pay for the construction of this road, but are willing to contribute a reasonable amount of free labour, will he state what steps are proposed to be taken to make the pier available for traffic.

\*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: On 29th December, 1900, the Congested Districts Board received from the County Council of Inverness a representation as to the access by land and sea to Peterspont Pier (which was constructed before the constitution of the Congested Districts Board). The Congested Districts Board are investigating the engineering and other questions involved, and will come to a decision at their next meeting early in March.

COONALOUGHHEY (CO. KERRY) LANDING STAGE.

\*MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Congested Districts Board for Ireland is prepared to carry out the improvements, which have already been sanctioned, at the landing place at Coonaloughey, county Kerry, and at what date work will be commenced.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): A grant for the improvement of the landing place at Coonaloughey was made in 1898. The attitude of the fishermen to the foreman in charge of the work became, however, so threatening as to necessitate his being placed under police protection. Work was in consequence suspended, and the Congested Districts Board have since declined to proceed with the undertaking.

\*MR. BOLAND: May I ask if it is not a fact that local opinion was not allowed to have anything to say in this particular case, and whether, seeing that the work would be of great public utility, the Congested Districts Board would not be instructed to take it up?

MR. WYNDHAM: There are a great many demands made upon the Congested Districts Board for which a good case can be made out, and they all have to go through a process of selection, because the state of the public funds does not admit of all being dealt with.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Are we to infer from the right hon. Gentleman's answer that the local fishermen prevented the Congested Districts Board carrying out this work?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. FLAVIN: That is the substance of the right hon. Gentleman's reply, Mr. Speaker.

IRISH DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE; VETERINARY INSPECTION STAFF; MR. C. NEILL'S APPOINTMENT.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the grounds on which Mr. C. Neill was appointed to the veterinary inspection staff of the Irish Privy Council, while Mr. C. J. Clifford, to whom he was junior assistant in Belfast, and who was qualified as a veterinary surgeon one and a half years previously, was refused the position; and will he explain why has Captain Tuke, who is not a veterinary

surgeon and who is over sixty-five years of age, been granted extension of time to the exclusion of qualified practitioners; and will the Government make known the principles on which appointments to their veterinary staff are made.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Veterinary Department of the Irish Privy Council was transferred to the Department of Agriculture on the 1st April, 1900, and it was subsequently to this date that Mr. Neill was appointed on the veterinary inspection staff. I am informed that Mr. Neill was appointed because he was considered to be the most suitable of the applicants. There is only an interval of four months between the dates on which Messrs. Clifford and Neill became duly qualified veterinary surgeons, but in any case these appointments are not made on the ground of seniority in the profession. The services of Captain Tuke have been retained until the 31st March, proximo, pending a settlement of the new arrange merits now being carried out in the matter of transit inspection. For the performance of his duties a veterinary qualification was not necessary.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government would be prepared to accept a change in the Labourers Act which would enable the occupying tenants of these plots to acquire the ownership on terms fair to the district councils and the ratepayers; and whether any resolutions have recently been received by the Department in favour of such a change in the law.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the second paragraph is in the affirmative. I believe a suggestion to the effect mentioned was made at the time of the passing of the Labourers Act of 1896, but the Government declined to accept it. More recently still, in 1899, a provision was inserted in the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act of that year expressly exempting from the operation of this Act cottages held by a district council under the Labourers Acts. The Government is not prepared to depart from the policy adopted in 1896 and 1899.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: May I ask whether the Small Dwellings Act is not practically inoperative, and, that being so, will not the Government deal with this question?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think sufficient time has elapsed since 1899 to make it expedient to consider the question of amending legislation at present.

GRANARD (CO. LONGFORD) ESTATE.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any, and, if so, what steps have been taken to ascertain the cause of delay in offering sales to tenants whose applications had previously been rejected as too high by the Land Commission on the Granard, county Longford, Estate; whether a request under the fortieth section has been applied for or granted; and whether steps to facilitate the sales will now be taken.

MR. WYNDHAM: I understand from the solicitors having carriage of the proceedings that the tenants are responsible for any delay that has occurred, and that when their objections are withdrawn the matter will proceed under the fortieth section. The solicitors deny that the previous applications were rejected by the Land Commissioners on the ground stated.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that in this case it is

only one tenant who is obstructing? Cannot the cases of the other tenants be expedited?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think it is possible. It may be the case that the obstruction is at the instance of one tenant, but the case has not yet come before the Land Court.

ALLEGATIONS AGAINST AN ARMAGH MAGISTRATE.

MR. M'FADDEN: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether the attention of the Lord Chancellor of Ireland has been directed to a judgment delivered by his honour Judge Kisbey, at the recent Armagh Quarter Sessions, in the case of Mary Anne Ballantine v. Lord Gosford, in which the county court judge characterised the conduct of Mr. H. A. Johnston, B.L., a magistrate of county Armagh, as an unworthy juggle calculated and intended to mislead and deceive the plaintiff and cause her completely and, as he thought, irrevocably to change her position to her pecuniary loss, also that in another part of the same judgment an act of Mr. Johnston's is described as a map trick, and a cunning and disgraceful piece of misrepresentation; and whether, seeing that Mr. Johnston is a magistrate for the county of Armagh, it is the intention of the Lord Chancellor to continue him in the commission of the peace.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): I understand that an appeal has been lodged by Mr. Johnston against the decision of the county court judge, pending which it would be premature to refer the matter to the Lord Chancellor, as is apparently suggested in the question.

CONVICT J. R. SULLIVAN.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a man named John R. O'Sullivan, of Mill-street district, county Cork, was sentenced at the Cork Assizes in 1892 to two terms of imprisonment of ten and fourteen years, to run successively; and whether, in view of the sympathy felt for the man's wife and family, he will communicate with the Lord Lieutenant with a view of recommending the exercise of the Royal Clemency in this case.

MR. WYNDHAM: The prisoner named in the question was convicted at the Munster Winter Assizes of 1891 of two separate offences and sentenced, as stated. His case has been considered by the Lord Lieutenant several times, on memorial, the last occasion so recently as the 10th January, when it was decided that the law must take its course.

MR. FLAVIN: Can the right hon. Gentleman say why the same clemency was not extended to this man as was shown to the bailiff of Lord Kenmare, who committed a murder?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order &#x0021;

BELFAST NIGHT LONDON MAIL.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that although the night mail from Belfast for Dublin, the provinces, and England is despatched at 10 p.m. the principal office closes at 9 p.m. for postal and telegraph business, and the work is transferred to an office in a back street, which arrangement causes public inconvenience; whether he is aware that the hour of closing is now the

same as twenty years ago; can he say approximately the annual saving by the present arrangement, and whether representations have been received by the postal authorities upon this subject from the local chamber of commerce: and whether, in view of the acceleration of mails in recent years, and the practice in other large offices of closing the chief office until some time after the despatch of the night mails, he will arrange to have the principal office kept open for an extended time.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: No representations on the subject have been received from the chamber of commerce; but the Postmaster General has decided to keep the public counter at the head office, Belfast, open until 10 p.m., and the necessary instructions will be given as early as practicable.

IRISH ROMAN CATHOLIC MAGISTRATES.

MR. BOYLE (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the respective numbers of the Roman Catholic and Protestant populations in the petty sessions districts of Dunfanaghy, Falcarragh, Bunbeg, and Stranorlar, in the county of Donegal, and the number of Roman Catholic and Protestant magistrates entitled to sit on the local benches in each of said districts; and whether he will take steps to give the Roman Catholic populations a representation on the local benches in said districts, if not

in proportion to their numbers at least equal to the number of Protestant magistrates entitled to sit in each of said petty sessions districts.

MR. WYNDHAM: So far as can be ascertained, the religious denominations of the local justices of the peace entitled to sit at the petty sessions, in the order named in the question, are as follows: Protestants, 7, 6, 2, and 9; and Roman Catholics, 2, 3, 2, and 7. respectively. There is no official information on the distribution of religious denominations by petty sessional districts.

Recommendations for the commission of the peace should be made to the Lieutenant of the county, who will submit them, if he considers them suitable, to the Lord Chancellor. It is not in my province to intervene in the matter as suggested.

ACQUISITION OF SMALL HOUSES IN IRELAND,

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many purchases have been completed in Ireland under the Small Houses (Acquisition of Houses) Act: whether he has had any complaint of the obstacles placed in the working of the Act by technical objections; and whether the Government intend to simplify and cheapen the machinery of the Act.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board have sanctioned one loan, applied for by the Dublin Corporation under the provisions of the Small Dwellings Acquisition Act of 1809, to enable the corporation to make advances for the purchase of five dwellings. No complaints of the nature mentioned in the second paragraph have been received by the board, but the evidence given at the inquiry held in reference to the Dublin loan indicated that there were some technical difficulties in connection with the registration of titles. In answer to the last paragraph, the Act has been in operation in Ireland for so limited a time as to offer insufficient grounds for considering the question of further

legislation.

#### LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACTS.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state what is the total number of applications under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts for cottages and plots and for allotments made since 1883, specifying the number of applications under each schedule in the representation forms, how many of these applications were rejected by the Local Government Board on the recommendation of their inspectors and by the Privy Council on appeal, specifying the number rejected in respect of each schedule.

MR. WYNDHAM: Information in respect to the different schedules of the forms of applications for cottages could only be obtained from the clerks of district councils, and this would entail an enormous amount of labour upon these officials without any commensurate result. The total number of cottages applied for to the Local Government Board from the inception of the Labourers Acts to the 31st March, 1899, was 31,742, of which 16,056 were, finally authorised to be built. The number of cottages rejected by the Privy Council was 560, and of the remaining 15,126 cases it would be impossible to say how many were invalid or how many were rejected by the Local Government Board without an examination of every scheme, which would occupy several weeks.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN put a long supplementary question which was inaudible in the press gallery, and Mr. SPEAKER warned him that he was exceeding the limits of such questions.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether at the local inquiries under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts the inspectors of the Local Government Board, as a general rule, pass all applications for additional half-acres by labourers who have already got one half acre under said Acts, and recognise no ground of objection except the neglect of the district council to endeavour to arrive at an agreement to acquire the additional plots before seeking compulsory powers; and whether the desirability of taking this step beforehand will be pointed out by circular to the district councils.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is not, I am informed, a fact that all applications for additional half-acres are, as a general rule, approved of if it is shown that all reasonable efforts have been made to acquire the additional plots by agreement. On the contrary, various other matters arise for consideration in such cases, for example, the tenant's avocation and his care of the existing plot, the size of the farm from which the plot is to be taken, etc. In fact, it is on grounds such as these that any applications for additional half-acres which have been thrown out have been rejected, and not on the ground mentioned in the question.

MR. O'SHEE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what amount remains unexpended in each county of Munster and Leinster, out of the Exchequer contribution of £40,000 per annum granted under the Purchase of Land (Ireland) Act, 1891, in aid of the rates leviable in respect of cottages provided since 1891 under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts.

MR. WYNDHAM: No portion of the grant in question remained unissued in either Munster or Leinster at the date of the last distribution, which took place in March, 1900.

#### SINKING OF A DREDGER OFF CORK HARBOUR.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade, with reference to the loss of a dredger outside Cork Harbour with twelve lives, whether she was surveyed previous to her departure by engineers or shipwrights who have had no practical experience in charge of ships, or in the actual use of boats and life-saving equipment generally, or by ex-shipmasters who, by reason of their previous service, are fully conversant with these necessary appliances, and able to judge as to their efficiency or otherwise.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The-Board of Trade surveyors who surveyed the dredger to which the hon. Member refers were a shipwright and an engineer. Having undergone special training, and being guided by definite rules, they were fully qualified to deal

with the question of boats and life-saving equipments generally as well as with the question of stability.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman if he can say what practical experience engineers possess as to the actual use of boats and life saving at sea.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: That is a question of which notice should. I think, be given.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that considerable dissatisfaction exists in the merchant service at the manner in which these ships are surveyed?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I must decline to answer this question?

#### BELFAST VALUATION.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will agree to the Return respecting Belfast Valuation standing on to-day's Paper.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The new valuation of Belfast will not be completed before 1st March, and until the appeals have been heard and the final amounts settled it will not be possible to give the information asked for.

#### CORK CORONER AND THE PUBLIC EXECUTIONER

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a summons was issued by the coroner for Cork City for the attendance of a witness named Billington, who, when so summoned, refused to attend the court, and that a warrant issued by the coroner for Billington's arrest was not executed by the police authorities; also that, at an inquest in Belfast within the past few days, a summons was issued by the coroner for the attendance of a witness named Carlisle, who, when so summoned, did not attend the court, and that a warrant issued by the coroner was acted upon by the police; and can he explain why the coroner's warrant was acted upon in Belfast and not in Cork; and will he state whether a coroner's warrant for the arrest of a witness for

contempt of court is as efficacious as a warrant issued by a magistrate; and:



what is the procedure adopted in England in similar cases.

MR. ATKINSON: At the request of my right hon. friend I will reply to this question. The coroner's warrant was acted upon by the police in Belfast because there was nothing to show that it was not duly issued by the coroner in the rightful discharge of his duties, whereas in Cork it was obvious from the proceedings which took place before the coroner before he issued his warrant that the presence of Executioner Billington was not required at the inquest for the purposes of the only inquiry on which the coroner had jurisdiction to enter, but for an indirect and improper purpose. The practice in England and Ireland is, I believe, identical; the presence of the executioner at the inquest is, I believe, never required. The different warrants mentioned in the last paragraph are equally efficacious.

MR. O'DOHERTY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say if the police authorities are a court of appeal to which a coroner's court is subject?

MR. ATKINSON: No, Sir.

MR. FLYNN: With regard to the warrant issued by the coroner of the city of Cork, what is the right hon. Gentleman's ground for stating that the attendance of the executioner was required for an improper purpose?

MR. ATKINSON: It is quite impossible to discuss this matter in the form of question and answer, but if the hon. Gentleman brings it forward on the Estimates I shall be happy to explain, and defend the action that has been taken.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: May I ask whether it is a fact that the law in Ireland requires that in all cases of a death in prison an inquest shall be held; and a record kept of the verdict?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That is a general question, which does not arise out of the question on the Paper. General questions of law cannot be raised in this manner.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I want to know, is there any record of the death and of the verdict of the jury in this case, and, if not, what is the reason?

MR. ATKINSON: The reason is that the coroner most improperly and illegally refused to complete the inquest.

MR. O'DOHERTY: If the coroner acted improperly, why has he not been dismissed by the Lord Chancellor?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order;

SMALL-POX IN DONEGAL.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been directed to a case of small-pox near Cardonagh, county Donegal, imported into that district lately from Glasgow; and what steps (if any) the Local Government Board for Ireland will take to prevent any more such cases being imported from Glasgow; whether he is aware that the request made by the Public Health Committee of the Londonderry Corporation to the Local Government Board to issue a sealed order preventing the importation of old clothes and rags into that city and district from Glasgow during the prevalence of the small-pox epidemic in the latter city has been refused; and whether, considering the intimate touch of Londonderry and district with

Glasgow, the Local Government Board will direct the Londonderry port sanitary authority to take precautions with respect to the examination of the cross-channel steamers similar to those taken by them during the late bubonic plague epidemic in Glasgow.

MR. WYNDHAM: The medical inspector of the Local Government Board, who has made careful inquiry into the allegation contained in the first paragraph, states it is absolutely without foundation. The Board were unable to comply with the request made by the Public Health Committee, as it has not been shown that small-pox is conveyed through the medium of old clothes. The Board do not consider it necessary to enforce in respect of small-pox the precautionary measures which were held to be essential in respect of bubonic plague. The Board have informed the authorities at Londonderry and other ports that vaccination or re-vaccination provide the best safeguards against a spread of small-pox.

#### IRISH RAILWAY EXTENSION.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether his attention has been called to the agreement entered into by the Great Northern and Midland Great Western Railway Companies of Ireland, in the year 1894, not to contribute to or promote or encourage in any way, directly or indirectly, the construction of new lines into the district of the other company; and will he state what steps the Government intend to take to protect the traders and farmers in the districts referred to in this agreement from the monopoly of these two railway companies.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir; the Board of Trade have no information with regard to any such agreement, nor, if it exists, is it one in connection with which they have any legal or administrative control. The question of quasi-monopoly enjoyed by any railway company or railway companies is one for the determination of the Legislature in connection with any competing schemes which may be brought before it, and not for the Board of Trade.

#### TOBACCO CULTIVATION IN IRELAND

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the acreage under cultivation of tobacco in the various counties of Ireland last year, the average yield per acre, the cost of cultivation, the price obtained, and the net profit per acre.

MR. WYNDHAM: Experiments in tobacco culture were carried out by the Department of Agriculture in fourteen counties last year, with results sufficiently satisfactory to justify further trials this year. So far, only the stages of drying and fermenting in regard to last year's crop have been reached, and until the manufacture is complete it would not be possible to give figures as to the cost of cultivation, etc. All available details of the experiments will be found in the November and February issues of the Journal of the Department.

#### THE RECENT "DAY OF GENERAL MOURNING"; POLICE AND WICKLOW SHOPKEEPERS.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will state on whose authority Constable Garry, on the evening of 1st February, visited the shopkeepers of Carnew, county

Wicklow, and told them that the following day, Saturday, 2nd of February, would be a holiday, and that they were not to sell any goods, and that all business was to be suspended as a mark of respect for the memory of the late Queen.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that the constable made no communication to the shopkeepers of Carnew such as is alleged in the question.

LONDONDERRY POST OFFICE STAFF.

MR. O'DOHERTY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state the number of clerks appointed to the Londonderry Post Office during the past year; whether examinations are held for the positions of clerks in the said post office, and with whom the nomination (if any) required by candidates lies; and how many examinations were held during the past year; and, seeing that the practice in post offices in other Irish cities is to duly advertise or give public notice of the qualifications required of candidates and the dates of the examinations, will he explain why this practice is not followed in Londonderry; and whether, in future, the Postmaster General will take steps to have all such examinations duly advertised.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There were no male sorting clerks and telegraphists appointed at Londonderry last year, but two females were appointed. Limited competitions are held from time to time, as vacancies occur, for the position of learner at Londonderry, nomination by the Postmaster General through the postmaster being necessary. One competition for female learners was held last year. Such competitions, whether held at Londonderry or other towns where the same system exists, are not advertised, as a sufficient number of candidates is obtainable without advertising. At Belfast, Cork, and Dublin, where open competitions are held, the examinations are advertised by the Civil Service Commissioners in the local papers. No alteration of the existing practice is in contemplation.

MAIDSTONE ELECTION PETITION.

MR. CHARLES ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the circumstances connected with the recent Maidstone Election Petition, he can hold out any hope of an amendment of the Law relating to Corrupt Practices at Elections.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am not aware of any circumstances connected with the Maidstone Election which seem to me to suggest any general alteration in our law in regard to bribery.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It may be for the convenience of the House that I should give notice that at the very earliest opportunity I shall move, as a sessional order, the Friday Supply Rule, and also move to amend Standing Order 51 by omitting the words "Ways and Means." I am afraid that I shall also have to ask the House to give the Government special facilities for Supply before Easter. The amount of work we have got to get through in order to carry out the law before Easter is very considerable. Very important subjects of debate must arise, and I confess, though I have no other complaint to make, that I view the prolongation of the debate on the Address, with some alarm, simply from the fact that the discussion on the Estimates must be got through by a certain fixed date; and every day on

which we maintain the general discussion going on for the last week makes it rather more difficult for us without putting ourselves to considerable inconvenience in getting through the necessary work.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Does the right hon. Gentleman propose to take Committee of Supply early this week?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. LOUGH: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether he will consider the advisability of setting apart Tuesdays instead of Fridays to Supply, or whether he will not take an opportunity of consulting the House on the point?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is a question which I have considered already, and I must admit that, on the whole, I do not think the general opinion of the House is in favour of it.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will give fair notice of the proposed innovation of the abolition of the opportunity for moving Amendments on the Speaker leaving the chair when the House goes into Committee of Ways and Means?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I can give the hon. Gentleman the information he asks for now. It is simply after Standing Order 51 to leave out the words "or Ways and Means."

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I want notice as to the day on which he proposes to move his motion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That depends upon the length of time the House desires to discuss the Speech from the Throne.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say if he proposes to move the suspension of the Twelve o'clock Rule to-morrow?

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent): And whether before he moves his motion he will be prepared to muzzle Members of the House of Commons?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No: I do not propose to move the suspension of the Twelve o'clock Rule to-morrow.

MR. DILLON: I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman not to deprive me of the opportunity of moving the Amendment I have on the Paper.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order &#x0021; Questions as to the time at which the Government will move the closure are irregular. They are practically debating the question.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

[EIGHTH DAY'S DEBATE.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [14th February],

"That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth;

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament."; (Mr. Forster.)

Question again proposed.

GIBRALTAR DOCKS.

\*MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis) said the matter which he had now to introduce to

the notice of the House was one of great importance; of national importance. The question was whether Gibraltar had ceased to be an impregnable fortress and a safe naval refuge, and had become an untenable refuge for ships, owing to the character of certain works made there, and to the great improvements and the increased range, mobility, and invisibility of modern guns. By his Amendment he asked that an inquiry, a prompt, complete, and thorough inquiry, should be made into the circumstances which had arisen and which might render Gibraltar a source of weakness to the Empire instead of being a source of strength. He had feared at one time that he would have had to discuss the question and endeavour to persuade the House that the view he took upon the question was the right one, and he thought he could have so persuaded the House. But such a discussion would have involved many considerations with regard to foreign nations which he would have

hesitated to adduce and have been sorry to discuss in the House. He had always been anxious not to debate this question in the House, and the right hon.

Gentleman the Leader of the House would not question the fact that he (Mr. Bowles) had taken months before, and repeatedly since, such steps as lay in his power to induce the Government, by private representations, to undertake the inquiry he desired. He assured the House that it was only because those efforts failed that he was, as he thought, driven to resort to the pamphlet he had published upon the subject and to put the Amendment on the Paper. To his great relief he had now received a communication from the Government, which made him hope it might be unnecessary to proceed further with his Amendment; and he had, if he might use the metaphor, not come down to lay siege to the Government, but to receive the keys of the fortress.

He had few more words to say upon the subject. It was, in his opinion, his duty towards the question itself, and also to those who had promised to support him in his resolution not to withdraw the Amendment quite silently or without some assurance from the Government that they would take steps to satisfy himself, and those who had done him the honour to support him, by agreeing to such an inquiry as he desired into the safety and adequacy and defensibility of the works, and the comparative advantages of the east and west sides of the Rock. It was a question whether any of the works on the western side might not require to be transferred to the eastern, and, if so, whether any other works would require to be erected there.

He trusted he might receive that assurance, and he also trusted that if the inquiry showed, as it undoubtedly would show, that there were dangers in the present system which it was essential to remedy, the Government would consider what remedy to apply and would apply it. The Government might consider that he had taken up this matter with an undue amount of determination and pressed it with what might be considered an undue amount of pertinacity, but if that were so he had done it solely from a sense of public duty and to avoid what he, at all events, thought was likely to be a danger to the Empire. He had done his duty so far as he could, and he was glad to admit that he had been met with an open-mindedness on the part of the Government which was as novel as it was agreeable. He formally moved the Amendment of which he had

given notice.

Amendment proposed;

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'And we humbly represent to Your Majesty the desirability of now making a further and more complete inquiry into the works under construction at Gibraltar, and the dangers to which those works are exposed; and of suspending the further prosecution of work on Docks Nos. 1 and 2 until such inquiry has been completed and its results considered by Your Majesty's Government.'";(Mr. Gibson Bowles).

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): As my hon. friend has only moved this formally, I hope the House will forgive me for rising to reply without awaiting the formality of the Amendment being-seconded. I am sure everybody will agree that my hon. friend made no undue claim upon the House when he said he was moved solely by a sense of public duty and by no other motive in bringing up this question. In refraining from pressing the Amendment he has, I think, given additional proof of the patriotism and public spirit with which he is animated. I am glad, although I am in one respect sorry, that my hon. friend has not had an opportunity of making a speech upon this subject, because a speech from him upon a subject with regard to which he possesses a minute knowledge and does not depend upon hearsay for his facts would be most welcome. But my hon. friend must realise that it is impossible to have a discussion upon this question without raising international and strategical problems which in the public interest it would not be wise to thrash thoroughly out across the floor of the House.

It is possible that international questions might be dragged by accident into the discussion, and when such international questions are dragged into a debate it is difficult to be assured that there may not be misunderstandings and misconceptions, which it is always desirable to avoid. Now we thoroughly recognise the necessity, with my hon. friend, that the ever changing nature of naval warfare requires us from time to time to review the conditions under which a great naval base like Gibraltar is defended, and my hon. friend has done much to show that such occasion of review presents itself at the present time, and I am sure, if he will give us his valuable assistance in carrying out that review, either formally or informally, we shall be grateful to him, and I know, through private communications with him, that my hon. friend is quite ready to lay before the Admiralty and the War Office all the information at his disposal. In the meantime I do not think it is necessary for me to do more than thank him for the patriotic line he has taken.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES made an observation which did not reach the gallery.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend whispers to me that I have not promised the inquiry; but that I will certainly do now, and I ask my hon. friend to take notice of the fact that I hope he will serve upon it and give us the benefit of his information and advice.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) concurred in the views of the Leader of the House, and thought the inquiry would be an extremely useful one. His only object in intervening in the discussion was to make it perfectly clear that the scheme for

the defence of Gibraltar, which was now called into question, was not in any way thoughtlessly adopted either by the late Liberal Government or the House itself. He believed there never was a scheme sanctioned more deliberately by the House with its eyes open than this scheme. At the time it was proposed an informal expert Committee sat for several days. The Committee consisted of every Member of the House who chose to take part in it. and it was satisfactory to all, including the hon. Member for King's Lynn, who expressed in the debate which subsequently took place an opinion in favour of the dock in the position decided on, and said that even in the unlikely event of a war with Spain, it would not in all probability suffer much damage.

\*MR. GIBSON BOWLES said that if the hon. Gentleman was going to enter into a discussion to which he would not have an opportunity of replying, and to, refer to observations made by him in a debate which took place in 1896, he should also read the reply made by him in his pamphlet.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said that he only referred to the debate in order to show that the, scheme at that time was apparently satisfactory to the hon. Member. At the same time the hon. Gentleman was quite entitled to take the line he had. He had discharged his public duty conscientiously, and he (Mr. Robertson) was glad that he, had received a favourable reply from the Government.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): This seems to me to raise a question of a somewhat serious nature. It appears to me a very strange thing that both the Governments;the late Liberal Government and the Conservative Government;should propose to spend many millions upon works at Gibraltar, and that it should fall to the lot of my hon. friend, a civilian Member, to find out that this was not a wise thing to do. Having regard to the many naval experts there are in the Service, it is strange that it should fall to my hon. friend to discover that there is sufficient doubt about the construction of these forts, or harbours, or docks, or whatever they are, to necessitate having a Committee to inquire into them. I do find it extremely difficult to understand how it came to be possible for my hon. friend to go to Gibraltar and see things which ought to be, to the ordinary military man, obvious, and then to write a pamphlet which induces the Government practically to alter the plans they have adopted. If this be true of the greatest fortress we hold, one of the wonders of the world, and one of the glories of the Empire, how can we who profess to know nothing about the Army or Navy feel satisfied that the Army and Navy are being managed properly in other directions? The First Lord of the Treasury acknowledges that he wants a Committee to inquire into this question, and he asks a gentleman who is neither a soldier nor a sailor to act upon it. That seems to me to be a most extraordinary thing. The alterations in the conditions of warfare, no doubt, have been very great, but have we to learn from the Boers that modern artillery has a range of 9,000 or 10,000 yards? We should have known this long ago. Many civilians knew it, and my hon. friend knew it. Lord Goschen was for years at the head of the Navy. He has been succeeded by a great man (the Earl of Selborne). Did any of these people know about the dangers which have been pointed out by my hon. friend? It has fallen to my hon. friend, a civilian,

to point out to the Army and Navy these elementary principles. If this is the way the affairs of our Army and Navy are conducted, all I can say is that the public will demand, more than ever before, that there should be most sweeping reforms.

This is not a party question in any sense, because at the General Election the question next to the war was the reform of the Army and Navy, and there is a feeling abroad that, in spite of the enormous sums which we have expended, in spite of the many millions, now amounting to over £30,000,000 or £40,000,000 annually, for the Army and Navy, we have not got a technical body in any of these branches of the service able to find out the dangers which have been referred to. It remains for a private Member of this House to discover them. It is for the purpose of inquiring into these things that a Committee is to be appointed. I do say that, in the interest of our great country, and in the interest of the Army and Navy, it is necessary that this matter should be looked into. We should, with these facts before us, look more carefully than ever into every detail of Army and Navy administration, so as to put the country on a footing of real security. I am sure that the public will agree that the Army and Navy organisation is completely wrong, and the idea will be forced upon them that something of a drastic nature should be carried out at once.

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): The hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has based his statements on a large assumption; namely, that the hon. Member for King's Lynn is correct in his facts with regard to this issue. I do not at all regret that this Committee has been granted; but I must endorse to a very large extent what has been said by the hon. Member opposite. I do not think that any question has been more elaborately inquired into by all the experts available than this question, and I hope the House will not assume that the hon. Member for King's Lynn; whose great authority on these questions I admit, and who is very often correct in his views; is right in this case, because there is a great deal to be said on the other side, as will no doubt appear when the new Committee sifts all the evidence available.

The whole question is a very simple one, and may be put into a single sentence: whether the risk of war with Spain; and that is a very small one; is not completely outweighed by the great and undoubted dangers which the east side of the dock presents for the dock accommodation now being provided. That is the principal question that the Committee will have to consider. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] There are the great depth of the sea, exposure to the wind and waves, and to the attacks from the sea to be set off. That is the main question the Committee will have to consider, and I doubt if the evidence will bear out what my hon. friend has stated. I trust the House will not assume that my hon. friend is correct in this case because he has published a pamphlet and obtained a Committee.

\*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I extremely rejoice at the turn this debate has taken, and I congratulate my hon. friend the mover of the Amendment. I also rejoice at the prompt action of my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury in at once meeting my hon. friend, and thus avoiding further discussion.



I only rise now to draw attention to a matter which I have often brought before the House on former occasions, and that is the position of this House with regard to the expenditure of money on the Army and Navy. The body I want to have an explanation about as regards this matter of Gibraltar is the Cabinet Defence Committee. That is the body I consider entirely responsible for the existing state of things. I am not going into any details. I shall confine myself broadly to the commonplace fact that this important question concerning Gibraltar is partly naval and partly military. It involves considerations of naval strategy, and when you come to the details it requires technical military knowledge. I hope that by and by we shall get at the fact whether this matter was or was not decided by the Defence Committee of the Cabinet. Was it decided by two Defence Committees of two different Governments or not? We are told that this Defence Committee keeps no records, and therefore perhaps we shall never know. I trust I shall have an opportunity to illustrate more fully the evil of our present system in dealing with these problems; the system which precludes the action of this most responsible Defence Committee of the Cabinet from being commented upon by this House. The whole difficulty would be got over if the Government would allocate £5 as salary to the President of the Defence Committee on the Army or Navy Estimates. This House would then be in a position to find out who was responsible in this country for what has been done and what has been left undone at Gibraltar and elsewhere. I am delighted at the course events have taken.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I have to thank the First Lord of the Treasury for the assurance he has given. I assure him that, so far as I can, consistently with my public duty, I shall give him every assistance I am able to afford. I beg leave to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

**SOUTH AFRICA (SURRENDERS OF TROOPS).**

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I want to bring before the House the necessity of inquiring into the surrenders that have taken place in South Africa, so that by the lesson there learned we shall prevent a recurrence of them in the future. There is no subject which has more profoundly moved the British people than the continual list of surrenders in South Africa. They have not said much about them, because "surrender" has rather a bitter taste in an Englishman's mouth. For my part, I do not mean to impugn the bravery of our officers and soldiers in South Africa. I do not think that any man, however hostile he may be to the war, can say that the officers and men in South Africa have not behaved with the greatest gallantry and courage, and I do not want in the smallest degree to gloat over the disasters that have taken place. I do not intend to follow the example of hon. Gentlemen opposite who during the election placarded the walls with the word "Majuba." For my own part I would prefer to leave in oblivion any disasters to the British forces, but if hon. Gentlemen opposite intend to follow the course to which they frequently had recourse during the election, they will have to considerably increase the number of the placards, because one placard would not contain the tale of surrenders in South Africa. In the casualty lists published in January there are lumped together

some 8,703 men and 329 officers, a total of over 9,000, who have surrendered to the Boers, and in addition about 30 of our guns have been captured.

I contend that we are entitled to information on these points, seeing that it is granted on the highest authority that the bravery of our officers and men in South Africa is unchallenged. If they are brave, and if the army in South Africa has shown the greatest courage, as I am glad to say it has been shown, there must be something wrong in connection with the surrenders that have taken place. They began at the commencement of the war, and they have been going on almost continually ever since. No greater humiliation has been inflicted on the British forces since the great war of last century in America, That is a sufficiently ominous parallel, and we do not wish to carry it further. The Prime Minister said we wanted to have pointed out the defects of the system. That is my view.

We know there must have been defects, because the British have an army of 250,000 men in South Africa, and the Boers have never been able to bring into the field more than 50,000 men. We have suffered the losses I have mentioned in men taken prisoners. Supposing we had been at war with a first-class Power, why, of course, these 9,000 who were taken would not have been released again. Now that they have been released, I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be able to assure us that he will give publicity to this inquiry, so that if we should ever be engaged in war with a first-class Power we shall never have to undergo the humiliation we have undergone during the last fifteen months. The information at our disposal is of the most meagre and unsatisfactory character. We know that the press censorship in South Africa is extremely severe. It cannot be exercised with more courtesy, but I hope it will be exercised with a little more leniency. We have not been able to get that information about the disasters to which we are entitled.

Some people will say that this is a question of washing dirty linen in public. I do not quite agree. These matters have been published, and it is far better for our Army and our strength that this linen should be thoroughly cleansed, rather than tied up with red tape and hidden in some obscure corner of the War Office. The right hon. Gentleman told us it was his object to lay before the Parliament as full and frank a declaration as possible in these matters, and he hoped it would be contained in the despatches recently published. That, however, is hardly so. I have gone very carefully through the despatches, but the information they contain does not carry us much further. Take the case of Nicholson's Nek, which occurred on 30th October, 1899. Thirty-seven officers and 917 men were taken prisoners; more than the effective strength of many regiments now in South Africa. What is the information Sir George White is able to give us? He says;

"My information has been obtained from subordinate officers who, being severely wounded, were sent into my camp by General Joubert."

Is it reasonable to suppose that we can be satisfied with such information upon a disaster of this magnitude? It really gives us no information at all. When we consider that the names of all these officers and men were mentioned, it is most important, not only for the credit of the Army and the bravery of the soldiers but also for the credit of these

officers themselves, to show where the true blame lies. Another case is that of Stormberg, on 10th December, when two guns and 630 prisoners were taken. These men were twenty-four hours on their legs, and if the Boers had been more active they would have captured the whole force. Upon whom does the blame rest? That is what we want to know. Have sufficient precautions been taken that no such occurrences shall take place in future? Then there is the Sanna's Post disaster, on 31st March last, when seven guns and 426 prisoners were taken. That was the result of an ambush, and Lord Roberts says that the disaster; "was mainly due to the failure of the patrol from Bolsman's Kop to warn their comrades of the ambush."

We should like to know who instructed the four men composing that patrol, and why they did not fire their guns to warn their comrades, especially as by so doing at that point this disaster would have been prevented? I do not pose as a military expert, but I think this illustrates one of the defects of our Army training. We do not give sufficient attention to field training; we think far too much about marching past in barrack square and pipeclaying accoutrements. I mention this not to cast blame upon anybody, but in order that the authorities should draw conclusions which will make the British Army more efficient in the future than it has unfortunately proved to be in South Africa. There is not the smallest doubt that field training is one of the most important questions, and we are told in drill book and elsewhere that the question of outposts and reconnoitring is among the most important in the training of the private soldier. We had another case just afterwards. Encouraged by this success the Boers went out and captured more than 400 officers and men at Reddersburg. These men were sent to Dewetsdorp by General Gatacre, but withdrawn by Lord Roberts's orders. Here again, why were they sent to Dewetsdorp? What was the reason of their surrender? Was it want of ammunition or want of water? We have no information whatever. I do not want to know for the purpose of impugning the gallantry of our soldiers, but I believe they must have been led by some person or other into a death-trap and obliged to surrender. It has been stated in the public press that though they surrendered at twelve o'clock, in the morning of that day they heard volleys of firing from the relief troops, and yet they were unable to hold out until relief came. Unfortunately it has been only too common in South Africa that the relief forces have arrived a day too late, and that is a point which I think is well worth the attention of the War Office. Then I come to a series of disasters connected with the name of Lindley. On the 31st May last a force of Yeomanry surrendered to the Boers. All we know is that they were ordered to join the Highland Brigade at Lindley; that on their arrival, instead of finding the British there, they found the Boers, and that General Colville had marched with them. Colonel Spragge halted three miles to the west of Lindley; there were very few Boers in front of him, but they immediately assembled on hearing of the defenceless position of his force. Colonel Spragge was able to send messages to General Rundle, General Colville, and Lord Methuen, and it is extraordinary that, while he apparently was in the centre of this triangle, neither of these generals was able to relieve him, nor was he able to take his troops to the nearest British force and so

prevent this surrender to the enemy. General Rundle, we are told, tried to relieve the pressure, but did not succeed. Lord Methuen marched forty-four miles in twenty-four hours, but arrived too late. What we should like to know is, whether these troops held out as long as they could. The force was composed of the very highest type of British chivalry, at any rate, and it has been stated that the troops composing it were mainly millionaires. I do not wish in the slightest degree to impugn the conduct of millionaires. We know that when my right hon. friend below me passed his Budget in 1894 they were not willing to pay for their country, but I am sure they are willing to die for it; at any rate, millionaires should not have the undeserved reflection left upon them that they surrendered before they should have done. It is also stated that these battalions were seen to march away under the escort of eight armed Boers without making any attempt to escape. These are points which the right hon.-Gentleman would do well to clear up in the interests not only of his own Department, but also of the Army at large.

Another question is, what is the value of the patriotic but untrained soldiers who volunteer to go and fight the enemy in South Africa or elsewhere? We are undoubtedly largely relying at this moment upon the patriotic but untrained men sent out to the Cape, and we want to know whether these forces are really capable of sustaining ; not by their courage, that is beyond doubt, but by their training; the credit of the Empire in foreign countries. Would they be sufficient to meet the trained armies of Continental nations should they be called upon to face them? But to return to this matter. There must have been some mismanagement somewhere, because two days after the capture of this Yeomanry detachment a convoy consisting of fifty wagons, with an escort of the Highland Brigade, left Rhenoster River station. Surely, after the capture two days before of 500 Yeomanry, this convoy should not have started, as Rhenoster River station is not more than twenty-five miles from the scene of the disaster. However, it started on the morning of one day, and on the afternoon of the next it was captured by the Boers. That made the Boers still more militant, and they attacked Rhenoster River station itself, where there were immense stores. There is not a single word in the despatches of Lord Roberts about these stores, but we know from reports in the press that the stores were there, and that they were guarded by the Derbyshire Militia. In this case Lord Roberts says, after five officers and thirty-two men had been killed and one hundred wounded out of a total force of 700, that "further resistance would have been useless." He does not say that of any other force to which a disaster occurred upon which he has reported. I hope that may lead the right hon. Gentleman to believe that the Militia has a right to claim more

attention from his Department in the future than it has received in the past. I do not want to go through the whole of this list, but there is the occurrence at Dewetsdorp, on 26th November, when 500 men and two guns were taken by the Boers. That place had been in our possession for months. Why was that outpost not entrenched? Why were the British not able to reply to the Boers? Why had 500 men to lay down their arms to a force of 2,000 Boers with six guns? We used to think that one British soldier was equal to four foreigners, but at present it looks

very different indeed.

Here I may show how injustice may be done to British officers by these surrenders. In many of the disasters of the past the greatest heroism has been displayed. At the small post of Helvetia, a very strong position reported on by Lord Kitchener, 200 prisoners and one gun were taken. Here is an extract from the Morning Post special correspondent's account of this incident (dated 12th February);

"The capture of the Liverpools at Helvetia some time before was executed in a similar manner. Descriptions of that affair have no doubt reached home already, but it may not be known that after;" (I will not mention his name; a certain major) "had surrendered with his men and the 4&#x00B7;7 in. gun the Boers sent to Captain;, who held a detached position with fifty men, demanding his surrender also. This he indignantly refused, and successfully beat off the enemy."

This is a direct imputation of cowardice against the major in command of this detachment, because the correspondent says he had 200 men and a gun at his disposal.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: He was severely wounded.

MR. LAMBERT: I know; I am coming to that. This is an imputation of cowardice; but if you refer to Lord Kitchener's telegram you will see that the officer was severely wounded, and ought not to have this reflection on his courage cast upon him by an uninformed correspondent of the Morning Post. It is therefore in the interest of the officers themselves, as well as of the Army, that I bring forward these matters. Will the right hon. Gentleman give the information for which I ask? I think it is reasonable, and I hope he will give it. At any rate, the country will not be satisfied unless we have it.

As the hon. Member for North Islington said just now, one of the great questions at issue at the last election was the reform of the War Office. In the address of almost every hon. Gentleman opposite that question took a very prominent part. The War Office has not the confidence of the country. In my opinion, that is undoubted. It may have the confidence of the right hon. Gentleman. I believe he is the only man who really defends it through thick and thin, but he has appointed a Committee to tell him whether even he ought to have that confidence. Undoubtedly grave miscalculations have taken place which have shaken the confidence of the country with the War Office. We were within an ace, as is shown by General Buller's despatches, of the greatest calamity that has ever occurred to a British garrison in the history of the Army; we were within an ace of the surrender of Ladysmith, with 10,500 men and about thirty-six guns. If Ladysmith had fallen it would have been a disaster the like of which has never been suffered by the British Army. The War Office were able to send out what they thought to be a sufficient force in October, 1899, but a really sufficient force did not arrive until January or February, 1900. If we were at war with a foreign Power the enemy would not wait for us; they would not wait for Lord Roberts to get out there, or until reinforcements arrived; they would strike at once at our vulnerable points. Therefore we ought, in the light of our past experience, to get some information which will guide us in the future, and

prevent such risks as we have run during the last twelve months. We on this side of the House do not think the War Office reputation was raised by that dream of last September that the war was over. At that time it was a ridiculous fallacy to state that the war was over, though possibly this military perspicacity was more worthy of and would do honour to the Primrose League. It is extraordinary that this military perspicacity came in at the exact moment to suit the electoral exigencies of hon. Members opposite. I do not think that has raised the War Office in the eyes of the country. We do not feel justified in giving the War Office a blank cheque. The right hon. Gentleman claims credit for the War Office that not a single man went hungry and not a single man suffered through want of supplies being landed at Cape Town. That may be true. Precisely the same excuse was put forward during the Crimean War. THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): No, no &#x0021;

MR. LAMBERT: Does the right hon. Gentleman deny that?

MR. BRODRICK: Yes, I do.

MR. LAMBERT: Then I will quote the authority of Lord Palmerston, who said, after the inquiry had taken place into the Crimean War, and after all the evils which our soldiers had suffered had been disclosed;

"It is true that ample supplies were sent from this country to the Crimea, but from want of arrangements on the spot the troops there derived no advantage from them."

It is just the same in South Africa. The Government have sent ample supplies to Cape Town, but from want of arrangements on the spot the troops derived no advantage from them. Of course, the War Office can send any amount of supplies to Cape Town, for it has at its disposal the whole of the mercantile marine to send supplies and the unlimited credit of the British Empire.

MR. BRODRICK: I rise to a point of order. I wish to know whether the hon. Member is in order in bringing in the question of the whole of the supply of the troops in the war upon an Amendment which applies only to the surrender of certain troops?

MR. LAMBERT: I would remind the right hon. Gentleman that I have not yet moved my Amendment, but I was endeavouring to show that the War Office was not, by its previous action, entitled to take credit for this or be trusted in regard to these matters.

\*MR. SPEAKER: It is quite true that the hon. Member is speaking to the main question. He is not out of order, because he is not confined to the terms of any Amendment before the House.

MR. LAMBERT: I can quite understand that the right hon. Gentleman would rather not go into the question of supplies.

MR. BRODRICK: I am perfectly ready to go into the question at any moment, but I wish to do so upon a motion on which I am entitled to reply.

MR. LAMBERT: And I hope the right hon. Gentleman will reply with more accuracy than he did upon the last occasion. This sort of thing has a very bad effect on the recruiting for our Army. It is impossible to get men of high intelligence if recruits have an inkling that they may be led into death-traps. [Ministerial

cries of "Oh, oh &#x0021;" Will the hon. Gentlemen opposite say that they have not been led into death-traps? In former days the British soldier thought it a disgrace to lay down his arms, and British soldiers to-day do think it is a disgrace to lay down their arms to Boer forces. You will not get the highest standard of recruits if you have not the fullest assurance that the state of organisation and training of the troops is of the highest possible efficiency. The country will very cheerfully meet any demands made upon it for increasing the efficiency of the force, but they will not pay money without considerable demur unless they are perfectly certain that it is going to be well spent. It is in the hope that this Amendment which I now move may have some effect in that direction, and that the publication of the explanation of these disasters may have some effect upon public opinion in the country, and show that the right hon. Gentleman and the War Office are endeavouring to remedy these defects, that I move this Amendment.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) seconded the Amendment. Amendment proposed;

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, ' But we humbly suggest to Your Majesty that there should be published as early as practicable the proceedings of full

inquiries into the circumstances that have occasioned the surrender of considerable bodies of Your Majesty's troops in South Africa."; (Mr. Lambert.) Question proposed, "That those words be added."

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I think that the House generally will feel that the speech which the hon. Member made in introducing this motion was not one which was animated by party feeling, and that he has raised a subject which deserves the deep attention of the House. I have myself contended that during the whole course of this war one of the most serious questions which faces this country, and which deserves the close interest of the authorities of the Army, has been this question of the surrender of such large bodies of troops during the war. I do not think it would be fair to accuse those who take the view that some, at all events, of these disasters might have been avoided by the officers commanding the troops, of imputing want of courage to British troops in the field. There is ample evidence to show that, wherever our troops have been well and intelligently led; and on many occasions where they have not been intelligently led; they have displayed during this war an unfailing and remarkable courage. I agree very largely with the hon. Gentleman who moved this motion when he said that it is not fair to expose troops who have shown such splendid courage, as our troops have shown throughout the war, to the conditions and the risks to which they have been on several occasions exposed in regard to these surrenders. I think it is a fair argument for him to use that such unjust exposure shakes the confidence of the men. It is most unfortunate that more notice of these surrenders was not taken earlier in the war. This want of attention on the part of the military authorities in regard to these surrenders has tended to make some of the officers in command on subsequent occasions careless both in choosing their positions and in fortifying them. Perhaps the most remarkable of all these surrenders was the first, which took

place at Nicholson's Nek. It is a very extraordinary thing that, so far as I know, no criticism has been passed by the War Office upon that important event. It is hardly possible to blame the officers in command upon that occasion, but I think that it is a most extraordinary thing that the general who commanded the whole army should have allowed this force to remain so long in an exposed and critical position without making any attempt to relieve it. When I find that some generals have been severely condemned by His Majesty's Government, and some of them even removed from the Army, I ask again the question which I asked the other day, Whether the same treatment would be meted out to most highly placed generals, which is apparently to be meted out to those who have committed even less faults, but who are not so highly placed? The condition of our troops at Nicholson's Nek was known to the general in command during the night, and yet that unfortunate force, which had lost its guns and ammunition waggons in consequence of an accident, was allowed to remain in a most precarious position, without any serious attempt being made to relieve it, until two or three o'clock the next day, when it was forced to yield. Two of these disasters; Sanna's Post and Reddersburg; had a most injurious effect upon the whole course of the war. I believe that there was a great chance of the Boers surrendering after the successful march of our troops to Johannesburg and Pretoria had it not been for those two disasters and others which followed.

Those two surrenders greatly encouraged the Boer Government and President Kruger and his friends, and we owe a great deal of the continuation of the war to these disasters. The defeat at Sanna's Post was probably one of the most extraordinary events which has ever happened in the history of warfare. A considerable force was retreating, with a large convoy in front of it, and there was absolutely no advance guard to the convoy to see that the way was clear. The enemy were actually allowed to conceal themselves in a spruit or donga on the Bloemfontein side, and they were not discovered by our scouts, because there were no scouts. When Burnham, the famous American scout, was asked for his explanation he humorously

replied that this disaster "came of scouting with buck wagons." The affair at Lindley has been referred to very often, and it was a very astonishing case, for which a general has been brought home. So far as one can judge, the means of defence of this force were not completely exhausted by the officer in actual command before surrendering.

I pass over Dewetsdorp and Rhenoster River, though at the latter place the Derbyshire Militia were compelled to surrender, because their camp was placed close under a commanding kopje on which no guard was placed, and also one or two other events which have been referred to. I come to our last heavy loss, which occurred at a place called Nooitgedacht, some twenty-five miles north-west of Pretoria. Here is an extraordinary case, in which a force, under the command of a general officer who has had a brilliant career, was left for five days without any entrenchments being thrown up, or without any efforts to fortify a circular hill which commanded the camp, and without any attempt being made even to construct sangars, although it was known that the enemy were in the neighbourhood in force. We have not had any official reports of this disaster,



and all we know is what we have been able to gather from the accounts given by officers and men and by the newspaper reports. If it be true that that position was occupied for five days without any attempt being made to entrench it or to erect sangars, I say that it is a discreditable case, which calls for the closest investigation on the part of the War Office. When we think of the loss and the suffering which have been caused by this want of preparation and want of military knowledge on the part of our generals; when we consider the long list of killed and wounded which has accompanied these surrenders, we are fully justified in asking the War Office for a complete inquiry, and for a very full report upon these disasters. I do not propose to trouble the House further on this question. It is a question which demands the fullest investigation in the interests of the Army itself, and I sincerely hope that this investigation will be specially made, and that some steps will be taken on the one hand to mete out justice to those who are responsible

for these very severe blows to the strength of the Army, and on the other hand to fairly reward those who have done well.

I believe that this war will lead not only to a great reform in the Army, but also to a reform of the instruction given to our officers and men, as well as to the drastic reorganisation of the Army. I believe that this war has proved before the world the courage and the endurance of our troops, the resolution of our generals, and, I hope, the tenacity and determination of the Government; but there are great lessons to be learned from this war which this country must learn, if it is not to meet a series of catastrophes, in the event of our ever being-engaged in a great war with a Continental Power. Happily for us we have received our lessons where we are able to deal with our difficulties and overcome them; and I believe it is almost by the direct blessing of Providence that these tremendous lessons have been taught our country when our Army and people were not in the presence, as they might have been, of force majeure. I sincerely hope that these disasters will result in the great improvement of the instruction of our officers and men. I am confident that there are no troops in the world who will fight so well as our troops, and that there are no officers that are more capable of leading their men with skill and courage than British officers, when properly trained and properly experienced.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): I do not wish to detain the House or to prolong the debate. Indeed, I look upon it as about the most hopeless debate which the House could enter into; where civilians, as most of of us are, venture to discuss the points where our generals have failed in the field. I hope we shall not be treated to a repetition of the series of disasters of which we have had a long list; many more, indeed, than I at first thought. There is one remark that civilians as well as soldiers would like to make to the War Office, and that is that the result of the proceedings of courts of inquiry should be published, and whenever an officer leads his troops into disaster there should be a public inquiry,

just as when a captain loses his ship. If a court of inquiry sits on an army officer the public do not know whether he has been acquitted or not; and in the interest both of officers themselves and the Army, there should be a public

inquiry, so that no blame should attach to the innocent.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD (Essex, Epping): It is always difficult to discuss in this House, while we have been remaining comfortably at home and not fully aware of all the circumstances of the case, the question of the behaviour of our troops in the field. I confess when the hon. Member for South Molton first opened his remarks was in considerable sympathy with him; but when he proceeded with his comments as to the conduct of the War Office, and the reorganisation of the War Office, I felt it impossible for me to go with him if he went to a division. There is no doubt that the surrender of large bodies of troops in South Africa has left an extraordinarily painful impression, not only on our soldiers and sailors, but on the public generally. The inconvenience of discussing the question in this way was shown when the hon. Member for South Molton went on to discuss matters of strategy.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg pardon; I did not discuss strategy at all. All that I asked for was that information should be given to the House in regard to these surrenders.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: There I am with the hon. Member; but when he goes on to say "Why was not this or that done?" when he acknowledges that he is not in possession of information, and yet lays down what ought to have been done, or rather inquires why so and so was not done; then I say he is not capable of discussing questions of military tactics or strategy. I agree that in all cases of surrender of troops, as in all cases in which ships are lost, the officers ought to stand a court of inquiry. I noticed in the remarks of both the hon. Member for South Molton and the hon. Member for Ecclesall that each of them seemed to drift away from the terms of the motion to discuss why such and such things were or were not done. We cannot possibly discuss why such surrenders took place until we have got full information from the War Office, and therefore I hope the right hon. the Secretary for War when he comes to make his statement will give us more information than we have at present in regard to all these surrenders, but especially the most painful of all, that at Nicholson's Nek I would say, possibly many of these surrenders are due to the want of education, not only on military matters, but on other matters as well, amongst both officers and soldiers. When a man is in a difficult place, if he is thoroughly educated, he will be able to act on his own initiative. Hon. Members may say that we shall have to wait until the country is thoroughly well educated until we can recruit men from the higher educated classes rather than from the class of men we have to look to at the present time.

The hon. Member for South Molton and the hon. Member for Ecclesall alluded several times to what might have taken place if we had been at war with a first-class Power; but it would have been much easier to have taken the field against such a Power than against the nation whom we are fighting in South Africa, because of the enormous extent of country in which the operations are being conducted, and because our enemies there are masters of a knowledge of every pass in the mountains and of the whole topography of the country. On the other hand, if we were engaged fighting against a first-class foreign Power it would

never be our lot to invade their country, but we should be able to make a choice of the ground on which the encounter was to take place. I have no doubt that the Secretary for War will see that the demand from both sides of the House for inquiry is reasonable, and that it is absolutely necessary that the House and the nation should be informed of his opinion on a subject upon which the Government has been pledged for a long time.

\*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): This is a question in which I quite agree with my hon. and gallant friend opposite who has just spoken, that the country is deeply

interested. We all know that for twelve months past, when there has been extreme anxiety throughout the country with reference to our military position in South Africa, the Government promised and vowed to the country that there should be a full inquiry into all that had taken place in the war. They said so in the House of Commons; they said so in the country; and by giving those pledges they diverted for the time an inquiry that might be considered inconvenient. I therefore am not speaking merely on the question of surrender, because that is only a part of the whole, but I think we are entitled to-night to have from the Government a categorical statement of what they intend to do with reference to inquiries as to what has occurred in the war. We have only had a vague statement on that subject, and I know that the impression has gone forth that, now that the difficulties have been surmounted, the inquiry is not to be granted, or, at all events, is to be granted in a very limited manner. I am happy to hear from the Leader of the House that that view is unfounded; but I hope that through the mouth of the Government to-night we shall have a distinct statement of the inquiry that is intended to be made, when it is to be made, and in what form it is to be made. They have had quite time enough to consider that, and I hope we will have a statement on the subject.

With reference to the particular matter that the hon. Member for South Molton has raised, no doubt it is one of the most painful incidents in the whole of this war. I do not suppose that in any war; I do not speak of wars where British forces were opposed by enemies five or six times their numbers; such a series of continuous surrenders has ever been recorded. In all foreign armies, so far as I know, such inquiries are made as a matter of course. I remember perfectly well when the great court-martial upon Marshal Bazaine took place it was founded upon the fundamental principle of the discipline of the French army that a surrender of troops in open campaign is necessarily a subject of court-martial or other form of inquiry. As my hon. and gallant friend opposite has said, we know nothing officially about the circumstances. I cannot say I know nothing at all about the circumstances. We know from the public press and newspaper correspondents, as far as the censor permitted, that circumstances occurred which led to surrender. They may or they may not be accurate, but the circumstances which have been made public are such as appear to be utterly insufficient to justify the surrenders. Therefore, when it is said that we ought not to allude to them, I say we must allude to them because the public both in this country and abroad have been supplied with information as to the circumstances which led to these surrenders, and I do not think I am wrong in

saying that, at all events to an unprofessional opinion, those circumstances have seemed in many cases not to justify those surrenders.

That is a state of things which makes it absolutely necessary that we should have an official and public inquiry into a thing which, I venture to say, has not been to the credit of the military reputation of this country. That being so, without professing to examine particular cases, which I feel totally incompetent to do, I share the opinion which I believe is generally spread throughout the country, that surrenders of this character ought not to have taken place, that there must have been miscarriage somewhere, and that we ought to know where that miscarriage has been. I hope and believe that we shall have an assurance that there shall be such an inquiry instituted as shall repair the mischief that has been done to the credit of British arms by surrenders the circumstances of which have never been explained, and which, as far as we know them, require a very clear and satisfactory explanation.

MR. BRODRICK: Nobody will complain of the tone taken by the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken in dealing with what is, after all, a very important subject, and one on which the Government recognise no division between themselves and the vast majority of the Members of this House.

The hon. Member who introduced the motion was, I think, if I may say so, very ill-advised in mixing up subjects of general attack with a matter of this kind.

While, in one way, every Member

of the House will desire to arrive at a right conclusion as regards the surrender of these large bodies of troops at different times, there must, obviously, be a difference of opinion on some of the topics which he introduced; and I think it is not only unusual under the orders of the House, but, at the same time, extremely undesirable, to accompany these questions of mistakes made by officers in the field with sneers at the War Office, which could not by any possibility have interfered, and would not have the right to interfere, in regard to the action of officers in the field. The hon. Member went further than that, and indulged in what I thought was a most ungenerous suggestion with regard to the surrender of the Yeomanry under Colonel Spragge. They were not too willing to pay taxes, but, he said, with an irony which was unmistakable, probably they were willing to give their lives.

MR. LAMBERT dissented.

MR. BRODRICK: I beg pardon. I am in the recollection of the House. I am not going to allow the hon. Member, without protest, to make these observations about a body of men who fought admirably, with a very insufficient allowance of food; they were almost starving; for several days, until they had sustained heavy losses, until all their doctors were either killed or wounded, so that their own wounded could not be attended to, and who, finally, only gave way when, in the opinion of the Court of Inquiry, to which I referred in this House in December, and which the hon. Member might have read if he had taken the trouble to look up Hansard, they could not resist any further. The Court of Inquiry accordingly exonerated Colonel Spragge and his officers altogether from blame.

MR. LAMBERT: May I ask what the right hon. Gentleman is quoting from? Have the proceedings of this Court of Inquiry been laid on the Table of the House? If

not, why does he quote them in the House?

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member's repartee is no excuse for making insinuations which, as I have already told the

House, in December last in reply to an interrogation from the Irish benches, on the authority of the Government, were not upheld by the Court of Inquiry. \* If the hon. Gentleman, who seems to be very fond of drawing a bow at a venture and is not very particular whom he attacks provided he can, in some way, connect it with the Government, is going to take that line, I think we shall have to revise the arrangements of the usual forms of criticism which we have hitherto employed in regard to the Army. I would much rather enter on the subject in the spirit which has animated the other speakers in the debate.

There is no question whatever that the country has seen with great regret the continual surrender of considerable bodies of men. The reasons I might go into at some length, but I may say that there is no doubt that this war has been a very unusual one. The enormous range of country, and especially the topographical character of it, has rendered the isolation of bodies of men perhaps more frequent than in any other war in which this country has been engaged for a great number of years. The rapidity of firing of modern ammunition, too, lends itself to the exhaustion of the weaker party. But the whole question is whether or not the system of military law which we have at this moment for dealing with these charges is adequate to enable those who are responsible to judge whether the officers immediately in command are to blame, or whether the superior officer who placed them in that position should be made responsible. My hon. friend the Member for Ecclesall made a suggestion as regards Nicholson's Nek. Undoubtedly that disaster sent a thrill throughout the country, but there has been no disaster about which it has been so difficult to arrive at a conclusion. In order that the House may realise what the difficulties are, I would just remind the House of the fact that the men at Nicholson's Nek were taken prisoners at the beginning of November, and were not released for many months afterwards. When they were released, the officers who had been responsible, both in the actual engagement and also in

\* Refer to The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxviii., p. 795.

command, were scattered all over South Africa. The attempt, therefore, to arrive at a complete decision by Lord Roberts as to the responsibility in the case was an extremely difficult one. I should like to say, as Sir George White's name has been mentioned, that I think we ought to be careful of carrying too far the responsibility which has been assigned to that officer in this business. He is the last man to put responsibility on the shoulders of anyone else. He did, as a matter of fact, take upon himself the responsibility for the whole, and if any man could redeem a mistake, I think not only the admirable defence which he afterwards made, but the cheerful spirit in which during many months he upheld his own troops and prompted those who were coming to the rescue was, in itself, as great an atonement as any man could make. But, again, we have to decide in a case like that what was the degree of blame attached not only to Sir George White, but also to the officers in immediate command, who, having got into this difficult position and having lost their mules and ammunition, made up their

minds to advance rather than retire. As a matter of fact, there have been courts of inquiry held in all these cases where it was possible to hold them. There have been ninety-nine courts of inquiry in regard to about twenty different operations, and in a large number of these cases officers have been made responsible. Ten officers, I think, have been dismissed from the Army or have been put on half-pay, and penalties have been imposed on other officers, and in those cases where a penalty has not actually been imposed, from the military point of view, the result has been to impair the probability of promotion of the officers concerned.

The hon. Member asks that the findings of these courts of inquiry should be laid on the Table of the House. I must say at once that I think the House is as much interested as the Government in considering whether that course would be conducive to military advantage. A court-martial may be fatal to an officer-The finding of a court of inquiry is only a suggestion to the Commander-in-Chief, it is not a sentence. The finding of a court-martial is followed by a sentence. I most honestly agree with what has

fallen from various Members on this subject, and desire to say that, as far as I am concerned, wherever the result of a court of inquiry establishes a prima facie case, I shall insist that the officer be brought to a court-martial. I know that that is the opinion of Lord Kitchener, and I know that the Commander-in-Chief is prepared to recommend it. I think that, in cases which are sufficiently bad to cause an officer to be put on his trial by court-martial, we must not be afraid of publicity. But when you come to the delicate questions that arise under courts of inquiry, where officers are brought under the review of the Court but against whom no charge may be sustained, I am not sure that it would be wise to subject all those cases; it would give infinite pain to those connected with the officers in cases where the decision happens to be unfavourable, or where the Commander-in-Chief notices one and not another; to a retrial at the bar of public opinion.

Before quoting the opinion of the Commander-in-Chief, perhaps I may be allowed to cite that held by the Duke of Wellington with regard to such cases; an opinion which, I think, is not worn out by the length of time which has elapsed since it was given. The question of bravery or skill in the field in difficult circumstances is exactly the same now as it was in the time of the Duke of Wellington. Our national character, I hope, is the same also, and the opinion of the Duke of Wellington was that the less cases of misconduct in the field were brought before the public the better for the Army. I find in the despatch of 29th August, 1811, the Duke of Wellington said;

"My reason for entertaining this opinion is that the instances of want of spirit among the officers of our Army are very rare, and the example of punishment of crime is not required. This being the case, I should wish to avoid giving soldiers and the world information of an officer, particularly if he belonged to a foreign nation, behaving otherwise than well in the presence of the enemy. If there should be an unfortunate person who fails in that respect I would prefer to allow him to retire to a private station rather than expose his weakness."

That is a very strong opinion, and without having seen this despatch, to which I

called his attention this morning, Lord Roberts holds identically the same view. His view is that the Commander-in-Chief must take the responsibility in the field of recommending action with regard to any officer who has failed in his duty. He has, in the course of the last few months, found it his duty to make a large number of such recommendations. I know it to my cost. I have only been in office three months and a half, but not one week has elapsed during which I have not had the duty, on the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief, either of removing from the Army or of enforcing the resignation of some officer who has failed in South Africa.

I think the House, in asking for the proceedings of these courts of inquiry to be published, should be to some extent swayed by their confidence in Lord Roberts's determination to take action wherever such action is necessary. I do not for a moment ignore the importance of what has fallen from the right hon. Gentleman opposite with regard to a general inquiry into the War Office. The right hon. Gentleman has asked whether the Government will reiterate the pledge that was given with regard to an inquiry. He said that the promise of the First Lord of the Treasury should be made more precisely. I should have said, on the contrary, that the promise which my right hon. friend made in February of last year has been most definitely renewed whenever the occasion seemed to warrant it. We have recognised our obligation, if asked for, to have a full inquiry into the War.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: If asked for by whom?

MR. BRODRICK: If asked for by the House. If the House feels it desirable to have a full inquiry into the war, a full inquiry there will be. But it will not be an inquiry limited merely to the conduct of the War Office; it must be an inquiry also into the conduct of operations in the field. I say this on my own behalf as Secretary of State, though I cannot help hoping that such inquiry, if made, will have some regard to the desirability of making public all such questions as those on which we are engaged. No doubt those who will conduct the inquiry will have as strong and patriotic feelings in these matters as anybody in this House. That is not a question as between the Government and the House. I may say that with regard to the date of this inquiry we have not in the slightest degree diverged from what my right hon. friend stated in the first instance ;namely, that it must take place when the war has substantially reached its conclusion. Nobody can say at this moment that the war, in which over 200,000 troops are engaged, has substantially reached its conclusion. And I would add to that that any inquiry which was held in those circumstances would, in some respects, fail of its object, because, obviously, many witnesses must be required who are still in South Africa, and it would be impossible for the inquiry not to come to a standstill.

Our position, then, with regard to these courts of inquiry is this. In the first place, if there is an inquiry into the war, then most certainly all these matters and all these Papers will come before the Committee or Commission, if they desire to inquire into them. The second point is, that in cases which are brought before the House on which some special public interest induces either this House or the House of Lords to demand a special explanation, it is always

possible for us to produce such Papers as are necessary to give the proper enlightenment. But our general feeling is that it is not desirable, without reference to particular cases but in every case in which there has been a surrender, to put, not before this House merely, but before the country and the world, all the circumstances which are brought to light in these courts of inquiry. That is a point upon which I would ask the House to have some confidence in Lord Roberts, and also to remember that the Government have nothing whatever to gain by acting too lightly with regard to those who have made mistakes. I can only say this for myself. I alluded just now to the number of cases of, usually, junior officers who have failed in some duty and on whom military discipline has had to be exercised. I laid it down within a fortnight of the time when I took office, that no officer, whatever his rank or whatever his previous record, would be allowed to be re-employed in Great Britain or in any

Home command on his return from South Africa, whether he had held it before or not, unless under the direct recommendation of Lord Roberts, or Lord Kitchener, if now serving under Lord Kitchener. That decision, which must, of course, hit some officers very hard, but will only hit those who have deserved to be suspended from further employment, will be some guarantee to the House that officers who have failed will not be allowed to come home without being actually removed from the Army. We are determined to deal severely with these cases. But I attach the greatest importance, in reference to these operations in the field, not merely to prompt punishment, but also to prompt reward. Cases have occurred in which one man has failed to maintain his post, and a man close by, in perhaps almost as difficult conditions, has maintained himself and driven off a body of the enemy. It is the opinion of Lord Kitchener that prompt reward should be given in such cases, and that encouragement should be given to a man who, having gone through many months of most arduous labours, certainly deserves any recognition that we can give him on such an occasion. I wrote to Lord Kitchener some time ago, and telegraphed to him a few days ago, asking him to put forward at once such names, and assured him that the most prompt reply that was possible would be given.

It is recognised by my hon. friend below the gangway that this war and the experience of it must lead to great reforms in the Army, and not merely in the organisation of the Army, but also in the training of the Army. I can only say that not one of these episodes will be allowed to pass by without giving us some instruction in that respect. Whether the officer is immediately to blame or not, not merely the officer but the regiment is brought in review by an episode of this character; and I think the House will believe that Lord Roberts, whose whole life and career have been devoted to the practice of his profession, and who has obtained the confidence of those who have served under him by his intimate knowledge of the Army, is the best man that can possibly deal with it. We ask the House to rest satisfied with this declaration. It is, of course, possible to

urge us to allow a public discussion in each case. I am not sure, from what I have heard of the speeches to-night, whether that would have the effect desired.



There must be some feeling excited, some partiality shown, which would not aid in the elucidation of the facts. The one and only consideration which we have before us is how the discipline of the Army can best be maintained, and how we can most satisfactorily prevent the recurrence of these evils. Upon these points we are at one with the military authorities. We desire to see prompt dealing with all these episodes; we are determined that the officers responsible for them, whatever their station, shall not escape. And in asking the House to have confidence in us in this respect, I ask them always to recollect that, should we fail in that duty, at the inquiry which my right hon. friend proposed, there will be ample opportunity for the House of Commons and the country to judge of our performance of the trust committed to us.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): There are many things that the right hon. Gentleman has said which will be very agreeable to the House and the country, and there are others, I am afraid, which will not be so satisfactory.

All that the right hon. Gentleman said as to the expediency and policy of promptness, both in dealing with necessary severity with cases in which severity is required, and also in giving rewards where rewards have been notoriously and obviously earned; all that he said on that subject will be entirely approved. But I was greatly astonished and disappointed at the attitude which the right hon. Gentleman assumed towards the inquiry which has been promised. To begin with, we will put aside the question of the end of the war, which the right hon.

Gentleman raised, because, really, his argument is somewhat strange. He says the war cannot be said to be ended now because there are 200,000 men in South Africa. There were 200,000 men in South Africa in October last, when the right hon. Gentleman and his friends were telling us that the war was at an end.

MR. BRODRICK: I never said the war was ended. It was the right hon. Gentleman who said so in his address.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: That is a quibble. As that has been raised, let me make this explanation. I am supposed to have been a partner in the guilt of the Government because, hearing them talk of nothing else, I thought they had high authority for it, and I had none. And then I was attacked by the First Lord of the Treasury, who said that he learned the information from me.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never said so.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Oh, yes. And afterwards it turned out that, as a matter of fact, he had the advantage of me by about twenty-four hours. But that is by the way. The right hon. Gentleman postpones this inquiry until the mysterious time when the war will be at an end. The right hon. Gentleman now says that the Government were prepared to redeem their promise if such an inquiry was asked for; but that was never the footing upon which it was put. There was no question as to the inquiry being asked for a year ago; it was, on the contrary, explicitly and categorically promised, and, what is more, it was used as the means of stopping inquiry. Questions would have been asked either in debate or in the ordinary course on the Votes, but we were told that all this would come out at the inquiry to be held at the end of the war. But it will not do for the right hon. Gentleman to adopt this attitude. If he cannot redeem his promise, let him give some reason for it, and we will judge; but certainly it

does not rest with anybody in this House or out of it to ask for such an inquiry, because it is the Government who have promised without qualification that such an inquiry should take place.

Well, Sir, as to the matter before us, as to the publication of the inquiries into these disasters, the right hon. Gentleman quoted the opinion of the Duke of Wellington. The opinion of the Duke of Wellington was practically to the effect that many people's feelings might be hurt and much harm might be done, not only to the individuals but to the reputation of our countrymen as a whole, if publicity was given to questions of this kind. That was in a different state of circumstances, when the public heard little or nothing of disasters that occurred. That was before the days of newspaper correspondents and an active press. We know now, unfortunately, all about these disasters. But we may possibly have a wrong impression of the facts, and this is another reason why they should be perfectly investigated. There is another view. While you are saving the reputation of some men you may be allowing the reputation of others to be injured or ruined; men who did not deserve it. As a matter of common justice as well as the right of the House of Commons for full information, I think my hon. friend and those who support him are justified in pressing for this inquiry. I am well aware that there are many cases where mischief might be done by a full statement of all the facts being published, but we must take the bad with the good in these matters. Undoubtedly the country will not be satisfied if we have not all the information given to us as to this series of disasters, commencing on the first or second day of the campaign, when the greater part of a regiment of cavalry rode off into captivity, and coming down through all the unpleasant gamut. I think we are entitled to know how far the stories we hear are true or not. Let us have the most complete inquiry we can, accomplished in the most pleasant manner possible; but whether it is by Departmental Committee at the end of the war or whatever means are employed, surely we are entitled to go to the bottom of these mysterious events. I will not say more upon this matter than to repeat my surprise at the attitude that the Government have taken up with regard to this inquiry, and all I can say is I think they will greatly mislead Parliament and the people, involuntarily no doubt, if they fail to carry out the undertaking which they gave, unless there is some very good and adequate reason for not completely carrying out their promise.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not mean to speak at any length; but I think, from one or two observations which have fallen from the right hon. Gentleman, he would like me, I will not say to answer, but to touch upon the one or two points to which he referred and clear up any doubts there may be. My opinion is that courts-martial have not been much used in the past in regard to surrenders in the field, and he desires to approximate the War Office practice to the Naval practice of dealing by courts-martial with disasters of that character. But in the nature of the case every court-martial will be held, and so far the desire of the hon. Member will be met; but there may be cases of inquiries which are not courts-martial, and all that my right hon. friend has laid down is this; that he does not think it desirable to make it an invariable

practice or even the ordinary practice to make public the results of the military inquiries. Those military inquiries may not have to do with cases of surrender, but these in the main are to be handed over to courts-martial. My right hon. friend and the Government, who agree with him, do not hold that we ought for a moment to lay down the proposition that inquiries are in the nature of the case to be brought before this House and the country. Sometimes they may be and sometimes they may not be. It depends on the circumstances of the case, and whether it is desirable in the public interest. I hope that that is a clear statement of the matter.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: But inquiries into all cases of surrender will be made public?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that the view of the War Office is that they should voluntarily, apart from the general inquiry which is promised, make all those inquiries public.

SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): But they were promised.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: When?

SIR CHARLES DILKE: In February of last year.

MR. BRODRICK: No. I beg your pardon; I did not say so.

SIR CHARLES DILKE: No; the present Chief Secretary for Ireland last year said so. I understood it to be a promise. I asked the question whether they would be made public, and he said, "Of course they will." I took that to be a promise.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course that was not within my knowledge, or my right hon. friend's knowledge. But any statement publicly made shall be carried out. Putting that on one side, the Commander-in-Chief was of opinion that with regard to these preliminary inquiries and not on oath no absolute general rule could be laid down in the matter.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street): In the course of his speech the right hon. Gentleman said, as I understand, that in these preliminary inquiries wherever there was a prima facie case there would be a court-martial in the future, although there might not necessarily be publicity in the preliminary inquiry.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Let us have no misunderstanding. It has been laid down that in cases of surrender in the future there would always be a court-martial. Then what I want to know is, how far in cases of surrender in the time of war; there can hardly be surrenders in time of peace; in the past there will be a court-martial? There should be no distinction between the two cases. We are not seeking for anything to take place with regard to the future and not with regard to the past. What we want is an inquiry into the surrenders in the time of the war. All inquiries, to be of any value, will be inquiries into the past. What I desire to know from the right hon. Gentleman is, when the witnesses are available, and when the courts-martial are held, whether the inquiries will be with regard to the surrenders of the past. These are the only inquiries which can be of any value to the discipline of the Army in the future.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Just so. I understand. My right hon. friend informs me that he has already ordered some courts-martial into past cases, and that he is now

engaged in seeing how far that system should be extended. A retrospective system has a somewhat different aspect to the prospective system. I do not think we should be pressed too

far to lay down a general rule. Then the only other point with which I have to deal referred to by the right hon. Gentleman is as to the general inquiry, which, he truly said, had been on more than, one occasion promised. He seemed to think that my right hon. friend had introduced a new principle when he said, "If asked for." Now, if a promise is given to a person who does not ask for its fulfilment. I do not see why it need be fulfilled.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Cicero de Officiis.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Of course he could not hold you to a promise if he had absolved you. I have no doubt that my right hon. friend had in his mind when he used these words this fact: that if the Commander-in-Chief considered that it was expedient that these inquiries should be made public, they should be made public. But, after all, it is not a matter for the Commander-in-Chief to decide. It is outside his province. However that may be, I can only say that the pledges which have been given will be adhered to unconditionally.

Then comes the question of the date of the inquiry. It had better begin as soon as the war, to use the phrase of my right hon. friend, is substantially over, and as soon as the necessary witnesses are obtainable. I hope that statement is sufficiently extensive and explicit. There is only to add that the Committee of Inquiry will have the power of bringing before it all witnesses, all documents, and everything material. It is quite clear that these surrenders, in common with everything else connected with the war in South Africa, will come within the purview of the Committee, and no attempt at concealment will be possible in any matter in which, in the interest of the public, that Committee is of opinion that inquiry is desirable. In conclusion, I will say that, in the first place, no concealment is desired, and, in the second place, no concealment is possible. Having given that pledge in those broad and clear terms, I trust the House will allow this debate to come to a conclusion.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: In regard to these promises of inquiry there have been overlapping promises. Since Lord

Palmerston made his famous declaration, contrary to the opinion of theologians, that all children are born good, I do not think any public man has shocked the House of Commons more than the right hon. Gentleman opposite has by his doctrine of promises. Let me remind him that the promise of general inquiry was a volunteered promise by himself, it was not asked for.

\*MR. A. J. BALFOUR: What difference does that make if the person to whom you made the promise does not want you to keep it?

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Why, personally, I attach some importance to the point is this: I have never had much belief in an entirely general inquiry. The right hon. Gentleman volunteered a general inquiry in his Manchester speeches and afterwards repeated his statements in the House. There were also specific statements made by the Government with regard to enquiries on specific points, and I ventured just now to remind the House of the promises made, as I understood, by the Chief Secretary for Ireland. We debated the matter of these

surrenders here on two former occasions, in February and July of last year, and I distinctly understood, and I believe all present understood, that the result of the inquiries, in so far as it could safely be done, would be given to the House. It was because that was generally understood that specific cases were not pressed on the House, and that several Members who showed a disposition to press specific cases were put off by all of us.

The only other thing I wish to say is that all through the debate to-night this has been treated entirely as if it were a question affecting the officers only; but there is a much larger question involved, and that is the discipline and training of the Army, for which the War Office is responsible. So far as I am concerned I feel deeply the responsibility that must attach to anyone on such an inquiry. My fear is that in a general inquiry the essential points may be lost in the enormous mass of detail. We all desire to get at the exact points which really affect the discipline and training of the Army in future, but in the course of doing this there is a danger that we may roam over a larger field, and that the essential points on which we ought to learn will be lost. It is perhaps unfortunate that the only defence against specific attack made here to-night concerns the conduct of the Yeomanry. The only specific defence was made with regard to Lindley. It is impossible to consider such a case as Lindley without considering the light it sheds on the question of employing in the field under similar conditions regular troops along with irregular troops which have not had the same amount of training. I understand that the Secretary of State for War contends that the War Office has nothing to do with this. I hold that the way in which the War Office has sent out untrained men is very largely responsible for a great many of these surrenders. Even now waiters from clubs, men who have never seen a horse before they enlisted, are being sent out at a high rate of pay. What can you expect in such cases? I shall not dwell on this matter, but I am most anxious that it should not be treated as one that concerns only the conduct of officers in the field. The whole House believes that British officers have maintained their past traditions. The question must be treated as one that concerns also the training of the Army and the organisation of the War Office.

MR. WINSTON CHURCHILL (Oldham) earnestly hoped that the First Lord of the Treasury would find some means of escaping from the promise to grant the general inquiry which he had acknowledged he had given. He entirely agreed with the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean that a general inquiry would be most unsatisfactory. It would be too vague, it would be immense in its scope, and it would be many months before any conclusion could be reached, and in the course of the inquiry every kind of incident would be dragged up and discussed at inordinate length, and the public would cease to take any interest even in questions that might be of the greatest importance. They did not want that. He entirely associated himself with the mover of the Amendment in his desire that a full and clear account should be given of the many extraordinary incidents that had happened in the war. There of course had been reports from press correspondents. He had in several cases himself supplied the only report given to the country on

some of these important matters. He felt keenly the responsibility which had thus been placed on him, and he thought it was time for the Government and the War Office to relieve him of some of it. He quite agreed that it would be utterly impossible for the House of Commons to embark on the discussion of any of these particular surrenders. The only point private Members had a right to insist on was that the promise given by the late Under Secretary for War of a full and thorough inquiry into all the surrenders that had taken place should be faithfully and scrupulously carried out. They wanted the opinion of high military authorities on the various "incidents," put forward with the same uncompromising vigour as was displayed by Lord Roberts in his comments on the Spion Kop operations. It would then be a question whether it would be necessary to carry the matter to a court-martial. These committees of inquiry were not regular courts. Officers who were to blame would still be liable to come up for trial. What was wanted was an official verdict on what did happen, which would apportion the praise and blame and leave the country in no doubt on the matter.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): My hon. friend opposite in the beginning of his speech deprecated a general inquiry into the history of the war. If only to relieve him from a part of that burden and responsibility which at present rests so heavily on his shoulders, I think he ought to welcome a general investigation. I think this debate on the whole has been not only an interesting, but a very satisfactory one, and has amply justified the course taken by my hon. friend behind me in putting down this Amendment. At one moment the First Lord of the Treasury startled the House by propounding a doctrine so novel and revolutionary as to amount almost to a new departure in ethics; but a second and diluted version of the right hon. Gentleman's proposition revealed it to be after all an innocuous and commonplace observation. But what I desire to make perfectly clear is this. We all understand the Government to have made two promises. In the first place, that wherever it is still practicable to do so they will bring the cases of persons who are *prima facie* responsible for any of these surrenders before a court-martial, which is an open court, where the evidence is taken on oath, and where you have all the responsibility attaching to persons who are acting in the light of day, subject to public criticism. Secondly, that as regards those cases; I hope they are very few; where, from the lack of a *prima facie* case against any specific individual it is impossible in accordance with the practice of military law to hold a court-martial, the Government promise that they will form part of the general inquiry which is to take place at the close of the war, and that the facts, so far as they are ascertainable, will thus be brought to the light of day. On that distinct assurance I think my hon. friend may be well content with the result he has achieved in initiating the debate, and that he should not, in accordance with the general feelings of the House, proceed to a division.

MR. LAMBERT: I entirely concur with my right hon. friend. There is one observation I would like to make in asking leave to withdraw the Amendment. I hope that the inquiry will not be prolonged, and that the whole circumstances will be placed before the country as soon as possible.

MR. COGHILL (Stoke-upon-Trent) said he should like to say one or two words on

the Amendment before it was withdrawn. Of course they all remembered last September they were told that a General Election must take place before the war would come to an end, and then they were told that the war had come to an end, and it was necessary that the opinion of the country should be taken on the war by the Government. He was surprised to hear the Secretary of State for War allude to certain difficulties which our troops had had to encounter in South Africa. He had referred to the difficulty of the topography there. They all knew that a great many of our misfortunes in South Africa were due to the insufficient knowledge of the country that our officers possessed. He must say that he rather regretted

that the hon. Member for South Molton should have taken the particular shortcomings he had selected to bring before the notice of the House. He was sure that there were plenty of other shortcomings at the War Office the hon. Gentleman might have mentioned that evening. He must say that he had a great deal of sympathy with the officers and men who had surrendered in the war. The difficulties in their way had been enormous, and a great deal of blame had been put on some junior officers which ought not to have been. He remembered a sentence written in a letter by the junior Member for Oldham to the Morning Post, in which he said there had been too many surrenders in the war. Almost immediately afterwards, however, he found himself a prisoner. He thought, therefore, every hon. Member in the House must see the great difficulties there were in the way of our officers, and he for one most heartily sympathised with all those who were taken prisoners.

But there were plenty of shortcomings at the War office for which the strongest condemnation of the House was necessary. Why not put blame on the proper shoulders? Why not put the blame on the shoulders of the man who was principally responsible? That man was undoubtedly Lord Lansdowne, who was at the head of the War Office, and the man responsible for all the blunders in South Africa.

Instead, however, of getting rid of him, as the Government ought to have done, they had actually promoted him to the post of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. If the Government were going to blame their officers, let them do it justly. There had been too much favouritism and family influence at the War Office. The British public desired that that state of things should come to an end. Until it did, we should never have a full and fair reform of the War Office. Eighteen months ago the First Lord of the Treasury in a speech at Manchester said that he was;

\*MR. SPEAKER, interposing, reminded the hon. Member that the debate was not upon the conduct of the War Office, and that his remarks were therefore out of order.

MR. COGHILL said he bowed at once to the Speaker's ruling. All he had to say was that he welcomed the promise made that night that they were to have an inquiry into the doings of the War Office; but he was afraid that the inquiry when it did take place would come all too late. People would have lost all interest in the subject, and he was afraid either that a great deal of evidence would have become stale, or that a great many of the witnesses would have died or disappeared. He hoped and trusted the inquiry would be held within a reasonable time, because they could not help remembering that Lord Salisbury said only last

week that he deprecated even now any inquiry into the conduct of the war. The public were determined to have an inquiry, and that the existing jobbery and favouritism should once and for ever be put an end to.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Main Question again proposed.

#### INDIAN EXPENDITURE.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): The Amendment that stands in my name refers to the Report of the Royal Commission appointed two or three Parliaments back. This is the first opportunity which has presented itself to the House of raising any discussion on the recommendations of the Commission. The Commission was appointed in consequence of an Amendment moved to the Address in reply to the Queen's Speech in 1895 by Mr. Naoroji.\* As a result of the debate, the Secretary of State for India, Sir Henry Fowler, agreed to the appointment of a Commission. The Commission was appointed by common consent of both Front Benches, the Members being Lord Weby, Mr. Courtney. Mr. Jackson, Mr. Curzon, Sir D Stewart, Sir E. W. Hamilton. Sir R. H. Knox, Sir J. Peile, Sir A. Scoble, Mr. Ryder, Mr. Buchanan, Sir W. Wedderburn, Mr. Naoroji, and myself. Later on, when Mr. Curzon was appointed Viceroy of India, Sir R. Mowbray joined the Committee. The inquiry lasted five years, and the Commission reported in

\* See The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. xxx., p. 567.

April last year. The Report was a very complete one. There was a Minority as well as a Majority Report, but the minority agreed in the main with the majority. They simply carried the recommendations of the majority a step, further.

The Report is divided into three sections; first, the financial machinery of India; second, the progress of expenditure; and third, the apportionment that takes place in the expenditure between India and the United Kingdom. I only intend to deal with the third section of the Report.

My Amendment asks that those recommendations of the Report on which unanimity has been secured should not only be carried out in the future, but should be made retrospective. It goes a step further than that. It calls attention to the recommendation in the Report, made by the minority of the Commission, it is true, but none the less deserving the attention of Parliament on that account, and suggests that, to save further inquiry and delay, a lump sum should be paid by the Government of the United Kingdom to India in settlement of the arrears of the items which the Government has arranged shall in future be transferred from the Indian to the British Exchequer. The definite recommendations made by the Commission unanimously were that the Imperial Government should make a grant in aid of the charge for the India Office of £50,000; half the military charges for Aden, £72,000; increased contribution to the charges for Persian Mission, £5,000; and half the cost of transport of troops to and from India, £130,000; or a total of £257,000. How have the British and Indian Treasuries agreed to meet these recommendations? They give the full amount recommended, but raise it from other sources. They grant for the transport of troops, £130,000; the military charges for Aden, £100,000; the Zanzibar maritime cable, £10,000; China establishments, £12,500; and Persian Mission, £5,000. These items amount



to £;500 more than the sum recommended by the Majority Report of the Royal Commission, and agreed to by the minority. I ask the House to note that all these items will from 1st April be charged to the British Exchequer instead of the Indian. If it is just that this should be done in the accounts of 1901&#x2013;2, it is equally just for last year, and for every previous year, so long as any of these misappropriations have taken place. But these items are in themselves utterly inadequate to meet the justice of the case. Half the small charge, for Aden, £;100,000, is agreed to by the British Treasury, but in my judgment the whole of these charges for Aden ought to fall on the British Exchequer. Aden is not an Indian port. Aden is the key to the great commercial routes to Australia and China, as well as to India itself. It is a position absolutely essential to the Imperial interests of Great Britain. It holds precisely the same position to the Suez Canal on the south as Malta holds on the north. Take the proportion of shipping and the trade involved which has called at Aden during a year. In recent years the trade between the United Kingdom and British India has averaged about £;70,000,000; between the United Kingdom and other Asiatic countries, £;45,000,000; between the United Kingdom and Australasia, £;55,000,000; so that the proportion of the Eastern trade of this country other than that with India using this fortified coaling station is as £;100,000,000 to £;70,000,000. Therefore, if India is to bear only her proportion on the basis of trade relations, the recommendation of the Royal Commission and the arrangement between the British and the Indian Treasury would have been £;145,000, rather than £;100,000. I have no intention of claiming the whole, but if India is compelled to bear any of the charges for Aden surely the Colonies ought to bear their fair share also. Aden exists quite as much for the defence of East Africa, the Mauritius, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, Hong Kong, and the Australasian Colonies as for that of India. Each of the places should bear its share, and if they do not India should not.

Take the item of £;10,000 for the Zanzibar and Mauritius cable. A cable was made eighteen years ago between Zanzibar and Mauritius, communicating with the mainland. A subsidy was granted from the Imperial revenues for this cable, and the British Treasury Charged £;10,000 of this to India. In 1894, when I raised this question, I was told that the reason this £;10,000 was charged to India was the important strategic position of Mauritius with regard to the defence of the Indian Empire. If any hon. Member will take the trouble to look at the map he will see that Mauritius is about 2,000 miles from Aden, and about the same from India, and there being no cable from the Mauritius to India, it is ridiculous to talk of it as a position of any importance whatever with regard to the defence of India. This is £;10,000 of sheer plunder from the Indian Exchequer by the British Treasury. Why? Because it is unjust. If it is dropped to-day it ought to have been dropped eighteen years ago. I have no hesitation whatever in claiming on behalf of the Indian Government and the Indian people that this unjust charge for the eighteen years should be refunded. Let us note what is stated in the communication from the Treasury to the India Office of 11th September, 1900,

published in a recent Paper giving the details of the apportionment which has been made. This sentence occurs with reference to this charge;

"For their part," says the British Treasury, "they readily agree to give up the Indian contribution of £;10,000 a year towards the subsidy of the Zanzibar-Mauritius cable."

Why has not the Secretary of State long since availed himself of this readiness on the part of the Treasury? I have never before known the Treasury to show any readiness to part with £;10,000 a year. The justice of the case really needs no other evidence than this sentence from the Treasury itself.

Then there are the matters of the Persian Mission and the establishments in China. The House would hardly believe that of the charges connected with our Embassy in Persia and our consular establishments in China India is compelled to pay a very large portion. The Consulates in China are a great deal more important to our wealthy colony of Hong Kong than they are to India, especially with regard to the trade of Hong Kong, which is drawn almost entirely from the ports at which these various consulates are established. There is a large trade carried on by our Australasian colonies with China, but not one penny of these charges is cast on our wealthy colonies. India has had to bear her share for many years, but now relief is given to the extent of £;12,500.

With regard to the Persian Mission, for the last fifty years we have been taking £;7,000 a year out of the pockets of the Indian taxpayer to pay for our British Ambassador at the Court of Persia. At last we have been able to get from the British Treasury a concession of £;5,000 of this amount, but still some £;2,000 is kept standing. The total payments by India to the British Treasury in regard to diplomatic and consular charges in countries outside India amount to £;43,000. These are Imperial duties, and every penny of the charges ought to be charged on Imperial funds and not to India. Why is this £;2,000 retained in regard to the Persian Mission? If it is unfair to charge the £;5,000, it is unfair to charge the whole £;7,000, and it is ridiculous that the British Exchequer should expect India to pay towards the salary and expenses of our Persian Ambassador. This amount with regard to the establishments in China is one of the items the Secretary of State has thrown in; it is not asked for by the Majority Report, nor indeed is it asked for by the Minority Report, except indirectly in connection with Imperial charges and consular and embassy services. The Minority Report was signed by three members of the Commission; Sir William Wedderburn, Mr. Naoroji, and myself; who had some claim to represent the Indian people; we simply accepted the recommendations of the Majority Report, and did not go into details. That this amount has not been asked by the majority shows, I think, the extreme moderation of their demands, because here it is thrown into their laps by a generous Treasury. The arrears under both these heads should be refunded. Surely the terms to which the Treasury "readily agree," and others which are given without any recommendation from the Commission should in common justice include the restitution of arrears. I have endeavoured to show that the £;257,000 transferred under all these items fails to meet the full justice of their own particular claim by at least £;47,000 on the recommendations of the Royal Commission. This would raise the amount which

ought to be paid from £;257,000 to £;304,000.

Then the Treasury and the India Office entirely ignore the unanimous recommendations of the Commission that a grant should be made by the Imperial Government in aid of the charges for the India Office amounting to £;50,000 a year. No doubt the Secretary of State will urge that the total grant proposed equals the total grant recommended. But that is a futile argument, because, first of all, the total amount recommended is made up of specific items, of which this £;50,000 is one, and then the arrangement made by the Treasury and the India Office is also composed of specific items, of which this £;50,000 is not one. Does the Secretary of State say that anyone of these items is unjust? I am sure he will say nothing of the kind. That leaves us clear to consider the justice of the claim for the £;50,000, which is not included in this arrangement, but was. unanimously recommended by the Commission. Let me, as a simple way of putting the case before the House, read a brief summary from the Report of the Commission (p.90) showing how they deal with and why they recommend this, grant of £;50,000;:

"The charge for the India Office is at present borne entirely by India. It may, however, be urged that, in a special sense, both the United Kingdom and India are interested in that organisation which exists in the capital of the Empire, and there brings together in a kind of co-ordination the Government of India and the United Kingdom, and we have considered the question whether the charge of this organisation is not a proper subject of apportionment. Light is thrown on this subject by a study of the treatment of similar questions in relation to colonies, whether Crown or self-governing. Historical circumstances explain the origin of the difference, but in relation to the colonies the ultimate solution arrived at is: the United Kingdom pays the whole cost of the committee of its own Government which represents it in relation to the colonies; the colony pays the whole cost of agencies established here in this country for the transaction of its business. Upon this principle the cost of the India Office would be thus apportioned; its Parliamentary representatives, with an adequate staff, would be paid by the United Kingdom, and the rest of the establishment would be paid by India. There is, however, a difference between the two cases. The East India Company paid the whole charge of its establishment in England, including that of the Board of Control. The Crown, in taking over the government of India, took it over on existing conditions, and the present arrangement is sanctioned by tradition and long practice. Tradition and long practice have established another arrangement in the colonies. A contribution has never been asked from them, and the great self-governing colonies throw so little work on the Colonial Office, that their share of the charge of that office would be infinitesimal. Although, therefore, in theory they might fairly be asked to contribute, it would not be worth while to raise the question with them for so small a result. The cases, therefore, are not, on examination, as parallel as they appear at first sight. It is, however, a fact that the colonies do not contribute to the charge of the Colonial Office, and in order that there may be no ground for allegation that India is treated less favourably than other parts of Her Majesty's Empire, we recommend that Parliament should be

asked to make a contribution towards the charge of the India Office. This contribution may be made the subject either of a charge on the Consolidated Fund, or of an annual vote in aid of the home charges of the establishment of the Secretary of State. A choice between the two methods of procedure involves a question of policy. These home charges amounted in the years 1897&#x2013;8 to £;240,000. The larger part, however, of this sum represented costs of ordinary Indian administration. The vote from the Colonial Office, including non-effective allowances, amounts to about £;50,000 a year, and a like amount would be, we think, a fair contribution towards the cost of the India Office."

For the reasons I have read the Commission unanimously recommended this grant of £;50,000. The Secretary of State for India is only an hon. Member of the Cabinet of this country. He is none the less efficient on that account, but is it fair that the great and valuable services of the Secretary of State for India should be available for the United Kingdom and the rest of the Empire as a Member of His Majesty's Cabinet, with all the responsibility which Cabinet rank involves, without one penny being paid towards his salary by the taxpayers of this country? It is most unfair, and I think that at any rate the salaries of the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary should be paid by this country and not by India. The whole cost of the Secretary of State's establishment ought to be paid by the British Exchequer. Why has the recommendation as to this amount been ignored? I hope the right hon. Gentleman in his reply will inform us. It cannot be from pecuniary or economical reasons, because the declared object for the other items is that they will simplify the accounts between the two countries. The real object if the recommendation being ignored is because if it were adopted it would give this House a due and proper opportunity of raising a debate on Indian

questions on the Vote for the Secretary of State's salary. He is the only Minister of the Crown who has this exclusive privilege. Upon the salary of any other Minister, whether it be great or small, reductions may be moved, and this, that, or the other question raised affecting the administration of the Department to which the Minister belongs. But it cannot be done with regard to India, and the result is. although any question affecting any one of our colonies, either Crown or self-governing, or the Isle of Man or Jersey, can be raised upon the salary of the Colonial Secretary or the Home Secretary, that any question, no matter how great its urgency, affecting India cannot be raised in this House at all except on an Amendment to the Address, a motion for the adjournment of the House;a course to which nobody likes to resort if it can be avoided;or upon the Indian Budget. If any portion of these charges were placed on the Estimates it would give the House just that opportunity which is most needed by Members taking an interest in Indian questions of raising matters at a time when they could be properly discussed by the House

There are many other recommendations to which I should like to refer, but I do not wish to take up the time of the House more than is necessary, as there are many other Amendments to follow, and I wish to make way for them. I feel I have sufficiently made out the case for my Amendment from the recommendations with which I have already dealt, but I cannot refrain from dwelling upon one

particular point recommended in the Minority Report which has been powerfully accentuated since the Report was completed. I will read Clause 99 on page 187 of the Report;

"We are strongly of opinion that India ought no longer to bear the heavy financial strain of 75,000 British troops. At the present time about 10,000 of these troops have been withdrawn from India for employment in the Transvaal War, while 5,000 native troops have also been withdrawn to replace British troops transferred from Ceylon, Mauritius, and Singapore for service in South Africa. If in a time of war, when the strain is great on the Empire, it is considered safe to withdraw 15,000 troops from India it is clear that on a peace footing the number of British troops may be safely reduced by 20,000. We do not recommend their withdrawal from India, where they should continue to be quartered, but equity requires that the revenues of India should be relieved of their entire charges, and that they should be treated as part of the reserve forces of the Eastern portion of the British Empire generally and borne in future upon the Army Estimates in that capacity."

A few days ago I put a question to the Secretary of State asking what troops belonging to the Indian Army were at present stationed in countries outside the frontier of India, and the right hon. Gentleman told the House that there are now 5,200 British troops belonging to the Indian Army in South Africa, 300 British and 16,300 native troops in China and Hong Kong, 1,500 native troops in the Mauritius, 800 at Singapore. 2,100 British and 800 native in Ceylon, and 600 natives in Juba Land; a total of 7,600 British and 20,000 native troops. I think I am right in understanding that these are men only, officers not included.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing) was understood to intimate that officers were included.

MR. CAINE: In my question I asked only for men. I did not put officers in. But it does not matter, the figures are near enough for my purpose. If there is one thing more than another necessary in the interests of India, and especially for the prevention of these recurring famines which wring our hearts whenever we read our papers, it is that money should be available for irrigation and other purposes which tend to prevent famine. The reason these enterprises are paralysed in India is the enormous amount of the military charges which India is called upon to bear. It is no concern of mine to-day to go into the question as to whether the Army is too great or too small in India, but here is the actual fact, that the Imperial Government think it perfectly safe at this moment to denude India of 30,000 British and native troops. Are these 30,000 wanted permanently in India or are they not? That is the question. If you can take them away at a time like this you can do without them altogether. We are going to have debates on Army organisation. I would recommend the Secretary of State for War to realise that he might easily, with perfect safety, add 30,000 to the British Army from India. I want the House to remember the history of the administration in India during the last five years. I do not want to go into the question of whether that administration has been right or wrong, but there is no doubt whatever-, according to the Government, that India has been seething with sedition. Personally, I deny it altogether.

But the Government have suspended the Habeas Corpus Act or its equivalent in India. If that had been done in Ireland I do not know what hon. Members below the gangway would have done, but there would have been ructions at any rate. Men have been prosecuted for sedition, and a stringent Press Act has been passed. On the top of this so I called sedition there have been plague, pestilence, and famine, and the condition of things in India has been such, according to the policy of the Government, as to make it most unsafe to take these troops out of the country. I think the fact that they have been taken out of the country settles once for all the controversy as to whether India has been seething with discontent. It is perfectly clear that nothing of the sort was the case. But if it was safe to denude the country of all these troops at a time when India has been more strained than at any time since the Mutiny, it is safe to keep them out altogether. But I do not propose that they should be kept out altogether. Leave them there, but inasmuch as they are continually being used by the Government whenever there is any trouble in the East they ought, though kept in India, to be charged against British revenues and looked upon as a reserve force for the defence of the whole Empire.

My Amendment suggests that all these arrears and the ignored recommendations should be lumped together and sunk once for all in a liberal grant in relief of the Indian famine. It is very difficult always to go back on these various difficult and intricate questions of apportionments, and I believe the Indian people will be quite willing to accept such a settlement. They know the extent of their grievances just as well as we do in this country, but I think in the face of a large grant they would accept the clean slate, and let the dead past bury its dead. The Treasury and the India Office agree to £;257,000. As I have already said, if it is right now that this sum should be paid by the British Exchequer instead of by the Indian Treasury, it has been right ever since the apportionment was made. Taking it at the low figure of twenty years, it comes to a sum of £;5,000,000, which, to put it plainly, has been cheated out of the Indian Government and the Indian people by the British Treasury, while, if interest at the rate of 3 per cent. is added, the amount is about £;7,000,000. I am not alone in making this recommendation. One of the greatest authorities on Indian questions, the Earl of Northbrook, an ex-Viceroy of India, said it would be only just if twelve years, at any rate, were refunded to the Indian people. No grant can equitably extinguish the enormous sums of which India in the past has been defrauded by the British Exchequer. The claim of India as laid before the Commission by the Indian Government was twofold. They first asked for a specific reduction on various services, and, secondly, they appealed for liberal treatment in the apportionment of common charges. An attempt has been made by the Treasury to meet the first; but the second can only be met by a generous and liberal grant from the one Government to the other. I plead for this on the ground of equity, and I leave it to my hon. friend who will second the Amendment to plead for it on the ground of generous sentiment to a great dependency which has borne sore trouble and affliction with bravery and to the admiration of the whole world. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my name.

\*MR. SCHWANN (Manchester, N.): It has always been said that if ever India is lost to this country it will be through the action of this House. My opinion is absolutely contrary to that dictum. If that event should ever occur, it will be through the inaction of this House. I think there is proof of this fact. Two cases are before us, one of which has been given in detail by the hon. Member for Camborne. He has explained that owing to the action of the Royal Commission £257,000 is now to be deducted from the payments of India to England. Who are the gentlemen who appealed for and demanded this Commission? They were nearly all Members or ex-Members of this House. The hon. Member for Camborne himself, Mr. Naoroji, Sir William Wedderburn, and one or two others brought this appeal before the Secretary of State. The Commission was granted, and we now see the large revision which is going to be made of the payments made by India. I think that is one clear proof that the intervention of this House in the affairs of India is not always a bad thing, but, on the contrary, it is very often very beneficial. I might mention in this respect some of the frontier wars, and more especially the case of Chitral. That question was debated at great length in this House, and the result has been that Lord Curzon, the present Viceroy, has come round very largely to the opinion expressed in this House, and he now seems to have adopted very largely the principles of Lord Lawrence.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: He has adopted the proposals made by myself in this House.

\*MR. SCHWANN: I know that the proposals made by the noble Lord were endorsed by this House, and that shows that this House takes part in Indian affairs with great advantage to India. Having proved to some extent that the action of this House is beneficial and desirable, I think we shall all feel that when India has been subject to so many misfortunes, not only last year, but misfortunes which commenced in the year 1897; when famines have struck at the root of prosperity and added large burdens to India; when famines have been followed by plague, and the resources of the country has been crippled to a very great extent, then I say that there is some justification for asking what means are to be devised to mitigate the effects of drought and famine in the future. Last year we had in India a combination of all the misfortunes which happened in 1897. for the famine was far more wide-reaching and far more disastrous upon India, and during the whole of that time the bubonic plague attacked the nation. With this combination of evils before us, I think it is not unnatural that this House should turn its attention to this question, and ask the noble lord what means he suggests to avoid such evils in the future. Everybody thoroughly understands that you cannot interfere in any way with the atmospheric conditions of India, for you cannot cause rain to fall there by the firing of cannons, and we know that a country like India is exposed at intervals to the ravages of drought. I think that we have a right to draw the right hon. Gentleman's attention to this, and to urge him to do all that is possible in this direction in India. We contend that a large portion of this sum which the hon. Member for Camborne has suggested should be repaid to India should be given in the form of a sum to be devoted to means and devices for at any rate mitigating, if not avoiding entirely, the effects of famine in India in the future. Perhaps the House will allow me to read a very short extract which gives

approximately an idea of what has been happening in India. Mr. Vaughan Nash says;

"The distinctive mark of the famine was its three-fold character, the lack of crops, of fodder, and of water. To the first cause the rush to the famine works and the terrible sufferings in the villages was due; to the second the loss of cattle, of which millions upon millions perished; whilst the scarcity of water added to the sufferings of the people and their beasts, and paved the way for the attack of cholera which is still raging through the famine districts. The visitation, therefore, was one of merciless severity. It gave no quarter to any living thing, man, woman, or child; and the beasts in the jungle, the birds whose bright plumage makes the only bit of vivid colour in the brown wilderness of an Indian famine, the patient bullocks who draw the plough and haul the farm produce to the market, the milch cows, and the goats and kids perished together. Besides the famine and the diseases following in its train, the plague was busy at work."

While all this misery and suffering was going on, we know that the Government of India did all that was in its power to alleviate the ravages of famine by carrying out, the Famine Code, and establishing centres and famine camps. I will not say a word against the Indian officials in this respect. They behaved like heroes and died at their posts. Many of them were moved to these acts of devotion by the fortitude and the patience with which they saw the inhabitants of India bore

the dreadful losses and suffering laid upon them. Mr. Nash said;and it is a fact;

"There was grain enough in India for every;one, and sufficient food for the needs of the cattle, but the people had no money to buy it."

Of course that seems in itself very self-evident, for famine naturally occurs when the people have not got the money to buy food with, but we must remember that the necessities of the Indian people are very small indeed. We know that there are-families in India who live on two annas per day (2d.), and we know that it does not require a very large sum to enable one of the agricultural class in India to maintain life. There are one or two circumstances in connection with the distribution of relief which I hope the noble Lord will be able to explain to the House. In several districts of India during the time of the famine, suspicions;no doubt well grounded;passed through the minds of the officials that there was in connection with the relief a good deal of either skulking or malingering, or people who placed themselves upon relief without due reason and cause, and in the relief camps, in one or two of the presidencies, even the minimum amount of relief was reduced. I think myself that this requires some explanation from the noble Lord as to why under the circumstances, when famine was raging throughout these districts of India, in some of these places it was found necessary to put certain relief camps upon what are called "deterrent conditions." There may have been a number of natives who thought the conditions laid down were very exacting, and this may have kept many people who needed assistance from the camps.

I do hope that the noble Lord will give us the information which is necessary to



explain why this took place. The fact is that the Indian cultivator has for some years, as far as we can judge, been going from bad to worse. In 1882 it was said by Lord Cromer in his Budget speech that the average total income of the Hindoo people was 27 rupees, or 33s. 6d., per head. In 1898&#x2013;99 it fell to rupees, or 23s. 2d., and I am not sure whether last year the total income in some of these famine districts was not reduced to something like 12 rupees. If in years without a famine the annual income of an agriculturist has fallen, as it has done in the years between 1877 and 1897, by 10 rupees, it seems to me that it is highly desirable that what we recommend should be done, and that Commissioners should be appointed and some of them sent out from England to find out whether greater attention cannot be paid to the mitigation of these famines. I was very sorry to read that famine again threatens India this year. I think it is desirable that an inquiry should be made as to what means can be adopted for increasing the wealth and mitigating the misery and obviating famines in the future. I am glad to think that the noble Lord himself, on the 26th January, 1897, used these words; "That the opportunity this famine affords ought not to be allowed to pass without our taking every opportunity to inquire into and ascertain the best methods of protecting the people of India from the recurrence of similar calamities."

I would also suggest that it would be desirable to go into the question of land tenure, because it seems that recent experience of India proves that our western ideas of land tenure are not always applicable to India. I am bound to say that from the information I have had of those who are most interested in this question, I have serious doubts upon the question.

\*MR. SPEAKER: I must point out to the hon. Member that the terms of the Amendment do not cover general observations about the finances of India.

\*MR. SCHWANN: I am only trying. Sir, to suggest some means of employing the sum of money which my hon. friend is asking the Government to transfer. The following quotation is from the preamble of the Government of India's Bill to "amend the law relating to agricultural land in the Punjab";

"The expropriation of the hereditary agriculturist in many parts of the province through the machinery of restricted sale and mortgage has been regarded for many years past as a serious political danger. It is recognised that the danger is accompanied with had economic results, that it is increasing, and that if not arrested it will grow to formidable dimensions. It is also recognised that the idea of a free transferable interest in land which is at the root of the trouble is of comparatively modern origin, and is contrary both to the existing practice in most native; States and to the traditions and sentiments, if no longer to the practice, of the people of the Punjab."

This draws attention to one point which it seems to me might be usefully considered by the Government of India. Then, again, a more elastic assessment of taxes has been found to be desirable because by degrees the land is becoming alienated, and getting into the hands of the village moneylenders. Lord Cromer, in Egypt, has introduced legislation which will have a tendency to free the people from the clutches of the village Shylocks who abound in the country. Some

such similar laws are necessary in India. In other native provinces they enjoy milder systems of taxation and tenure, and they have greater elasticity. It has been said that the laws of the native States are "laws of leather, while those of British India are of iron." Talking of the alienation of the land which is gradually taking place in the four districts of the Punjab, the following figures will show to what an enormous extent this evil has grown. In the first district in the year 1895, in an area of 120 square miles and a population of 108,000, 20 per cent, of the lands were alienated to moneylenders. In the second district, containing an area of 349 square miles and a population of 108,000, the percentage of alienated lands was 28. In the third district, containing 333 square miles and a population of 50,000, the percentage was 17; and in the fourth district, with 349 square miles and a population of 30,000 people, the percentage of alienated lands was 11 per cent. I think the greatest stress should be laid upon these facts. I should also like to recommend to the noble Lord the question of irrigation. This is a subject in which the Indian Government has always interested itself, but in which I do not think it has quite carried out the recommendations of its own Commission. For example, take the example of the Famine Commission in 1879-80. Page 150, Part 2 of the Report says;

"Among the means that may be adopted for giving India direct protection from famine arising from drought, the first place must unquestionably be assigned to works of irrigation. There must be reckoned the direct protection afforded by the saving of human life, by the avoidance of loss of revenue remitted and off the outlay incurred in costly measures of relief. But it is not only in years of drought that they are useful. In seasons of average rainfall they are of great service and a great source of wealth, giving certainty to all agricultural occupations, increasing the out-turn per acre of the crops, and enabling more valuable descriptions of crops to be grown."

What has been the action of the Government in the years 1882 to 1898? If I summarise the figures given in the statistical abstracts, I find that the combined totals of railway expenditure for all those years has been £246,000,000, while the total for irrigation only amounts to £39,000,000, leaving a balance in favour of railways as against irrigation of £207,000,000. "Everybody I must admit that railways are very useful, but at the same time they do not produce the food by which millions of the people of India are to be sustained. Irrigation does that in the most ample manner, and I think this House will see the propriety of urging upon the Government of India and the noble Lord the necessity of promoting irrigation. Railways are useful to convey grain, but they do not prevent famine. I will quote to the House an extract from the Standard's Simla correspondent in reference to what I was said by Sir Mackworth Young, the Lieut.-Governor of the Punjab, who has been making a tour of the provinces. In regard to the Chenab Canal and irrigation works which had just been opened, the Lieut.-Governor made an important speech, of which the following is an extract;

"He pointed out that India had just passed through a famine, which at one time imposed on the Government the duty of supporting directly upwards of six

millions of people. All this time the inhabitants of the Chenab Colony had been living in a tract of country which a few years ago was a waterless desert, utterly dry and barren. Yet the existence of the famine was hardly known to those assembled. The land had brought forth abundantly, the people had lived in peace and plenty; their surplus stocks, which were enormous, being carried off by the railway which the Government had built, to be sold at famine prices in less favoured parts of India."

I would like just to refer to the classical case of the success of irrigation works in India; I mean the Godavari Delta. At one time there were only 150,000 acres which afforded a precarious livelihood to the people, and now there are 700,000 acres producing certain crops. There is now there 500 miles of canals which have been

found very useful for agricultural purposes. The population previous to irrigation was 600,000, and now it is 2,500,000. I can give other details in regard to revenues, exports, and imports which would show that this country, which was smiling as a rose garden now, was before a desert, and highly unproductive. There is also the question of technical education which I would also impress as strongly as I can upon the noble Lord, for he knows that, through the advance of civilisation by the railways, and by the free introduction of goods from all parts of the world; from England, Germany, America, and other countries; many of the native village industries have been swept away, and the result has been that a much larger proportion of the inhabitants of India have been obliged to turn their attention to agriculture.

That means, as is the case in Ireland, that there is too great a pressure upon agriculture as a means of livelihood, and the produce is scarcely sufficient to maintain the population. It has been stated that there are millions of people in India who have never known what it is to have their hunger satisfied.

I believe that this House contains a great many new Members, and I hope that they will take an interest in Indian debates, for the responsibility rests upon their shoulders quite as much as upon ours. I hope that the suggestion of my hon. friend may be carried out, and that we shall have certain amounts put upon the Estimates, so that we may have more frequent opportunities of discussing the affairs of India. These discussions are generally relegated to the dog-days, and the natural result is that many Members of this House do not take that interest in these Indian debates which they should do. Many hon. Members of the present Parliament have been out in India and they possess a knowledge of her wants and needs. Therefore, it is highly desirable that they should give the House the benefit of that knowledge, and to the best of their ability promote the interests of the millions of their fellow subjects in that great Empire.

Amendment proposed;

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty, that although Your Majesty's Government have arranged that from the 1st day of April next charges amounting to £257,500 shall for the future, in accordance with an unanimous recommendation of the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure, be transferred from Indian to British expenditure, no provision has been made for any repayment of the arrears of these charges, while other

recommendations of the Commission have been ignored altogether; and that, in justice to the people of India, all these arrears should be repaid by the British Exchequer to the Indian in the form of a liberal grant in relief of the Indian famine."";(Mr. Caine.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

\*SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAG-GREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.) said that the details and facts furnished to the House by the hon. Member for Camborne in his opinion perfectly justified the appeal made by the Amendment. He had never concealed his disappointment at the refusal of the Imperial Government to make a grant to India for the relief of the sufferings she passed through during the famine. The reasons urged for the making of a grant were certainly just, and were such as would enable the Government to make an adequate contribution to the Indian Exchequer with a good deal of grace. Although he concurred in the Amendment, he felt bound to take exception to one argument used by the mover in support. The hon. Gentleman attempted to prove that it was on the ground that India was seething with sedition that it was found necessary to keep 30,000 additional troops in the country in order to over-awe a disorderly people. But he contended that the military forces, both British and native, were maintained in India for no such purpose, but for the protection of the country mainly against foreign aggression, and for Imperial requirements. It had never been pretended that there had ever been any danger to the Empire from within the frontier. It was now generally admitted that the necessity for keeping up the strength of the Anglo-Indian army in excess of actual requirement was to have 30,000 men in a convenient situation so that they might be ordered out for Imperial purposes if necessary. It had been stated on the highest authority that India was a school where a large contingent of military forces might be trained and kept ready to hand in case of emergency, and therefore it was only just that the expense of those troops should, be defrayed by the English and not by the Indian Exchequer. The Royal Commission had recommended the payment of a sum of £257,500, heretofore defrayed by India, to be levied from the British Exchequer, and he thought from the-point of view of a fair business adjustment and sound policy, that it would be a graceful act on the part of the Imperial Government to the Empire of India if a sum of from £5,000,000 to £7,000,000 were awarded to the Indian Exchequer, nominally, under the head of famine relief, but really as an act of justice in payment of arrears, which would be accepted by the Indian people as an act of Imperial generosity. It was unnecessary to enlarge upon the sufferings of India during the last few years on account of the famine; at the same time he regretted to have to say that a very severe state of scarcity, if not actual famine, at present existed throughout Western and Central India, and relief measures would have to be adopted. He ventured, therefore, to make an appeal to the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India that he should give this: Amendment his favourable consideration. No one had more readily or persistently acknowledged the blessings India derived from British rule than he had done, but he felt bound to say that when it was a question of £; s. d., India did not always have that sympathetic treatment which was her due at the hands of Parliament. For instance, a great outcry had been

made in the past about the advantages which India was supposed to possess over Lancashire in the cotton industry. Whatever the position might have been before, in the last five years it had disappeared. Famine had stopped the supply of cotton, and the plague and the Chinese disturbances had sent to ruin many of the mills one after another until the industry had entirely become unremunerative. He therefore appealed to the noble Lord to reconsider the subject of the cotton duties.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; I must remind the hon. Member that the terms of this Amendment are very narrow. They do not include the question of the treatment of India by England, but only that of whether certain sums shall be returned to India in the form of a grant for the Indian famine. Under these circumstances I must request the hon. Member to confine his observations to the question raised by the Amendment.

\*SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE said that one of the objections urged when a grant was suggested on former occasions was that India had sufficient credit for all her needs. No doubt India, with the British Government at her back, had credit, but to have credit was one thing and to have ready money was another. He supported the Amendment on the ground that from the highest dictates of Imperialism, and from a sense of the obligation which that sentiment imposed on the Government, it was absolutely necessary that a grant should be made to the Exchequer of India in the manner indicated in the Amendment.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.) thought it would be generally admitted that it was highly necessary that this question in regard to the adjustment of the finances of India should be brought before the House at the present time. As hon. Members were aware, this was a matter which had often been debated in the House, and Commission after Commission had sat upon it, but seemed to be a long time coming to a decision. He was informed the reason for this delay was that in these matters concerning India the money was not paid by England but by India, and therefore it was all the more necessary that the House should be scrupulously careful in doing what was right.

The charges in support of the Amendment had been fully made out, and it was not his intention to weary the House with any general representation of the case. He would merely draw attention to one specific point, which was the recommendation made on page 188 of the Report; the Minority Report; of the Commission, in regard to the desirability of altering in some direction the military charges now borne by India. He was glad to notice that that was one of the main principles of the Amendment, and he would be glad

to hear that the noble Lord shared the general opinion. On the ground of sentiment it appeared to him that the Government ought to make some arrangement which would provide that a certain number of troops should be stationed in India as an Imperial force, and should be paid out of the Imperial revenue. Such troops could be used on occasions of emergency, and such a course would bind still more closely India to this country, and it would also be a practical way of enabling the people of India to understand that as an Empire they shared not only the responsibilities but the expense of the Empire to which they were so much attached. From the point of view of financial justice he merely desired to

point out what he believed would be the practical way of bringing about the relief to the Indian Exchequer which he thought the justice of the case demanded in regard to the repayment of the arrears which were claimed by the Indian Government. A proposal of this kind would, he thought, be useful and important from the military point of view. The history of the present time emphasised the importance of our position in the East. In his work, entitled "Problems of the Far East," the Viceroy of India had stated his belief that the great centre of future problems would be Hindustan. He also held that view, and on any question arising in the East our interests demanded that we should have a mobile and well-equipped force in India always ready for Imperial purposes in cases of emergency.

No one would doubt that if the exigencies of the Empire in the East demanded it a strong military force ought to be stationed in India, which was the most convenient situation. The history of the last two years, the war in South Africa and the operations in China, showed the importance of our having a force always at hand in case of danger not only in the East but in South Africa as well. The last point of view from which he would deal with this question was the practical point of view. Such an arrangement would get rid of the bad feeling of the last forty or fifty years as to the financial relations between the two countries.

We had drawn on India, for troops for Imperial purposes no less than nine times in the course of forty years; and in the future, no doubt, there would be still greater necessity for doing so. It seemed to him that such an arrangement as he had sketched out would be a practical means of dealing in a fair way with the arrears of payment which were claimed by the Indian Government, and would be a practical and final solution just alike to India and to this country.

\*MR. WYLIE (Dumbartonshire): The question which for the last two or three years has overshadowed all others in connection with India is that of the famine, and this Amendment deals with certain means of alleviation. Famine is of frequent occurrence in India, but the last one exceeded them all in the extent of territory it affected. It has affected no less than a quarter of the total area of India, and about one-fifth of the population. The Government of India is always in a thorough state of preparedness to deal with normal famines, but this famine was of unexampled magnitude, and the Government of India acted in a manner deserving the greatest credit. During the time the famine was at its height there was a larger number than ever before simultaneously relieved, and no Government in the world could have grappled so effectively with the situation as the Indian Government have done. The officials of the Government, from the Viceroy downwards, have acted with the greatest self-devotion.

I do not at all concur with the proposal made by the mover and seconder of the Amendment, that because a certain sum of money has come into the Indian Exchequer, pretty much by way of windfall, it should be appropriated for the famine. I think the Indian Government requires no injunction to increase the means of alleviating the famine. A question has come before the House in the course of this discussion very prominently; namely, How can famines be averted? This is infinitely more important to India, and very much more worthy the

consideration of this House. The causes of famine in India are manifold, but there are two or three great causes. The first and principal cause is the failure of the rain supply, which occurs periodically in periods varying from one to ten years.

\*MR. SPEAKER: I have to remind the hon. Gentleman that the causes of the famine do not arise on this Amendment.

MR. WYLIE: Well, Sir, I bow to your ruling. I was following the discussion which has occurred on the Amendment.

\*MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the hon. Member also that the mover and seconder of the Amendment were not bound to confine themselves to the terms of the Amendment.

MR. WYLIE: I quite bow to your ruling. I was going to refer to the causes of famine and to the means of preventing famine, but I shall take the opportunity of doing so on the Indian Budget. I confine my remarks to dissenting from the proposal of the mover and seconder of the Amendment, which I think is a direct injunction to the Indian Government to increase the means to be devoted to the famine fund. I think it should be left to their entire discretion, because they have shown the greatest liberality and the greatest statesmanship in dealing with this appalling disaster.

SIR ROBERT MOWBRAY (Lambeth, Brixton) said he would endeavour to confine himself strictly and absolutely to the Amendment before the House. The hon. Member for Camborne continually referred to the recommendations of the Royal Commission. If this were a matter of sentiment, he would support the hon. Member in asking for a very generous and liberal grant to India to meet any difficulties in which it had been placed by the famine. He thought we owed a debt of gratitude to the Government and the Princes of India, and it would be a generous thing on the part of this country to acknowledge it. But that was not the proposition before the House. The proposition was, in the words of the hon. Member who moved the Amendment, that we had been drawing from India what we were not entitled to draw, and had put ourselves in the wrong in that way, and that we ought to make atonement for the wrong by paying twenty years arrears. When the question of arrears was gone into, I he did not know why the hon. Member stopped at twenty years. Why did he not go back to the time when the Government was taken over from the East India Company? He confessed that the hon. Member was I very generous when he only took twenty years. He did not think that after the Government had agreed to the recommendations of the Commission the House would consider that they ought to pay arrears also. He was bound to say that, so far as his recollection of the discussions in the Commission went, he did not remember the recommendation which was now made being laid before the Royal Commission at the time its Report was in preparation, and it ought to have been laid before the Commission when the Report was being considered. He was exceedingly glad that His Majesty's Government had seen their way to carry out in full, so far as the amount of money went, the recommendations of the Royal Commission. It was quite true, as his hon. friend had said, that the Government had not acted in accordance with the precise recommendations in the Report, but India would get more than was recommended by the Commission. He

would support the Government in opposing the Amendment.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: I think everyone who has listened to the debate on this Amendment will admit that it has been supported by speeches of sincerity, moderation, and ability. The proposition before the House is that the Government should undertake to pay a lump sum to the credit of the Indian Treasury, and that proposition is based on the fact that the Commission which was appointed some years ago made certain proposals in regard to the apportionment of expenditure between the two Exchequers by which India is to benefit to the extent of £257,000. The Member for Camborne, who was a prominent member of that Commission, suggests that the Government should make up arrears for twenty years. The Report of the Commission is a very long and a very interesting document, but it roughly comes to this conclusion, that there is no injustice in the existing arrangement between England and India. The Report, for the purpose of liberal treatment for the future, makes a proposition by which certain charges should be transferred to England.

I hope the House will allow me, for a few minutes, to give my own experience in connection with, this most difficult subject of the relative amounts which the two Exchequers should contribute towards the objects in which they are commonly interested. I was Under Secretary for India many years ago, and I had been but a short time in office-when I came to the conclusion that the Admiralty and the War Office were unjustly putting charges on the Indian revenue, and I obtained very shortly after I became Under Secretary the appointment of a Select Committee in 1874 to inquire into the home charges of the Indian Government. They took a great deal of evidence, sitting for four years. The Committee had before it Mr. Cardwell and the Commander-in-Chief, the Duke of Cambridge, and I am bound to say that the conclusions forced on my mind, from the investigations then made, greatly altered the ideas I had-before entertained. The charges placed on India might be heavy, but in no single case were we able to ascertain a charge which the Imperial Government put on India out of which it made a profit. And the more I have looked into these charges since the more I have come to the conclusion that, speaking of the expenditure of the two Governments, the connection of Great Britain with India does not reduce her expenditure, but, on the contrary, adds to the Estimates which annually have to be presented to Parliament.

This Committee to which I allude, and which was appointed twenty-six years ago, had its recommendations included in the Report of the Commission, and the Commission expressed the highest approval at the conclusions at which they then arrived. I may roughly indicate them, because I think the principle will recommend itself to both sides of the House. Their first recommendation is that strict impartiality should be secured in the financial arrangements. I think that the supervision and general control of the House of Commons is very beneficial to India. The next recommendation is that the English Estimates should not be relieved at the expense of the Indian revenue, and that we should always consult India on all charges which may affect India. That is the view which I held twenty-six years ago, and to that



view I adhere. The Commission never asserted that money has been appropriated or that, as the hon. Member said, India has been cheated. They are certain that the charges made were justifiable in themselves and that no benefit accrued to the British Government from the charges so made, but they suggested, and this is the whole point, that for the purpose of securing liberal treatment for the future certain proportions of the charges hitherto borne by India should be transferred to the Imperial Exchequer, the amount being £257,000. Therefore I have to deal with a specific suggestion made by a Commission based on certain arguments and conclusions; namely, that the Imperial Exchequer should relieve the Indian Exchequer of that amount. I went, fortified by that Report, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and discussed the matter with him. He took a most liberal view of the situation, and he said, "I will assent to the propositions of the Commission." I wonder of how many Commissions appointed in recent years that can be said. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in fact, said, "So far as the amount is concerned I am ready to give the amount which the Commission recommend." I think that was a very generous and prompt response. What is now asked? It is asked that I should turn round on the Chancellor of the Exchequer and say, "It is true you have acceded to the Commission's recommendations, but you are asked for arrears." What arrears? If this Report had been based on the contention that a gross injustice had been done to India in the past, then there might be reason for asking for arrears, but the Report says that the charges, in the main, have been just, and therefore it is impossible to press this request for arrears. If I went to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and made a request for arrears I should be guilty of a breach of faith. Could anybody justify that disingenuous dealing with the head of Imperial finance?

My hon. friend the Member for North-East Bethnal Green indulged in a very happy phrase when he said he was an Imperialist and believed in the enormous benefits which British rule has conferred on India, but that he wished that the British Government would not take such a £; s. d. view of the transaction between the two Treasuries. I do not want to indulge in anything like party animadversions, but may I ask the hon. Gentlemen opposite, the majority of whom will probably vote for the Amendment, what is the foundation for the allegations made as to the charges being unduly put on the Indian revenue? When I came to the House of Commons the Manchester school of politicians was supreme. They dominated English finance, and their test of the efficiency of the administrator was regulated by the amount by which he could reduce the expenditure which he inherited from his predecessor. I always thought that was a short-sighted view to take of effective administration. After all, money is given to achieve a certain object, and the effective point is to see whether that object is achieved. The First Lord of the Admiralty in Mr. Gladstone's Government took enormous credit to himself when he brought down the Navy expenditure under a certain figure. I think it was ten millions. One of the means by which he did that was to claim for services rendered in Indian waters by the British Navy to the tune of many thousands of pounds. We have secured for the future a juster and a fairer appreciation of what is to the benefit of India, and I certainly do not think that, having obtained, as I think a large and generous contribution

from the Treasury, I should be justified in putting forward a claim for arrears which is absolutely contrary to the whole of the trend of the Report of the Commission. The hon. Gentleman called attention to the fact that, although the amount we propose to give to India somewhat exceeds the amount recommended by the Commission, we have not adhered to the details of expenditure which they recommended; and the hon. Gentleman specially alluded to the fact that the proposition was made that £50,000 should be voted as an appropriation in aid of the India Office, that that £50,000 should be put on the Estimates, and that consequently the House of Commons should get an additional opportunity to those which they now enjoy of discussing Indian affairs. But the motive that induced the Commission to make that recommendation was not that the House of Commons should have that additional opportunity.

MR. CAINE: What I said was that your salary and the salary of the Under Secretary should be put on the Estimates.

SIR ROBERT MOWBRAY: May I also say that the recommendation of the Commission was that, although £50,000 should be paid for the India Office, the charge should be put either on the Estimates or on the Consolidated Fund.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: My hon. friend has put his finger upon the motive which induced the Commission to make that recommendation. The motive was not that Parliament should have additional opportunities of discussing Indian affairs, because if they had had that idea they would not have made the suggestion that the charge should be put on the Consolidated Fund. They recommended this grant because they thought that £50,000 should be given in connection with this object. We looked carefully into the matter, and came to the conclusion that there were other objects which should have prior consideration, and we struck out the £50,000 and put in £50,500, so that India benefits by that small amount. Let me just say that I personally have no objection whatever, so far as I am concerned, to a Vote appearing on the Estimates for the purposes of discussion; but the House should look at the matter from a House of Commons and Indian point of view.

Every year there is a discussion in this House on the Indian Budget. The resolution which the Secretary of State proposes is simply a peg on which the House of Commons can hang speeches. It has no practical validity of any kind; it was purposely framed by Sir Charles Wood for that purpose. Therefore the House has every year on the Indian Budget the opportunity of raising any question of policy or any matters connected with Indian administration. It is not in the least necessary by law or otherwise for the Secretary of State to make his annual statement; he does it deliberately for the purpose of giving the House an opportunity for discussion. That seems to me to be the best method of bringing Indian affairs before the notice of the House. To put a token Vote on the Estimates for the purpose of provoking discussion would, I think, not be very beneficial to India. Going back to the days to which I was referring, when the Manchester school was predominant, the discussions on the Estimates always assumed an economical shape. The object was to reduce expenditure, and Ministers were called to task unless they could justify the expenditure which they

proposed. But we have got rid altogether of that school. The object now is to increase expenditure. Every Minister who is in any way responsible for a Department behind which is a large personnel finds his time taken up in opposing demands for increased expenditure, and notwithstanding the power which the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer can exercise in this House, and the knowledge that increased expenditure here falls upon the English taxpayer, our expenditure; civil, military, and naval; is increasing at an appalling rate. In a few years Members of the House of Commons will find that this is one of the most serious matters they will have to deal with. If that is the case with regard to expenditure for which the House of Commons is responsible, what would be the position of the unhappy Indian Secretary of State, who has under him an enormous personnel, if a sum representing his salary was placed on the Estimates? He would have every conceivable motion made from different parts of the House to increase the salaries of the innumerable civil, military, and other servants under the Indian Government.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: That would be out of order.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: The hon. Gentleman says it would be out of order. But my hon. friend is one of the most adroit adepts when the Estimates come up in attacking Ministers not for what is in the Estimates, but for what is not in them. You can by a number of methods put such pressure on Ministers that it is very, very difficult for them not to have to consider between the period at which they are so attacked and the next year some proposals for increased expenditure. If this is the case when the interests of the taxpayer are apparent to every Member of the House, what would be the position of the Secretary of State for India when the increased expenditure would fall upon not the English, but the Indian taxpayer? I am sure, from an Indian point of view, as well as from a House of Commons point of view, that the present arrangement is a far more satisfactory one than to substitute for the discussion on the Indian Budget a debate which would take place on the Vote for the Secretary of State's salary.

MR. SCHWANN: Then there is the date at which the Budget comes in.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: That is another matter. I am not responsible for the disposition of the time of the House, and I should be glad if I could get the discussion on the Indian Budget at an earlier part of the session. I think I have shown that in acting as I have done I looked most carefully into the subject, have secured rapid acquiescence in the Report of the Commission, I have got a large appropriation from the Imperial Exchequer for the benefit of Indian finance, and I think it is quite unreasonable, because I have been so successful, to expect me to go in for arrears. If arrears are asked for, may I ask from what source they are to come? I am in rather a proud position now with regard to Indian finance. It is true we have only just emerged from a most serious drought, and I am afraid there are prospects of drought for the next six months, and this affects our revenue and increases our expenditure, but I believe for the last financial year, the present, and the next, we shall have, notwithstanding all this expenditure, a surplus in each year. But we know that in this country there will be a big deficit. Where are the £5,000,000 which the hon. Member asks the Chancellor of the Exchequer to provide to come from?

MR. CAINE: A graduated income tax.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: I should suggest the tea duty. Anyhow, the hon. Member must recollect that his proposi-

tion means increased taxation in this country, as this money could be provided only by a loan, which would be a permanent burden on the revenues of this country, or by increased taxation. Under these circumstances it really seems impossible to expect that I should go to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and ask for this amount. The hon. Member for North Manchester went somewhat out side the Amendment, and alluded to the economical conditions of the people of India. I do not know whether I should be in order;

\*MR. SPEAKER: I do not think the noble Lord would be in order in following that out.

\*LORD G. HAMILTON: I was afraid I should be precluded. Perhaps I may be permitted to say that the hon. Gentleman took the view that the material economic condition of the population generally was deteriorating. I only venture respectfully to say that I have and I accepted evidence from any quarter that could be given, but I have never yet been able to find one iota of fact to justify that view. I go so far as to say that if we as a nation and a Government cannot improve the material condition of India, it destroys the very foundation of our right and our claim to govern that country. Although India has suffered terribly during the past few years from drought and pestilence, the sufferings she has had to meet have been due not to increased poverty, but to the dimensions and the intensity of the drought which has occurred. A Commission, as the hon. Member is aware, is inquiring into the results on the people of the drought, and if it can be brought to my notice or to the notice of the Viceroy that there is any evidence to show that in any particular district the land assessment is too high or that the condition of the people is deteriorating, I can assure the House that he or I will undertake the most thorough investigation.

There are other matters to come before the House, and I can only say that it is very unpleasant to have to oppose any motion which is apparently made in the interests of India. India has suffered terribly during the past two or three years, and the people of India have borne their sufferings and privations with a courage, resignation, and absence from crime which commands the highest admiration. They have shown, too, their loyalty and devotion in the most marked manner, and, if I may allude to the irreparable national calamity which has recently befallen us, I feel that there is no part of the Empire in which the death of Queen Victoria has come home so much to the masses. Therefore I am glad that at this, the beginning of a new Parliament, there should be such evident signs that there are many Members on both sides of the House who are anxious to take an interest in Indian affairs. If on this occasion I am unable to assent to the proposition which has been made, it is not because I do not sympathise with the motives of the hon. Gentlemen supporting it, but because I have obtained on certain considerations and certain arguments a great concession to India from the Imperial Exchequer, and it is quite impossible, after what has passed, for me to make the demand which the Amendment desires.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I am sorry this question has been raised in this form, because the debate necessarily must be narrowed down to the one question referred to in the Amendment, while the House no doubt would desire an opportunity of discussing a great many of the questions that are involved in the Report of the Royal Commission in addition to that of the arrears, as the hon. Member for Camborne calls them, and which he proposes should be paid by the British Exchequer to India in one lump sum.

I am in a very awkward position tonight. I was the parent and the author of this Commission. I gave the advice to Her Majesty to issue the Commission, not, as the hon. Member for North Manchester seems to think, as the result of a House of Commons debate, but because as Secretary of State for India I was satisfied that the financial relations which then existed between the Exchequer of this country and the Exchequer of India were not upon a satisfactory basis. That Commission sat for I forget how many years, and took a vast volume of evidence. Then it apparently collapsed,

and it required all the force of questions and debate in this House; almost the threat of proceedings against the Commission for contempt of the Crown; before we could extract from them a Report. But the Report has come. There again I am in an awkward position with reference to dealing with it. That Report, so far as it is an exposition of the past financial history; and the past financial history means the whole system of Indian Government; is one of the most luminous, accurate, and best volumes ever issued in the shape of a Blue-book. If any Member of this House, desirous of taking an interest in Indian affairs, wishes to put his hand on an authoritative statement of what has been and what is the financial relationship between this country and India, he will find nothing better than what I may call the historical part of that Report. But when we come to the practical recommendations of the Commission it is a very different story. There are very few recommendations. I am bound to say, with every respect to my hon. friend opposite, the Member for Brixton, who was one of the members of the Commission, that they, I will not say shirked, but evaded almost every difficult question submitted to them.

MR. CAINE: Hear, hear&#x0021;

SIR HENRY FOWLER: I am glad to be cheered in that statement by another member of the Commission. Looking at that Report I am at a loss to know what they do recommend and what they really did. We could not have had a more humorous illustration of this point than the remark of my hon. friend opposite just now.

They apparently (I say apparently because I do not know what was passing in their minds) wished; I am quite sure the hon. Member for Camborne wished it; to put the Indian expenditure, so far as the Home Department was concerned, under the immediate control of the House of Commons, so that it could be discussed on the Estimates. But the Commission, whether they meant it or not, gave the alternative of putting it on the Consolidated Fund, which is the only possible mode in which the House of Commons control could be absolutely and for ever evaded.

SIR ROBERT MOWBRAY: I concurred in the recommendation on the ground that it should be put on the Consolidated Fund only.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: And it will be found that other members of the Commission meant something else. This is not the time, but on a suitable occasion I should like to call attention to the facts which this Commission ascertained, and to show why; I say it with no small sense of responsibility and with considerable reluctance after the speech of the noble Lord; in the main I dissent from and should be very sorry to be bound by the conclusions of the Commission so far as the financial relationships between England and India are concerned. I think the findings of the Commission; I say it with diffidence, but it is my opinion, and I do not shrink from expressing it; are not just to India, and I do not consider the settlement proposed a satisfactory one. The noble Lord says he had a very pleasant interview with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not only generous but prompt. I am not surprised. I say nothing about the generosity, but I am quite sure he was wise to be prompt, for an uncommonly good bargain he made so far as the Treasury was concerned. At the proper time I will endeavour to call the attention of the House to some of the relationships between the two Exchequers which are not satisfactorily dealt with by the Report of the Commission.

Now, the noble Lord quoted, and justly so, the recommendations of the Committee of which he was a member twenty-six years ago. I subscribe to every word of the recommendations of that Committee. But the noble Lord, commencing that section of his speech and alluding to the many inquiries which had taken place on Indian finance, stopped at that Committee and did not bring his account down late enough. I am sure he must have forgotten for the moment what is called Lord Northbrook's Committee, which sat for a great number of years endeavouring to solve these questions, more especially in regard to Army costs. Lord Northbrook's Committee's Report I think carried out the principles of the noble Lord's Committee, but the details amounted to much larger sums as due to India than this Commission has reported.

With reference to the special question with which this Amendment deals; namely, what my hon. friend calls the arrears; the argument of the noble Lord is unanswerable. There are no arrears. You are making a settlement between two exchequers; it is a settlement which has been in dispute for a quarter of a century, and on which the most distinguished Viceroys have held opinions contrary to those held by the most distinguished Chancellors of the Exchequer; but the settlement when arrived at at the end of that period, whether it be right or wrong, cannot be spoken of as in the nature of a debt on which arrears can be computed and which we are called upon to pay. I have not concealed in this House my view that it would have been wise; not only generous, but wise; on principles of high policy if twelve months ago, when I think I first submitted the proposal, the House had made a generous advance to India with respect to the famine. Of course, a good deal has happened since then. I feel the force of the argument the noble Lord has put before us, especially accompanied, as it has been, by the statement that the finances of India are in a more flourishing condition now than then, and that there is every prospect, notwithstanding the famine which may be feared in certain districts, that the financial position for next year will be a satisfactory one. We know that the financial position of

this country next year will not be a satisfactory one, and under these circumstances I appreciate the force of the objection which he now raises. I should certainly not press him in that respect, but I wish to reserve, as I have already stated, my own opinion, and to express it at the proper time, with reference to what I might call the temporary nature of this settlement between England and India. I am satisfied that a time will come when the House of Commons will consider this question in a much more liberal form than this Commission has done.

The only other point on which I wish to say a word is with reference to the recommendation which has already been mentioned; that of putting a sum of money upon the Estimates in order to bring Indian matters under the review of the House of Commons. I agree with what the noble Lord has said, and perhaps I should go even further. The Government of India is a very difficult and complex piece of administrative and legislative machinery. It was devised by great men fifty years ago. India has been well and wisely governed, as I venture to think, during the past half-century, and you cannot take a machine of that sort to pieces bit by bit. If the House is going to introduce new principles and new modes of government, to deal with Indian expenditure as it deals with English expenditure, the taxpayer in the one case being totally different from the taxpayer in the other, I think the House of Commons will impose upon itself a duty it will not be able to discharge. I think it will shift responsibility from the shoulders upon which responsibility ought to be placed, and where it is now felt, to shoulders which would not feel the responsibility; and, above all, it will have taken the first step towards making Indian questions of detail and of administration part of the party politics of the House. I think the House of Commons will pause a long while before it impairs the interests of India by taking such a step as that.

Having said that, I am free to say that I echo every word the noble Lord said with reference to the responsibility of the English Government and of this House for what I may call questions of Imperial and Indian policy. This House has never been without an opportunity under the present system of dealing with these questions, when they have arisen, far more effectively and far more conclusively than it would have been by a reduction of £10, £20, or £100 being moved on the Secretary of State's salary. There is not a single question of Indian policy raising matters of vital importance to the Government of India which this House has not had an opportunity, certainly during all the years I have been a Member of Parliament, of fully discussing and finally deciding.

["No."] Hon. Members say "No." Will they give me a case?

MR. CAINE: The sedition laws

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: The question of the Chitral Expedition was discussed, not in August, but within a fortnight of the House assembling. In the month of January or February there was a debate of three or four nights, in which a large number of Members took part, and after which the House came to a decision. Were the Cotton Duties decided in August? They were decided in March, as I well remember. The Opium Duty question has come up several times since I have been a Member of this House. With reference to the Indian Budget, I quite agree that it ought to

be brought forward much earlier. It cannot be brought forward before May on account of the financial dates of Indian finance. But last year, if I remember rightly, it was brought forward in July; a fortnight or three weeks before the end of the session. I do not think that any motion which could be made to accelerate the bringing forward of the Indian Budget at a time which would give proper opportunity for discussing Indian affairs would meet with any opposition from either side of the House. But the mere fact that these questions are dealt with, not perhaps as fully as we should wish, on the Indian Budget at the end of the session must not be taken, either by the people of this country or by those of India, to mean that Indian affairs of magnitude are discussed only at that time, and that there are no opportunities given in all the forms with which this House is familiar for discussing questions of Indian policy.

I very much regret that -we have not had an opportunity of fully discussing this Report, but I venture very respectfully to submit to the noble Lord that this is not a settlement which can be finally accepted as disposing of questions, some of which have been raised by the mover of the Amendment, and some of which have not been touched upon at all to-night, which affect the finance of India as well as the finance of England, and I hope that, on some future occasion England, and India also, will be in a position to approach this matter again, perhaps with better light than

this Commission has had, and that, while availing ourselves of the vast volume of very valuable evidence which they have collected, and of the very admirable exposition they have given of the Indian position, nevertheless we shall approach it with fresh light, and I think in the long run both this  
AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N.E.)

Hammond, John

O'Dowd, John

Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

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

Hayden, John Patrick

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

Ambrose, Robert

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. H. Seale-

O'Malley, William

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Helme, Norval Watson

O'Mara, James

Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Boland, John

Holland, William Henry

O'Shee, James John



Boyle, James  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Pirie, Duncan V.  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Burt, Thomas  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Price, Robert John  
Caldwell, James  
Joyce, Michael  
Reddy, M.  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Leamy, Edmund  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Charming, Francis Allston  
Lloyd-George, David  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Lundon, W.  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Condon, Thomas J.  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Crean, Eugene  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Roche, John  
Cremer, William Randal  
M'Cann, James  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Crombie, John William  
M'Crae, George  
Samuel, S. M.(Whitechapel)  
Cullinan, J.  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Daly, James  
M'Fadden, Edward  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
M'Govern, T.  
Shipman, Dr. John  
Delany, William

M'Hugh, Patrick A.  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Dillon, John  
Minch, Matthew  
Sullivan, Donal  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Moulton, John Fletcher  
Thomas, Alfred(Glamorgan, E.  
Doogan, P. C.  
Murnaghan, George  
Thomas, D. Alfred(Merthyr)  
Duffy, William J.  
Murphy, J.  
Tully, Jasper  
Duncan, James H.  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Evans, Samuel T.  
Newnes, Sir George  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Nolan, Col. John P.(Galway, N.  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Fenwick, Charles  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
White, Patrick(Meath, North)  
Field, William  
O'Brien Kendal (Tipperary Mid  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Brien Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
O'Connor, James(Wicklow, W.  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Doherty, William  
Mr. Caine and Mr. Schwann.  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton

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

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Chamberlain, J. Austen(Worc'r  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Bell, Richard  
Chapman, Edward  
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden  
Bignold, A.  
Charrington, Spencer  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Bigwood, James  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Blundell, Col. Henry  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Roscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A. E.  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Arrol, Sir William  
Bowles, T. Gibson(King's Lynn  
Colomb, Sir John C. Ready  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Cook, Frederick Lucas  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Austin, Sir John  
Bull, William James  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Baily, James (Walworth)  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Carlile, William Walter  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)

Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W(Leeds  
Cavendish, Y. C. W. (Derbyshre  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch'ch  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Banbury, Fredrick George  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Dickson, Charles Scott

country and the House of Commons will arrive at a different conclusion than that  
at which the Royal Commission has arrived.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 112; Noes, 204. (Division List No. 9).

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop  
Pym, C. Guy  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Keswick, William  
Rasch, Major F. Carne  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Knowles, Lees  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Lawrence, William F.  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Burning Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.  
Ridley, Hn. M.W. (Stalybridge  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Lee, Capt AH.(Hants, Fareham  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Finch, George H.  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Leighton, Stanley  
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N.S.

Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Fison, Frederick William  
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.  
Russell, T. W.  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. T. Myles  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Long, Col. Charles W(Evesham  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln.  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Flower, Ernest  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Foster, Sir Michael(Lond. Univ  
Lowe, Francis William  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Garfit, William  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Gibbs, Hn. A.G.H.(Cy. of Lend.  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Smith, H. C.(Nrthmb. Tyneside  
Gordon, Hn. J. E(Elgin&Nairn)  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Smith, James Parker(Lanarks)  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Malcolm, Ian  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'rHmlets  
Martin, Richard Bidduph  
Spear, John Ward  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Maxwell, W.J. H. (Dumfriessh  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Stock, James Henry  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fredk. G.  
Stroyan, John

Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Milton, Viscount  
Sturt, Hon Humphry Napier  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J.G.(Oxf'd Univ  
Greene, Sir E.W.(B'ryS Edm'nds  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Groves, James Gimble  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Tollemarche, Henry James  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
More, Robt. Jasper(Shropshire)  
Tomlinson, William Edw. M.  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Tufnell, Col Edward  
Hain, Edward  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Valentia, Viscount  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld G. Midd'x  
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)  
Vincent, Col Sir C. E. H.(Sheffield  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'ndond'y  
Mount, William Arthur  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
Wason, John Cathcart(Orkney  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemo'h  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Webb, Col. William George  
Heath, Arthur Howard(Han'l'y  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Whiteley, H.(Ashton-under-L.  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Helder, Augustus

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Henderson, Alexander  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Wills, Sir Fredrick  
Hoare, Edw. Brodie(Hampst'd)  
Percy, Earl  
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)  
Hogg, Linday  
Pilkington, Richard  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C.B. Stuart-  
Hope, J. E. (Sheffield, Brights'i'e  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Wylie, Alexander  
Hoult, Joseph  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Johnstone, William (Belfast)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T (Denbigh  
Pryce-Jones, Lt-Col Edward  
Sir William Walrond and  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Purvis, Robert  
Mr. Anstruther.

Main Question again proposed.

#### CONDUCT OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

\*MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): The Secretary of State for the Colonies, in the speech which he delivered on Monday night, which was characterised by an almost ferocious bitterness, hurled across the floor of this House the epithet "Pro-Boer" as a term of reproach to hon. Members sitting on this side of the House. So far as I am concerned, and the other Members who sit on these benches, the Secretary for the Colonies is welcome to call us pro-Boers. [Ministerial cries of "So you are."] I am a pro-Boer, because during the last two years I have made a careful study of the history of these people. [Ministerial laughter.] I do not suppose that hon. Members opposite who laugh have taken the slightest interest in that history, and yet it is one of the most interesting that they could find. I am convinced from the study that they have been deeply wronged for many generations by the Government of England, that they are now fighting for freedom against enormous odds, and that they are two small States fighting for their national existence against the cruel and unprovoked aggression of an Empire which is too large already to be

wholesome. We Irish Members, and the Irish people for whom we speak, deeply sympathise with these two small States, who are fighting the most glorious and gallant fight which modern history has any record of, and we think it is a magnificent thing in these modern days that there exist men who are willing to risk everything and lose all for an ideal, and for liberty. For these reasons we are not ashamed to be called pro-Boers.

The other night the Secretary of State for the Colonies threw a challenge across the floor of this House, and I am glad that, speaking for the Irish party on this occasion, I am able to say that there is a party in this House who are not afraid to bring this matter to an issue. The Amendment which I propose to submit to the judgment of this House affirms two propositions: (1) That the breaches of the usages of war by the British, which have been going on for many months in South Africa, should be immediately put a stop to; and (2) that steps should be taken immediately to put an end to this miserable and scandalous war. I will take up first of all the question of breach of the usages of war. Hon. Members of this House listened the other night to one of the most powerful indictments I ever heard made in this House from the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs. In the course of his speech he brought forward abundant evidence of farm burning in South Africa, which showed distinctly two things, that the farms were burnt in many instances without justification; if the excuse which had been alleged could be called justification; and that this abominable practice had been carried out in the teeth of modern usages of war upon a large and widespread scale. I listened with interest to the reply which was made to that indictment by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. What was the course adopted by the Colonial Secretary? Why he gave the go-by absolutely to this indictment, and he said that this question of the breach of the usages of war and the burning of farms in South Africa was a matter for the War Office, and was not in his Department. But that was not the course adopted by the right hon. Gentleman on the 7th of December last, when he went into the matter fully, and made certain statements in reference to the burning of farms. Then he stated that he had telegraphed to Lord Kitchener for full details, and he promised us that he would soon be able to lay the full

details before the House. I want to know why, on the present occasion, the Secretary for the Colonies has not one word to say in answer to that indictment, and why he now finds that it is a matter for the War Office when in December last he dealt fully with the case himself?

Before I pass from that particular point I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that when we come to the speech of the Secretary of State for War, he had practically nothing to say about the burning of farms, and those terrible facts which were announced to the House in the speech of the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs remain to this hour unanswered. I am glad that an opportunity has now been afforded me of reinforcing what has been said by the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs, and I ask the Government for an answer to that indictment, which I think we are absolutely entitled to demand. What was the position taken up by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies in December last? He justified the policy of the burning of farms on



the ground that the war had entered upon a guerilla stage, and inasmuch as this atrocious policy of devastating the country and burning the farms of non-combatants has been justified from the beginning upon this one plea and this one plea alone; namely, that the war had passed into a guerilla stage; I feel bound to examine that point for a few moments. For my own part, even if it was true that the war had passed into the guerilla stage, I would not admit that that was any justification for the burning of farms and the turning out of women and children homeless upon the veldt without shelter. But is there any truth in this allegation? I deny it. And I say that when it was first alleged by Lord Roberts in the month of December last it was a grotesque and absurd misrepresentation. I will quote to the House a few of the statements upon which this popular impression of the war being a guerilla warfare was based. I will quote first of all an extract from a speech made by General Sir Redvers Buller on his return to England in the month of October last. He said;

"Nearly the whole of the people we know as Boers have either surrendered or are prisoners, or are doing their best to surrender. The people left in the field are either mercenaries or bandits. Those men remaining in arms are endeavouring to gain profit by remaining in arms, and are not in any sense fighting for their country."

If that statement were true, what has been the justification of the burning of Boer farms from that day to this? According to Sir Redvers Buller, nearly the whole Boer army were in English prisons or doing their best to surrender, and in order to punish these few banditti and mercenaries you have been devastating the country and burning the farms of the Boers. One of the earliest statements which was made in regard to this change which was supposed to have come over the character of the war was made by Lord Roberts himself, and I will ask once more: why was the correspondence between Lord Roberts and General Botha; which took place in the month of September last and which forms one of the most important documents in connection with this war; suppressed and withheld from the country, so that, but for the enterprise of the Manchester Guardian, we should never have seen it at all? And yet this despatch was one of the most important that was issued by Lord Roberts. Writing on the 2nd September, 1900, to General Botha, Lord Roberts makes use of the following words;

"I feel that when the war has once entered on the stage of guerilla or irregular fighting I shall be neglecting my duty, besides the national interests, if I continue to allow the families of those who fought and are still fighting against us to live in the towns which are guarded by our forces. This is no longer a question of commissariat, but rather a matter of policy in order to guard ourselves against the conveying of military information to our enemies."

That is about the first we heard of the war having entered upon a guerilla stage. In that letter to General Botha Lord Roberts said that he could not allow the women and children to live in the British camps, and now the women have been seized upon and dragged into British camps. Here is the answer of General Botha, and all the information that has reached us since the writing of that letter through English sources proves that in this dispute General Botha told the truth

and that Lord Roberts's statement was utterly inaccurate. He says;

"As regards your contention that, with the exception of the burgher forces under my command, no other Boer forces should be in existence, I most strongly deny this, since our armed forces are still disposed and directed in the same manner as in the beginning of the war, and in accordance with the country's laws; Commandos should be in the field everywhere, and it naturally follows that now, as during the war, what is incumbent upon us must be done by small forces. Moreover, we have been compelled to still further scatter our commandos in order to be able to check the looting patrols under your Excellency's chief command, who scour the country to carry off cattle and provisions from the different farms."

As Botha said, he was compelled to scatter still further his commandos in order, if possible, that it should be used to capture these bands, which it did on many occasions. Let me reinforce my view of the case, and the view put forward by the generalissimo of the Boer forces, from a very important British source. We were given to suppose at a very early stage of these debates that Reuter's messages, censored though they were, were not to be quoted as an authority. We had, however, a high example to the contrary given by the Secretary of State for War, who, the other night, quoted without stating its source a very defamatory statement in this House on the authority of Reuter. I have here a very important Reuter message censored by the military censor, and sent three months after Lord Roberts's statement. It appeared in The Times on 24th December, and says;

"It appears to be a prevalent idea that the Boer forces in the Orange River Colony now fighting against us are a number of marauding bands wandering about without aim or object except that of doing as much harm as possible with the smallest possible risk to themselves. Nothing could be more wide of the mark. De Wet has every single commando under his supervision. All his patrols and columns march and counter-march at his order. The forces under his command have been reduced by his strength of will to a properly organised army moving at his word."

That is the opinion of an English correspondent given three months after Lord Roberts's statement. Let me direct attention to a still more important piece of evidence. There appeared in The Times on the 15th January a letter from Bloemfontein, signed "A Camp Follower." It was printed in large type, and everyone who knows the methods of The Times knows that that is the way in which it conveys that its correspondent is a man of weight and high standing. He asks what has been the cause of the misfortunes.

"Nothing else [he replies], in my humble opinion, than the consequences of the absurd description which has now been applied to the war as guerilla warfare. I have been in the field taking part in the recent operations, but for the life of me I cannot see in what respects the Boers could be described as carrying on a guerilla warfare. De Wet has been marching up and down the country with a strong force of between 2,500 and 3,000 men. Three other forces commanded by Haasbrock, Hertzog, and Prinsloo were under his command and made demonstrations or actual attacks whenever De Wet deemed it necessary for the safety of his own force."

That is the opinion of a man whom The Times considers to be a man of weight and

authority. Now I come to Lord Kitchener's own opinion, which is the most important piece of evidence submitted to the House as to the consequences of this attempt to mislead public opinion by describing the present and late phases of the war as guerilla warfare. A document was published in The Times on the 20th February, which I deliberately assert from internal evidence was inspired by Lord Kitchener himself. It is stated to be from the correspondent of The Times at Pretoria, and is dated 21st January. I will leave it to hon. Gentlemen to say whether it does not contain plain proof of having been inspired by Lord Kitchener. Here is the description Lord Kitchener gives of his army as left to him by Lord Roberts;

"When Lord Kitchener took over the command, he and those generals who were associated with him had to face a condition of affairs closely resembling that which met Lord Roberts on his arrival in South Africa twelve months ago. In the natural course of events a certain amount of disorganisation had set in. Troops had become loosely distributed all over the two colonies. Brigades which should have been able to operate in conjunction had lost touch with each other. On our lines of communication there were points where bunches of horse, foot, and artillery had been collected, while other and equally-important points were inadequately guarded and open to sudden attack at any moment. Positions which might prove of considerable strategic value were totally unoccupied, and entire battalions had become isolated in other positions in such a manner as to be rendered practically useless."

I say that that was Lord Kitchener's revenge for Paardeberg, and if this description is true then Lord Roberts, instead of being Commander-in-Chief, I ought to be degraded.

COLONEL LOCKWOOD: May I ask if the hon. Member will state to the House if he knows of his own knowledge

that that letter was inspired by Lord Kitchener?

\*MR. DILLON: The letter was published as from The Times correspondent in Pretoria, and every hon. Member knows that no such account could leave Pretoria without Lord Kitchener's consent.

MR. PYM (Bedford): May I ask the hon. Member if there is not an addendum to that account, which states that the condition of our troops in South Africa was the natural result of previous operations?

\*MR. DILLON: That is perfectly true, and that only makes it more plain to me that the censor had his eye over it. The letter winds up by saying that nobody imagines that it was the fault of Lord Roberts; but will any military man get up in this House and say where British troops are exposed in positions helpless and isolated and perfectly open to attack, and where bunches of artillery and cavalry are collected in places where they are not required, that it is any justification to state that it was not the fault of the Commander-in-Chief? What is the Commander-in-Chief for? The whole purpose of this article is to explain the ground on which Lord Kitchener had to take three months to remove the consequences of Lord Roberts's disorganisation before he could take the field. I do not wish to dwell longer on this point, but I think I have made out my case, and that is that the allegation of guerilla warfare which was put forward as a

justification for the crimes and outrages against the usages of war, which have been perpetrated in the Transvaal, was a fictitious and absurd justification. There has been no guerilla warfare. There has been legitimate warfare, and the only element of guerilla warfare is that you are ten to one, and, being ashamed of not being able to conquer the Boers before now, you have invented the term in order to justify your extraordinary position.

Now let me come to the burning of farms. As I have already pointed out, the Secretary of State for the Colonies avoided the subject. We have not the statistics which were promised, and we have no particulars. In December last, however, the Secretary of State for the

Colonies made two important statements. In the first place he stated that the burning of the Boer farms did not matter because they were like labourers' cottages in this country. I have been myself in a small house built by a farmer in Western America for two or three years. It did not cost as much to build as the house in which the right hon. Gentleman lives at Highbury. I think it cost only about £200, but so far as sentiment and the feeling of the inhabitants of that house were concerned, it would create a more bitter feeling if it were burned down than if the house of the right hon. Gentleman or the houses of hon. Gentlemen opposite were burned. But is there any truth in the statement of the right hon. Gentleman? Only the other day the junior Member for Oldham described the Boers as half squire and half farmer. That is true. They are landowners, and are not like labourers in this country, and I think it is a brutal and unfortunate remark to talk about the comparative cheapness of labourers' cottages. All the evidence before us goes to show that the houses of the Boers, particularly in the Free States, were especially fine and well furnished. Did we not read in the descriptions, so harrowing to the feelings of many hon. Members, of pianos and pictures and comfortable furniture being burned? [A laugh.] An hon. Member opposite laughs, but it is true, and I do not think the subject one suitable for laughter. I do not think I ever read anything more painful; and I would like to believe it was also painful to many hon. Members opposite; than the detailed descriptions which filled the columns of the newspapers of furniture being dragged out of houses and burned before the eyes of unfortunate women and children. I have already quoted the testimony of the junior Member for Oldham. Here is a quotation from the Cape correspondent of the Manchester Guardian. [Several HON. MEMBERS laughed.] I have yet to learn that the Manchester Guardian is such a very contemptible newspaper. It is as respectable a newspaper as any in England. The Cape Town correspondent says;

"I can say from my own knowledge, as one brought up in a farming district in England, that the Boer farms are larger and better furnished than the average farmhouse in England. I have in my mind a place in the Rouxville district where, during the 1880 war, the Dutch settlers continued to the British settlers the free loan of the only church in the district ;the Dutch church;a farmhouse with ten rooms, tennis court, terraced garden, orchard, imported pheasants, 500 head of horned cattle, and so forth. The farmer is of German descent. He and his children speak;or spoke ; English at least as much as Dutch. To-day the place is a waste. A message was

received from the farmer the other day; he is with De Wet: 'They will not take me alive. I hope to God that not even my bones will rest under the Union Jack.' I belong to a race which suffered somewhat similar treatment a hundred years ago, and I can assure you you are very much mistaken if you imagine that the memory of these things will die out. They will not die out, for the children of the Dutch and their children's children will remember them. The Secretary of State for the Colonies made another very remarkable statement, which I feel bound to examine somewhat critically. On the 7th December, when pressed upon this question of farm-burning, he said;

"We understood this proclamation [alluding to Lord Roberts's proclamation about farm burning] to mean that he would require evidence of some complicity on the part of the persons whose farm houses were destroyed. I am not saying that the words were exactly to that effect. I am saying that we understood, and we enquired the other day when the matter assumed greater importance, and we have a reply from Lord Kitchener, who has now taken the place of Lord Roberts, that we are perfectly right in the assumption."

I venture to submit that that is an absolutely incorrect statement, and it is very important that we should be clear upon this matter. I am not going to charge any Member of this House with making a statement which he does not believe to be true. But what I say is that the right hon. Gentleman has been furnished with incorrect information on this matter. Now let me show how the House has been misled on this particular point. Let me draw attention to the language used by the Financial Secretary to the War Office, who, when pressed the other night, said;

"Hon. Members had rather taken it that those farm-burnings were done without authority by irresponsible persons. [Cries of "No, no" and "Proclamation" from the Opposition.] If he remembered right, Lord Roberts, in his proclamation, did not say that when the railway was broken farms within ten miles should be burned, but that they should, be liable to be burned. [Laughter from Opposition benches.] For some time afterwards no farm was burned. After that farms were, by Lord Roberts's special orders, under certain conditions, burned."

Now let us read Lord Roberts's proclamation. First the Secretary of State for the Colonies states that farm-burning was conditional on complicity being shown, whereas the Financial Secretary to the War Office declares that Lord Roberts did not use words to the effect that farms should be burnt. Proclamation No. 5 says; "Whereas small bodies of raiders have recently been doing wanton damage in the Orange River Colony;"

[An HON. MEMBER: Wanton damage.] Perfectly proper acts of war. Will any hon. Member to-night deny that? Wanton damage means damage without an object, but the Boers were destroying the railway for the purpose of interfering with Lord Roberts's communications. But that is not the point I wish to call attention to. Listen to these words, as showing that the proclamation could not be misunderstood;

"and whereas such damage cannot be done without the knowledge and connivance of the neighbouring inhabitants, I hereby warn said inhabitants, and also civil residents, that whenever public property is destroyed or injured in the manner

specified above, they will be held responsible, the houses in the vicinity of the place where the damage is done will be burned, and the civil residents will be made prisoners of war."

Now I should like to know what the noble Lord has got to say to that. It is only two nights since he denied Lord Roberts used these words, and he based on that denial a defence of the policy of the Government, and the inference that the burning of farms was necessary.

\*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): As my noble friend is not here, may I state that what he said was that complicity had been proved by the nearness of the farms to the scene of the damage.

\*MR. DILLON: I am glad to have that defence of the Government. In the first place, the noble Lord did not say that. What he said was, according to the official Report;

"If I remember right, Lord Roberts in his proclamation did not say that where the railway was broken farms within ten miles should be burned, but that they would be liable to be burned."

I have proved that Lord Roberts said nothing of the kind, but that the farms "will be" burned, just as we stated in -course of debate in this House. The Lord Advocate now says that complicity must be proved. Nothing of the kind. The absolute proof of the falsity of that statement is shown by the words in the proclamation;

"And whereas such damage cannot be done without the knowledge and connivance of the neighbouring inhabitants."

Where is the proof of connivance? I put it to the House of Commons, is that fair play? You first of all lay down in a proclamation that wherever damage is done, all the inhabitants in the neighbourhood must be held responsible; and then you come forward in the House of Commons and say, "No, we did not burn the farms unless the inhabitants were proved to be responsible." That is deceiving the House of Commons, and I am content to leave the matter there. I now come to the next proclamation, No. 6, dated 16th June, 1900, and it sets forth what has been stated in previous proclamations even more categorically;

"No. 1.;The principal residents of the towns and districts will be held responsible jointly and severally for the amount of damage done in their district, and all receipts for goods requisitioned on behalf of the military authorities will be cancelled, and no payment will be made in respect thereof."

I say that is robbery, and a breach of the good faith of this country. There is no qualification in that proclamation. The man whose goods and chattels may have been requisitioned may have been a prisoner of war, and may have been deported, and yet because the railway was broken in the neighbourhood of his farm all receipts for goods taken perhaps months before are to be cancelled;

"The houses and farms [continues the proclamation] in the vicinity of the place where the damage is done will be destroyed and the residents of the district dealt with under martial law."

[An HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear&#x0021;] Some hon. Members cheer that, but my point is that that is not what the Secretary of State for the Colonies stated to the House of Commons, and not what the noble Lord the Financial Secretary to the War

Office stated either. So much for these excuses and justifications put forward for the burning of farms. This is really a very serious matter. The burning of farms has been carried out on an enormous scale, and no attempt has been made by any speaker on behalf of the Government to justify it, nor have any details been given as to this policy.

Although the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs submitted to the House a very horrible series of cases in connection with the burning of farms, and although the matter has been treated with contempt, yet I feel bound to bring forward further evidence to show two things; firstly, the wide extent of this devastation, and, secondly, the fact, which I maintain to be incontrovertible, that these farms were burned not because of any active treachery or hostility from the houses or their inhabitants, but for the purpose of devastating the country and making it uninhabitable. Some hon. Members opposite appear to admit that policy, but I appeal with confidence even to the public opinion of this country, but with more confidence to the public opinion of America and Europe, on the subject. Is that policy one on which the Government of this country is prepared to stand. Why, that was the policy which was pursued by Louis XIV. in the Palatinate, which has been execrated by mankind for two centuries. It was justified by the French generals of that day on the ground that it was necessary, in order to bring the war to a termination, to make the country uninhabitable to the enemy. I must give a few cases. The first witness I will call is the special correspondent of the Globe newspaper, not a very pro-Boer organ, certainly. Earl de la Warr, writing to the Globe newspaper from the Modder River, says;

"It is certainly worthy of remark that the Boers, who are not supposed to have any discipline at all, have in this part of the country (Cape Colony and Free State) apparently behaved with exemplary consideration for the rights of private property. It is not too much to say that there was more indiscriminate looting done after the Modder River fight in a few days by the British than was done by the Boers in the whole six weeks before the fight."

Now I will take the evidence of a Melbourne newspaper. We are accustomed now to swallow everything that comes from the colonies; everything is gospel and ought to be believed. This is an interview which a correspondent had with Australian troops who had returned home. He writes;

"The men all speak in the utmost disgust of the heartrending work of burning farmhouses and turning women and children out to sleep on the open veldt. They say, however, that the British troops throughout treated the enemy with humanity and consideration;"

[HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear &#x0021;] Yes, but you must accept the whole of the statement;

"though, of course, there were some individual instances of horrible savagery and brutality. On the other hand they found the Boers very courageous and manly. Of all the men fighting on the side of the British the Australians give the palm to Strathcona's Horse, the Canadian regiment, for all-round 'toughness' and pitilessness. During the fighting Strathcona's Horse, they allege, never gave quarter unless the presence of an officer compelled them to."

Now I take the evidence of an Irish priest from Australia, who was attached to the New South Wales Company of Bushmen. His letter, which was signed with his name, was published in a Sydney paper. He writes;

"Then began the most diabolical work I have yet witnessed. Every home in the valley, probably twenty in all, was burned to the ground. Women and children stood in groups, the children rending the air with their cries. They were allowed to move their furniture before the match was put to the building. The women were admirable. Not a tear bedimmed their eyes. They stood there defiant, neatly dressed in black with snow white aprons and bonnets. It was only when I said a few sympathetic words to one woman that she melted into tears. 'You,' she said, 'do not approve of this?' 'I loathe it,' was my reply. 'I am,' she said, 'a British subject from the Protectorate. We rented this farm from an Englishman to whom it belongs. We have nothing in the world but these crops which your horses have destroyed and;God help us. Will you,' she said, 'try to save my house from the fire. I shall do so at once,' I answered, and I kept my promise, but my pleading was of no avail, I told the heroic woman that I had tried to save the house. 'Will you shake hands with me?' was her reply. I did so right heartily, and she called me aside to show me the relics of a new white apron. 'It was from this,' she said, 'I tore the bandages for one of your wounded men (Beaumont). I carried him in my arms from the field and bandaged his arm. He lay on my bed until the blankets were sodden in blood. And this,' she said, 'is my reward.'"

Sergeant W. Payne, writing home to Trowbridge, says;

"We are purely ignorant in South Africa except what we do ourselves, and that is we are burning all the farms down within a radius of eight miles."

Now I will take the evidence of two Irish soldiers to which I attach special importance, because the men give their names, are well known in their own neighbourhoods, and the letters were written to their relatives, and were obviously not intended for publication. The first is from the son of the Rev. W. Cripps Ledger, who was a corporal in the Irish Yeomanry. He says;

"We found most of the houses deserted by the men and only the women and children could be seen. On inquiry of those as to the whereabouts of the men, we are nearly always told that they have been killed in action or taken prisoners. This is in some cases true, but in most instances the men are out in the hills with their mausers watching us. Most of the houses were burned to the ground by us and the women and children taken along with the column. At other places only saddles, carts, wagons, etc., were destroyed, as was all forage and grain which we could not take or use. Sheep, cattle, and horses were all taken along too."

I attach great importance to this letter, because it proves that these houses were burned down not because of acts of war committed from them, but as a part of a deliberate wholesale policy of devastating the country. Here is the other case. James Cook, who is now in the Constabulary in South Africa, writes home to his father, the clerk of the petty sessions at Newtown Butler;[HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear &#x0021;], who is known to some of my hon. friends. He says;

"Most of my time was employed in burning Boer farmhouses and forage and commandeering cattle, sheep, etc., around Potchefstroom and Frederickstad. We



live chiefly on mutton and poultry, and whatever we need in the way of vegetables, brown bread, etc., we got from the Boer women in exchange for meat. So you see I have been having a rare time of it. The most disagreeable part of our work was the turning of Boer families out of their homes. Policemen are well paid, and it is a fine chance for anyone to see a bit of South African life.

When I consider the pay and the grub, I got to pity poor Tommy, who generally has the hard work to do for 1s. 3d. a day and bully beef and hard biscuits."

I am rather inclined to pity poor Tommy, too, who only gets 1s. 3d. per day instead of 5s. I do not see how the Government are going to get over this evidence. I could go on for hours. This is a case to be made out by evidence, and if I did not give evidence it would be said that I was simply making wild statements. What I want to prove is, that the statements in connection with farm burning, given by the Government as a defence of what has been done, are not true statements and entirely misrepresent the facts. If I wanted final proof that, up to a very recent period at all events, farms were burned as part of a policy of wholesale devastation I need only turn to The Times of the 4th January, which contains a telegram from Pretoria giving an account of a meeting of burghers addressed by Lord Kitchener, when he made his proposals for peace, and at the end of that telegram it is stated; "Orders have been issued forbidding the burning of farms unless to punish the wrongful acts of the actual inhabitants."

If that had been the policy all along, what need was there to issue these orders? Out of their own mouths they stand condemned. I have got details of other cases which I do not now propose to go into, but if this matter is debated again I shall be prepared to go through the whole of them. I will mention only one other case as an instance of the atrocities which have been perpetrated. A member of the Royal Scotch Fusiliers, describing the actions of General Barton, writes;

"We took over £6,000 worth of stuff from Botha's farm; cattle, grain, forage, wagons, etc."

That is a sample of the way you treat a gallant enemy. A correspondent of the St. James's Gazette ;and certainly no one will accuse the St. James's Gazette of being a pro-Boer organ;writes, under date 14th September, 1900;

"The general told me that he had received orders to 'sweep' the country and a view of his following soon made it obvious that he had not failed to carry out his orders. All farms on the line of inarch were cleared of horses, cattle, sheep, wagons, carts, etc., the forage being burnt and the owners bidden to join the ranks of the prisoners, of whom there were already a goodly number. In several cases I ventured humbly to point out that many of these men, in fact most of them, had been paroled and allowed to return to their farms and had received a protection certificate from the District Court. Some of them were Britishers who rather than take up arms against their country had sacrificed all and had taken refuge in Basutoland. My pleas were of no avail. All who had once been on commando, and in spite of having been paroled, were retaken prisoners. Britishers were allowed to go at liberty, but their livestock were taken and their stacks burnt."

That appears to me to be an overwhelming case as showing that this policy of farm burning in the Transvaal was a policy, as indeed was admitted in some of the proclamations of the generals, of devastating the country in order to make it uninhabitable for the enemy. [An HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.] If that is admitted, then my whole case is admitted, but it is flying in the face of the usages of civilised warfare. You have no right to devastate a country and burn the roof trees over the heads of non-combatants in order to make the country uninhabitable. What would Europe have said if the German troops, when they advanced and took possession of Orleans, burned it down and laid the country waste between Orleans and Paris? All Europe would have cried shame on them. But because these countries are distant and you have your hand on the telegraph wires you dare to do in South Africa what you would not dare to do nearer home. What I am claiming here, and what those of us who are denounced as pro-Boers are claiming, is, that so far as the usages of war are concerned, these people, who after all are a Christian nation and a white race, shall have the same rights which the civilised nations of Europe have been accustomed to accord one another in their wars. I think I have converted even hon. Gentlemen opposite to my view as to the character of these operations, because when I pointed out that it was a policy of devastation in order to make the country uninhabitable several hon. Members cheered. Certainly it was the policy which was approved of by your generals. We have heard a great deal in these debates about the humanity of Lord Roberts. Lord Roberts is a countryman of mine, and a great many countrymen of mine have taken a prominent part in this war. I confess that when Lord Roberts went out to the Transvaal I said to several friends, "Now, at all events, we shall have this war decently conducted." I have been deeply disappointed, and I now perceive that in the judgment of Lord Roberts's character, which has been painfully forced upon me; because I had different ideas of Lord Roberts before the commencement of the war; I am in sympathy with the right hon. Gentleman for West Birmingham, who twenty years ago, in conjunction with several bishops and other dignitaries, denounced Lord Roberts for his atrocities in Afghanistan, and appealed to the Government to put a stop to the burnings and executions which were carried out in that campaign. That is a fact we cannot get over. Lord Roberts is still the same man, and, although I knew that the Colonial Secretary had changed his politics, I was not aware he had changed his ideas as to humanity and the usages of war; and when hon. Gentlemen get up and think they can stop this debate by appealing to the humanity of Lord Roberts they ought to remember that he was impeached by the Secretary of State for the Colonies himself. Memories are very short in this House. When the hon. Member for Westminster, who is a bitter political opponent of ours, stood up in this House to make a remarkably able appeal for the sick and wounded soldiers in the Transvaal, which I venture to say has made his name dear to the British soldier, how was he received? He was received with sneers and insults from the Treasury Bench, and he was told that the well-known humanity of Lord Roberts ought to be a sufficient answer to his charges, and that everyone knew that Lord Roberts would never tolerate any ill-treatment of his sick soldiers. The hon. Member for

Westminster was not discouraged: he persisted in his charges, and his charges have laid the basis of a great reform. The hon. Member appealed on behalf of sick and wounded soldiers, and now when we, who are less popular, make an appeal that your enemy the Boers should be treated at least as human beings, we are met with exactly the same sneers, and the same statement that the humanity of Lord Roberts is so great that it is an insult, and outrageous, and absurd to challenge it in this House. When the other night attention was directed in this House by the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs to the infamous and outrageous proclamation of General Bruce Hamilton, the very same answer was returned. It was said that General Bruce Hamilton was one of the most humane officers in the British Army, and was incapable of committing an act of inhumanity. What had the right hon. Gentleman to admit to-night. He admitted that that proclamation was ignominiously withdrawn, that they drew the line at General Bruce Hamilton, and refused to allow his proclamation to be enforced. I mention these facts to show that it is no answer to us to talk about the humanity of officers. We bring forward facts supported by evidence, and we challenge the Government on them. We challenge the Government to say; and they will have to say before the matter is ended, because it will be brought up again and again; whether this country, in the face of Europe, is prepared to accept this policy of devastation without any act of treachery as regards individual houses, for the purpose of making the country uninhabitable, and whether the Government are prepared to defend that policy.

I now pass to the second point of my Amendment, and it is a point to which I attach even greater importance, because in the first place, it is a most unparalleled and unheard-of breach of the usages of war. I think it is most disgraceful and most cowardly, and it has not been dealt with in this House before. I refer to the seizing of women and children as prisoners and their forcible deportation into prison camps. What was my astonishment to hear the Secretary of State for War declare that in these prison camps, or, as he described them, refuge camps, at present existing in the Transvaal, Cape Colony, and Natal, the women and children are perfectly free, and could come and go of their own free will. I say that is a statement in the teeth of all the evidence that has come under my notice. All the information I have been able to collect leads me to the conviction that, as regards a great number of these women and children, they have been forcibly seized, and have been carried away, and are now prisoners of war wish to know what custom of any civilised country in modern times, or even in ancient times for that matter, are the Government going to appeal to to justify their treatment of women and children as prisoners of war? The right hon. Gentleman stated that they were perfectly free. Is he prepared to substantiate that statement? Is it true or not true that, in a camp at Port Elizabeth, women, who have been brought by force as prisoners of war, are surrounded by sentries, and that when they desire permission to see their friends;

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Gentleman rather misunderstood what I stated this afternoon. I was asked about women and children living in laager in the conquered colonies, but I know that a certain number of women have been deported

from the colonies for particular reasons.

\*MR. DILLON: Is not that my case? What civilised Government ever deported women and children? Has it come to this, that the British Empire is afraid of women and children?

MR. BRODRICK: The women who were deported are those who were found, or suspected of, giving information to the enemy.

\*MR. DILLON: I ask again the name of the civilised nation that has ever deported women because they were suspected of giving information? Who were the enemy? Why, their own people. The Germans when they conquered France did not deport the women. A pretty pass you have brought the British Empire to. Now listen to this, Gentlemen of the British House of Commons. I ask the Secretary of State for War. Is it true that this oath or declaration has been tendered to the women now huddled together in tents surrounded by mounted sentries in Port Elizabeth; I do hereby solemnly declare on oath that I will not take up arms against the Government of Great Britain"? I never thought to see the day when England would have sunk so low. I put it to hon. Members opposite, are they not ashamed? When this declaration is signed, the women are allowed to see their relatives. Was that the impression left on the House at question time? Did not hon. Members listening to the right hon. Gentleman imagine that these women and children were all free, and had come into the refuge camp for the purpose of protection? I have no objection to refuge camps when the women can come and go when they please, but what I denounce is taking away women and children from their homes, treating them as prisoners, surrounding them with guards, and not allowing them to leave the camp. Is that for the purpose of preventing them from starving? Is it to prevent them, from starving that you tender them the oath?

MR. CLAUDE LOWTHER (Cumberland, Eskdale): Devastation is a usage of civilised warfare. Wellington devastated the country around Torres Vedras.

\*MR. DILLON: I think that is an unfortunate interruption. In the first place, Torres Vedras was in the early part of the last century, and the usages of warfare have changed since then. Secondly, when Wellington devastated the country before Torres Vedras he devastated it with the consent of the inhabitants he was defending. Will the hon. Member undertake to say if the sack of Badajoz, or of other towns in the Peninsula, were to be repeated to-day that every civilised country in Europe and America would not cry shame on such deeds? But I have yet to learn that Wellington took women prisoners of war, or that he got the women to take an oath not to take up arms against him. But in order to show that this is not an old case, let me read what took place at Standerton only the other day. This is a telegram describing the operations of General French;

"The effects of General French's eastward movement are seen along the line of communication. The scene at Standerton is almost unique.

"Three convoys arrived the other day almost at the same time, and as far as the eye could reach was seen a never-ending line of ox wagons, while a hospital train with a red crossed carriage steamed slowly away, bearing its human freight south.

"The longest convoy comprised women and children, who are arriving in hundreds,

and whose immediate resting-place is on the high ground above the Vaal towards the south east.

"Opposite them, at a distance, is a laager containing earlier arrivals, and further off a large number of neatly-arranged tents containing the first arrivals, with horses, cows, sheep, goats, and pigs innumerable, the stock of these unwilling emigrants from homes which unhappily have been harbours of refuge to those Boers who, unmindful of the clemency offered by Lord Kitchener, elect to light a losing, not to say a suicidal, game of war to the bitter end."

That telegram, which is in the Daily Mail of the 21st February, shows beyond all question that at this moment General French is pursuing the same policy of devastation, and is carrying away women and children against their will, I shall await with curiosity to see what attempt the Secretary of State for War will make in defence of this extraordinary policy. I assert without fear of contradiction that this policy of shutting up women and children in prison camps is entirely without precedent in modern times, and that therefore the Government which indulges in it is disgracing and dragging in the mire the good name of this country. Now let me go a step further. Not only have women and children been shut up in these camps and treated as prisoners of war, but when the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs made a charge the other day; which I am constrained to believe; that in this camp a notice was posted stating that those families whose husbands and brothers were still on commando would be put on half rations, and would only be restored to full rations when their relatives surrendered, I expected a most indignant denial from the right hon. Gentleman, but all he said was that the hon. Member was making this charge without an atom of evidence. The hon. Member had exactly the same evidence, namely, Renter's telegram, which the right hon. Gentleman had himself the other day when he made charges in connection with the Esau case.

MR. BRODRICK: I told the hon. Gentleman that I had other corroboration that the report was absolutely true.

\*MR. DILLON: But the charges were made on the faith of a Renter message.

It being midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

HOUSE OF COMMONS (KITCHEN AND REFRESHMENT ROOMS).

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to control the arrangements for the Kitchen and Refreshment Rooms in the Department of the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House.

Ordered, That the Committee do consist of Seventeen Members.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of Mr. James Bailey, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Richard Cavendish, Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Dalziel, Sir Horatio Davies, Mr. Firkbank, Mr. Jacoby, Mr. Leigh Bennett, Colonel Lockwood, Mr. Macdonald, Dr. Macdonnell, Mr. Nicol, Mr. Pierpoint, Mr. P. J. Power, and Mr. William Redmond.

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

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

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 26th February, 1901.

Several others Members took and subscribed the Oath.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

LONDON, TILBURY, AND SOUTHEAST RAILWAY BILL.

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

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

Two Petitions from Andover, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (HIGHER GRADE AND EVENING CONTINUATION SCHOOLS).

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Manchester; Pudsey; Soothill; Sowerby Bridge; Rochdale; and Birkenhead; to lie upon the Table.

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petition of the Mining Association of Great Britain, against; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION ACT, 1896.

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Whitby and Monkseaton; Ealing; Woolwich; and Abram; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

Paper [presented 22nd February] to be printed. [No. 45.]

CIVIL SERVICES AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1901-2.

Copy presented, of the Estimates for Civil Services and Revenue Departments for the year ending 31st March, 1902, together with a copy of the Memorandum by the Financial Secretary to the Treasury relating thereto [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 46.]

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Copy presented, of Ninth Annual Report of the proceedings of the Inspection Committee for the year ended 20th November, 1900, with Appendices [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 47.]

BARRACKS ACT, 1890.

Account presented, showing the money raised and issued under the provisions of the Act, the securities created in respect thereof, and the amount expended for the purposes of the Act to the 31st March, 1900, with the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 48.]

PUBLIC OFFICES (ACQUISITION OF SITE) ACT, 1895, SESSION 2; PUBLIC OFFICES (WESTMINSTER) SITE ACT, 1896; PUBLIC OFFICES (WHITE HALL) SITE ACT, 1897; AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS EXPENSES ACT, 1898.

Account presented, showing the moneys issued out of the Consolidated Fund, the moneys borrowed and the securities created in respect thereof, the disposal of moneys issued to the National

Debt Commissioners for temporary investment under the provisions of the Acts, and the expenditure to 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. 49.]

ARMY (YEOMANRY) (REPORT OF COMMITTEE).

Copy presented, of Report of Committee on the organisation, arms, and equipment of the Yeomanry Force [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ARMY (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE, 1900&#x2013;1901).

Copy presented, of Supplementary Estimate of the further amount required in the year ending 31st March, 1901, to meet additional expenditure occasioned by the War in South Africa [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 50.]

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1901&#x2013;2.

Estimates presented, for the year 1901&#x2013;2, with Explanation of Differences [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 51.]

NAVY STATEMENT (EXPLANATORY OF ESTIMATES).

Copy presented, of Statement of the First Lord of the Admiralty explanatory of the Navy Estimates, 1901&#x2013;2 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NAVY (SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATE).

Copy presented, of Supplementary Estimate of His Majesty's Navy for the year 1900&#x2013;1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 52.]

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

1. Bank of England.; Copy of all applications made by the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the Governor and Deputy Governor of the Bank of England for advances to the Government authorized by Parliament, from 5th January, 1900, to 5th January, 1901 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 53.]

2. Private Bills.; Copy of Rules for the Practice and Procedure of the Referees on Private Bills (in pursuance of Standing Order 88); to be printed. [No. 54.]

3. Church Temporalities (Ireland).; Copy of Report of the Comptroller and I Auditor General upon the Account of the Irish Land Commission in respect of Church Temporalities in Ireland for the year ended 31st March, 1900 [by Act]; to be printed. [No. 55.]

CIVIL CONTINGENCIES FUND, 1899&#x2013;1900.

Copy ordered, "of Accounts of the Civil Contingencies Fund, 1899&#x2013;1900, showing (1) the Receipts and Payments in connection with the Fund in the year ended the 31st day of March, 1900; (2) the distribution of the Capital of the Fund at the commencement and close of the year; together with Copy of the Correspondence with the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

NATIONAL GALLERY REPORT.

Copy ordered, "of the Report of the Director of the National Gallery for the year 1900, with Appendices.";(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

LEAD POISONING.

Address for "Return giving (a) the number of cases of lead poisoning reported under the Factory and Workshop Act, 1895, in the manufacture of earthenware and china during the period from the 1st day of January, 1899, to the 31st day of December, 1900, distinguishing between cases in the decorative processes and cases in the process of dipping, ware cleaning, etc.; (b) the number of persons suspended from working in dangerous processes by the certifying surgeons for the Hanley, Burslem, Tunstall, and Stoke districts in the same manufacture during

the same period, in pursuance of the special rules (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 235, of Session 1900).";(Mr. Jesse Collings.)

#### TRAWL VESSELS (PROSECUTIONS).

Return ordered, "for the years 1892 to 1900, inclusive, ending the 31st day of December, of prosecutions undertaken in the Sheriff Courts of Scotland, under the Summary Jurisdiction (Scotland) Acts, of the Masters of Beam or Otter Trawl vessels for alleged infringement of the bye-laws of the Fishery Board, or the provisions of the Acts prohibiting Beam or Otter Trawling within certain waters round the coasts of Scotland, in the following form, with Summary::

Date of alleged offence.

Name, etc., of person charged.

Name, Letters, and Number of Beam or Otter Trawl Vessel.

Where alleged offence committed.

Statute or bye-law contravened.

Place and date of trial.

Result of trial.

By whom detected.

Summary.

Names, etc., of persons charged more than once during foregoing period of eight years.

Number of times such persons were charged.

Total amount of fines.

Total length of imprisonment undergone.

;(Mr. Cathcart Wason.)

#### TENANTS' IMPROVEMENT (IRELAND) BILL.

Order for Second Reading upon Wednesday, 19th June, read, and discharged. Bill withdrawn.

Leave given to present another Bill instead thereof.;(Major Jameson.)

#### TENANTS' IMPROVEMENT (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

"For improving the condition of Tenants in cities, towns, and villages in Ireland," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 19th June, and to be printed. [Bill 67.]

#### QUESTIONS.

##### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR-INQUIRY INTO MANAGEMENT.

MR. SOAMES (Norfolk, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state when the inquiry into the management of the war will be begun.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I am afraid it is impossible for me at the present time to say anything more definite than I have already stated.

##### THE JAMESON RAID INDEMNITY.

\*MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he will lay before the House all communications that have passed since the annexation of the Transvaal Republic between himself and Mr. Rhodes or other persons with respect to the claim of the late Transvaal Government with reference to the Jameson Raid, and also the ground of any set-off which can prevent the British Government enforcing this claim.



THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): No communication has passed on the subject since the annexation of the Transvaal.

\*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer the latter part of the question?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: It seems a strange thing to ask me, assuming there is a good case against the company, to find a ground of set-off for the company.

\*MR. ALFRED DAVIES: May I refer the right hon. Gentleman to the speech of;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;

PATENT RIGHTS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether British patent rights now extend to the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No alteration has at present been made in the Patent Laws of the late Republics.

NEWSPAPER PROSECUTIONS;CASE OF MR. ALBERT CARTWRIGHT.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether proceedings have been taken against Mr. Albert Cartwright, editor of the South African

News, on the ground that he had reprinted in his paper a letter alleging that on a particular occasion Lord Kitchener had given instructions that General De Wet's force, when surrounded, should not &#x0021; be allowed to surrender, but be shot down; whether he is aware that the letter making these charges had already appeared in the Freeman's Journal of 15th January, and the parts of it conveying this charge in the London Times of 16th January; and whether it is intended to take any steps against the editors of these papers.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have no official information on the subject of the proceedings against Mr. Cartwright which were presumably taken by the Cape Government.

TREATMENT OF BOER WOMEN AND CHILDREN;RATIONS.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the women and children confined in camps are placed on full rations if they voluntarily surrender, but on reduced rations if the husbands and fathers do not surrender.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I am in communication with Lord Kitchener on this subject. The difficulty of feeding the very large number of persons who are now coming into these camps is very great, and I understand that a distinction has been drawn between those who have surrendered with their husbands and fathers and those who come in to be fed while their relations are still in the field. The information at my disposal is not sufficient to enable me to give an exact answer at this moment.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): Does the distinction apply to women whose husbands are prisoners or whose relatives may happen to have been shot during the war?

\*MR. BRODRICK: I know no more than I have given to the House.

PAARDEBURG OPERATIONS; GENERAL COLVILE.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK (Midlothian): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War

if he can state why no report on the battle of Paardeberg has been received from General Sir Henry Colvile.

\*MR. BRODRICK: Major-General Sir Henry Colvile held a subordinate position at the battle of Paardeberg, and was therefore not required to make any report.

IRISH PRISONERS AT ST. HELENA.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, amongst the Boer prisoners held in St. Helena, there are a number of Irishmen who had taken the oath of allegiance to the South African Republic; and whether these men are to be tried for their participation in the war, or to be allowed to return to their native home; and, if so, when.

\*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton): There are some Irish prisoners at St. Helena; they will be treated in the same way as their Boer comrades; as ordinary prisoners of war. No release of prisoners can take place before the termination of the war.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Can the noble Lord give us any idea when that will be?

[No answer was given.]

SOUTH AFRICA CONCILIATION COM- MITTEE; LIEUTENANT MORRISON'S LETTER.

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General whether His Majesty's Government propose to prosecute an association called the Conciliation Committee, which has publicly circulated charges against British officers and soldiers based on statements alleged to have been made by Lieutenant Morrison, but the accuracy of which that officer has denied.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I have no material on which it would be proper for me to express an opinion on this question even if it were desirable that I should do so.

PAY OF BRITISH SOLDIERS DURING CAPTIVITY.

MR. SOAMES: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the pay of British officers and men is stopped when they are prisoners of war; and, if so, whether any allowance is made to their wives and families.

\*LORD STANLEY: The pay of prisoners of war is not now stopped unless their surrender is proved to have been the result of their own neglect or misconduct. At no period of the war did the issue of separation allowance to their families cease.

THE CASE OF ESAU.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War why he has not laid on the Table the telegram from Sir Alfred Milner with reference to the case of Esau as promised.

\*MR. BRODRICK: I have laid it on the Table. As I gave its terms viva voce I do not think the hon. Member can be inconvenienced.

TRANSPORT; DEMURRAGE AT SOUTH AFRICAN PORTS.

MR. P1RIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can inform the House of the total demurrage paid to vessels during 1900 at the ports of Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, East London, and Durban respectively; and if he would grant a Return specifying the names of the vessels, the cargo carried, the port of demurrage, the time of detention, and the money paid as demurrage in

each case.

\*LORD STANLEY: The operations at the Cape have required a large number of vessels to be retained at the various ports to meet the constantly arising demands for transport. I am not in a position at the present moment to state what has been the exact expenditure upon any particular war service, but it will appear in the accounts rendered to Parliament or can appear in a Return.

ENTERIC AND DYSENTERY STATISTICS.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can furnish any Return to show, from the experience gained in South Africa, the comparative liability to suffer from enteric and from dysentery of men at different ages.

\*LORD STANLEY: The comparative liability of soldiers to suffer from enteric fever at different ages is already well established and will be found in the Annual Reports of the Army Medical Department. In the Report for 1898 at pages 500 and 501 the South African experience is given for the years 1891 to 1898. There are no special Returns available in connection with the campaign. As regards dysentery there are no similar Returns available.

INOCULATION FOR ENTERIC FEVER.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that Professor Wright, of Netley, has stated, as the results of inoculation for enteric fever in one regiment, that the incidence in the inoculated was 0·55 and the death rate 0·27 per cent., while in the uninoculated it was 6·14 and 3·35 percent, respectively; and whether he can inform the House of the results of inoculation for typhoid or enteric fever among the forces serving in South Africa.

LORD STANLEY: The statement of Professor Wright referred to the official statistics from India for the 15th Hussars. There are no statistics available for the forces in South Africa. It will not, I fear, be possible to go into them properly until the war is over. The pressure on our medical officers for returns of various descriptions is a heavy addition to their pressing duties.

THE STORMBERG CASUALTIES.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War will he explain how it happened that two privates of the Royal Irish Regiment, who were reported by the War Office as killed at Stormberg on 10th December, 1899, were on 1st February, 1901, fourteen months after, reported by the War Office as alive and serving with their regiment; and what steps do the War Office propose to take in the future to prevent such reports being made and not corrected.

LORD STANLEY: The information to which the hon. and gallant Member alludes was furnished by the officer commanding on the 31st January, 1901, and was to the effect that three privates of the Royal Irish Rifles who had been reported as killed at Stormberg were still alive. It is inevitable that such mistakes should occur in a campaign, especially in the case of a reverse. Every effort has been made by the casualty department at Cape Town to clear up such matters, but owing to the constant movements of the various regiments and the distances and difficulty of communication, it has been found very difficult to secure greater accuracy and earlier correction of mistakes.

#### SOUTH AFRICAN REPUBLICS (MILITARY NOTES).

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can say why the Paper entitled South African Republics (Military Notes), which was presented by Command, and laid upon the Table on 12th December, 1900, has not been issued to Members; and when it will be issued.

MR. BRODRICK: It was considered that the wants of Members would be sufficiently met by supplying copies to the library. There are not enough of the stock remaining in England to give a full supply to the House, and it was thought to be a waste of money to reprint the work.

MR. CHANNING: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there is a considerable demand for this Paper?

MR. BRODRICK: There are several copies in the library.

MR. TENNANT (Berwickshire): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there are twenty copies for 670 Members?

MR. BRODRICK: All the 670 are not interested in the matter.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): Seeing that intimation was given that the copies might be taken away, is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there are only one or two left?

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I have one on my library table at the present moment.

#### MOUNTAIN BATTERIES.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what is the present armament of the mountain batteries of the Army; whether the guns are still muzzle-loaders, firing black powder ammunition; whether one of the two mountain batteries in South Africa has been re-armed with naval guns; and what has become of the other.

MR. BRODRICK: It is the case that the guns of the Indian mountain batteries are of an old pattern, that they are muzzle-loaders, and fire black powder. Of the two batteries in South Africa one has been re-armed with heavy guns; the other, which has retained its guns, is in Natal. A new design of mountain gun has been approved, and manufacture is about to begin.

#### ARMY RESERVE;SECTION D.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that a large number of men in Section D of the Army Reserve, who, on the completion of their first period of service, were re-engaged for four years only, their attestation paper stating that the service was to be for Home defence, having been sent out to South Africa, are now detained beyond the period for which they were engaged; whether there is anything in the attestation paper on this subject; whether there is any intention of giving compensation to the men of Section D so detained, who consider they have been unfairly treated; and whether, on completing their seventeenth year of service, they will have some additional allowance in the way of pension or otherwise.

LORD STANLEY: I am not aware that there are any men of Section D of the Army Reserve serving in South Africa or detained with the Colours contrary to the terms of their engagement. Men of this section are liable, as shown by their attestation paper, to serve in the United Kingdom or elsewhere, and to be

retained for an extra year if a state of war exists when their four years engagement expires. It is not proposed to compensate them in respect of this extra year's service, seeing that they accepted the liability for it and received a retaining fee.

#### CAVALRY ESTABLISHMENTS.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the 4th squadrons added in 1900 are permanent additions to the establishment; and, if so, why, in the case of the King's Dragoon Guards and the 3rd Dragoon Guards, the 4th squadron was broken up on their departure for the front; and whether it is intended to reduce them to three service squadrons and one reserve.

MR. BRODRICK: The 4th squadrons were added to the King's Dragoon Guards and 3rd Dragoon Guards for home defence purposes. They were added in 1900, and, as an increase of this nature is at first in recruits and not in trained soldiers, the regiments on their departure for South Africa only made up three squadrons each; which is the war establishment of all the cavalry regiments in South Africa. The question of whether the permanent organisation of cavalry at home shall be three or four squadrons is under consideration.

#### PURCHASES OF ARMY HORSES IN IRELAND.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will state the total cost of the department for purchasing horses in Ireland; also if, in view of the statement of the Financial Secretary that under 300 Irish horses were purchased from non-dealers in Ireland, he would either abolish altogether the establishment for the purchase of horses in Ireland or insist on the remount officers exhibiting by direct purchase a little more reliance on their own judgment of horseflesh; and whether the Irish farmer loses about £12 per horse by the present system of purchasing almost exclusively from dealers.

LORD STANLEY: There is no intention of abolishing the establishment for purchasing horses in Ireland. As I informed the House, efforts will be made to purchase from private individuals as well as dealers. I cannot give any information as to prices, but I will ascertain the cost of the department.

COLONEL NOLAN: If the noble Lord will look up the records he will find that exactly the same answer was given eight or nine years ago.

MAJOR RASCH: But was not the establishment started in order to get rid of the dealers?

LORD STANLEY: We wish to give equal facilities as far as possible to private individuals.

COLONEL NOLAN: Will you see that they get as good a price?

LORD STANLEY: I hope every horse is bought at its proper value.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): Do the representatives of the War Office in Ireland find any reluctance on the part of the Irish to sell horses to be used in the prosecution of a war to which they have a serious objection?

[No answer was given.]

#### IRISH MANUFACTURES AND GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the Government will establish a receiving depot in Dublin for

samples of tenders from Irish manufacturers and contractors who are desirous to compete for contracts for supplies and fittings for the troops and horses stationed in Ireland.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. I have nothing to add to the reply given to a similar question put by the hon. Member in July last.\*

CRIMEAN SOLDIERS' WIDOWS AND THE PATRIOTIC FUND.

SIR JOHN LENG: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is within his knowledge that several hundreds of widows of Crimean soldiers, some of them eighty years of age and upwards, have not yet received any benefit from the Patriotic Fund, which was subscribed forty-six years ago in anticipation that such widows would be promptly benefited; and whether, in view of the arrangements now being made by the Government for the relief of the widows and orphans of the soldiers who have fallen in the present war, anything can be done for the unrelieved widows whose husbands served in the Crimean campaign.

LORD STANLEY: The Patriotic Fund was raised to assist the widows and children of those killed in action or dying on active service during the Crimean War. All widows coming within these conditions and now surviving are, so far as is known to the Commissioners, in receipt of permanent allowances. Under the extended

\* See The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxvi., page 1508.  
powers given to them in 1897 the Commissioners have applied the surplus of the Fund to the relief of 936 widows of soldiers and sailors having Crimean war service who were not eligible for relief under the Commission's earlier powers. The Commissioners are, I understand, obtaining an actuarial valuation of their funds, with a view to considering the possibility of increasing, this number. They believe, however, that the number of widows of Crimean soldiers surviving far exceeds that which they can hope to assist.

MR. FLAVIN (Kerry, N.): Are not the Crimean veterans in Irish workhouses, entitled to money out of this fund?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir.

MR. FLAVIN: Oh, of course the workhouse is good enough for them&#x0021;  
VOLUNTEER AMMUNITION IN ABERDEEN.

MR. MACONOCHE (Aberdeenshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if arrangements can be made to hold a stock of ammunition for volunteers in the county of Aberdeen.

LORD STANLEY: Every volunteer unit holds at its own headquarters a stock of ammunition proportionate to its strength.

VISIT OF IMPERIAL TROOPS TO AUSTRALIA.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War how much has been paid to the Colonial Governments in reference to the visit of Imperial troops to Australia; and whether any, and, if so, what portion of the expense of the visit has been paid by the Colonial Governments.

\*LORD STANLEY: No payment has been made to the Colonial Governments in this connection, as the Imperial troops are to be the guests of the Colonies, during their visit.

ROYAL PATRIOTIC FUND RETURN.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War when the

Return, Royal Patriotic Fund, voted 14th December last, will be presented to the House and circulated to Members.

\*LORD STANLEY: The Return will be ready very shortly.

ARMY CONTRACTS; TEMPORARY SECRECY AS TO PRICES.

COLONEL NOLAN: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, having regard to the fact that the records of the War Office and of the Committees of this House show that in past wars secret contracts have opened the door to corruption and to excessive profits for middlemen, the statement of the Financial Secretary that the price of horses purchased in Ireland during the past year is to remain a State secret forms a portion of the policy of secrecy in all contracts, or does this secrecy extend only to the price of horses or the price of Irish horses.

\*LORD STANLEY: The purchase of horses is not made by contract, and it is not considered to the public interest to publish the prices while the present purchases continue.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS FOR THE NAVY.

MR. M'FADDEN (Donegal, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether his attention has been called to the Pastoral Letter to the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, assembled in National Synod at Maynooth last year, in which they complained that though Roman Catholic sailors were required to go to every quarter of the globe and to be ready at all times to fight, no Roman Catholic priest is allowed to accompany them, and no proper provision is made for the practise of their religion; and whether the Government will take immediate steps to remedy this state of things by appointing Roman Catholic chaplains sufficient for the spiritual requirements of the Roman Catholics at present serving in His Majesty's Navy.

\*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): My attention has not been drawn to the letter referred to by the hon. Member, but the statement that no proper provision is made for the practise of their religion by Roman Catholic seamen in the Royal Navy is incorrect. Every possible facility, consistent with the exigencies of the Service, is accorded, and while it is impossible to place a Roman

Catholic priest on board His Majesty's ships, provision is made at all ports where Roman Catholic missions exist to afford spiritual ministrations to the men. As stated in my reply to the hon. Member for Clare on Friday last, a Roman Catholic chaplain has been sent to China, whose services are in addition to those provided locally. The Admiralty is always ready to consider, and, if possible, to give effect to any reasonable proposals which may be made with the object of providing for the spiritual welfare of men of all creeds serving in the fleet.

COLONEL NOLAN: Is the hon. Gentleman aware that an impression prevails in some quarters that a ship would sink if there were a Catholic priest on board?

A NATIONALIST MEMBER: What greater difficulty is there in sending a Roman Catholic priest on board a man-of-war than there is in the case of a Protestant?

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The difficulty is to find accommodation for more chaplains than we already have. The Admiralty, too, are advised that more chaplains are

not necessary.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the hon. Gentleman put himself in communication with Cardinal Logue?

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I cannot give any promise to communicate with any particular bishop or archbishop. Cardinal Vaughan has been in consultation with the Admiralty, and I understand that he represents the Roman Catholic view.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: But is it not the fact that most of the Catholic sailors in the Navy are Irishmen, and in view of that will the hon. Member communicate with Cardinal Logue?

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir. I cannot give any such undertaking.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then I give notice I will raise this question on the Navy Estimates.

COOPERS HILL COLLEGE.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will state the names of the Board of Visitors of Cooper's Hill College who recommended the dismissal of the seven professors of physics and engineering, also of those who refused to make such a recommendation; what amount over and above the maintenance of the college has been received in students' fees for the last five years; what urgent reasons exist calling for these dismissals in the midst of the year's course; can he say how will such a proceeding increase the efficiency of the college; and will he grant the inquiry asked for.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The names of the members of the Board of Visitors of Cooper's Hill College who recommended the changes which have been decided upon, involving the retirement of certain of the present teaching staff, are as follows:; Sir Charles Crosthwaite, Sir William Preece, Sir Alexander Rendel, Mr. Hugh Leonard, Colonel Pearson, Sir William Bisset, Sir Courtney Ilbert, and Sir John Wolfe Barry. One member of the Board, Sir Douglas Fox, was absent on the Continent, and gave no opinion; otherwise the Board was unanimous. During the last five years the cost of maintaining the college exceeded the amount received as students' fees to the extent of £7,719. I cannot within the limits of an answer to a question give the reasons for the decision which has been arrived at, but they may be found in the Papers, which ought before now to have been in the hands of Members. As the matter has been very fully considered by the highest competent authorities I do not propose to hold any further inquiry.

MR. O'MARA: Is it a fact that one member at least of the Board of Visitors who was stated to have recommended the dismissal of the professors has petitioned to have the inquiry granted?

LORD G. HAMILTON: No, Sir.

MR. CHANNING: Will the noble Lord see that the Papers are distributed?

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have no control over the printing, but I had hoped that several days ago the Papers would be printed by now and distributed.

MR. O'MARA: Did not Sir Douglas Fox ask to have the inquiry granted?

LORD G. HAMILTON: Sir Douglas Fox was absent.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Will the Members be given the opportunity of



discussing this question?

LORD G. HAMILTON: I cannot answer the question.

BURMA JUDICIAL SERVICE.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India if his attention has been called to the speech of the Lieutenant Governor of Burma, at a recent Durbar, in which he said the time appears to have come for the establishment of a separate judicial service composed of judges both appellate and subordinate whose whole time would be devoted exclusively to judicial work; whether this statement was made on the initiative and approval of the Government of India; and if it is in contemplation to introduce this reform in other parts of India.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have no information as to any proposals which may be under consideration for the establishment of a separate judicial service for Burma.

Such a proposal, however, if it were made and approved, would not introduce any new principle, but would merely have the effect of assimilating the practice in Burma to that which has been already adopted elsewhere. There are very few, if any parts of India where civil litigation is not dealt with by a separate agency from the executive and magisterial work.

CHINA; THE LOOTING AT PEKING.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the articles seized by the British troops in Peking, with a view to restitution after peace is declared, have been removed from the places or palaces where they were seized; and, if so, whether these articles were left untouched by the Russian troops during their prior occupation of the same places or palaces; and, if so, on what grounds the British troops acted differently from the Russian troops.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The articles in question have not been seized, as the question implies, but put into safe custody by General Gaselee with a view to restitution to their owners when the war is over. I have no information as to what has happened to all the other articles which were in the palace when it was first occupied by the Russian troops.

BRITISH TRADE STATISTICS; EXPORTS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the total value in 1900 of the purchases by the mother country of goods produced within the British Empire, and of the value of the goods made in England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland bought by the Empire, and of the value of the goods bought of and sold to foreign countries.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The declared value of the imports of merchandise (that is, not including bullion and specie) from British possessions in 1900 was £110,099,117, and from foreign countries £413,436,422. The declared value of the exports of British and Irish produce from the United Kingdom to British possessions in the same year was £94,322,232, and to foreign countries £197,129,074. The figures are subject to revision on final examination of the accounts.

IMPORTS OF FOREIGN MANUFACTURES.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can

inform the House what the total value of the import of goods manufactured by foreign labour was in 1900, and how much revenue to the public a tax of ten per cent. thereon would produce.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: It is not possible to state the value of the import of goods manufactured by foreign labour, the statistics compiled by the Customs only showing the countries from which the goods were shipped, and not the nationality of the labour employed in their manufacture, which would be quite impossible to arrive at in the case of goods made abroad from materials imported from this country in a half manufactured condition.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: But did not the imports of foreign manufactured goods last year exceed a hundred millions sterling?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I think the total was eighty-six millions odd.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Does that include part-manufactured goods?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR was understood to reply in the negative.

TIN PLATE INDUSTRY; AMERICAN DUTIES.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware of the competition of the tin plate works in the United States of America, supported by their tariff, with the tin plate works in South Wales, and of the danger of this industry being lost to the people of the Principality; and whether he can make representation to the Government of the United States of America with a view to induce them to reduce their duty on tin plates entering their country.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, I am aware of the competition between the tin plate works in the United States and the tin plate works in South Wales. It is satisfactory, however, that while the exports of tin plate to America have declined, those to other countries have increased in recent years. Discretion as regards the suggestion in the last paragraph rests with the Foreign Office, but I have no reason to suppose that any representations from this country to the United States Government with a view to a reduction of the duty on tin plate would be likely to have any result.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: Will the right hon. Gentleman urge the Chancellor of the Exchequer to take fiscal measures to protect this industry?

[No answer was returned.]

DIRECT AND INDIRECT TAXATION.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state the proportion of public revenue raised by direct taxation and the proportion raised by indirect taxation in the United Kingdom, the United States, France, and Germany.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): For the year 1899&#x2013;1900

direct taxation contributed 48&#x00B7;4 per cent. of the total tax revenue of the United Kingdom, as compared with 51&#x00B7;6 per cent. from indirect taxation. I am afraid I cannot give the figures for foreign countries. I may, however, point out that, in the case of Federal Governments, such as the United States or Germany, any comparison, unless very carefully made, would be apt to be misleading.

#### TAPERING PIT PROPS AND BARS.

MR. MARKHAM (Nottinghamshire, Mansfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to a meeting of the North Staffordshire Institute of Mining Engineers, held at Hanley, on 14th January, when Mr. W. N. Atkinson, one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, presided, and a discussion concerning a patent for tapering pit props and bars, taken out by Mr. H. Hepplewhite, one of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines, took place, when Mr. Atkinson spoke in favour of the patent and stated that the question of tapering props was one of economy and not one of safety, and that Mr. W. Statham stated tapering would be unsafe in some mines; whether he has any information to show that some colliery companies have declined to recognise the validity of such Inspector's patent, and refuse to pay the royalties; and whether, seeing that some colliery companies are paying the Inspector for such patent right, he will see that none of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines devote their attention to matters other than those of the safety of the men, and take measures to prevent any of them receiving money from colliery companies.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): Nothing had been heard of this matter in the Home Office until the hon. Member's question appeared on the Paper. I have now made inquiries, and find that it is the case that Mr. Hepplewhite, an Assistant Inspector of Mines, has taken out a patent for tapered props and has formed a company to run it, also that the validity of the patent is disputed. With I out going so far as to say that no inspector may ever be interested in an invention, I think Mr. Hepplewhite's interest in this patent is incompatible with his position as Inspector of Mines, and I have decided that he must abandon either the one or the other. I have, however, no reason to think that he has ever acted as inspector otherwise than properly and impartially. Mr. Atkinson, who has no interest in the matter, informs me that he did not speak in favour of the patent at the Institute of Mining Engineers. In my opinion he was perfectly justified in joining in the discussion on the subject of tapered props.

#### GUN LICENCES.

MR. JOHN GORDON (Londonderry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, with the view of preventing accidents and increasing the revenue, the Government will introduce legislation to compel the purchasers of pistols and revolvers to exhibit their gun licences before buying firearms from dealers.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I cannot make any promise as to legislation on this subject.

#### THE JURY SYSTEM.

MR. JOHN GORDON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, in view of the dissatisfaction among jurors, the Home Office will consider the advisability of introducing at an early date adequate reform of the present system.

\*MR. RITCHIE: I cannot give any promise as to the introduction of legislation on this subject.

#### METROPOLITAN POLICE PAY.

SIR ALBERT ROLLIT (Islington, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the

Home Department whether he will reconsider the question of increased pay for the metropolitan police constables so far as to make the entire increase granted pensionable, instead of granting one-half in the shape of a lodging allowance, especially as the allocation of one-half the increase in the latter form has caused dissatisfaction among those who do not participate owing to their being lodged in the police station houses.

\*MR. RITCHIE: Beyond pointing out that the statement that half the increased pay for the Metropolitan Police Force has been given in the shape of a lodging allowance does not accurately represent the facts, I can only say that I am not prepared to reconsider the decision to which I came after going into the question very fully and carefully in all its bearings, and which I hold to meet fully the circumstances of the case.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): Is it not the fact that the increase given to the City Police is wholly pensionable? Why should not the Metropolitan Police be treated in the same way?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;

VACCINATION;THE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR.

\*SIR JOHN ROLLESTON (Leicester): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in view of the fact that by the working of the conscientious objector's clause in The Vaccination Act, 1898, loss of time and money are inflicted upon poor people objecting to vaccination by having to attend a police court and pay fees for a certificate, and in view of the fact that numbers of working people still neither have their children vaccinated nor obtain certificates, and of the increase in the number of vaccinations claimed as the result of that Act, he will, during the present session, introduce a Bill to completely eliminate the principle of compulsion from the Vaccination Acts.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The reply to the question of my hon. friend can only be in the negative.

VACCINATION RETURNS.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will grant the Return respecting Vaccination which stands on to-day's Paper.

MR. WALTER LONG: Some of the information desired could not be given at the present time. Particulars as to the expenditure out of the rates in respect of vaccination in each financial year are given in the Local Taxation Returns relating to that year; and it does not seem necessary that a special Return should be granted.

OVERCROWDING IN EAST LONDON.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he is aware of the difficulty of proving cases of overcrowding in houses occupied by aliens in East London; and whether he will consider the desirability of amending the Public Health Act, 1891 (London), in such a manner as to allow sanitary authorities to enter houses at any hour without applying for a magistrate's warrant.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am not sure what is the precise nature of the difficulty to which my hon. friend refers; but if he will bring under my notice any particular

instances in which that difficulty has been experienced, I shall be happy to consider what alteration, if any, in the law may be desirable.

#### RATES ON AGRICULTURAL LAND.

MR. SPEAR (Devonshire, Tavistock): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether, in granting the Return as to Rates on Agricultural Land which stands on the Paper for today, he will include in the Return a statement showing the sum paid to each union in lieu of one-half of the rates on agricultural land in each union.

MR. WALTER LONG: For reasons similar to those which I gave yesterday in reply to a question by my hon. friend, the Member for East Somerset, I regret that I am unable to grant the Return now asked for.

#### ABERDEEN POST OFFICE BUILDINGS.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the revised plans for the erection of a new post office in Aberdeen have now been finally settled; when it is intended to begin work on the erection of this new post office; and, what sum it is intended to allot to this work in the Estimates for the coming financial year.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): Revised sketch plans were sent by me to the Postmaster General on the 17th December last for his observations. I have stated that I cannot undertake that the work can be commenced before the middle of this year, and I am afraid it is not in my power, at present, to give the right hon. Gentleman any more definite information on that point. The sum of £4,000 is taken in the Estimates of the coming financial year for proceeding with the work. This was as much as I thought I was likely to be able to spend.

#### TRUST FRAUDS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General if he can state how many cases of a breach of trust, to the prejudice of the widow and the orphan or other beneficiary, engaged in 1900 the attention of the High Court of Justice; and what steps he proposes to take against this class of fraud, and to bring to the notice of the public about to settle moneys or create trust deeds that the Judicial Trustees Act, 1896, enables them to appoint a judicial trustee under the supervision of the Court.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: A great many cases of breach of trust of the nature referred to in the question have engaged the attention of the Courts in the year 1900. Their number could be ascertained, if at all, only by a long and troublesome inquiry. The Government have under consideration a measure for amending the Larceny Act with regard to frauds by agents. The fact that the Judicial Trustee Act, 1896, stands on the Statute-book is, of course, well known. The attention of the public can be further called to it only through the usual channels of information or by means of such questions as that put by my hon. and gallant friend.

#### ENGLISH JURY PANELS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General if he can state the number of cases in which jurors have, during the last fifty years, been ordered by the Crown to stand by without cause shown in England.

Sir ROBERT FINLAY: I find on inquiry that it is impossible to give the particulars asked for, as no record has been kept of the cases.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I inquire if it is possible that a single case cannot be given?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Undoubtedly there have been cases. There is not the slightest question as to the existence of the power, which was settled so long ago as 1807 in a case to which both Lord Campbell and Lord Chief Justice Cock-burn were parties. It is exercised and will be exercised whenever it is required in the interests of justice.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Will the hon. and learned Gentleman give us the benefit of his own experience? Can he tell the House, from his own experience, how often he has seen this practice exercised in the English Courts?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: My practice in the Criminal Courts has been so limited that I am afraid my experience would be of very little value.

MAIDSTONE ELECTION.

MR. CAINE: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General if he is considering the cases of bribery scheduled in the Judges' Report to the House on the Maidstone Election with a view to the prosecution of the offenders.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: Yes, Sir.

MR. CAINE: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General if the persons who are electors and who were scheduled by the Judges in their Report to the House on the Maidstone Election Petition for giving and receiving bribes will be eligible to vote in the election now in progress.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: No, Sir.

TELEGRAPH FORMS.

LIEUT.-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state when the contract for the supply of the paper used for telegrams is terminable; and whether, on the termination of the present contract, the Postmaster General will arrange for the supply of paper of a more durable and substantial character.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The contract for the supply of the delivered telegram forms is for one year from the 1st ultimo, and continues until determined by six months notice. The Postmaster General has not received any complaints of the quality of the paper used for the forms issued to provincial offices. It seems on the whole to be fairly suitable for the purpose, and in view of the large number (upwards of 75,000,000) used, the cost of effecting any material improvement would be considerable; but he will give further consideration to the question before another contract is entered into.

WELSH-SPEAKING POSTMASTERS.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that inconvenience is frequently caused in Wales by the appointment of postmasters, not able to speak Welsh, in districts where a large proportion of the inhabitants transact their business in Welsh; and whether he will state whether it is the practice of the Department, when making such appointments, to issue

the advertisement in such a form as to ascertain the qualifications of the candidates upon this point.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is the practice of the Department when making appointments to postmasterships at places where a knowledge of Welsh is necessary to ascertain that the candidate whom it is proposed to appoint possesses such knowledge.

DUBLIN AND BELFAST MAIL TRAINS.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that on the Great Northern Railway, Ireland, third class passenger carriages are not attached to the limited mail trains between Dublin and Belfast; whether he can state what is the reason of this exemption on the Great Northern Railway, who have a monopoly of the train service of the northeast portion of Ireland; and whether he will take steps to have third class passenger carriages attached to the limited mail trains on the Great Northern Railway, as is the case on the other lines of railways in Ireland.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The question as to what passenger carriages should be attached to the trains referred to is not one for the Postmaster General to consider. He has no right to interfere with the discretion of the company in this matter.

MR. DALY: But when the Government arrange their mail contracts do they not make special stipulations with regard to the trains?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I am not aware of it.

MR. JERMYN'S CASTLECOVE ESTATE.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that seven tenants on the estate of Mr. E. L. Jermyn, in the electoral division of Castlecove, county Kerry, served originating notices, with the consent of the landlord and agent, to have judicial rents fixed by court valuers for 25th March, 1899, and that these cases have not yet been dealt with; and whether he will take steps to have valuers sent to value the land.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I am informed that in six out of the seven cases referred to a revision of the tenement valuation became necessary under the provisions of the Local Government Act before judicial rents could be fixed, and that until this revision, which was only recently completed, was performed, the Land Commissioners were not in a position to refer the consents to the valuers. All the cases will now be dealt with, with the least possible delay.

ARMAGH AND KINGSCOURT RAIL WAY SCHEME.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a Bill was passed through Parliament last year empowering the making of a line of railway between Armagh and Kingscourt Ireland, and making a competing route with the Great Northern Railway between Armagh and Dublin; and that the promoters of the line of railway between Armagh and Kingscourt have sold their rights to make the line of railway between Kingscourt and Armagh, which, if carried out, would give a monopoly to the Great

Northern Railway Company, which all the public bodies along the entire route protest against; and whether, under Clause 17 of the Agricultural and Technical Act, he will take any steps to prevent an arrangement between the promoters of the Kingscourt and Armagh Railway and the Great Northern Railway, which, if carried out, would injure an important manufacturing and agricultural district between Armagh and Kingscourt.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): At the request of my right hon. friend I will reply to this question. The matter to which the question relates is not one in which the Department of Agriculture have power to intervene under Section 17 of the Act of 1899.

#### HORSE BREEDING IN IRELAND.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how it is that the Royal Dublin Society, in offering twenty-five premiums of £100 each for stallions eligible for inclusion in the register of the Department of the Board of Agriculture in Ireland, have allotted only four premiums to Ulster, six to Connaught eight to Munster, and seven to Leinster; and whether he will direct that a re-arrangement of the premiums be considered with a view of giving Ulster a larger number, to which she seems entitled.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed by the Royal Dublin Society that the number of premiums for thoroughbred sires allotted to each province is based upon the extent to which breeding from thoroughbreds is carried on in each province. This knowledge the Society has obtained through the agency of their local committees, which for several years past have administered horse breeding grants in each county. The Society's list of registered thoroughbred stallions in Ireland for the year 1900 shows that there were 93 in Leinster, 63 in Munster 32 in Connaught, and 13 in Ulster, arrangements are revised annually, and tered as the experience of the previous year may suggest.

#### FAIR RENTS IN COUNTY LONGFORD.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state when the next Sub-Commissions for fixing fair rents will be held in Longford, and when the decisions in first and second statutory terms of

cases heard in Longford recently will be given.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hearing of a list containing cases from the Unions of Granard, Longford, and Ballymahon will be commenced at Granard on the 12th instant. Judgment will probably be delivered in the heard at the last Longford sittings in the course of a couple of weeks.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: When will the next sittings be held in Longford?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot answer that without notice.

#### SLIGO COUNTY COUNCIL; THE COURT HOUSE FLAG.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a body of police entered the courthouse of Sligo, in July, 1899, and took by force there from a green flag, the property of the Sligo County Council; that some of the councillors assembling for the transaction of the business of the county were assaulted on the occasion; that



the flag still remains in the possession of the police; and whether, in view of the fact that green flags were universally displayed in London on last St. Patrick's Day, he will order the restoration of the flag in question to its rightful owners, and allow it to be displayed during the sittings of the council.

MR. ATKINSON: Perhaps I may be allowed to answer this question. I have not as yet received any report in reference to it, but my recollection is that the matter referred to was fully discussed in the House in the session before last, when it appeared that the county council acted illegally and improperly, that ten police seized and removed the flag by order of the High Sheriff, the legal custodian of the courthouse, that no unnecessary force was used by the police, and no assault committed by them, save what were unavoidable in the discharge of this duty. The flag still remains in the possession of the police. The answer to the last two questions is in the negative.

MR. O'DOWD: Is it not the fact that that flag was not raised at all?

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) RETURN.

MR. O'DOHERTY (Donegal, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant the Return, under the heading Local Government (Ireland), standing on to-day's Paper.

MR. WYNDHAM: A Return was laid on the Table in the session of 1898 (No. 237 of that year) which contains all the information required in the first part of the hon. Member's proposed Return. The information desired in the second and fourth paragraphs of the Notice can be given. I am in correspondence with the Local Government Board on the advisability of granting a comprehensive Return of the salaries of officials before and after the passing of the Act of 1898, and I will advise the hon. Member when I am in possession of the facts. Perhaps the hon. Member for East Donegal will take these observations as applying equally to the Return on the same subject which stands in his name.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION RETURN.

MR. O'DOHEETY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant the Return of the Irish Land Commission standing on the Paper of to-day.

MR. WYNDHAM: The date February, 1800, under the first heading of the Notice is clearly a mistake for February, 1901. A Return was published in July last. Since then I am informed that but one lay assistant commissioner has been appointed, to whom a further Report in continuation of that granted last session would now apply. Under the circumstances it is hardly desirable to issue a further printed Return at present. I have, however, forwarded to the hon. Member particulars regarding this one gentleman in the form indicated.

THE RECENT "DAY OF GENERAL MOURNING";POLICE AND WICK LOW SHOPKEEPERS.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the police ordered the publicans of Roundwood and Lara, county Wicklow, to keep their shops closed on Saturday, 2nd February, and whether they acted on their own initiative, or upon instructions received from a superior officer, and under what statute are the Irish Constabulary entitled to order the closing of public-houses on an ordinary

weekday.

MR. WYNDHAM: This question only appeared on the Paper this morning for the first time, and as local inquiry is necessary I must ask the hon. Member to repeat it on Thursday next.

#### LIMERICK CLERK OF THE PEACE

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland will he explain why, on the appointment of the present Clerk of the Crown and Peace for the county and city of Limerick, his salary was fixed at the same amount as his predecessor, while those of the officials in the office were reduced.

MR. WYNDHAM: The salary of the present Clerk of the Crown and Peace for the county and city of Limerick has not been fixed at the same amount paid to his predecessor. The salary of the present holder of the office is £;900 a year, that of the late officer was £;950 a year. The Government have no concern with the appointment of officials subordinate to the Clerk of the Crown and Peace and have no voice in the salaries paid to them.

#### COMMISSION OF THE PEACE FOR SOUTH ARMAGH.

MR. JOHN CAMPBELL (Armagh, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will grant the Return respecting the Commission of the Peace in South Armagh, which stands on Monday's Paper.

MR. WYNDHAM: I shall be happy to supply the hon. Member with all available information on the subject in answer to a question, if he will place one on the Paper for next Monday. It is unnecessary to incur the expense of embodying the information in a formal Parliamentary Paper.

#### CHAIRMAN OF THE IRISH BOARD OF WORKS.

MR. PATEICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Chairman of the Board of Works (Ireland) has resigned his position; and can he say if Mr. Robertson resigned on the termination of his engagement or on what other grounds, and whether his resignation has been accepted.

MR. WYNDHAM: Mr. Robertson has not resigned. The period of his appointment will expire on the 31st of March next.

#### SALARIES OF COUNTY OFFICIALS IN WEXFORD.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDS (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state the result of the appeals of the county Wexford County Council against the orders of the Local Government Board for Ireland increasing the salaries of certain county officials in county Wexford.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that the Court of Appeal has reversed the decision of the Court of King's Bench, and quashed the Orders made by the Local Government Board.

MR. FLAVIN: What effect will the judgment have on other counties in Ireland?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order &#x0021; That does not arise out of the question.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the decision of the Irish Court of Appeal, delivered on the 25th instant in the case of the Wexford County Council against the Local Government

Board (Ireland), will apply to all cases in which the wishes and decisions of other county councils in Ireland were similarly overborne by the Local Government Board.

MR. WYNDHAM: The judgment of the Court of Appeal only decides the four cases from county Wexford. If there are other cases in which county councils are dissatisfied with the awards of the Local Government Board the councils will, no doubt, act on legal advice as to their position under all circumstances.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Will the right hon. Gentleman not accept the decision, and thus refrain from putting the county councils to the expense of appeals?

MR. WYNDHAM: The decision is a very important one, and the Local Government Board would do well to take a few days to consider it.

SPENCER DOCK, DUBLIN.

MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the lock gates at Spencer Dock, Dublin, connecting the Royal Canal with the Liffey, have fallen down owing to their rotten condition, and thereby emptied the docks, causing traffic on the Royal Canal to be suspended, to the loss and inconvenience of the boatowners and traders who use the canal, although the renewal of these gates and new stone sills was ordered by General Hutchinson, K.C.B., who inspected this canal, and again by Sir Francis Marindin, C.B., who inspected the canal; and if the Board of Works will again instruct one of their inspectors to examine the canal, with a view of compelling the Midland Great Western Railway Company to carry out the works ordered by the Board of Trade, so that the traffic may be resumed on the canal.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The lock gates have not fallen down nor have the docks been emptied. In the afternoon of the 15th inst. a piece of iron accidentally got into a position which obstructed the proper closing of the lock gates. This caused a lowering of water in the dock and a temporary interference with traffic. The matter was put right by the morning of the 10th inst., and traffic was then resumed. The renewal of those gates and sills was not ordered by General Hutchinson or Sir Francis Marindin.

STATE OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland, Wansbeck): On behalf of the hon. Member for Durham, Chester-le-Street, I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the terms of reference to the proposed Joint Committee to inquire into the arrangements made at the opening of Parliament will be so framed as to make it possible for the Committee to take into consideration the accommodation for the Press.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I think there can be no doubt that the terms of reference to the Committee would allow them, indeed almost oblige them, to consider the matter referred to in the question.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (GOVERNMENT BUSINESS).

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I rise to make the motion, "That Government business have precedence this day and to-morrow of all other business." Perhaps it would be well to remind the House that, though the resolution is very accurately stated from a technical point of view, it really is, in substance, rather a misleading resolution. The resolution is not to facilitate Government business in the

ordinary sense of the word. It really is to facilitate the task of the critics of the Government and give those critics wider opportunities for exercising their rights. We ask no privileges or advantages for Government legislation. The motion is simply aimed at enabling us to get through absolutely necessary Supply before March 31st.

MR. CREMER (Shoreditch, Haggerston): I rise to a point of order. Several hon. Members are afraid that if this motion is carried it will deprive them of their opportunity to-morrow.

\*MR, SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member had better wait and hear what I have to say. I am making the motion in this unusual form because I am getting somewhat alarmed as to the amount of time which will be available for dealing with Supply before that date. This year March 31st falls on a Sunday, so that that day and March 30th are not available for dealing with Supply before the end of the financial year. It will therefore be necessary to introduce the Appropriation Bill upon Monday, March 25th. If that were done, the Second Reading would be taken on Tuesday, March 26th. the Committee stage, on which no discussion can take place, on Wednesday, March 27th, and the Third Reading on March 28th. It would, I believe, be possible to defer the First Reading to Tuesday, March 26th, but if that were done, private Members would be deprived of Wednesday for the discussion of private Members' Bills, because the Second Reading would fall on that day. I therefore take Monday, March 25th. Before and including March 25th, we shall have fifteen days only for the discussion, in the first place, of the Civil Service, the Navy, and the Army Supplementary Estimates, and, in the second place, for getting the Speaker out of the chair and obtaining Vote A and Vote I of the two spending Departments and a Vote on Account. All these financial operations must be got through before the Appropriation Bill is introduced; and in addition to that we have, out of the fifteen days, to find one; which will, I think be an early one ;on which the Chancellor of the Exchequer will make his statement on the subject of the Civil List in connection with the appointment of the Committee by which that Civil List is to considered and discussed in the first instance. That practically reduces us to fourteen days for the discussion of all that financial business. I wish I could think fourteen days was an excessive calculation; but I find that last year we took sixteen nights to get through the corresponding business of last year, and there were not last year, as unfortunately there are this year, largo Navy Supplementary Votes to consider in addition to Civil Service and Army Supplementary Votes. I am sorry to say that the Supplementary Votes this year are rather formidable in their amount. There are, I believe, over £1,000,000 Civil Service Supplementary Estimates, over £1,000,000 Navy Supplementary Estimates, and over £3,000,000 Army Supplementary Estimates. The mere magnitude of a Vote is, I know, no certain index of the amount of discussion it will legitimately provoke; but when I look at the figures I feel it is not improbable that the House will wish to devote quite as much, if not more, time this year to the discussion of the Supplementary Estimates as it did last year and on some preceding occasions. That is not all. The operation of getting the Speaker out

of the chair for Naval and Military Supply is the proper and the best occasion on which to discuss those large questions of policy raised by the statements of the Ministers responsible for these two great Departments; and, as we have made no secret that we have proposals to make with regard to the Army, I cannot doubt that the House will desire very full opportunity for considering and discussing the statement of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War. And, as there is a large increase on the Naval Estimates of the preceding year, I doubt not that on the Naval Vote also discussion will be asked for, and no doubt will be required. In these circumstances, I think, the House, not at all in the interests of the Government, but in the interests of its own rights of criticising the Government, should do all it can, as I am sure it will, to help us to find time for dealing within the legal limits with this large mass of financial business. But I do not see how that important end can be attained unless the House will allow us to start upon this work on Thursday next with, as it were, a clear run before us. It is for this reason that I have asked the House to allow us at the conclusion of the debate on the Address immediately to set to work upon those preparatory resolutions without which we cannot deal with this mass of financial business. I need hardly say that I am very anxious not to interfere with the discussion of the private Bill which stands first to-morrow, and I see no reason any such interference should take place. I am very anxious not to interfere with the discussion of private Members' Bills. If I have convinced the House that we come forward and ask for no privileges to advance our own particular business, if we make no request to monopolise the time of the House beyond keeping up with our own particular business; if the House is satisfied, as I hope it is, that I am asking nothing beyond the time necessary to carry our financial proposals; then I think we ought to be able to do all the business on the Paper in the course of this evening, leaving to-morrow quite clear for the purpose desired by the hon. Member in charge of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Government business have precedence this day and to-morrow of all other business." (Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The formidable and, I would say, beyond all doubt the unprecedented inroad which the right hon. Gentleman proposes to make upon the opportunities for free and full discussion in this House; that inroad the right hon. Gentleman bases on what he calls the exigencies of the situation. But this in-

road is made necessary not by the exigencies of the situation, but because the Government have failed to appreciate and provide for those exigencies. There is not a circumstance that the right hon. Gentleman has referred to that was not in the knowledge of every Member of this House weeks and weeks ago. To begin with, he knew, and we knew, that there was to be and that there must be a very full opportunity for debate under the present circumstances on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. That was the distinct and clear understanding on all hands. The right hon. Gentleman knew the day of the week on which the 1st of April falls; even that the Government might have known after careful inquiry. The financial position in which they must find themselves was well known. It was

well known to all of us that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have a heavy task to undertake to meet and set in order the financial requirements of this year and next year. The only element of novelty in the whole range of circumstances to which I refer is the question of the settlement of the Civil List; and surely the appointment of a Committee for that purpose need not occupy any long space of time. So that the question which every Member is entitled to ask is; "Why did you not foresee this position Why did you not call Parliament together earlier?" It was even contemplated, I understand, to call Parliament together later still, but that project was fortunately abandoned; and now we are in that position in which many of us foresaw that the proceedings of the Government would land us. Who are to discuss all these important questions ;these Supplementary Estimates, so large and important, the Civil Service Estimates, the Estimates for the Naval and Military services, the general scheme of Army reform, which the Government is to put forward, the Estimates for next year;we are to discuss these and many other things in a helter-skelter fashion, and we know we shall be told that if we do not cut the debate short no time will be left for the completion of the necessary business. In the difficulty in which we are landed it is not easy to see how something of this kind is to be avoided, and I agree with the right hon. Gentleman; but my argument is that it is his fault that we are in this position. Even the Secretary of State for the Colonies must

see this when he thinks it over more carefully. If the step I suggested, of calling Parliament together earlier, had been adopted, it would have, if not completely obliterated the difficulty, greatly modified the pressure on hon. Members. As things are, what can we do? We have the proposal of the Government, which in itself does not seem to be a strange one under the circumstances; but there is one fact which arouses astonishment;the interference with Wednesdays. There was a complete understanding that no Wednesday was to be interfered with up to Easter. Members came to me on all sides who were desirous of introducing Bills and asked me if Wednesdays were likely to be available, and I said, I was given to understand that no Wednesday would be taken before Easter. Now the first Wednesday is to be taken or may be taken. I do not think that is in accordance with the arrangement which was made. I do not know how the matter stands with regard to to-morrow, because the light hon. Gentleman says he may not require to take tomorrow. If to-morrow is taken it will be contrary to the promise made.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never made such a promise.

SIR II. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: Oh, yes.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Just read the promise I made.

SIR. H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It was an understanding that no Wednesday was to be taken up to Easter.

\*MR. JAMES LOWTHER said he had had on many occasions to protest against arrangements such as this, and, therefore, on this occasion he wished to say why, in his opinion, the right hon. Gentleman was justified in taking the action he now proposed. In past years Governments were constantly getting into a fix with regard to the financial business of the House by devoting their time to the

furthering of political measures; they then came down and laid claim to the time of private Members for the purpose of disposing of the financial business. In this case, as he understood, the Government proposed to devote the whole of their own time as well as any additional time which the House might assign to them wholly to financial business, and to such an arrangement he had no objection to offer, as it avoided the misappropriation of the time to be taken from private members. Something had been said with regard to not taking Wednesdays, but he had always contended that if a demand was to be made on the time of private Members that demand ought to be a consistent one, and ought to affect the time of private Members fairly and squarely all round. He therefore strongly urged the right hon. Gentleman not to be persuaded into giving up Wednesdays, on the public ground, and the public ground only, that the demand he had made was owing to the exigencies of the position in which the Government found themselves with regard to the essential financial business of the House.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I do not know whether I correctly gathered what the right hon. Gentleman meant to convey, but I certainly understood the right hon. Gentleman to give a definite promise that tomorrow should be devoted to the Bill down as the first order of the day.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is my hope and expectation.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I do not know in what sense that is meant. It rests with the Government, and I hope I may take it that it is quite certain and clear that the Bill will be taken tomorrow.

\*MR. YOXALL (Nottinghamshire, W.), in moving the amendment that the words "and to-morrow" should be omitted from the motion, said that this was the first Wednesday available before Easter, there were only five Wednesdays in all before Easter, and after Easter all Wednesdays became very precarious so far as private Members were concerned. If the motion was passed almost every shred of private Members' time would be taken away in order to assist the Government. He had not long been a Member of the House, but he had sat long enough to see many of the rights; he would not say privileges of the private Members taken away. He would not have grumbled so much had there been,

in his opinion, much necessity on the part of the Government to make this encroachment on private Members' time, but the exigencies of the position must have been known both inside and outside the House for a considerable time. By the proposal to take every Tuesday before Easter balloting for Tuesdays for private Members' resolutions became an elaborate and solemn farce, yet it was religiously gone through once a week, and the Speaker was compelled by the rules of the House to take part in it, which was, to say the least, undignified. The right hon. Gentleman, in order to take away every Tuesday, suggested that he might also take the first Wednesday when, instead of a private Bill of great importance that was to be brought forward being discussed, the House would have to discuss financial business and Supplementary Estimates, which might very well have been discussed before the General Election.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My hon. friend may take it that I do not press for tomorrow.

\*MR. YOXALL said the House was now asked to debate financial matters which they were aware might have been discussed during the brief session before Christmas,

and in support of that abuse the right of private Members to bring forward private Bills, which very frequently, resulted in most important legislation, was to be taken away. He protested against it, and he asked the House to support him in his protest. It was not a question of party, it was a question of the right of 600 Members out of 670. The ballot had given him the opportunity to bring forward a Bill on Wednesday, and therefore he had been compelled to move the Amendment. On the following day a proposal was to come before the House of the greatest importance to half a million working men, who, with their wives and families, represented 2,500,000 of the subjects of the King. Fate and the fortune of the ballot had given that one opportunity for bringing in this measure, and all the arrangements which had been made to test the question in the House were to be upset by the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman. He appealed to private Members on the Government side of the House to support him in his Amendment. It would not mean the resignation of the Government nor another General Election. Hon. Members could in this case vote according to their own consciences without turning out the Government or losing their seats. The right hon. Gentleman had expressed the hope that it might not be necessary to take Wednesday. He was perfectly convinced that it would be taken from private Members. If the right hon. Gentleman was in earnest in his desire not to take Wednesday, which was set down for the discussion of the Eight Hours Bill, would he at a reasonable hour that night ask the House to close the debate on the Address, and then take the debate on the resolutions to which he had referred?

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): I second the Amendment of my hon. friend with great pleasure. I join in the appeal to the Leader of the House that he should not disappoint the great national feeling with which the people have been looking forward to the debate on the Eight Hours Bill to-morrow. It is probably one of the most important labour questions that will come before the House during the present session. It has the first place for tomorrow, and I cannot imagine anything more mean for the Government to do, with several months before them for the transaction of business, than to commence this system of robbery so early in their Parliamentary career, and especially when that robbery takes effect in the way this motion would do. Who have heard that something like half a million workers are concerned in this great movement. These men are engaged at the imminent risk of their lives every day. They are engaged in the production of the first necessity for British commerce, and without it commerce would come to a stand.

\*MR. SPEAKER asked the hon. Member to confine his remarks to the question before the House.

MR. BROADHURST: Perhaps I did wander from the point, but my desire was to emphasise the importance of having a discussion on this to-morrow. I hope the Leader of the House will alter his mind in this particular case, and accept the Amendment made by my hon. friend the Member for West Nottingham. If the Government are pressed hard for time for their financial business it is the fault of the Government themselves. They and they alone are to blame. I quite understand



that this motion of the Leader of the House meets the views of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Isle of Thanet, because he is generally against legislation except upon one or two particular subjects. If the Government would bring in a Bill which he approves of, no doubt he would support it. I sincerely trust that the Leader of the House, with his usual good nature, and I might say good sense, will accept this Amendment without a division. There is no other Member of this House who would have dared to make this motion except the Leader of the House. His manner is so seductive that really the same appeal from the mouth of any other Member of the Government would have led to universal screams of execration from this side of the House. We are always prevented when the right hon. Gentleman makes an appeal from giving vent in the volume we would otherwise do to our indignation. I strongly support the Amendment of my hon. friend.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out the words 'and To-morrow.'"; (Mr. Yoxall.)

Question proposed, "That the words 'and To-morrow' stand part of the Question."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot help feeling that some Members of the House do not fully comprehend the purpose of my motion. Perhaps it is my own fault. There is no suggestion that tomorrow should be taken for Supply. We do not mean to take any business tomorrow except what remains over of the three first resolutions that stand on the Paper to-night. I do not see any reason whatever why the debate on the Miners Eight Hours Bill should be materially curtailed by the resolution I have brought before the House. I trust that the debate on the Address will be through very shortly. The first resolution deals with a universal desire on the part of Members of the House, the second deals with a rule which has been, year after year, approved by the House, and the only change I have introduced is one which is in favour of the critics of the Government.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The right hon. Gentleman need have no fear at all about the House not having understood him on the previous occasion. I think so far as hon. Members on this side of the House are concerned that they perfectly understood what he was proposing and that he was making an exceedingly adroit move. Nobody here desires to prevent the discussion of this important Bill which concerns so many of the labouring classes of the country. We should be all exceedingly sorry to take any action which would prevent the discussion of the Bill. He has tried to use that knowledge as a screw upon us to prevent us from insisting upon the proper discussion of the remaining Amendments to the Address and the proper discussion of his new resolutions. The way the matter stands is this; the right hon. Gentleman says to us, by putting Wednesday into this resolution, "If you don't conclude the debate on the Address tonight, and, in addition, if you do not to-night dispose of these three new resolutions, then I will take to-morrow away from the discussion of this important matter." He is therefore making an adroit move to force us into the position either of scamping the proper discussion of the grave questions involved in these three resolutions, or of having the appearance of interfering with the discussion to-morrow of this important Bill. The debate on the Amendment to the Address which has been moved, or is to be moved, by the hon. Member for East Mayo, raises an

aspect of affairs in South Africa which has not been adequately discussed since the House met, and only this morning matters have transpired in the Papers laid on the Table, such as the correspondence between Lord Roberts and Louis Botha, which are of the utmost importance, and which have not been discussed at all. I think it would be a monstrous thing indirectly to put the screw upon us, so to speak, to prevent us having an adequate discussion of the Amendment of my hon. friend. I was astonished to hear the hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment suggest that the debate on the Address should be closed at a convenient hour this evening, and that at ten or eleven o'clock tonight we could enter upon the task of discussing these three new resolutions with any hope of their being disposed of before the end of the sitting. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House knows perfectly well that that kind of talk will not deceive anybody. The first resolution, which he speaks of making a small Amendment on the Standing Orders, is in itself a most novel, and I would say revolutionary, proposal which sweeps away at one stroke one of the only remaining privileges of private Members to raise discussion on Mr. Speaker leaving the chair when the House goes, into Committee of Ways and Means. I respectfully say that the first resolution ought, if properly discussed, to occupy an entire sitting of the House. Then the second resolution is one dealing with the arrangements about Supply, which, though it has been passed by the House since 1896, has never been acquiesced in, certainly, by Members sitting in this quarter of the House, and so far as it rests with us never will be passed by the House without considerable discussion and vehement opposition. The third resolution is one taking away from private Members all the Tuesdays up to Easter. It is ridiculous to think that these three resolutions can be disposed of in a portion of a sitting, as was suggested by the mover of the Amendment. If the Government are in a difficulty, as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, then the responsibility and blame rests upon themselves. We in this quarter of the House are not interested in assisting the Government to get out of this difficulty. What I think would be the proper course to adopt would be for the Amendment of my hon. friend for East Mayo with reference to affairs in South Africa to be discussed fully at this sitting of the House, that to-morrow should be reserved, in accordance with what I certainly thought was a clear promise and understanding of the Government, for the discussion of this important English private Bill, and that the whole of the sitting on Thursday should be devoted to the consideration of these three very grave and serious resolutions which interfere with the few remaining rights of private Members. That would be the proper course. If the right hon. Gentleman was of opinion that the Address had been sufficiently debated it was his duty to have moved the closure yesterday or the day before. If he is not of opinion that the debate on the Address has been sufficiently prolonged, then the course I now suggest is the only one that will enable him to meet the difficulty in which he stands. By taking that course he will no doubt have to devote the sitting on Thursday to the discussion of the three resolutions instead of taking the Supplementary Estimates. He will lose a day by it, but that fault lies entirely with himself. Certainly on behalf of the Irish Members who come

here to assert the liberty of speech which is very largely denied to them in Ireland, who come here not to assist the Government to do their business and to get them out of their difficulties, but to express their opinions on all matters of duty appointed to them, I protest against this proposal of the right hon. Gentleman. Notwithstanding the manner in which this Amendment was moved, I will vote for it, and I will vote in favour of any motion intended to thwart the intentions of the Government in depriving independent Members and private Members from the exercise of the few remaining privileges which they have of discussing matters of importance.

\*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): I rise to join in the appeal to the Leader of the House in regard to this motion. There is one aspect of the question to which I would respectfully call his attention. It is now quite evident from what has been said by the hon. and learned Gentleman who has just sat down that the chances of the Eight Hours Bill coming on to-morrow, if this motion be agreed to, are exceedingly remote. I would remind the House, and the Leader of the House in particular, that this Bill is not one which can be treated as a little matter of no importance. It passed the second reading in this House some years ago, and was only defeated in Committee on one of its clauses through a misunderstanding. The Government, I submit, is pledged in regard to this matter. Some years ago the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary, in a speech in the county of Durham, distinctly enunciated an Eight Hours Bill for miners as part of the programme upon which the Unionist party was then appealing to the country. The Minors Eight Hours Bill has obtained a particularly favoured position for this session. It is an old friend of the House of Commons, but the feeling of the present House has not yet been tested in regard to the measure. The point to which I specially desire to direct the attention of the Leader of the House is that within the precincts of the House of Commons; at this moment there are scores of men from the mining districts of England, Scotland, and Wales who have come here at considerable expense in the expectation that that Bill would be taken to-morrow. If the motion of the right hon. Gentleman as it stands is agreed to the Bill will not be taken to-morrow, and all the expense which has been incurred by the working colliers in sending delegates will be wasted. That is an aspect of the matter which should not be overlooked. There is no question concerning which greater unanimity of opinion exists than the one down for discussion to-morrow. Even as a matter of good tactics the Government would be well advised in agreeing at least to the spirit of the Amendment and giving us an undertaking that this Bill will be discussed to-morrow as one affecting the well-being of nearly three-quarters of a million of the most deserving members of the working classes of the country. For these reasons I add my appeal to those already made, in the expectation that the Government will agree to the proposal now before the House and give us an opportunity of ascertaining the real feeling of this Parliament in regard to a measure of so much importance.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: This is a much more serious question than I think the right hon. Gentleman has yet realised. What does he think will be the opinion of the miners all over the country if they are told that the question in which they

take so natural and deep an interest is to be sacrificed simply because there are enormous Supplementary Estimates and an unusual and unprecedented financial condition? I do not think that that will recommend the Supplementary Estimates or their objects to that class of the community. The hon. Member for Waterford has I think suggested a very practical and wise solution of the difficulty. I do not see what right or necessity the Government have for interposing as between to-day and to-morrow these three resolutions. They are absolutely unnecessary. The Government have what I call cornered the House, and they must take the consequences. What is the penalty they will suffer? They will possibly lose a day, more probably half a day, of Supply on Thursday. If the right hon. Gentleman will take these three resolutions not to-night or tomorrow, but upon Thursday, there will be a security that the Eight Hours Miners Bill, which I venture to say is one of the most supreme consequence in the opinion of one of the largest communities of labour in this country, will come on on Wednesday, and then there will be very much less feeling than I think would arise if the Eight Hours Bill was disposed of in the way now contemplated. If this is not done, I venture to say that the persons interested in that Bill, when they perceive that subordinate resolutions have blocked the discussion of a matter of such vital importance to them, will consider that they have not been fairly treated. Therefore I hope the Government will adopt the suggestion of the hon. Member for Waterford and take these resolutions on Thursday.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda): I wish to add my humble appeal to the First Lord of the Treasury. My appeal must be based on the importance of the question that we have at heart. It is perfectly clear that the question left for decision before it is possible to discuss the Bill we want considered is so important that there will be no chance whatever of discussing the Miners Eight Hours Bill. On behalf of that large body of men, as one of them, as one who has known what it is to earn his bread hewing coal, and to work long hours, I must say that it is our opinion, honestly, that if we get that Bill passed it will tend to decrease the number of lives that are lost. I know some question that statement, but that is our simple and honest opinion. Therefore, on behalf of a number of widows and orphans we once more ask the right hon. Gentleman to allow us to have the discussion. I do not know how it is, but there is a feeling among the miners of the country now that the question is ripe, and we have, therefore, been expecting a favourable result from the proceedings of to-morrow. I am not at all wishful to put anything in the way of the work the Government have to do, but, considering the fifteen days that we have in which to provide money for the killing of men or for armaments for that purpose, is it possible to believe that in the House of Commons of this great country we cannot have one day in which to discuss a matter whereby we may save a number of lives? I cannot believe it, and I appeal with all the earnestness of my heart that the right hon. Gentleman will allow us to have this debate tomorrow.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): There is an air about the right hon. Gentleman when he proposes resolutions of this sort that leads the House sometimes not to perceive their party astuteness. What are we discussing this evening? We are discussing the Address to the King. To that Address there are a number of

Amendments, and one very important one has been moved by the hon. Member behind me. The right hon. Gentleman tells us that unless that discussion is brought to an end to-night, and unless we refrain from speaking upon that or any other matter with regard to the Address, and also from discussing fully the resolutions of the right hon. Gentleman, this Eight Hours Bill will not be allowed to be brought on to-morrow; by his direction. What is the aim of the right hon. Gentleman? It is to throw upon us the responsibility of his own acts. I rise simply to say that if the Minors Bill does not come on to-morrow we do not accept the responsibility. That must rest with the right hon. Gentleman. It is all the more hard, and I might almost say unfair, that the right hon. Gentleman should take away this day, because it is done not directly, but indirectly, insidiously, and contrary to a pledge, as I understand, given to the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

MR. LABOUCHERE: The Leader of the Opposition certainly understood, as I gather, that the five Wednesdays before Easter were not to be taken. My right hon. friend, who is a practical business man, understood it in that sense, because, as he told us, when Members who had obtained a good place in the ballot went to him and asked what day they should take, he told them to take one of those Wednesdays. Even if you gave another day for the Miners Bill it would not occupy the position that it would by coming on the first Wednesday. We know that only three or four Bills at most taken after Whitsuntide can pass into law. Under these circumstances, as I do not believe the right hon. Gentleman is inclined to yield at all, I will only say that the First Lord and his followers must accept before the country the responsibility of what they are doing.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley): So many appeals have been made to the right hon. Gentleman from the other side that I feel a certain measure of misunderstanding might easily arise if no appeal was made from this side. We have no desire to curtail discussion on the Eight Hours Bill, but that is what will be said in the country by those who do not understand the forms of the House. It is easy enough to say that if hon. Members from Ireland were to curtail their discussions and if the House as a whole were to accept the resolutions as to Supply, this Bill would be reached absolutely without interference. But in practice we know that hon. Gentlemen opposite will not curtail their discussion even for the purpose of allowing to be debated a Bill which may be the means of saving lives of men. Also in practice there will be many Members who will have much to say upon the resolution with regard to Supply. It seems to me that a fair compromise lies in the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire. Let hon. Gentlemen opposite have the rest of to-day to discuss their Amendment to the Address, and let these Supply resolutions be dealt with on Thursday. If this is done I venture to prophesy, although my right hon. friend may not agree with me, that, having regard to this discussion and the cession the First Lord might make if he would, it will lead to such a curtailment of the discussion on Thursday as would satisfy the right hon. Gentleman and give him the larger part of that day for the discussion of the important questions of finance which the Government,

the House, and the country are so anxious to see dealt with.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.): May I add one word in support of my hon. Friend? If the right hon. Gentleman cannot see his way to grant this compromise he may be able to give a day for the discussion of this very important question. Not only in my own constituency, but throughout the country great interest is taken in this matter. I have always supported the Second Reading of the Eight Hours Bill. At the last election, however, no pledge was exacted from me in that respect, and I feel, therefore, the more honourably bound to endeavour to secure from the right hon. Gentleman a promise that if not at the present time, at the first convenient opportunity, this measure, in which so much interest is taken, should be adequately considered.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): I think the main feature of this discussion is that no single speaker has a word to say in defence of the action of the Government. The further the debate proceeds the more apparent it is that had the right hon. Gentleman not placed these resolutions on the Paper at all and suspended the Twelve o'clock Rule in the ordinary course, the probabilities are that he would have got the Address through to-night, we would have had the discussion on the Eight Hours Bill to-morrow, and he would have got his resolutions on Thursday. I am quite sure that would have been the result to-day. This seems to have been a case of bad generalship on the part of the right hon. Gentleman, and there does not appear to have been enough scouting on this question, as was the case in South Africa. It seems to me that it is unjust on the part of the right hon. Gentleman to refer to Members on this side of the House in the way which he did in his speech. No Member has a right to say that we shall not discuss vital and important resolutions, some of them being absolutely without precedent. I do not remember a single ease in the middle of a debate on the Address when a motion of this kind has been brought forward before. ["Oh, oh &#x0021;"] My impression is that it is absolutely without precedent. Then another precedent is being set up with regard to Ways and Means. I totally disagree with the right hon. Gentleman when he says that it is a proposal which will not require much discussion. Why, this is one of the last opportunities which private Members can rely upon for the discussion of the most important questions upon going into Supply. It seems to me that the right hon. Gentleman has very much underestimated the importance of that particular resolution. It comes to this; that the very first opportunity we have for the discussion of this most important question the Government are going to take the Miners Bill away from us. After calculating all the chances as to a particular day, I think I am correct in saying that that day was selected with the approval of very high authorities in this House. It seems to me that this division, if we go to it; and I do hope the right hon. Gentleman will make it unnecessary; will be a division on the Miners Eight Hours Bill plus the taking away of most important privileges from private Members. I do appeal to hon. Members opposite who are in the House for the first time to say a few words for the miners who supported them at the last election. I venture to say that there are not many Members representing miners who did not pledge themselves at the last election to support this Bill. At the General Election they promised to

support this Bill, and they sit opposite because of their pledge to support this Bill, and they are now called upon practically to vote for or against the minors. It will not do to say it is a mere question of confidence in the Government. It will not do to say it is a square vote, and I hope hon. Members on the opposite side of the House will support us in the Division Lobby. I make this suggestion before I sit down, that the right hon. Gentleman should withdraw for the moment the resolution before the House and defer until Thursday the other resolutions, and appeal to the sense and fairness of the House to allow him to get this Address through on the present occasion. If he would do that; and we ought not to have been occupied with this discussion at all at this moment; it seems to me that all parties would be satisfied in that way. As the representative of a great many miners, I ask the right hon. Gentleman to let us have this discussion to-morrow. This is the first time that this Parliament has had an opportunity of discussing this question, and the first day which private Members have an opportunity of bringing in a Bill, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will grant this appeal in some form or another.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I have always been a great advocate of the rights of private Members, but circumstances vary. ["Oh, oh &#x0021;"] Nobody can say, at any rate, that I do not always say what I think. Now what is the issue to-morrow? Hon. Members opposite talk about this as being a measure which the miners are all craving for. I have been a Member of this House for fifteen or sixteen years, and

it has been brought forward for a good many years, and I have always found that there are two sets of miners; one fighting the other on this question. It is a matter in which the miners themselves are not nearly agreed, and in which the miners of the north are strongly opposed to the views of miners elsewhere. The Government are asking us to get to work on the great question of Army and Navy reform, and I urge the Government to use their full power to put this great subject before us and not waste any more time.

MR. SETON-KARR (St, Helens): I only wish to appeal to the Leader of the House to afford us an opportunity of discussing this Eight Hours Bill.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have no objection to this Eight Hours Bill being discussed, but we must have the time for Supply.

MR. SETON-KARR: I do not wish to suggest that the right hon. Gentleman had any intention of burking this discussion, but that is a construction that may be possibly put upon the action of the Government. If we are going to have a guarantee that this Bill is going to be discussed to-morrow, then it is not necessary to make any further appeal. I also wish to make an appeal to this side of the House, because I do not think that the Government attach much importance to appeals which come from the opposite side of the House. There is this to be said, that as far as Members opposite who have been moving Amendments to the Address are concerned, they do not deserve much consideration. [An HON. MEMBER: What do we come here for?] It is entirely the fault of hon. Members opposite that so much time has been wasted. I think the best and strongest appeal on this question was made by the hon. Member for the Rhondda Valley. Like him I represent a constituency in which this question is one of the deepest interest,

and the hon. Member himself was good enough to come down to my constituency during the last election to try and persuade the miners who sent me here to send somebody else, but he did not succeed. However, upon this question I am with him, and I shall vote for the Bill again,

as I have done before. I wish to support the appeal which has been made in order that we may have a discussion on this Bill. I think that the right hon.

Gentleman; who, I am sure, will not pay much attention to hon. Members on the opposite side of the House; may possibly pay some attention to hon. Members on this side.

\*SIR F. S. POWELL (Wigan): I represent a constituency interested in the coal industry, and I hope, therefore, that the House will allow me to say one word upon this question. My intention is to associate myself with those who are appealing to my right hon. friend to afford them an opportunity for the discussion of this important subject. There may be some difficulty about taking the discussion tomorrow, but I do hope that before this debate ends we shall have some assurance from my right hon. friend that facilities for the discussion of this subject will be given upon a subsequent occasion. Unlike my hon. friend who sits next to me, I do not favour this Bill, but, on the contrary, I am opposed to it; and it is because I am opposed to it that I do not want to appear to stand as a private Member before my constituents charged with having attempted to defeat this Bill by a side wind. That is a position which an hon. Member ought not to occupy, and I do sincerely hope that my right hon. friend will give us an assurance that we shall have an opportunity for a full discussion on this subject. It is a question which most vitally affects the interests of the miners, whatever their opinions may be upon it; and they are greatly divided; and for weal or woe it is one of the largest questions which can occupy the attention of the House of Commons.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): As the representative of a great number of miners, I must raise my voice in support of the appeal which has been made. It is no use delaying this question, because already, in consequence of the action of the party opposite, there is a suspicion amongst the miners in this country that this Bill is always crowded out whenever it can be, and I know that feeling is very widely spreading. I appeal to hon. Members on the opposite side to give their support to this appeal. Even if they are opposed to this Bill, let them at least show the miners that they are not afraid of it coming before the House to be divided upon. Do not let us have it brought against us that this Bill has been prevented from going forward, as it undoubtedly

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Cust, Henry John C.

Howard, Capt. J. (Faversham)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Dalkeith, Earl of

Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel



Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Aird, Sir John  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets, S Geo.  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Jessel, Captain H. Merton  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Dickson, Poynder, Sir John P.  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.  
Arrol, Sir William  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop)  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers  
Kimber, Henry  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Knowles, Lees  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Balcarres, Lord  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Lawson, John Grant  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W(Leeds  
Faber, George Denison  
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. E. H.  
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch  
Fardell, Sir T. George

Lee, Capt. A. H. (Hants. Fareh'm  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r)  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Leighton, Stanley  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Finch, George H.  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B.(Hants  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Beckett, Ernest William  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.  
Bignold, Arthur  
Fitzroy, Hon. E. Algernon  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Bigwood, James  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Lowe, Francis William  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Forster, Henry William  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent  
Bond, Edward  
Garfit, William  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fred  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Gordon, Hon. J. E.(Elgin & Nairn  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison  
Bowles, T. Gibson (King'sLynn  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Macdona, John Cumming

Brassey, Albert  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Goschen, Hon. G. Joachim  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'gh, W  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Ballard, Sir Harry  
Greene, Sir E.W. (B'rySEdm'nds  
Malcolm, Ian  
Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Carlile, William Walter  
Greenfell, William Henry  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Groves, James Grimble  
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh.  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbys.  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Hain, Edward  
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Frederick G.  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G. (Mid'x  
Mitchell, William  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'ndrry  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Chapman, Edward  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Charrington, Spencer

Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Cochrane, Hn. Thomas H. A. E.  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th)  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)  
Coddington, Sir William  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Helder, Augustus  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Henderson, Alexander  
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)  
Colston, C. E. H. Athole  
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.  
Mount, William Arthur  
Cook, Fred. Lucas  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Corbett, A. Cameron(Glasgow)  
Hoare, Edward B.(Hampstead  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute  
Cox, Irwin E. Bainbridge  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightsde  
Myers, William Henry  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Hoult, Joseph  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
will be if the course suggested by the Government is adopted.  
Question put.  
The House divided:;Ayes, 269; Noes, 182. (Division List No. 10.)  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Round, James

Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury  
Russell, T. W.  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Rutherford, John  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Tufnell, Col. Edward  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse  
Valentia, Viscount  
Penn, John  
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles  
Vincent, Col. Sir. E. H. (Sheffield)  
Pilkington, Richard  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E.J.  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H (Renfrew)  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Simeon, Sir Harrington  
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Purvis, Robert  
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)  
Webb, Colonel William George  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tyneside)  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton)  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)  
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.

Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Smith, Hon. W. F.D.(Strand)  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und-Lyne  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Spear, John Ward  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromwich)  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Renwick, George  
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.)  
Richards, Henry Charles  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R(Bath)  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M' Taggart  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.  
Stock, James Henry  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye  
Stroyan, John  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Start, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork N. E.  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Joicey, Sir James  
Abraham, William (Rhondda  
Dillon, John  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Allen, Charles P.(Glouc., Stroud  
Donelan, Captain A.

Joyce, Michael  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Doogan, P. C.  
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth  
Austin, Sir John  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark  
Labouchere, Henry  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Duffy, William J.  
Langley, Batty  
Barlow, John Emmott  
Duncan, James H.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Dunn, Sir Wiliam  
Leese, Sir J. F. (Accrington)  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Elibank, Master of  
Leng, Sir John  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Ellis, John Edward  
Lloyd-George, David  
Bell, Richard  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
Lough, Thomas  
Boland, John  
Evans, Samuel T.  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Boyle, James  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Lundon, W.  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Fenwick, Charles  
MacDonnell Dr. Mark A.  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Brown, G. M. (Edinburgh)  
Ffrench, Peter  
M'Crae, George  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Field, William  
M'Darmott, Patrick  
Burt, Thomus  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
M'Fadden, Edward

Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Flynn, James Christopher  
M'Govern, T.  
Caine, William Sproston  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co)  
M'Hugh, Patrick A.  
Caldwell, James  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Gilhooly, James  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Mather, William  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. J. William  
Cawley, Frederick  
Hammond, John  
Mooney, John J.  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William  
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil  
Murnaghan, George  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Murphy, J.  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Newnes, Sir George  
Crean, Eugene  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Nolan, Col. J. P.(Galway, N.)  
Cremer, William Randal  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Crombie, John William



Helme, Norval Watson  
Norman, Henry  
Cullinan, J.  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Daly, James  
Holland, William Henry  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Horniman, Frederick John  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Delany, William  
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow W.)  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
O'Doherty, William  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo S.)  
Roche, John  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Tully, Jasper  
O'Dowd, John  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Ure, Alexander  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Wallace, Robert  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N.)  
Scott, Charles P. (Leigh)  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
O'Malley, William  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
O'Mara, James  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
White, George (Norfolk)  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Shipman, Dr. John

White, Luke (Yorks, E.R.)  
 O'Shee, James John  
 Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire  
 White, Patrick(Meath, North  
 Paulton, James Mellor  
 Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
 Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
 Philipps, John Wynford  
 Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
 Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
 Pirie, Duncan V.  
 Soares, Ernest J.  
 Williams, Osmond (Merioneth  
 Power, Patrick Joseph  
 Spencer, Rt. Hn. C.R. (Northnts  
 Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid  
 Reddy, M.  
 Stevenson, Francis S.  
 Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)  
 Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
 Sullivan, Donal  
 Wodehouse, Hon. A. (Essex)  
 Redmond, William (Clare)  
 Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
 Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
 Rickett, J. Compton  
 Tennant, Harold John  
 Yoxall, James Henry  
 Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
 Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)  
 Roberts, John H. (Denbighsh.)  
 Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r  
 TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
 Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
 Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings  
 Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. M'Arthur.  
 Robson, William Snowdon  
 Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Cower)  
 Main Question put.  
 The House divided::Ayes, 275: Noes, 184. (Division List No. 11.)  
 AYES.  
 Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
 Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
 FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-  
 Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
 Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm  
Fletcher, Sir Henry  
Aird, Sir John  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r  
Forster, Henry William  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Chapman, Edward  
Garfit, William  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.  
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Coddington, Sir William  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Arrol, Sir William  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Gordon, Maj Evans- (Tr. H'm'l'ts  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Colomb, Sir John C. Ready  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Bagot, Capt. J. FitzRoy  
Colston, Chas. E. H. Athole  
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Cook, Frederick Lucas  
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Balcarres, Lord  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'y.  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J.(Man.)  
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge  
Green, Sir E.W.(B. St. Edm'ds.  
Balfour Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)

Balfour, Maj K.R. (Christch'ch)  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Groves, James Grimble  
Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Hain, Edward  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M.H. (Bristol)  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Beach, Rt. Hn. W.W.B. (Hants.  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rHml'ts, S. Geo.  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G. (Midx  
Beckett, Ernest William  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Hamilton Marq. of (L'nd'nderry  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Bignold, Arthur  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Bigwood, James  
Dimsdale, Sir J. Cockfield  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynem'th.  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Bond, Edward  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Helder, Augustus  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Hermon-Hodge, R. Trotter  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Bowles, T. G. (King'sLynn)

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)  
Brassey, Albert  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Elliot, Hon. A. R. Douglas  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Faber, George Denison  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside  
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edwd.  
Hoult, Joseph  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manch.  
Howard, Capt J (Kent, Faversh.  
Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham  
Carlile, William Walter  
Finch, George H.  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick  
Cavendish, V. C.W. (Derbysh.)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Mount, William Arthur  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.

Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)  
Keswick, William  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Smith, H. C. (Northum, Tynesd.  
Kimber, Henry  
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G.(Bute)  
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)  
Knowles, Lees  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Myers, William Henry  
Spear, John Ward  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Spencer, Ernest (W. Bromw'ch  
Lawson, John Grant  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk  
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H.  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)  
Lee, Capt A.H. (Hants, Fareham  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Leage, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart  
Leigh Bennett, Henry Currie  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir J. M.  
Leighton, Stanley  
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlingtn  
Stock, James Henry  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Penn, John  
Stroyan, John  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Percy, Earl  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham  
Pilkington, Richard  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

Loug, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Lowe, Francis William  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Tufnell, Col. Edward  
Lloyd, Archie Kirkman  
Purvis, Robert  
Valentia, Viscount  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E. H. (Sheffield  
Lucas, Reginald. J. (Portsmouth  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. A. V. G. Ellison  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Macdonald, John Cumming  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.  
Renwick, George  
Wason, John C. (Orkney)  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb., W.  
Richards, Henry Charles  
Webb, Col. William George  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Staleybridge  
Welby, Lt-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton  
Malcolm, Ian

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green  
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L)  
Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Maxwell, W.J.H. (Dumfriessh.)  
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Milner, Rt. Hn. Sir Fredk. G.  
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.  
Milton, Viscount  
Round, James  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C.B. Stuart-  
Mitchell, William  
Russell, T. W.  
Wylie, Alexander  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Rutherford, John  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
More, Rt. Jasper (Shropshire)  
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst.  
Saunderson, Rt. Hon. Col. E. J.  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh.  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N.E.)  
Caine, William Sproston  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)



Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Caldwell, James  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Dillon, John  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Austin, Sir John  
Carvill, Patrick G. Hamilton  
Doogan, P. C.  
Bain, Col. James Robert  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)  
Barlow, John Emmott  
Cawley, Frederick  
Duffy, William J.  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Duncan, James H.  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Dunn, Sir William  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Elibank, Master of  
Bell, Richard  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Ellis, John Edward  
Boland, John  
Crean, Eugene  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Cremer, William Randal  
Evans, Samuel T.  
Boyle, James  
Crombie, John William  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.  
Cullinan, J.  
Fenwick, Charles  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Daly, James  
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)  
Brown, G. M. (Edinburgh)

Dalziel, James Henry  
Ffrench, Peter  
Burk, E. Haviland-  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Field, William  
Burt, Thomas  
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Delany, William  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
M'Hugh, Patrick A.  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Gilhooly, James  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Roche, John  
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert John  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Mather, William  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Hammond, John  
Mooney, John J.  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William  
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)  
Seton Karr, Henry  
Hardie, J. Kier (Merthyr Tydvil  
Moulton, John Fletcher  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Murnaghan, George  
Shipman, Dr. John  
Hatch, Ernest Frederick Geo.  
Murphy, J.  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Nannetti, Joseph P.

Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Hayne, Rt-Hon. Charles Seale-  
Newnes, Sir (George  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants)-  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
Norman, Henry  
Sullivan, Donal  
Henderson, Alexander  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Holland, William Henry  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Tennant, Harold John  
Horniman, Frederick John  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid)  
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings  
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)  
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower  
Joicey, Sir James  
O'Doherty, William  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Tully, Jasper  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Ure, Alexander  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Dowd, John  
Wallace, Robert  
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

Labouchere, Henry  
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)  
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.  
Langley, Batty  
O'Malley, William  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Leamy, Edmund  
O'Mara, James  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North  
Leng, Sir John  
O'Shee, James John  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Lloyd-George, David  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Lough, Thomas  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Williams, O. (Merioneth)  
Lundon, W.  
Pirie, Duncan V.  
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid>  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Reddy, M.  
Wodehouse, Hn. A. (Essex)  
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall  
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
M'Crae, George  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Rickett, J. Compton  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
M'Fadden, Edward  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Mr. Yoxall and Mr. Jacoby.  
M'Govern, T.  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Ordered, That Government business have precedence this day and to-morrow of all  
other business.  
NEW BILLS.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Cathcart Wason, Sir William Arrol, Mr. Alexander Cross, Mr. Harmsworth, Mr. Nicol, Mr. Weir, and Mr. Leveson-Gower.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 8th May, and to be printed. [Bill 68.]

#### POOR LAW SUPERANNUATION (IRELAND).

Bill to provide for Superannuation Allowances to certain local officers and servants in Ireland, and for contributions towards such allowances by such officers and servants, and to make other relative provisions, ordered to be brought in by Mr. O'Malley, Sir James Haslett, Mr. Harrington. Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Clancy, Mr. James O'Connor, and Mr. Cogan.

#### POOR LAW SUPERANNUATION (IRELAND) BILL.

"To provide for Superannuation Allowances to certain local Officers and Servants in Ireland, and for contributions towards such Allowances by such Officers and Servants, and to make other relative provisions," presented, and read the First time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 6th March, and to be printed. [Bill 69.]

#### LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) ACT (1854) AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act, 1854, ordered to be brought in by Mr. M'Crae, Mr. Bryce, Sir John Leng, Sir William Dunn, Mr. T. W. Russell, Mr. Colville, Mr. Wason, and Mr. Robert Wallace.

#### LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) ACT (1854) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Lands Valuation (Scotland) Act, 1854," presented, and read the First time; to be read a Second time upon Wednesday, 25th April, and to be printed. [Bill 70.]

#### ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS MAJESTY'S MOST GRACIOUS SPEECH.

#### [NINTH DAY'S DEBATE.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [14th February],

"That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth;

"Most Gracious Sovereign,

"We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.";(Mr. Forster.)

Question again proposed.

#### CONDUCT OF THE WAR IN SOUTH AFRICA

\*MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Mr. Speaker, last night I was engaged in describing the scenes which are at the present moment being enacted at Standerton, in the Transvaal, in the rear of French's army, where, according to the telegrams, there are long convoys arriving of women and children prisoners of war; and we read this morning in the Telegraph that General French has failed to capture Botha and his army, notwithstanding the great flourish of trumpets as to what he was going to do. But we may, I suppose, take comfort from the fact that if he

has not captured the Boer in the field, he has, at all events, taken wagon loads of women and children, and carried them off triumphantly as prisoners of war. It was the custom in the days of the Roman Empire to drag captive women and children at the heels of the conqueror, but since the fall of the Roman Empire I have never heard that any civilised nation has ever reverted to so barbarous a practice as capturing women and children by the thousand and detaining them as prisoners of war. But as there are some other matters which I must deal with in detail, I shall not consume the time of the House by giving now the heartbreaking details which I have in my possession of the condition of the women and children who are now shut up in the prison camps at Port Elizabeth, Pietermaritzburg, and other portions of the colony. We read in the accounts which reach us of eight and ten women being put into one tent; of children ill of measles (which is raging in the camp at Pietermaritzburg, according to the latest account) without accommodation for the treatment of these unfortunate children or proper attendance. We have read the tragic and horrible story of the death of young James Hertzog, a nephew or son of Judge Hertzog, who is at present in command of the western commando that has invaded Cape Colony. How his wife and children were torn from the blazing home, and when the local doctor told the British officers who were in charge that this poor boy, only eight years of age, was suffering from measles and quite unfit to travel, no quarter was offered, no delay was granted, and this boy and his wretched mother were placed on board a train for Port Elizabeth and sent a 600 miles journey, the immediate result of which was that no sooner did he reach the prison camp at Port Elizabeth than he was attacked with pneumonia and died in a few days. What do you think were the feelings of his kindred when they read the announcement of his death; "Died on a certain date, a prisoner of war at Port Elizabeth, Hertzog, aged eight years"? A pretty announcement to come as a result of the operations of your arms in South Africa;#x0021;

But I pass over these details to the fact, which was only obtained by the process of squeezing Ministers, the shameful fact admitted by the Secretary of State for War to-day, that in the prison camps and so-called refugee camps of the Orange Free State the women and children of those who are out on commando, and who declined to surrender, are put on half rations and informed that they will be kept on that allowance until their husbands or brothers come in and surrender. Is there any parallel for the cruelty and meanness of that in the whole history of war? For my part I never read of any proceedings so mean and cruel and so cowardly; to endeavour to overcome these men; whom you cannot, although you are ten to one, beat in the field; to seek to force and intimidate them into surrender by starving their women and children. What did the right hon. Gentleman do the other day when this charge was made by the hon. Member for Carnarvon?; it is no wonder we have to continually press for information; he sprang to his feet quivering with excitement and indignation and said the hon. Gentleman was making a foul charge without any attempt at proof. Well, I waited for the speech of the Secretary of State for War, and I remarked the significant fact that he never alluded to this charge. I expected him to telegraph, and I was surprised that he did not. He was willing to telegraph

about Esau's case, but he left the House of Commons under the impression that this was an unfounded and foul charge made by the Member for Carnarvon without a shred of evidence; and if it had not been for the question put to-day he would have allowed this debate to close leaving the House under the impression that there was no foundation for it. It is a foul charge, undoubtedly, but it is a true charge, and the right hon. Gentleman was obliged to get up at the Table and admit that it was true. This is the policy of Sicilian and Greek brigands. Brigands in Italy and Greece are in the habit of taking women and children prisoners, and then they threaten to cut off their ears and noses in their desire to have their relatives come forward to ransom them. Yes, I say that I see no difference except in degree between that policy and the policy carried out in this case. When hon. Members call into question the burning of farms, what is the reply? It is said that if it be good policy to end the war, then whatever tends to bring the war to a speedy conclusion is good policy. Would it be good to send news to the burghers that the noses and ears of their people would be cut off unless they come in and surrender? I say that I see no difference except in degree between doing that and letting them know that their wives and children would be half starved until they surrender, and yet a large body of the press of this country says that no act of cruelty would be wrong if it tended to put an end to the war. It is a most extraordinary state of things. It has been admitted by hon. Gentlemen opposite, in the course of what took place here last night, that a policy of devastation, of carrying fire and sword through these countries, was justifiable, not on the ground that you are dealing with treachery, but to make those countries uninhabitable to the enemy. I denounce that as an outrage on the usages of war as recognised to-day by every civilised country throughout the world. [Laughter.] Hon. Members opposite laugh, although we have the opinion of Europe and America upon our side, and it is admitted that this policy of starving women and children is adopted and as I understand, approved, by the Secretary of State for War, in the hope that it may tend to bring the war to a close. Let me describe this policy as regards women, and in the words of an English newspaper, which puts it more strongly than I can undertake to do myself. Now I am entitled to use these words, because they are the words of an organ which I regret to say is representative of a large mass of public opinion in this country. Writing in November last it says;

"When commenting some little time ago on the turn of the war, we pointed out that it would be more business-like on our part to adopt the policy of General Weyler in Cuba-Lord Roberts has come round to our view."

That is exactly what I say Lord Roberts has done. He is following in the steps of General Weyler, and it is only two years ago that this House and the civilised world was ringing with denunciations of that general's cruelty in Cuba; and there is this difference, that he was dealing with a rebellion, and fighting against rebels who had kept up the rebellion for two years, and had for a long time outraged the usages of civilised war, whilst you are dealing with two independent States, who from the beginning and down to this hour have observed with scrupulous fidelity the usages of war. Yet

you have followed in Weyler's footsteps, and, in fact, you have improved upon his example. Here is another passage which shows the object which the paper had in view;

"Besides [says the paper] the Boers in arms will naturally treat all those who are bound to aid us as traitors, and coercion will be set against coercion. In such cases the women and children are frequently employed to carry messages, and of course they must be included in the military measures and transported or despatched."

These are significant words, and I heard no voice of condemnation raised against them when they were used. They are found in the St. James's Gazette, which is accepted by many men as a reputable newspaper. That is the policy that has been advocated. It is a policy which the Government in this House were ashamed to admit. It is a policy with regard to which, in December last, the Secretary for the Colonies equivocated and left us under the impression that no such policy was in force, and which until yesterday, in fact until to-night, was denied. Yet it is a policy that many journalists in this country have advocated, and which has been practised in South Africa for nearly six months.

Up to this, Mr. Speaker, I have based my case upon the testimony of Englishmen and English newspapers; but I maintain that although you have control of the cable, and although you have the hand of your military censors upon every channel of communication from South Africa, that the men who are fighting you are honourable and civilised men, and that they too have a right to make their voices heard before civilised mankind. Now here is the last solemn statement made by Do Wet and Steyn. I know hon. Members will laugh at their names; but I venture to say that their names and those of Delarey and Louis Botha will be honoured long after the names of your generals have disappeared in oblivion. What do they say in their proclamation? Here is their solemn protest against the way in which this war is being conducted;

"Our enemy [they say] has armed Kaffirs and natives, and made use of them against us

in war. He has been continually busy capturing women and children, old and sickly men. Many women's deaths have been occasioned because the so-called Christian enemy had no consideration for women on a sick bed, or those whose state of health should have protected them against rough treatment."

It is a horrible fact, and one that cannot be denied, that on many occasions you have torn sick women from their beds ;women in such a condition as to make a man's heart bleed if he had a heart in his breast;women who have given birth to children in the cattle trucks on which you were dragging them away.

"The property of prisoners and the killed burghers have not been respected by the enemy. In many instances the mother and the father are taken from the house, and the children are left to their fate. The world is told by the enemy that he was obliged to carry this out, because our burghers were interfering with the lines of communication. Nearly all the houses in the two Republics were subsequently destroyed, whether they were near the railway lines or not, while with regard to the misuse of the white Hag, that is a contention put forward for the purpose of heaping upon us a calumny against which the Afrikaner is



striving since God first brought him into contact with the Englishman. Bobbing his opponent of his goods and property is not sufficient for the enemy. He will not rest satisfied till he has robbed us of our good name also."

I believe those words are absolutely and substantially true and represent the truth of the policy you are carrying out in South Africa. I was reading the other day words which I must say made a deep impression upon me, written by a man who is, to my mind at all events, one of the greatest of living poets.

Writing on these events he wrote;

"Blind from the first, blind to the end,  
Blind to all signs that ask men's gaze,  
In vain by lips of foe or friend

The world cries shame upon your ways.

"Fulfil your mission; spoil and burn;

Fling forth the helpless; babes as well,

And let the children's children learn

To hate you with the hate of hell.'

Those are not the words of an Irish Nationalist, but the words of the first living English poet of the day. [Cries of "Who, who?"] Who? why, William Watson.

Have you never heard the name? [A VOICE from the Irish benches: Why, you do not even know your own great men &#x0021;]

Well, Sir. I turn now from this subject; this painful and humiliating subject; to another aspect of the war, which is full of mystery and sinister significance, and that is the charge made against Lord Kitchener, for which, while I am prepared to admit there is not complete evidence, I say there is sufficient evidence to demand from you an immediate, serious and searching investigation.

["Hear, hear &#x0021;"] What is this charge? It is that Lord Kitchener has recently in the Transvaal repeated what he is alleged to have done on the eve of Omdurman; namely, that he conveyed to his officers secret instructions to take no prisoners. I will state the case frankly, and I claim that the evidence in support of the charge is sufficient to require the closest investigation. First of all, let me say that this charge has been made, as I shall show, in an anonymous letter, but it is confirmed by the letters of two or three soldiers whose names I shall give, and who state in published letters that in accordance with the instructions they received they killed the wounded Boers and refused quarter. I wish to say, however, that this charge has been denied by Lord Kitchener himself, and also by the Secretary of State for War in this House; but the denial has been made by both in very extraordinary language. It was easy to them to treat these charges with contempt, and say they were unworthy to be taken notice of, but they did not adopt that course. They published a categorical denial of the charge, and it is remarkable that in the case both of Lord Kitchener and of the Secretary of State for War they do not deny the precise charges as made, but other charges that were never made. What was the denial, let me ask? Here are Lord Kitchener's words, telegraphed by him to the Attorney General at Cape Town;

"Instructions of the nature mentioned were never given or thought of. We treat the enemy surrendered with every consideration."

That is Lord Kitchener's denial. The Secretary of State for War most indignantly denied the charge, and said that Lord Kitchener had never given orders or ever intended to slaughter the prisoners in his possession. But that charge was never made. Before he could slaughter his prisoners he should capture them alive. The real charge made is that private instructions were issued to take no prisoners.

That charge was first

published in a letter in the Freeman's Journal, Dublin, and the second letter from the same officer was published by Mr. Stead. ["Oh &#x0021;"and "Hear, hear &#x0021;"] Hon. Gentlemen groan about that. Lord Roberts takes a totally different view of Mr. Stead, as you will see. Here is the extract from the officer's letter;

"The orders in this district from Lord Kitchener are to burn and destroy all provisions, forage, etc., and seize cattle, horses, and stock of all sorts, wherever found, and to leave no food in the houses for the inhabitants. This applies to houses occupied by women and children only. And the word has been passed round privately that no prisoners are to be taken; that is, all the men found fighting are to be shot. This order was given to me personally by a general, one of the highest in rank in South Africa. So there is no mistake about it. The instructions given to the columns closing round De Wet north of the Orange River are that all men are to be shot, so that no tales may be told; also the troops are told to loot freely from every house, whether the men belonging to the house are fighting or not. You may imagine what this order will lead to in many instances, though, to do justice to the soldiers, I do not think they will in most cases go so far as some of their superiors would wish. I do not believe the soldiers or junior officers will carry out the intentions of their seniors, but in a great majority of cases outrages of all sorts will be committed under such a &#x00E9;gime."

Mr. Stead sent that letter to Lord Roberts, asking him for a contradiction, or a statement with reference to it, and Lord Roberts wrote to Mr. Stead the following most remarkable reply;

"I readily accept your statement that this officer is a man of good standing and undoubted repute";

I must confess when I read that letter of Lord Roberts's it added enormous additional weight to the officer's letter;

"and, accepting that statement, I am willing to notice what I should otherwise have ignored ;an anonymous letter."

I contend that that adds great weight to the evidence, because hon. Members opposite, or a great many of them, have a very hearty dislike of Mr. Stead, but Lord Roberts, who has known Mr. Stead for a long time, takes his word that this is a genuine letter from an officer serving in the Army. It entitles me to say that that adds considerable weight to the matter. So much for that letter.

Now I come to the next piece of evidence, and you will take it for what it is worth. It is a letter signed by William Clyne, of the Liverpool Regiment, which was published in the Liverpool Courier. It contains this statement;

"Lord Kitchener has issued orders that no man has to bring in any Boer prisoners; if he does he has to give him half his rations for the prisoner's

keep. Lord Roberts was too lenient with the Boers. De Wet sent in to General Knox asking for an armistice. Lord Kitchener told General Knox to keep on shelling him while he brought up reinforcements. That was the armistice he got. I turn to a letter from Private John Harris, of the Royal Welsh Regiment, published in the Wolverhampton Express and Star, which states; "We take no prisoners now. &#x2026; There happened to be a few wounded Boers left. We put them through the mill. Every one was killed."

I give these letters for what they are worth. I wish to be perfectly frank in this matter, and not to put my evidence stronger than it is.

I come now to what I must confess influenced my mind more than anything else in this whole matter. When I first heard of it, I confess I did not believe that there was any foundation for this charge. What affected my mind more than anything else were the comments of the English press on the charge.

[Interruption.] Hon. Members will perhaps be a little more patient with me for stating the evidence in a calm and frank manner to the House. They treat the subject as if I were making the most atrocious charges. [Interruption.] Yes, but wait one moment, and hear what your own newspapers said. The Pall Mall Gazette, alluding to that officer's letter in the Freeman's Journal, used this language;"We wish we could believe it." The Birmingham Gazette, writing a short time before, used this language;

"The Boers cannot regain what they have lost, and as the most absolute assurances of fair treatment have been given to them we have a right to ask for their surrender, and failing that, to treat them as mere wanton marauders and murderers, who must be exterminated in order that the lives of our soldiers may be spared, and so that the people of the Transvaal, who are quite ready to accept British Rule, or who were driven out of their homes when Mr. Kruger declared war, may resume their ordinary avocations."

The Daily Telegraph of London is a great journal, and it used this language; "It will probably be found that these sullen malcontents will go on lighting so long

as they have a bullet in their bandoliers, I on the off-chance of slaying one of their conquerors, unless the British authorities make it clear that all caught with arms in their hands I will be shot without mercy. The Germans had no compunction in so dealing with the Franks Tirsurs, and their severity did much to shorten the war. We shall hope to see the same measures adopted in South Africa unless the various forces now patrolling the two conquered territories met with immediate success. A few such engagements as that which is reported near Vryheid, in which Bethune's Mounted Infantry are said to have killed sixty of the enemy, would speedily dishearten the marauders, and the proclamation of a specific date after which every armed burgher should be treated as a rebel and shot would be productive of nothing but good."

What is the use of hon. Members opposite denouncing me as a traducer and a coiner of outrageous charges in the face of these statements from leading newspapers of Great Britain? And here I come at last to the respectable Standard. I don't know how they turned this war into a rebellion, or at what stage. It stated;

"In every rebellion a point is reached at which the services of the Provost Marshal become more effective than those of the strategist. The prompt and ruthless punishment of every insurgent burgher caught in delicto is required. We cannot keep a troop of horse outside each Boer farm, but we can show its occupant that he risks something more than his freedom, or even his property, when he takes up arms against the Crown."

I say therefore that each and all of these journals have advocated this policy. There are many other circumstances which are most mysterious and most sinister and disquieting about this whole-business. Lord Kitchener, it will be remembered, assembled a meeting of burghers at Pretoria on 21st December, and I am surprised that the speech then made by Lord Kitchener has attracted so little attention in this country. No doubt we have not had a full report of that speech, but it was a very extraordinary speech, and it certainly has gone a long way towards making me feel exceedingly uneasy with reference to this policy of "no quarter." Lord Kitchener, addressing the burghers, said he was going to adopt for a short time a policy of conciliation. He referred to Mr. Chamberlain's statement in the House of Commons. He mentioned that as the cause for adopting a policy of conciliation which was for the time being to suspend devastation. He stated that orders had been issued that for the time being farms should not continue to be burned. He concluded with these words;

"He desired to give them every chance to surrender voluntarily and finish the war by the most humane means possible. If the conciliatory method he was now adopting failed, he had other means which he would be obliged to exercise. He would give the committee notice if the time had arrived to consider conciliation a failure."

Now what are the other means? I think we are entitled to demand and to insist upon the Government telling us what are these other means. They cannot have been the policy of devastating and burning, because that has been carried out to such an extent that the whole country was nearly turned into a desert. They cannot have been the policy of refuge in prison camps, because that was in full force. It was "other means," and I want to know what are the other means. I have failed to imagine any other means. But Lord Kitchener is a man who would not use such an expression unless he had some means present to his mind. When I read these words they had to me a most sinister meaning, and I read them in conjunction with that very extraordinary expression; an explanation of which ought to have been demanded in the debate in December last; used by the Colonial Secretary himself. The language which was used in what was called his conciliatory speech was;

"Since the proclamation was ordered no doubt the situation has to a certain extent changed, because the position of the British forces is certainly much stronger than it was at that time, that is to say, although there is still all this skirmishing going on, regular warfare has practically ceased. Therefore it is open to the General now in command to reconsider his position and substitute other punishments if he thinks it right to do so."

Now that is most sinister. What right has any man to import the word

"punishment" into this matter? This is a war, and not a rebellion. I say the use of that expression "substitute other punishments" against your enemy was a most sinister and dangerous expression to use. You have no right to punish these men. They have as much right to fight in the field as you have. I put it at the lowest, and I say the word

"punishment" ought not to be uttered by the lips of any man in a general sense in connection with this war. No one can contend that the punishment in this case was narrowly applied to acts of treachery or breaches of the usages of war. No general expression from statesmen is needed to deal with such cases. Acts of treachery, whether on your side or on the side of the Boers, fall to be dealt with in the ordinary way by the laws of war, and no man of sense would complain or find fault with you on the one side or the Boers on the other for punishing such acts. No one would complain of the Boers shooting spies, even when they come in the form of peace envoys, or of your men doing the same if the Boers abuse the white flag. I say no man would complain of fair play in such matters. But this was an expression of general policy applying to the whole population in arms against you.

Here is another, and this is the last piece of evidence I will read to the House. ["Hear, hear."] I think this is a very important subject, and I do not see any reason why it should be curtailed. It comes from a gentleman whose communications I read with very great interest, because I believe they are written by a very clever man. I do not know his name. He is the Johannesburg correspondent of the Pall Mall Gazette, and I have not the least doubt from reading the communications that he gives what is the predominating feeling of the Uitlanders still there. He says;

"It seems an ungracious thing to say after his masterly conduct of the war up to the fall of Pretoria, but the truth cannot be hidden that Lord Roberts outstayed his welcome. There is a consensus of opinion, from the military officer to the man in the street, that unless stringent measures are taken peace will not reign in this country for twelve months to come, and the methods of Lord Roberts were not calculated to bring matters to a speedy issue. We have now reached a crisis when it becomes absolutely necessary to entrust the final touches of the campaign to a man whose personal feelings of pity and compassion are subsidiary to a stern determination to finish, the war at all costs."

These words show the public opinion of the Uitlander population in Johannesburg. According to the opinion of that gentleman, and also of, I have no doubt, many military officers, they were

tired of Lord Roberts and of his methods as too mild; they demanded more stringent methods; and I leave it to the imagination of hon. Members what these sterner methods are to be. I maintain that there is a case, and a strong case, for inquiry into this matter. I maintain that we are entitled to know whether there is any foundation for these sinister remarks, which have come from English channels, and not from Irish or foreign channels. I maintain that we are entitled to obtain from the Government an explanation of what was meant by the Colonial Secretary when he spoke of "other punishment," and what was in the mind of Lord Kitchener when he addressed the burghers in December last and said that

if conciliation did not come very soon he would be obliged to use other methods he had at his disposal. Let me refer once more to Lord Roberts. This thing has been treated as if it were the wildest absurdity to make such charges against British generals, but it is not. I have proved them out of your own newspapers. I shall now prove them out of the mouth of Lord Roberts himself. In the month of June last Lord Roberts issued this Proclamation No. 15, dated Johannesburg, June 1st, 1900;

"I do hereby warn all inhabitants of the Orange Free State, who after fourteen days from the day of this proclamation may be found in arms against Her Majesty, within the said Colony, that they will be liable to be dealt with as rebels and to suffer in person and property accordingly."

[Cheers.] And hon. Members opposite cheer that &#x0021; Was there ever such inconsistency? Hon. Members opposite cheer that after they denounce me a few moments before for making baseless charges. What is the meaning of being treated as rebels and suffering in person and property? A rebel is liable to execution.

[An HON. MEMBER: Not all] Not all. They are at the mercy of the General. Either Lord Roberts did not mean anything by that, or else he meant that he would treat these men; who have all the rights of belligerents, just as if you were fighting any great European Power; that he would treat them as rebels. What happened? I put a question here as soon as that was telegraphed, and I believe the Colonial Secretary telegraphed to the Orange Free State, and about two months afterwards that proclamation was withdrawn. Like Bruce Hamilton's, it was felt to be rather strong for the House of Commons stomach, but it remains on record as one of the most disgraceful proclamations that have ever been issued, showing the intention on the part of Lord Roberts to do an act which would have brought down upon his and your name the universal condemnation of all civilised mankind.

I pass over a number of charges made in the course of this debate against the Boers by hon. Members opposite. I shall take another opportunity of dealing with them later. I brand them now as absolutely untrue and calumnious. The statement that the Boers have systematically abused the white flag is, I say, a base and cowardly libel. One hon. Member opposite; the Member for the Tottenham Division of Middlesex; got up and said the Boers had got a different code of honour, and he was backed up by the Financial Secretary to the War Office, whom I was astonished to hear making such a charge. He did not state of his own knowledge that he had experience of the abuse of the white flag by the Boers, but he indicted the whole race; in the words of Edmund Burke, he indicted the whole nation, with having a different code of honour from the people of this country.

Sir, I think that is a monstrous charge, and one also absolutely without foundation. When we are dealing with this question of codes of honour let me draw attention to one case. There may be dishonour on more sides than one, and I am not here to say that none of the Boers ever did a dishonourable or treacherous act, but I am confident that if the question is examined on both sides the Boers will come as well out of it, at least, as your side. I direct your attention to the story of Surgeon-Captain Fiset, a French-Canadian officer, who was in the Transvaal. Here is his story as to his code of honour and the

code of honour of that humane man, General Bruce Hamilton. He says; "I was left ill at Heilbron; two hours later the Boers came into the place. One of their patrols came into the hospital and, despite my protests that I was a medical officer, searched my clothes, removing my purse and private papers. &#x2026; General Olivier came after to the hospital and asked if I had any complaints to make. I said, as a medical officer, he had no right to make me a prisoner. He replied he had a right to make prisoners, and had been informed an officer of the hospital had been given despatches. I said, if he thought I had despatches he could search me, but he could not be very shrewd if he thought General Hamilton would give despatches to a medical officer who had no right to take them. I was angry and spoke sharply. Fortunately he did not search me; had he done so he would have found the despatches he was looking for between my undershirt and my body."

[An HON. MEMBER: Good man.] An hon. Member says "Good man." Is that your code of honour?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order &#x0021; The hon. Member must address himself to the Chair.

\*MR. DILLON: Yes; I ask you, Mr. Speaker, respectfully, is that the hon. Member's code of honour? All I can say is, that if it is I congratulate the Boers upon having a very different code. This gentleman goes on; 'They had been given to me by General Hamilton to take to Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener, and I had been instructed to hand them over as soon as I reached the main column. Early next day my purse, horse, and saddle were returned to me with the General's compliments.'

The only other case that I will allude to in relation to these charges against the Boers is the charge of the murder of Esau. I wish to call attention to the fact that the right hon. Gentleman based this charge on Reuter. When we base statements upon Reuter we are howled at, but when a Minister does it, and not merely does it, but does it without mentioning that he is doing it, the case is regarded as very different. He made a statement, and we were entitled to assume, unless he had mentioned the authority on which he relied, that he is basing his statement upon official information. The right hon. Gentleman gave the most horrible details of the murder of Esau. He read a telegram from Sir Alfred Milner, and I noticed that there was no reference to the details which had been previously given, but, assuming all that is said about the killing of Esau to be true, what about the murder of Dolly? What about your officer Cox who murdered Dolly in cold blood, and about whose case there is no controversy and no doubt, for he admitted all he did in a court of law? And your officers declined to prosecute. If ever there was a cold-blooded murder it was the murder of Dolly. There ought to be some measure or balance in these charges. It is impossible that a great war could be conducted for a year without some acts of cruelty on either side. The question is, can you adduce a single shred of evidence to show that your record in treachery, cruelty and ferocity is less than that of the Boers? For my part, I think the balance goes entirely the other way.

I now come to the second part of my Amendment, which asks the House to declare

that it is the duty of the Government to take steps to bring this miserable war to an end by offering the Governments of the two Republics such terms of peace as brave and honourable men under all the circumstances might be expected to entertain. It may be asked what I mean by "such terms of peace." I have deliberately abstained from putting into the Amendment any details as to the exact terms which should be offered, because I hope there will go into the lobby, in favour of offering terms of peace, many Members who might differ as to the precise nature of those terms. But the essence of the Amendment is that definite terms of peace should, in the eyes of the civilised world, be offered to the responsible leaders and governors of the two States. That is a clear issue between my Amendment and the policy of the Government. Ever since May last, when Presidents Kruger and Steyn addressed themselves to Lord Salisbury, after the colonies had been cleared of the invaders, and asked for negotiations, the attitude of the Government has been one of refusal to consider any terms with the responsible leaders of the forces in the field. Can any Member quote a single precedent in the history of Europe during the past century for such action? Is there a single case in the comity of civilised nations, or wherever white races are gathered together in organised States, in which war has been waged between two independent States, where the victor in the hour of his victory has declined to enter into any negotiations with the Government of the vanquished? No such thing has ever been done before. What would have been said of Germany if, after Sedan, when they had not only the army of their enemy in their possession, but the whole of the machinery of Government and the head of the State; which you have not got in regard to South Africa; they had declined to hold any communication with the new Government set up in France? All civilisation would have cried shame upon Germany. But Germany did not attempt anything of the kind. It is idle, in support of your position, to say there are no Governments. There is just as much a Government to-day in the Transvaal as there was in France after Sedan. I assert that you can never have peace in South Africa until you negotiate with the Government of these two States. You may, I dare say you will, I have no doubt you will, by calling out reinforcements and continuing the war at ruinous expense wear down the resistance of the Boers. You may break up their main bodies and disarm them; you may have a cessation of hostilities until another opportunity occurs, but until you come to some arrangement with the responsible and trusted leaders of the people you will never get a permanent peace.

What is the position taken up by the Government? When pressed on this question the other day they said, "True, we will not negotiate with the Governments; our terms with the Governments and the leaders are unconditional surrender, but Lord Roberts and General Buller have always been most anxious to meet the enemy in every way, to open the door for surrender and to make the way easy." I deny that. I go further. I say a most extraordinary and unhappy attempt has been made to keep the House of Commons in the dark on this subject. Wherever the responsibility lies it has been singularly unfortunate. What happened here the other night? The Financial Secretary to the War Office got up mainly for the purpose of elucidating this particular point, and of assuring the House that



Lord Roberts had done everything in his power to promote a meeting with General Botha. I am the last man in the House to seek to make a charge against the Financial Secretary. I have always found him honourable and kindly to his opponents, but I do say that in this instance, I have no doubt through being misinformed, he grossly misled the House of Commons. This is what the Financial Secretary said;

"On the 8th June a verbal message was brought from Louis Botha requesting an interview with Lord Roberts. Lord Roberts answered the letter in his own hand consenting to an interview between the outposts, but Botha's answer was not satisfactory in that he would not agree to the terms on which they were to meet. I myself have not seen the actual letter, but I believe Botha stated that he did not mean to consider any terms unless independence was assured."

I got up amid much interruption and asked whether he would lay Papers giving full details of what passed. He did lay Papers; and what is the result? There is not a single word of truth in that statement; on the contrary, it is in every detail absolutely the reverse of what occurred. Why was the House of Commons kept in the dark as to this correspondence? Papers have been laid again and again since this correspondence passed, but no Papers in connection with South Africa during the past two years have been laid which were of greater importance or interest to the country than this correspondence which was suppressed and intended to be withheld from the House of Commons, but for the fact that I interrupted the hon. Gentleman. What really happened? On the 12th June Lord Roberts wrote the following letter to General Botha;

"Your Honour,;I address these few lines in the hope that they may have the effect of inducing your Honour, in the cause of humanity, to refrain from further resistance. The British force under my command so greatly exceeds the Boer army in number that, although the war may be prolonged for a few more weeks, there can be but one result. After the gallant struggle your Honour and the force under your command have made, there can be no question of loss of honour should you decide to accept the counsel I now venture to plotter."

First of all, there is not a suggestion in that letter of any verbal message coming to Lord Roberts. It is perfectly manifest on the face of the communication that that letter was sent on the initiative of Lord Roberts. In the second place, could anything more instructive, interesting, or wonderful be imagined than the commentary supplied by this letter on the condition of mind of Lord Roberts, for it is evident from this letter that he was under the impression that the war

was sure to end in two or three weeks, even if the Boers did their best. It is no wonder that Lord Kitchener had to criticise the arrangements of the Army after Lord Roberts left. Here is General Botha's reply to that letter;

"Your Excellency,;In answer to your letter of yesterday wherein your Excellency advises me, in the interests of humanity, not to continue this strife any longer to your Army as your force exceeds ours so greatly in numbers, I wish to give your Excellency the assurance that the subject is receiving my serious consideration. However, for the purpose of arriving at a decision, it is not only absolutely necessary for me to call a General Council of War of my officers

and to consult them, but above all it is necessary for me to consider the subject with my Government. I trust that for the sake of humanity your Excellency will give me the opportunity for such consideration and consultation.

"As some of my officers are near the Natal border, and I am also a long way separate from my Government, this will require some time. I ask your Excellency kindly, therefore, for an armistice for six days, beginning from to-morrow morning at sunrise, during which time no forward movement will be made on either side within the territory of the South African Republic.

"I would very much like to receive from your Excellency to-day an answer to your request, and if possible by the agent who is taking this letter."

Lord Roberts replies refusing the armistice requested. ["Read, read&#x0021;"]

For the moment, all I have to say is that that is not the account given to the House of Commons; it is the very reverse. We were told by the Financial Secretary that the ground on which the meeting did not take place was that Louis Botha wrote to say that he would not consider any terms unless independence was assured. There is not a line of justification for that statement; there is not a word of truth in it. Lord Roberts offered a modified form of armistice, and Louis Botha then replies;

"Your Excellency, ;In answer to your letter, dated 14th June, just received by me, wherein your Excellency consents to an armistice for five days, but with the reservation of the right to your Excellency to move your army in all directions within the South African Republic, except east of Elands River station and north of the Volksrust-Johannesburg Railway line, I must, to my great regret, inform your Excellency that this reservation makes it impossible for me to accept this armistice, which I have so much desired."

From beginning to end there is not one word about terms. Botha was willing to come to the meeting with no preliminary conditions, and to discuss the subject with an open mind. It is infamous that that fact should have been held back from the knowledge of the country, and the House of Commons and the public deliberately deceived in the interests of that section of Gentlemen opposite and of some of those who cheered when I said Lord Roberts refused the armistice, and in the interests of those for whom The Times speaks when before and ever since the war began it has raised a howl whenever there was a prospect of peace or negotiation. There is a faction in this country and in South Africa who have engineered and brought about this war for vile and selfish interests, and that faction have stood in the path of peace from the day the first shot was fired until this hour; they are the men who forged the Johannesburg letter; they are the men who thought it was no blot upon the personal honour of Mr. Rhodes to deceive his Government and to lie all round. As by forgery and lying they thought in 1896 to rob the people of the Transvaal of their liberty, and as by lying and forgery they embroiled in 1899 this country in the most disgraceful war that has ever blotted her annals, so down to this very hour they have continued this infamous work, and by lying, suppression, and forgery they have misrepresented the leaders of the Boers to this country, they have told the people of England what was false and what they knew to be false; that the Boer leaders refused to meet Lord Roberts unless

independence was guaranteed;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is now stating that the noble Lord the Financial Secretary to the War Office said something in this House which he knew to be false.

\*MR. DILLON: Indeed, I did not, Sir.

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member said that;

\*MR. DILLON: Indeed, I did not, Sir.

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member said earlier in his speech that the information to which he has just referred was given to the House by the Financial Secretary to the War Office. He has now proceeded to say, "They have told the country what they knew to be false." The hon. Member must withdraw that remark.

\*MR. DILLON: I will be only too glad to apologise if I gave that impression, but I think you did not follow my speech very closely. I quite admit that I spoke in heat, and my words may not have reached you.

\*MR. SPEAKER: I heard the hon. Member previously say that he did not cast any imputation on the noble Lord, as he stated he had not seen the actual letter, but in the latter part of his speech he certainly did cast such an imputation.

\*MR. DILLON: I will put an end to the matter by most fully withdrawing if anybody dreamt that I was casting an imputation on the noble Lord. To make myself perfectly clear, I said that the noble Lord told me he had not seen the letters himself, and that he did not see them until he went to the War Office and got the papers. But I had passed away from Members of this House.

\*MR. SPEAKER: I quite accept the hon. Member's statement. All I said was that in the heat of the moment he certainly used an expression which was capable of that interpretation. I quite accept his withdrawal.

\*MR. DILLON: I am quite prepared to make any amende to the noble Lord. I was applying my language to the authors of the Jameson raid, who, in my opinion, created and worked for this war, and stopped at no means, however disgraceful and unscrupulous, to embroil this country and the South African Republics. Most completely have they succeeded in their nefarious design. I charge them now with pursuing that detestable policy to the utter destruction of these people, but, please God, they never will succeed in achieving that. They stand today, as they stood five years ago, in the path of peace, with their forgeries and lies, but now with the blood of

20,000 Englishmen who have perished in this conflict upon their heads, and the ruin of two nations. The vengeance of God, though it is slow, will yet, I trust, find them out, because in the pursuit of their vile and selfish ends they have given all South Africa to fire and sword, and they have embroiled England in the bloodiest and most disgraceful war she has ever known, and called down upon her the universal condemnation of the civilised world. I beg to move the Amendment standing in my nature.

\*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I rise to second this Amendment, which has been moved in a speech of passionate eloquence, elaborate and powerful reasoning and illustration, and, I venture to say, a spirit of wise and broad statesmanship. [Laughter.] Hon. Members opposite may think those words ill-chosen, but although some of them may dissent, as I do, from some of the words

and contentions of my hon. friend, they will at least recognise the broad spirit in which he has entered upon this question and tried to raise the standard of action of this country in this great struggle.

This Amendment raises issues of the gravest importance upon which I, representing an English Liberal constituency, hold that the opinion of the House of Commons should be declared at this crisis in the nation's history. Many of us have been challenged during the recent election for voting in favour of my hon. friend's Amendment to the Address in the session of October, 1899. I feel the same satisfaction in seconding this motion as I felt in voting for that. The hon. Member for East Mayo was then supporting the application to this struggle of that principle of arbitration which we all pretend to want carried out, and what he has done now is to lay before the House the strongest case I have heard for years for an inquiry into the statements he has made; statements for every one of which he has given actual evidence of great force and weight. As I listened to his speech, I could not help thinking of the parallel between the debate of tonight and that of yesterday. Then

we were asking for, and the Government granted, an inquiry into the cases of ghastly and sorrowful surrender. Now my hon. friend, as I understand him, is laying this tremendous series of charges before the House rather as a case which demands the impartial and loyal consideration of this great court of the Empire, in order that the highest and noblest standards of warfare, which it has been the pride of this country to uphold in the past, may be maintained. The policy of crushing resistance without parley, or negotiation, or consideration for the feelings of those with whom you are fighting, is as unwise as it is cruel. I believe the whole of this country and a great portion of the forces in South Africa; although they will fight to the last with all possible gallantry, doing their duty, however tired they may be of the ghastly series of affairs; are weary of the struggle. We are weary of the enormous and increasing burden which will paralyse social reform, which is starving many charities and philanthropic efforts all over the country, and which is putting a millstone around the neck of British trade at one of the most serious crises it has had to face; but the Government, when we are all so anxious to bring this war to the speediest possible conclusion, have adopted the very worst methods for securing that end.

What are their methods? They are to add to the legitimate fighting strength; which, of course, it is the duty of the Government, though I do not support them in doing it, to exercise; two instruments which I think are the worst that can be imagined in such a case as this. First, they have refused to the enemy just the very thing that men of that type and character cling to with the most passionate devotion and loyalty; namely, their liberty; and, secondly, they are attempting to enforce their submission by this hideous terrorism of threats of suffering and torture of the weak and defenceless.

The First Lord of the Treasury said the other day that the prolongation of this war was due to the enemy, and not to ourselves. I venture to say that the prolongation of the war is, as a matter of demonstration, the result of the policy of His Majesty's Government.

We have recently had the despatches and proclamations of Lord Roberts laid

before Parliament. Those despatches, may or may not; I express no view; raise the opinion of military experts with regard to the strategic capacity of Lord Roberts, but they certainly lower our view of his capacity as a statesman and politician, and as one who has to administer the delicate and difficult considerations that go to the root of the instincts and feelings of his fellow-men. In these proclamations we have had what I can call nothing but a litter of inconsistent and contradictory statements. It is absolutely impossible for any man reading those proclamations to find out what would be the result of his action or his abstention from action. What impression could they produce on the narrow and prejudiced but shrewd race opposed to us? The Boers must have thought alternately that they had to deal with the fatuous imbecility of Dogbery and Verges, and the scarcely disguised merciless policy of a Duke of Alva. You have had in Lord Roberts's campaign more than one opportunity of bringing this war to a close. Lord Roberts himself admits that the risk of his rapid rush on Bloemfontein and Pretoria was serious from a military point of view, and I say; and I challenge contradiction; the one real justification for the risk and suffering of those rapid operations would undoubtedly have been to use the moment of success in order to put before the more influential members of the Boer community just those considerations and offers of terms which might have served to bring about at least the beginning of negotiations which might have resulted in an agreement between the two sides. This has been laid before the country in the clearest possible way by one of the greatest of Conservative statesmen, Sir Edward Clarke. What is the professed aim of the Government policy? It is to have a contented and peaceful South Africa, equal rights for all men, and fair play for all parties; the open door for all industries, and free institutions, which the Secretary for the Colonies and many others have explained again and again would ultimately be granted in order to give the freedom and the free self-government now enjoyed by Canada and Australia to these South African communities. I venture to say that the policy you have adopted week by week has put the whole possibility of such a solution farther and farther away from you. You can read the signs of the times in South Africa. Thank Heaven, Cape Colony has not joined in this movement, and I hope that no consideration may induce the Dutch in Cape Colony to join in the struggle, which would thus enlarge the area of the war. I am one of those who look upon the military result of this war as a foregone conclusion. I have no doubt as to the ultimate result of these military operations, but I do think that to carry out this policy with exasperation is one of the most unwise and improper courses to take in so grave an emergency.

My hon. friend the Member for East Mayo has quoted many passages from the press to show the real temper which is present in the minds of some supporters of His Majesty's Government and the policy they are pressing for. Let us here in the House of Commons let South Africa know the terms which the Government are prepared to give to the Boers if they surrender. Let us know the immediate terms, and let them be frankly and fairly made known to the Boers forthwith throughout South Africa. I listened to the last speech of the Colonial Secretary, and remember the speech which he addressed to the House in December

last, and they present a great contrast. There seems to be in the policy of the Government as explained across the floor of the House of Commons just the same vacillation as in the proclamations issued by Lord Roberts. Your policy must produce on the minds of your enemy the same uncertainty and hopelessness of making out what their fate would be, and there is the same distrust of your intentions. What I have to challenge His Majesty's Government upon is that if they continue the, policy which they are now doing; if the Colonial Secretary continues to refuse to offer terms of settlement, and if he continues to be guided in his policy by Sir Alfred Milner and Lord Kitchener, and still declares that until they give him leave to offer terms of peace he will leave things in their hands, then I say the responsibility for the prolongation of this war rests clearly with His Majesty's Government, and they will have to face the responsibility before history as to whether they are not themselves in their own hearts aiming at a policy of extermination, of absolute annihilation, and of absolute removal of these troublesome races. My attention was called to an article in the Economic Journal, written by a great financial authority in the City, over well-known initials. In this article the argument was deliberately put forward that the prolongation of the war was an advantage to His Majesty's Ministers and to those interested in speculations in South Africa. The prolongation of the war was said to be an advantage to British occupation, because each month, as it went on, diminished and swept away the Boer race; and day by day more and more of these wretched men were being reduced to bankruptcy, and more and more would be killed off and disappear. I listened with interest to a speech made by the noble Lord the Member for North Bedfordshire, who has rendered valuable service in South Africa, He spoke in a very appreciative way of the character of the Boer farmers, and he pointed out that the probable solution in South Africa would be the complete colonisation of these Boer colonies by British colonists, who had been encouraged to take these farm under a sort of compulsory expropriation.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order &#x0021; These matters do not arise under this Amendment.

\*MR. CHANNING: I will not pursue that argument further, but I was simply using it as an illustration that even in minds like that of the noble Lord who has been in South Africa there was a contemplation of this policy of driving the Boers out of their own country, in order that we might occupy it ourselves. This impression has arisen because of the persistent refusal of His Majesty's Government to put forward conciliatory terms which might be accepted by a brave and resolute people. I trust that the right hon. Gentleman will remove this impression, and that His Majesty's Government may even now do something to bring this hateful war to a conclusion. I say that His Majesty's Government, in the face of the speeches which have been made and of the articles which we have seen in the press, and in view of all the facts we have before us, are bound to attempt to clear themselves from the suspicion that this war is being prolonged in order to accomplish the extinction and the extermination of these people.

I have only one more word to add, and it is that I have always been taught; and

I believe every lad in the Anglo-Saxon race has been taught; to love and respect the passionate determination of a people to make any sacrifice to defend their homes. That is the fundamental quality of the Boers who are fighting against us to-day. We heard to-day that some of the Boer women were condemned in the camps because their husbands were showing this noble courage and fighting for their independence, and it was said that these women were to be subjected to starvation rations in order that their husbands might be coerced. I heard a few days ago that in some of our camps Boer women had been expressing in the strongest and most passionate terms their hope and belief that their husbands and sons would never allow the sufferings of the women to be a motive for surrendering their struggle for their liberties. Whatever we may think of the origin of the war, such noble motives as these should weigh in our hearts, and should have their influence in urging His Majesty's Government to take some such course as is suggested in this Amendment;

Amendment proposed;

"At the end of the Question, to add the words, 'But we humbly represent to Your Majesty that the wholesale burning of farmhouses, the wanton destruction and looting of private property, the driving of women and children out of their homes without shelter or proper provision of food, and the confinement of women and children in prison camps are practices not in accordance with the usages of war as recognised by civilised nations; that such proceedings are in the highest degree disgraceful and dishonouring to a nation professing to be Christian, and are calculated by the intense indignation and hatred of the British name which they must excite in the Dutch population to immensely increase the difficulty of restoring peace to South Africa. And we humbly and earnestly represent to Your Majesty that it is the duty of Your Majesty's Government immediately to put a stop to all practices contrary to the recognised usages of war in the conduct of the war in South Africa; and to make an effort to bring the war to an end by proposing to the Governments of the two Republics such terms of peace as brave and honourable men might, under all the circumstances, be reasonably expected to entertain.'"; (Mr. Dillon.)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): I have heard many astonishing things in the course of this debate, but I think the most astonishing of all was that which fell from the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down when he alluded to the speech of the hon. Member for East Mayo as dictated by a wise and broad statesmanship. I am no stranger to the methods of the hon. Member for East Mayo. This is a subject which deserves at the hands of the House of Commons a treatment distinguished by judgment and discretion, and, if possible, without passion. I have heard the hon. Member for East Mayo on many occasions, but, though well steeled to his invective, I confess that I do not think that either in the vehemence or in the length of his paroxysms he ever surpassed himself in the historical exaggerations which he has applied to this subject. Those hon. Gentlemen who do not know the hon. Member for East Mayo and who do not know his supporters might suppose that this rhetoric had been called into existence by this special case, whereas nearly every piece of invective was

familiar to us on this side of the House, It has been used before in the Irish debates; yes, and not only has the invective done duty before, but the cheers with which it was greeted I have also done duty before. It has done duty whenever British soldiers were fighting against the Mahdi, or the Khalifa, or the Afridis, or any real or supposed enemy of Great Britain.

The hon. Member, who revels in such a speech, asked us at the close to enter on the business in a spirit of conciliation. The hon. Member stood there as an apostle of conciliation; but what single sentence in his speech led to conciliation? What single opportunity did he give to Gentlemen on this side of the House to

join him in that effort, which many of us on this side of the House, even in the present debate on the Address, have urged the House of Commons to make, and to put aside these bitter nesses if we could in order to arrive at some common ground of settlement. On the contrary, the hon. Member said everything he could to stimulate antagonism. He said everything he could to exasperate and not to conciliate opposition. He did everything he could to make us farther apart and to make the cleavage greater. He did everything he could in these directions, and every word he used will be telegraphed to South Africa, and there they will impair the chances of an ultimate settlement. I should not object to his invective if it were always based on facts. The hon. Member has corrected me with regard to a statement I made, on information which reached me and which has since been corroborated by Sir A. Milner. I said not one word with regard to the Boers. What I said was that these were men whose minds had been poisoned by pernicious literature which the hon. Member freely quoted and which the hon. Member for Carnarvon also quoted, and which has since been found to be doctored for the palate of hon. Members opposite. The hon. Member objected when I rose to ask him what evidence he had of the truth of the pamphlet from which he was quoting; an interruption which he repudiated at the time, but which has since been found to be justified by one of the most outrageous and open instances of cutting out all which tells against his side, in order to make a case, which has ever been put before the House of Commons, even by a Conciliation Committee. In that race, in that competition of unjust modelling of evidence, the hon. Member for East Mayo is not far behind his colleague the Member for Carnarvon. The hon. Member attacked Lord Roberts for his political conduct of the war, and he even ventured to impeach his military conduct for the state in which he left the troops in South Africa. The hon. Member said, What was the Commander-in-Chief for, if he left the Army in that position? And he quoted from an article the purport of which was to explain the grounds on which Lord Kitchener had to take three months

to remove the consequences of Lord Roberts's "disorganisation" before he could move.

MR. DILLON: What I said was that if the account given in a specially inspired article published in The Times last Friday was correct, then Lord Roberts was not fit to command.

MR. BRODRICK: Yes, and he has repeated it again. How "specially inspired"? What right has the hon. Member to declare that the article was specially inspired?



MR. DILLON: It could not pass the censor otherwise.

MR. BRODRICK: Then why did not Lord Kitchener censor all the letters from which the hon. Member has quoted reflecting upon himself? The hon. Member must know as well as I do that letters have come to this country by the hundred and the thousand which cannot be touched by the censor. Coming to Lord Kitchener, an honourable and generous man, who has honourably served with Lord Roberts, with whom he is on the closest terms of intimacy and friendship, the hon. Member had the assurance to tell the House that Lord Kitchener had inspired this letter against Lord Roberts, and;putting his own construction upon it;said this was Lord Kitchener's revenge for Paardeberg. [Cries of "Shame."] The motive of the hon. Member can be seen from that statement, and from the fact that he left off reading the letter at the exact point where it relieved Lord Kitchener from the gross insinuation the hon. Member sought to convey. What was the nature of that letter? It contained these words;"It must not be imagined that Lord Roberts was in any way to blame for this state of things. "Why did the hon. Member not read that sentence?

MR. DILLON: I read that out loud to the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Apologise&#x0021;

MR. BRODRICK: I am afraid if the hon. Member did read it I do not recollect it.

MR. DILLON: Everyone heard me.

MR. BRODRICK: If he did read it then it certainly does not appear in print. Did the hon. Member read this;

"It was the inevitable outcome of a protracted campaign in a difficult country, with an enormous area, and also the complete change in the character of the war on the part of the enemy from a war of defence to an offensive guerilla war."

Why did not the hon. Member read that? Because it would have destroyed his bitter and groundless insinuation about Lord Kitchener going behind the back of Lord Roberts to a correspondent of The Times in order to poison the mind of the British public, which Lord Kitchener would never have thought of doing. Just in the same way the hon. Member was good enough to put into my mouth expressions I never used, and for which there was not a particle of evidence to justify his charges. The hon. Member has tried to saddle us with statements we have never made, just as he has tried to saddle Lord Kitchener with things he has never written. He has taken on trust garbled extracts which have reached him from anonymous letters, and when Lord Roberts, out of the courtesy of his nature, writing to Mr. Stead, said;what many of us, I fear, would not have said; namely, "I readily accept your statement that this officer is a man of good standing and unblemished repute,"

the hon. Member went as near as he dared to saying that Lord Roberts was standing bail for the truth of the accusation made by Mr. Stead.

MR. DILLON: Nothing of the kind.

MR. BRODRICK: I will not follow; the hon. Member further than I can I help upon these lines, for I believe that they are fraught with the utmost danger to future negotiations, the utmost inconvenience at present, and I believe it to be wholly foreign to the judicial temper m which the House should discuss these proceedings.

Looking at the subject from that point of view, I would say one word as to the exaggerated account which the hon. Member gave of the state of the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. He

said there had been a wholesale devastation of the country. That is absolutely untrue, according to any facts which have reached us, or even from any insinuations which have reached us, from any authentic source. There must, of course, be very considerable devastation in tracts of country which have been fought over in some instances half-a-dozen or a dozen times. Obviously that is inevitable in war. But what are the facts of the case? I will tell the House in two or three minutes. In the first place, we are still waiting for the actual facts as to the number of farms burned; but the hon. Member left the impression on the House that all the burnings and devastation had been carried out by orders of British generals. That is absolutely wrong. When the British entered the Orange Free State they found that lies had been spread in front of them, calumnious statements that the honour of women would not be safe and that farms would be looted; and they found that farm after farm had been deserted, and in every single instance those farms had been looted and in many cases burned by the Kaffirs. I have it on the authority of Lord Roberts himself that those in advance of the army arrived at homestead after homestead which they found a smoking ruin when they entered the colony. And to a large extent the destruction and devastation of the farms in the two colonies was caused by the desertion of the farms by the Boers and their destruction by the Kaffirs. I do not wish to say anything, to make matters more difficult between the two races; but I would remind the House that one of our greatest difficulties has been the attitude of some of the Boers towards the Kaffirs, and that the Kaffirs had a long score to settle with the Boers, when the time and the opportunity came for looting their houses. There was a second class of cases which came under the description of punishment; that word to which the hon. Member for East Mayo so vehemently objected. A British general was not merely entitled, but he was bound to take serious notice of cases of treachery in farmhouses. There has been an immense amount of treachery in this war, of breach of parole, and a great deal of harbouring of the enemy in farmhouses which had received our protection. There has been concealment of arms and ammunition. Ammunition has been discovered when some farms were burnt carefully kept out of sight. The destruction of these buildings forms the second class of cases for which I am perfectly ready in this House to stand bail and to defend the conduct of the generals, and which accounts for a very large amount of such devastation as has been caused.

There has been a third class of case; the destruction of the line on which the whole provision of the forces, and the non-combatants as well, depended during the progress of the operations. The hon. Member for East Mayo and other Members on the same side have addressed the House with great vehemence and have delivered a strong attack upon us because we have not always been able to give the whole of the population which depended upon us full rations of every kind during the campaign. But the same Members who so vehemently attack us for that make an equally vigorous attack because punitive measures were set in force in

order to protect the lines from being broken. At one time, for weeks together, the line was broken at some place or other every night, and it was absolutely necessary to take strong steps in these cases. Lord Roberts may have issued strong proclamations, and may have acted up to them in certain cases. If he did so it was because he thought it was necessary in order to preserve his force, and also in order to find food for the enormous civil population depending upon him. When we talk of war, do let us divest our minds of cant. War cannot be made without a certain amount of human suffering. All you can do is to palliate that suffering and alleviate it as much as you can. What Lord Roberts and Lord Kitchener have had to do will bear comparison with the humanity of any war that has ever been waged. [Cries of "No" from the Irish benches.] There is no war which has ever been carried on before in which the general began by sending on parole all those who were willing to go back to their farms; there has been no war in which the general has attempted successfully to feed all the women and children who came to him. Go back to the American War and see the devastation of tracts of country by Sheridan and Sherman; go back to the Franco-German War and see what was found necessary by the German generals through many months when they were in a hostile country. So far from hon. Members calling on all their gods to witness against their own fellow-countrymen, I say that we have a right to be proud of the humanity of our officers. We have a right also to be proud that in all these difficulties we have scarcely heard of one outrage by a private soldier, and we can hardly trace a single case in which a general has by some hasty expression or decision diverged from the path which we, sitting quietly here, find it so easy to trace out for him.

I am asked to declare again what the intentions of the Government are. They have been already stated by the Secretary for the Colonies in the admirable speech he made last December, and confirmed by the First Lord of the Treasury during the present session of Parliament. But we are told that if we do not at once answer the statements made by our opponents we have assented to them. I say again, as regards the question of the independence of the two Republics, the Government has not the slightest intention of giving way. Subject to that, we are willing to consider at the proper time, and we have encouraged the generals to communicate freely with the Boer commanders, reasonable terms of settlement. It is perfectly well known to all in authority in the Transvaal that there is no reluctance whatever on the part of His Majesty's representatives to meet them; but we shall do no good by going cap in hand at this moment and offering terms which would be indignantly rejected, such as those discussed in the House on the last occasion and on the present. I can only say this, that if more motions of this kind are made it will be our duty to answer them, but that we can add nothing to the declarations we have already made. So far from these motions being those of wise and broad statesmanship, I believe that they are in every way injurious to the ends which they are supposed to promote. They are not wanted as a check on our generals, they are not necessary as a stimulus to the Government to make peace, and believe they create a false impression abroad and in South Africa, while I know that the speeches by which they are accompanied contain grave and unwarrantable imputations on the Commander-in-

Chief and form a gross libel on our Army. They tend to heighten passions and to deepen resentments, and in consequence they increase the difficulty of settlement. I do not think that many of the observations addressed to the House were made with the object of conveying sympathy with the Boers ;[HON. MEMBERS on the Irish benches: Oh, oh&#x0021;];so much as with a desire to embarrass the Government. The Government have shown that, although they mean vigorously to prosecute the war by every means in their power, they are still ready at any moment to welcome proffered peace, on terms which perhaps are not usually given, and to allow those who have been in arms against us to go to their homes. We are determined that there shall be humane treatment of those who surrender, as well as of those who, according to the laws of war, are in arms against us. I trust that we shall not be hampered further by motions of this kind, which can add nothing to our determination in one direction or the other, but which are eminently calculated to prevent what ought to be, and I hope still is, the desire of all parties in the House;namely, an early and satisfactory conclusion of the war.

\*MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): Mr. Speaker, we all recognise the great importance of the statement which has just been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. I do not refer to the purely controversial matters dealt with in his speech, but towards the end of his speech he came on to discuss a matter which is vital at this time, the question of the terms upon which this war might be brought to an end, and he said that the statement which he made might he regarded as final. The statement was evidently very carefully considered and carefully worded, and we are told that after this, if any further questions are raised in this House, we may expect to be referred back to the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman this evening. We are entitled, therefore, to ask for some little in formation in regard to those terms to which we alluded. We are entitled to know what the Government really mean by the statement which they have put into the mouth of the Minister for War to-night. Now, the right hon. Gentleman spoke of future negotiations, and he deprecated the speech of the hon. Member for East Mayo on the ground that the motion which he moved and the speech which he had made upon it were calculated to increase the difficulties which might arise in the course of those negotiations. We are happy to hear there are to be negotiations. It is not so long ago;a very little while;that we heard that there were to be no negotiations, and that the only terms to be offered to the Boers were to be unconditional surrender.

The Secretary of State for War spoke further of reasonable terms of settlement. He said that the Boer leaders in the field were perfectly well aware that reasonable terms of settlement were open to them, and although it was not for us to go hat in hand to them, still they were aware that if they desired terms of accommodation, terms of accommodation could be had. We are extremely glad to hear that. We do not want to know the details or even the main substance of those proposals, but we do want to know what is to be their character. There has been a good deal of studied ambiguity with regard to this matter. At one moment we are told that there can be no negotiations at all, and at other times we are informed that there can be negotiations, but only in regard to the individual

soldiers in the field. What we really want to know is this: Are the Government prepared, as part of those terms on which the Boer army are to lay down their arms, to give them assurances as to the mode in which the Government of their country is to be carried on? The whole question rests upon that. Of course, we cannot expect for a moment that men in the field would lay down their arms unless they were told that their lives would be safe, but they will want to know something more, and it will be absolutely futile to ask these men to lay down their arms unless you also say what is to happen to the country when they have done so. They have taken up arms in the defence of their country, and they will not lay them down voluntarily until they know roughly, broadly, what is to be the position of the country and its Government when they have surrendered that power which they now hold. I think this House has a right to be informed whether our commanders in the field are prepared to inform the Boer leaders broadly, roughly, in outline, what the condition of the Government of the country is to be when the surrender has taken place. If that be not done I am afraid all this talk about coming to terms will be perfectly futile. It will very likely be the fact that within the next few weeks or days the Boer forces may undergo some grave reverse; it may be that the force under De Wet may be dispersed, and that under Botha broken up, but that will not put an end to the war, it will merely mark a new stage, and the war may drag from month to month and from year to year before the country can be declared settled, and before we can reach the goal which every man in this House ardently longs to reach, if it can only be reached with safety and honour.

I am satisfied that if terms were offered, if assurances, proofs, were given to our gallant enemy in the field that we honestly desire to respect their right to internal self-government, that we honestly intend and are determined to follow the objects we had when we engaged in this war, and that we are prepared to act up to the promises we had in our mouth at that time, and if they could see we did not desire to appropriate their country and the gold in it; if they were assured of all these things (and until they are so assured they will not lay down their arms); then I believe there might be in truth a healing up, not immediate but gradual, of the terrible wounds inflicted by the war. If they found we were prepared to stand by the main lines of the policy with which we began the war, they would say these people are honest, and England, whom we thought so unworthy, is still worthy of our faith. That would save for this country the possibility of holding permanently our South African possessions; but if that be not done, if these terms that are to be offered are simply terms of surrender to the individual commandoes, then we shall be no forwarder than we were before.

I trust the Government, if this is, as they say, their last attempt at conciliation, will tell us a little more about it, in order that we may derive some hope that at last they have arrived at something like a true estimation of the real facts of the situation, and that it is not their intention to palter with it.

\*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): What I want to know is whether the terms now to be offered to the Boers are the terms for which they are fighting; the

independence of their country. I do not believe they are, neither do I think that anything said either in or outside this House, by those who are termed pro-Boers or those who are for the war, will have any effect on the conduct of the war. The Boer generals and the Boer farmers are not spoiled children, they know what they are fighting for and why they are fighting, and the opinion of anyone in this House, whether on the Government side or on this side, is, and must be, to them a matter of the most supreme indifference. Anyone who can imagine men of the calibre of Louis Botha, Christian De Wet, Delarey, and the other generals of the Boer army, who are now exciting the admiration of the world and teaching nations the art of war, being influenced by anything said here by the members of the Government or Opposition has failed to appreciate the position.

I appeal for the independence of the Boers as a means of settlement, because we have no right to take their independence from these people. It is not that we cannot subdue the Boers, that is not my point of view. The words "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you" apply to nations as they do to individuals, and a nation professing to be Christian should do its best to uphold so sacred a charge. Not only are we trying to do that which we have no right to do, but we are attempting the impossible. Our army may wear down the Boer resistance, but you cannot wear down the Boer independence. In the end superiority is bound to prevail, and if these men have proved one thing more conclusively than any other, it is that in every respect; mental, moral, and physical; the Boers are superior to those we have been able to put in the field against them. It may be said that by that remark I am casting reflections upon my own countrymen, but that is not so. I have relatives on the

field fighting for His Majesty, and I cast no reflections upon men doing what they believe to be their duty when fighting for their country. I am stating facts, and it is because Gentlemen opposite, and Gentlemen on this side who support the war, have shut their eyes to facts all the way through that we are in the position we are in to-day. We may by force of numbers overrun the Boers, but in the end they are bound to, and must, dominate South Africa. The position on these benches around me (the Irish Nationalist benches), after a hundred years of an attempt to enforce British rule upon a people who rejected it and repelled it, ought to be sufficient to convince even the most unwilling of the impossibility of one white race imposing its will upon another white race. In South Africa you will have Ireland ten times multiplied because of the distance from this country, and because of the opportunities for effective resistance, and so I press as good policy, as sound morality, and as an act of justice which the Government owes to these countries, that even now it should be made known to the Boers, not by sending women and discredited immoral parsons as envoys to them, but by direct communication from the Government to those who are left at the heads of the Boer army in the field, that you proclaim an armistice to discuss terms of settlement. Treat these men as they have a right to be treated; as honourable men who deserve honourable treatment at our hands.

I rose to call attention to a statement of the Secretary of State for War to-night in connection with a leaflet to which he referred. He spoke in terms of deepest reproach concerning all those responsible for the issue of a mutilated

extract from a letter written by Lieutenant Morrison, published in a Canadian newspaper, reproduced in a garbled form in a New York paper, and cabled in that form to this country, and reproduced here. Such is the history in brief of the letter which the Conciliation Committee afterwards issued in leaflet form.

Anyone listening to the statements of the Secretary of State for War, or reading the comments of the war press on this incident, could come to no other conclusion than that the doctoring of the document and the leaving out of certain passages

was the deliberate work of the Conciliation Committee, or of the Manchester Guardian, which first reproduced the letter. I ask the House to remember the kind of men whom we have thus by implication been making liable. The chairman of the Conciliation Committee is no Socialist leader or Irish rebel. He is a man who for twenty years adorned this House, and for over a dozen years supported the Government in its anti-Home Rule policy, a man who commanded the confidence for his integrity and ability of every section of this House; the right hon.

Leonard Courtney. Will any man dare to say that he would be guilty of dishonourable conduct in connection with a leaflet of this kind? If the Secretary of State for War meant to blame him in connection with that matter, he was libelling a man whose shoe latchet he was not worthy to unloose. I rise to let it be known, speaking as a member of the Conciliation Committee, that the majority of that committee are not pro-Boer Radicals, but were until this war broke out supporters of the Unionist Government and the Unionist party. This fact requires to be stated emphatically, because everything is being done to spread the belief that only people of little influence and of less ability have dared to make a stand against the war. On the Conciliation Committee and on the Stop-the-War Committee are some of the best men in literature, and quite a number of the noblest professors and upholders of the Christian faith in the country. Men who hold high positions in politics are enthusiastic and devoted members, and to profess that a committee composed of people of that type could be guilty of conduct of this kind is a wanton insult which should not be allowed to pass. When we remember the history of the war; when we remember that the press by sheer and deliberate lying and misrepresentation misled the nation into the war, it lies with bad grace on the lips of any supporter of the war to feel indignation for a mere slip, for which the persons accused cannot be reasonably held guilty by anyone who knows them. I hope that whoever speaks for the Government this evening will take the opportunity of doing an act of justice to an old colleague by making it perfectly clear that no one in this House believes that he personally or his colleagues were directly responsible for it.

MR. BOYLE (Donegal, W.) said he was a member of an Ulster constituency, and he was proud to say that a majority of the Members from that province and a great majority of the population were entirely and avowedly against the war. They were not only against the war, but they were expressly against the methods by which it was being conducted by England. He represented a constituency in a very remote part where the people only got a tri-weekly paper. When he went there he was asked how the war was going on. Whenever De Wet achieved a victory there was gladness and glee around the homesteads. Why was that? Because the English

Government in West Donegal were doing the same things that the English were doing in South Africa

He had listened with the greatest possible interest to the powerful indictment by the hon. Member for East Mayo. The Secretary of State for War had made a feeble reply to that indictment. The Irish Nationalist Members who advocated right, justice, and freedom were accused from the Treasury Bench of talking cant. Were the speeches of Burke and Lord Chatham cant, when the British were trying to enslave a white race in America? The speeches delivered from the Opposition benches then were the speeches of wise and statesmanlike men. About the time the war began he had a relative at

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Blundell, Colonel Henry

Charrington, Spencer

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Bond, Edward

Churchill, William Spencer

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Clare, Octavius Leigh

Aird, Sir John

Boulnois, Edmund

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.

Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden

Bousfield, William Robert

Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn

Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Brassey, Albert

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Arrol, Sir William

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Cox, Irwin Edward Bain bridge

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Brymer, William Ernest

Cranborne, Viscount

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Bullard, Sir Harry



Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Balcarres, Lord  
Butcher, John George  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Carlile, William Walter  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G.W. (Leeds)  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Balfour, Maj. K. R.(Christch.)  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Bigwood, James  
Chapman, Edward  
Doughty, George

Kimberley who was not in any way connected with the military, but as all persons had to go under arms he went under arms. His friend wrote a letter to him after the siege of Kimberley to the effect that the Boers were very bad people and should not be encouraged by the Irish. Lately he had another letter from the same gentleman, in which he said that now the British were devastating farms and burning homesteads as had been done in Ireland. He would ask hon. Gentlemen opposite if it was a mark of civilisation to devastate farms and homesteads. He would say that they would not annihilate the Boers. So long as one Boer mother could give birth to a son so long would there be antagonism and hostility in South Africa to the English Government. Ireland was a parallel example. If the forces of tyranny could have annihilated the Irish race there would not be one Member of the old stock on these benches now. The burning of farms in South Africa was not the way to end the war. When they burned the homestead of De Wet he said he would make the English Government pay the sum of £;2.000,000 for 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, 226; Noes. 117. (Division List No. 12.)

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Renwick, George  
Dunn, Sir William  
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalyb'ge  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart  
Kenyon, on. G. T. (Denbigh  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Faber, George Denison  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Knowles, Lees  
Russell, T. W.  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J.(Manc'r  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.  
Rutherford, John  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Finch, George H.  
Lawson, John Grant  
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Lee, Cpt. A. H. (Hants., Fareh'm  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J.  
Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Leighton, Stanley  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Fison, Frederick William  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.  
Simeon, Sir Barrington

Fitz Gerald, Sir R. Penrose-  
Lockwood, Lieut.-Col. A. R.  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.  
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East  
Flower, Ernest  
Lowe, Francis William  
Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tynesd.  
Forster, Henry William  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks)  
Garfit, William  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Spear, John Ward  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft  
Stanley, Edwd. Jas. (Somerset)  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. F.  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'rH'lets)  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Stock, James Henry  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Stroyan, John  
Gosehen, Hon. George J.  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Malcolm, Ian  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)  
Maxwell, W.J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Thomas, J.A.(Glamorgan, Gower  
Greene, Hy. D. (Shrewsbury)

Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Groves, James Grimble  
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)  
Tufnell, Col. Edward  
Hain Edward  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow  
Ure, Alexander  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Valentia, Viscount  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G. (Mid'x  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Vincent, Col. Sir C.E.H.(Sheffield  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. R. Wm.  
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Murray, Rt. Hon. A. G. (Bute)  
Wallace, Robert  
Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Helder, Augustus  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Webb, Col. William George  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)  
Penn, John

Wills, Sir Frederick  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Pilkington, Richard  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Hornby, Sir William Henry  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R.(Bath  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Wylie, Alexander  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.  
Hoult, Joseph  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Howard, Cpt. J. (Kent, Faversham)  
Purvis, Robert  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.  
Colville, John  
Duffy, William J.  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Duncan, James H.  
Ambrose, Robert  
Crean, Eugene  
Evans, Samuel T.  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Cremer, William Randal  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Cullinan, J.  
Fenwick, Charles  
Bell, Richard  
Daly, James

Ffrench, Peter  
Boland, John  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Field, William  
Boyle, James  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Delany, William  
Gilhooly, James  
Caldwell, James  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Dillon, John  
Hammond, John  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Doogan, P. C.  
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)  
Cogan, Dennis J.  
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.  
Roche, John  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary M.  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Sullivan, Donal  
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Thomas, Abel(Carmarthen, E.)  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Dowd, John  
Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan, Gower  
Labouchere, Henry  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Tomkinson, James  
Leamy, Edmund  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Leigh, Sir Joseph (Stockport)  
O'Malley, William  
Tully, Jasper  
Lloyd-George, David  
O'Mara, James  
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.  
London, W.  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
O'Shee, James John  
White, Luke (York, E.R.)  
M'Crae, George  
Partington, Oswald  
White, Patrick (Meath, North  
M'Demott, Patrick  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
M'Fadden, Edward  
Pirie, Duncan V.  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth  
M'Govern, T.  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Reddy, M.  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)  
Mansfield, Horace Kendall  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, E.)  
Mooney, John J.

Redmond, William (Clare)  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)  
Rickett, J. Compton  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Murnaghan, George  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.  
Murphy, J.  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Question put accordingly, "That those I words be there added."  
AYES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Hammond, John  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)  
O'Dowd, John  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.  
Bell, Richard  
Horniman, Frederick John  
O'Malley, William  
Poland, John  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
O'Mara, James  
Boyle, James  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Shee, James John  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Labouchere, Henry  
Pirie, Duncan V.  
Burt, Thomas  
Leamy, Edmund  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Caldwell, James



Leigh, Sir Joseph (Stockport)  
Reddy, M.  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Lloyd-George, David  
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)  
Cogan, Denis, J.  
Lough, Thomas  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Colville, John  
Lundon, W.  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Roche, John  
Crean, Eugene  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Cremer, William Randal  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Cullinan, J.  
M'Fadden, Edward  
Sullivan, Donal  
Daly, James  
M'Govern, T.  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Delany, William  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, N.)  
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Mansfield, Horace Kendall  
Tomkinson, James  
Doogan, P. C.  
Mooney, John J.  
Tully, Jasper  
Dully, William J.  
Murnaghan, George  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
Murphy, J.  
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)  
Evans, Samuel T.  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.),  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)

Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Fenwick, Charles  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Ffrench, Peter  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Field, William  
O' Brien, Kend'I (Tipperary, Mid  
Mr. Dillon and Mr. Channing.  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden  
Arrol, Sir William  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Aird, Sir John  
Arnold-Fortter, Hugh O.  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
The House divided:;Ayes, 91; Noes, 243. (Division List No. 13.)  
Balcarres, Lord  
Flower, Ernest  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)  
Forster, Henry William  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Balfour, Maj K. R. (Christch'rch  
Garfit, William  
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh.  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Barry, Sir P. T. (Windsor)  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Bartley, George C. T.

Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'r H'ml'ts  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Gore, Hon. E. S. Ormsby-  
Mount, William Arthur  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon  
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute  
Bigwood, James  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Myers, William Henry  
Bond, Edward  
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Greene, Sir E. W. (B'yS Edm'ds.  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Bousfield, William Robert  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Bowles, Capt. H.F.(Middlesex)  
Gretton, John  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's lynn)  
Groves, James Grimble  
Pease, H. Pike (Darlington)  
Brassey, Albert  
Hain, Edward  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Penn, John  
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (M'd'sx  
Pilkington, Richard  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Hare, Thomas Leigh

Plummer, Walter R.  
Butcher, John George  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Carlile, William Walter  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemouth  
Prvce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Heath, Arthur Howard(Hanley  
Purvis, Robert  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Helder, Augustus  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Renwick, George  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r  
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)  
Ridley, Rt. Hn M. W (St'Iybr'dge  
Chapman, Edward  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.  
Gharrington, Spencer  
Hogg Lindsay  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Hornby, Sir William Henry  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Russell, T. W.  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Hoult, Joseph  
Rutherford, John  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Howard, Capt. J. (Kent, Fav'rsh  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Howard, J. (Mid., Tottenham)  
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. T. Myles  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.  
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Colston, Chas. E. H. Athole  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop  
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Smith, H. C, (N'rth'mbTynes'de  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.  
Knowles, Lees  
Spear, John Ward  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Stock, James Henry  
Digby, J. K. D. Wingfield-  
Lawson, John Grant  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Lee, Capt. A. H. (Hants, Farehm  
Stroyan, John  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Dorrington, Sir John Edward  
Leighton, Stanley  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Doughty, George  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S  
Tomlinson, W. E. Murray  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Tufnell, Col. Edward  
Dunn, Sir William  
Lowe, Francis William  
Ure, Alexander  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William H.  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Vincent, Col. Sir CEH (Sheffield)  
Faber, George Denison  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.  
Wallace, Robert  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Walton, Joseph (Harnsley)  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r.  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.  
Finch, George H.  
M'Crae, George  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
M'Killop, James. (Stirlingshire)  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)

Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Webb, Col. William George  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Malcolm, Ian  
White, Luke (York, E.R.)  
Fison, Frederick William  
Maxwell, W.J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.  
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell-(Birm  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. ER (Bath  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E.R,  
Wylie, Alexander  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
MR. A. J. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Main Question be now put."  
Main Question put accordingly.  
AYES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.  
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge  
Harris, F. L. (Tynemouth)  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Harwood, George  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-  
Aird, Sir John  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Heath, A. Howard (Hanley)  
Allen, C. P. (Glouce, Stroud  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Heaton, John Henniker  
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Helder, Augustus  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Davies, M Vaughan-(Cardigan  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Dewar, John A.(Inverness-sh.  
Henderson, Alexander  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Hermon- Hodge, Robert Trotter  
Arrol, Sir William  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John F.  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockheld  
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph  
Hogg, Lindsay  
Bain, Col. James Robert  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside  
Balcarres, Lord  
Doughty, George  
Hornby, Sir William Henry  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)  
Houldsworth Sir Wm Henry  
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch'ch  
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore  
Hoult, Joseph  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Duncan, James H.  
Howard, Capt. J. (Faversham)-  
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor  
Dunn, Sir William  
Howard, J. (Mid., Tottenham  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart  
Hozier, Hon. J. Henry Cecil



Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Edwards, Frank  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Elibank, Master of  
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)  
Bignold, Arthur  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Bigwood, James  
Faber, George Denison  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)  
Bond, Edward  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Jones, W. (Carnarvonshire)  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r  
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh).  
Bousfield, William Robert  
Finch, George H.  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.  
Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)  
Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Brassey, Albert  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Knowles, Lees  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Fison, Frederick William  
Labouchere, Henry  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon  
Langley, Batty  
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.

Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Brymer, William Ernest  
Flower, Ernest  
Lawson, John Grant  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Forster, Henry William  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Burt, Thomas  
Garfit, William  
Lee, Capt. A H (Hants, Fareh'm  
Butcher, John George  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington,  
Caldwell, James  
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Carlile, William Walter  
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(Tr. Hmlts  
Leigh, Sir Joseph (Stockport)  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Leighton, Stanley  
Cavendish, V. C.W. (Derbysh.)  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Goschen, Hon. George J.  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J.(Birm.)  
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter(Bristol, S  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r  
Greene, Sir E W (B'ryS Edm'nds  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Chapman, Edward  
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)  
Lough, Thomas  
Charrington, Spencer  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.  
Lowe, Francis William  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Grenfell, William Henry

Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Gretton, John  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.  
Groves, James Grimble  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Hain, Edward  
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. Ellison  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Colston, Chas. Ed. H. Athole  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Lord G (Midx  
M'Calmont, Col. J. Antrim, E.)  
Colville, John  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.  
M'Crae, George  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
The House divided:;Ayes, 297; Noes, 78. (Division List No. 14.)  
Malcolm, Ian  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Mansfield, Horace Kendall  
Rea, Russell  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Thomas, A. (Carmarthen, E.)  
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh.)  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Renwick, George  
Tomkinson, James  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Rickett, J. Compton

Tomlinson, W. E. Murray  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (Stalybri'e)  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson  
Tufnell, Col. Edward  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropsh.)  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs)  
Ure, Alexander  
Morgan, David J. (Waltham'w)  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Valentia, Viscount  
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monmouthsh.)  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Vincent, Col. Sir CEH (Sheffield)  
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)  
Morrell, George Herbert  
Russell, T. W.  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Rutherford, John  
Wallace, Robert  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)  
Saekville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.  
Mount, William Arthur  
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. T. Myles  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Warde, Lieut.-Col. C. E.  
Myers, William Henry  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Webb, Col. William George

Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Simeon, Sir Barrington  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire)  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-under-L.  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Partington, Oswald  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Smith, H. C (North'mb, Tynes'e  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Penn, John  
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)  
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald  
Percy, Earl  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York E. R.)  
Pilkington, Richard  
Spear, John Ward  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Pirie, Duncan V.  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (North'nts  
Wodehouse, Hn. Armine (Essex  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somers't  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Wylie, Alexander  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharpe  
Stock, James Henry  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward

Stroyan, John  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Purvis, Robert  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Rasch, Major Frederick Carne  
Sturt, Hon Humphry Napier  
NOES.  
Abraham, W.(Cork N. E.)  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Abraham, William (Rhondda  
Hammond, John  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Barry, E. (Cork S.)  
Holland, William Henry  
O'Dowd, John  
Bell, Richard  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Boland, John  
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
Boyle, James  
Jordon, Jeremiah  
O'Malley, William  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Mara, James  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Leamy, Edmund  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Cogan, Dennis J.  
Lloyd-George, David  
O'Shee, James John  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Lundon, W.  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Crean, Eugene  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Reddy, M.  
Cremer, William Randal  
M'Dermott, Patrick

Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)  
Cullinan, J.  
M'Fadden, Edward  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Daly, James  
M'Govern, T.  
Roberts, John Bryn-(Eifion)  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
M'Hugh, Patrick A.  
Roche, John  
Delany, William  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Sullivan, Donal  
Dillon, John  
Mooney, John J.  
Thomas, A. (Carmarthen, E.)  
Doogan, P. C.  
Murnaghan, George  
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)  
Duffy, William J.  
Murphy, J.  
Tully, Jasper  
Evans, Samuel T.  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)  
Wilson, Henry J. York, W. R.  
Fenwick, Charles  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Ffrench, Peter  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Field, William  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Captain Donelan.  
Flynn, James Christopher  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Majesty, as followeth;  
Most Gracious Sovereign,  
We, Your Majesty's most dutiful and  
loyal subjects, the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland,

in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Majesty for the Gracious Speech which Your Majesty has addressed to both Houses of Parliament. To be presented by Privy Councillors and Members of His Majesty's Household.  
SUPPLY.

Resolved, that this House will, Tomorrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Ordered, That the several Estimates presented to this House during the present Session be referred to the Committee of Supply.;(Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)  
WAYS AND MEANS.

Resolved, That this House will, Tomorrow, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.; (Mr. Austen Chamberlain.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY).

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not propose to move to-night the first of the two motions which stand in my name; that relating to Ways and Means; because I am very anxious to show, as far as I am concerned, that it is not my fault if there is not ample opportunity given to-morrow to discuss the Eight Hours Bill. I shall, therefore, commence by moving the second resolution standing in my name, which is the sessional Order dealing with Supply, which has been agreed to session after session by the House, and which in the opinion of every Member competent to form a judgment upon it has been a great convenience, and has greatly increased the opportunities of independent Members of discussing the general policy of the Government. I think I may be absolved from making any definition of that sessional Order, but it may be desirable to point out to the House that I have made one small change in the last paragraph of the Order. If hon. Members will take up their Papers and look at the last line on page 1, it will be observed that after the words "any vote of credit" I have added these words;

"Or of Votes for Supplementary or Additional Estimates presented by the Government for war expenditure."

These words are entirely new, and the effect of adding them is that if after Easter the Government have to come to the House for additional Estimates for military expenditure, these Estimates will not be discussed within the fixed and rigid limits of this rule, but they will be discussed with the full freedom accorded to discussions in Supply on Supplementary Estimates before Easter. I have always felt that the justification for this Supply rule was that it gave an opportunity for discussing the ordinary administration of the Government within reasonable limits and within reasonable time, and I think it would be a straining of the rule to make it include cases entirely outside the ordinary administration of the Government, and it was in order to meet that view that originally the words "Vote of Credit" were put into the rule. If, for example, things should go badly in South Africa; we have no reason to think they will; in fact, we feel confident that they will not; but if they should, it would seem most unreasonable that, if we had to come to the House of Commons with Supplementary Estimates for the war, say in June, May, or July, the House should



feel itself debarred from a full and free criticism of the policy of the Government by the limitations imposed by this rule. Therefore, the change I suggest is entirely in favour of the independent criticism of the Government, and so far as it can be said to be for or against the Government, it is rather against it. I trust the House will appreciate the motive for the change, and that after the long experience we have had of this rule it will be passed without any lengthened discussion, and with absolute unanimity.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, so soon as the Committee of Supply has been appointed and Estimates have been presented, the Business of Supply shall (until it be disposed of) be the first Order of the day on Friday, unless the House otherwise order on the motion of a Minister of the Crown moved at the commencement of Public Business to be decided without Amendment or Debate; and the provisions of Standing Order No. 56 shall be extended to Friday:

Not more than twenty days, being days before the 5th of August, on which the Speaker leaves the Chair for the Committee of Supply without Question put, counting from the first day on which the Speaker so left the Chair under Standing Order No. 56, shall be allotted for the consideration of the Annual Estimates for the Army, Navy, and Civil Services, including Votes on Account, the Business of Supply standing first Order on every such day:

Provided always, that on Motion made after notice by a Minister of the Crown, to be decided without Amendment or Debate, additional time, not exceeding three days, may be allotted for the Business of Supply, either before or after the 5th of August:

On the last but one of the allotted days, at Ten o'clock p.m., the Chairman shall proceed to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the outstanding Votes in Committee of Supply; and on the last, not being earlier than the twentieth of the allotted days, the Speaker shall, at Ten o'clock p.m., proceed to put forthwith every question necessary to complete the outstanding Reports of Supply:

On the days appointed for concluding the Business of Supply, the consideration of such business shall not be anticipated by a Motion of Adjournment under Standing Order No. 17; nor may any dilatory Motion be moved on such proceedings; nor shall they be interrupted under the proceedings of any Standing Order relating to the Sittings of the House:

Provided always that any Additional Estimate for any new service of matters not included in the original Estimate for the year shall be submitted for consideration in the Committee of Supply on any day not later than two days before the Committee is closed:

Provided also that the days occupied by the consideration of Estimates supplementary to those of a previous Session, or of any Vote of Credit, or of Votes for Supplementary or Additional Estimates presented by the Government for War Expenditure, shall not be included in the computation of the twenty days. Provided also that two Morning Sittings shall be deemed equivalent to one Three o'clock Sitting.";(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

\*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I desire to join in the protest which was made earlier in the evening against this motion being placed where it

is. I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman would have found the slightest difficulty in placing it the first order on Thursday next, and then we should have been able to discuss the matter free from any pressure, and without feeling that we were interfering with the opportunities of hon. Gentlemen who had been successful in the ballot. I think we desire, as a whole, that hon. Members shall have a chance to-morrow of discussing the Eight Hours Miners Bill. The right hon. Gentleman seems to have assumed on the part of the whole House rather too great a knowledge of the business before it. This is a new Parliament, and a very large number of hon. Members are here for the first time. I wonder how many hon. Members understand the effect of the seven rather complicated paragraphs which you, Sir, have just read to the House. Those of us whose memories go back to the old times of Supply think that, in the main, the operation of this rule has produced a better state of things. I believe that the origin of the rule was in the year 1895, after what was to the Leader of the House rather an unhappy experience then, for he had great difficulty in getting Supply through. Consequently the right hon. Gentleman came down one day in the year 1896 and laid this rule before us. I agree that the rule has worked an improvement, but only in respect of one portion of the rule; namely, that in regard to the allocation of a particular day to Supply. That we all now know beforehand when we are going to go into Committee to deal with the Estimates is a great improvement upon the old state of things. I remember well in this very place a resolution being moved in the year 1892 to the effect that a particular day should be allotted to Supply, and that that day should be Friday, and I remember the right hon. Gentleman telling me across the floor of the House that the thing was impossible. I was delighted to see the right hon. Gentleman come down to this House four years afterwards and ask the House to do what he had before declared to be impossible. So long as a good thing is done, I am not going to quarrel as to who does it. I agree that this part of the rule has worked admirably. But when I turn to the second part of the rule; the closure part; I do not admit that that has worked well. I hold a very strong opinion with regard to the closure. I hold that the use of the closure is a mark of the Parliamentary incapacity of the man who uses it. I recollect that two great measures which I saw pass through this House; the Local Government Act of 1893<sup>4</sup> and the Finance Act of 1894; were carried through respectively by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton without the aid of the closure. I remember Lord Randolph Churchill, as the Leader of the House, coming down here in August, 1886, after the General Election, and he got all his Estimates through without the aid of the closure. I have taken the trouble to look up the figures in the Library, and I find that in the year 1896 the total number of Votes was 150, and out of that number 21 were closed. In the year 1897 the number was 159, and 30 were closed; in 1898 the number of Votes was 170, and 32 were closed; in 1899 there were 151 Votes and the number closed was 46; and in 1900 there were 151 Votes and 46 of them were closed. Now what does the closing of Votes mean? It means not only that the money is voted without any possibility even of the Minister in charge of the Vote getting up to answer

questions, but it means that at ten o'clock upon a certain day the Chairman, or you, Mr. Speaker, may get up and put Votes seriatim, and nothing can happen except a division. It not only means that, but also that with all the great departments for which money is voted there is no possibility of the House in Committee examining into the conduct of those departments and into the economy or extravagance of their expenditure. What is the object of Supply after all? I confess that I entertain a much higher opinion of the functions of the House in Committee of Supply as compared with its legislative labours than some of my colleagues. I have the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord, of the Treasury in entire agreement with me in that view. I have read his speeches delivered in 1881 and 1882, when Mr. Gladstone was proposing the Closure, in which he gave a most admirable picture of the functions of the House of Commons.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have forgotten them.

\*MR. JOHN ELLIS: I can assure the House that those speeches form most admirable studies for young members. Now what did the right hon. Gentleman opposite say when Mr. Gladstone proposed this rule? He said;

"It will have the effect of enabling private Members to bring forward in that discussion on the Estimates all those questions in which they are interested, and it will enable them to keep close control over the administrative action of the Government for the time being."

Now what is the object of discussions in Committee of Supply? I do not think it is so much a question of economy, because, in my opinion, the House of Commons is rather inclined to press expenditure upon the Government than otherwise. It is in Committee of Supply that we are enabled to have the effective criticism and cross-examination of the policy of a particular Minister. We all know that in these days a good deal of the cross-examination of Ministers formerly done at question time in the form of supplementary questions has been curtailed, and at the best this method is always unsatisfactory. I have seen the right hon.

Gentleman the Member for Monmouthshire get up in this House and exercise his great powers

of cross-examination in Committee of Supply with the most happy effect upon the Government of the day. I can assure hon. Members who have listened to me that they cannot value too highly the privilege of putting a question to a Minister and getting an answer or an explanation at once during the informal debate of Committee of Supply. The right hon. Gentleman opposite, in the speech from which I have already quoted, said;

"Broadly, Supply alone affords private Members in this House that right of criticism, that constant power of demanding from the Government explanations of their administrative and executive action, which, without Supply, can never be possessed."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Hear, hear

\*MR. JOHN ELLIS: Then let the right hon. Gentleman do nothing to diminish that power of criticism. Surely I have given him some reason to doubt the working of this rule when I point out that last year forty-six Votes out of 151 were closed. [Mr. A. J. BALFOUR dissented.] Does the right hon. Gentleman dispute my figures?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No; but I dispute the inference drawn from them.

\*MR. JOHN ELLIS: It is a fact that a number of Votes were closed, and amongst them were a large number of Votes which had never come before the House in any form. This rule embraces in its operation the discussion on a Vote on Account. I can speak upon this matter with some knowledge, because I have had to consider the matter from quite another point of view. A Vote on Account does not give to any hon. Member the same facility of effective criticism as the ordinary Votes put from the Chair do. Under the regime of Mr. Courtney some antiquated rules were furbished up, and they became a part of the procedure to be adopted by succeeding chairmen. In this way the power of criticism was very much restricted in Committee of Supply. We all know that towards the end of the session hon. Members of this House who are interested enter into a kind of scramble with one another as to what Vote shall have the first order place on a Friday. Very often the Member for the Forest of Dean gets up and asks that the Estimate for the Board of Trade or some other Department shall be taken on a particular Friday, but I am glad that the right hon. Gentleman opposite has often resisted these appeals, and refused to give information as to what shall be put down first. There is always that kind of pressure brought to bear on the Government. This rule, so far as the closure part is concerned, puts the power into the hands of any Government of very much diminishing, if not of burking, the discussion of any inconvenient Vote of Supply. We have had this rule enforced only for five years, and it was worked by the right hon. Gentleman fairly well through the earlier years of that time. But we might have a very much worse Leader of the House than the right hon. Gentleman, whose fair-mindedness and absolute sense of honour, and the fact that he never breaks a promise, are some guarantees against the abuse of this rule. But it is possible that we might have someone in his position who might not be of the same calibre or possess the same qualifications. We must not forget that inroads are constantly being made into the effective power of control by this House over the Executive administration of the country. Necessarily, that requires watching, and if I had been allowed the necessary time I intended putting a few Amendments down to that effect. I think experience has proved that twenty days for Supply is altogether insufficient. It is really only nineteen days, because at ten o'clock on the nineteenth day the Chairman is bound to rise and put the Votes. Therefore, it is only nineteen-days at the most. The right hon. Gentleman took power some short time ago to have three additional days devoted to Supply, and I remember that when the rule was first moved we on this side of the House thought that twenty-five days at the very least should be allowed for Supply. I think Votes on Account ought to be excluded, as the discussion then comes under entirely different rules. The right hon. Gentleman has put in some words at the end of his rule which have entirely given away his own case, and conceded substantially what I am pleading for. He says there may be some Votes on which the House ought to have opportunity for fair and effective criticism; but I maintain that we ought to have that on every Vote. I do not intend to move any Amendment, but simply to express my satisfaction with the rule as regards the allocation of a particular

day, but my very strong objection to the closure part of it, which I believe may be found to have some very unexpected consequences.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I do not agree with the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down in the satisfaction he has expressed in regard to the working of this rule. I have always looked upon this rule as an exceedingly adroit device put forward by the Government to enable them to get Supply as easily as possible. It is a Front Bench rule, and I have no doubt at all that gentlemen on the Front Opposition Bench will agree that it is most admirable. But from the point of view of the private Member I believe it is absolutely fatal, and calculated to stifle independent criticism of the Government of the day. In a special way I regard it as fatal from the point of view of Ireland. Although it will be admitted that Irish Members on every occasion when the rights of the private Members have been called in question have taken their side and endeavoured to maintain their privileges, yet, at the same time, I would care very little for the operation of this rule were it not that it interferes with the rights of Irish Members to discuss the Irish Estimates. Under the operation of this rule, at first four nights were given to Irish Supply, but of late years the discussion of the Irish Estimates has been limited to three nights, although it must be evident that three nights are thoroughly inadequate for the purpose. There is scarcely any opportunity of raising questions in regard to administration in Ireland except on the Estimates, and it is absolutely absurd to imagine that that can be done in three nights.

Let me just call the attention of the House for a moment to the way in which this rule has been worked so far as Ireland is concerned. It will be admitted, probably with the greatest readiness, by the Leader of the House, that the most important Departments in Ireland, and those needing the most criticism from the Irish Nationalist Members and examination from the House generally, are those which deal with the administration of the Chief Secretary, and with the Royal Irish Constabulary, and yet under the operation of this rule these great Departments have not been discussed, and the Votes for their maintenance have been closed year after year. In 1897, the year after this rule came into force, neither the Royal Irish Constabulary, the Lord Lieutenant's Department, the Resident Magistrates, the Prisons Board, nor the Queen's Colleges, which raise the whole question of University Education in Ireland, were discussed, and the Votes were, at the end of twenty days, put by you. Sir, from the chair and carried without opportunity for debate. In the year 1898 the Local Government Vote was guillotined, and there was no discussion upon it. The same thing; occurred with the Votes for County Courts, the Royal Irish Constabulary which raises all sorts of constitutional questions, the Prisons Board, and the Industrial Schools. And will it be believed the Chief Secretary's Vote was closed without any discussion that year under the operation of this rule. I think the present occupant of the office of Chief Secretary, if he will allow me to say so is not exceedingly desirous that that Vote shall be closed. I am speaking from what I know of the right hon. Gentleman, that I think he would desire that the administration of his Department should be subjected to the free discussion of this House; but under the operation of this rule we have had this

most important Department closed. It is absurd to imagine that in these circumstances the Irish Members could acquiesce in this system. I have often had occasion to admire the audacity of the Leader of the House, but never more than to-night,

when he said in proposing the rule that he did not think it necessary to justify it by argument, because everybody was in favour of it. The hon. Gentleman who spoke before me called attention to the fact that this was a new Parliament. Now, when this rule was proposed in 1896 it was discussed for three nights before it was passed; and, every time it has been renewed since, it has been subjected to long and critical discussions. Surely, in proposing this rule to a new Parliament, it would have been only respectful in the Leader of the House to have explained the meaning of the rule; but, in his own airy fashion, he said he would not support it with argument, because he understood that everyone was in favour of it; I believe that, from a constitutional point of view, the duty of discussing Supply is more important than legislation; and this rule strikes at the root of the power of this House to discuss grievances before voting Supply.

I do not know whether the Leader of the House has anything special to say to the Irish Members. When he first proposed the rule we were told that we should have full time to consider the Irish Estimates, and that care would be taken that the Irish Votes would be taken on consecutive nights to suit the convenience of Irish Members. At first he gave us four nights, which were quite an inadequate number, but having got this rule, to some extent by smooth phrases, he turned round and reduced the Irish nights from four to three. I ask him what he proposes to do during the present session? Does he propose to give us three nights or to go back to the original number of four? In any case, so far as the Irish Members are concerned, they are bound to protest in every way against the passage of the rule. I think we have all of us reason to complain that the right hon. Gentleman has brought forward this rule at this hour of the night. I do not myself believe that anything is to be gained by party managers by their attempts at sharp practice in this House. There is no question that counting on the universal desire of the independent Members that the Miners Eight Hours Bill should be discussed to-morrow, the Government thought they would get this rule through without discussion. So far as the first rule is concerned they have failed; they have put it off till Thursday next.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: To please you.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: To please us; If the right hon. Gentleman had put it off at an earlier hour in the evening, he would have saved two hours discussion. However, he knows his own business best. He has put the first rule off till Thursday next, but he has taken this long, serious, and cumbersome rule at this hour of the night without giving one word of explanation to new Members of a new Parliament. I hope he will not succeed in getting it passed before twelve o'clock to-night. I think that to deprive private Members of the right to discuss the Estimates is very seriously to abridge the privileges of the House, and I sincerely trust that the Government will not succeed, after an hour's debate, and introduced as it was perfunctorily, in getting the rule. We protest

that this rule has worked iniquitously, so far as Irish interests are concerned, and that it is subversive of and dangerous to the rights of private Members. MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I confess there is something to be said for this rule and something against it. Why did we not make this a Standing instead of a Sessional Order? The question was discussed at the time it was brought in, and it was then suggested that it should be a Sessional Order in order that we might have an opportunity of discussing it every year. It was thought that changes or modifications might be made in it as the result of experience; but practically no changes were made in it in the last Parliament, and it seems to me that in a new Parliament we should have those changes which are admitted to be desirable. The first change I would suggest is that instead of devoting twenty days to Supply there should be twenty-five days. Twenty days are really not sufficient after the statement of my hon. friend, who pointed out that Ireland only got three days. We know that there is a great deal of discussion on matters relating to Ireland, and that there are differences of opinion between the present Government and the representatives of Ireland. They certainly ought to have more than three days.

Well, there is another objection, and that is that there is not a sufficient division of the Estimates. We have the Irish Estimates, the Scotch Estimates, the Army Estimates, and the Navy Estimates. It happens that at one time Gentlemen connected with the Army are very anxious to put forward matters in relation to the Army, and colonels, majors, and captains get up and make most lengthy speeches; but the consequence is that those interested in the Navy and other services have not got time to say much for themselves. We know perfectly well that there is a Service Association to which all these Army men belong, and they get up and talk at interminable length. Naturally the Civil Service Estimates are on that account put off. Now, there are a certain number of Gentlemen on this side of the House; and perhaps I count myself among the number; who are modest and unassuming, and who really get thrust out on these occasions, and cannot find an opportunity for discussing those subjects in which they are interested, and these Votes are included in the massacre of the innocents. There are the Home Office questions, which I have seen again and again put aside. Sometimes with a struggle Gentlemen interested in these matters get one single question debated. And there are Board of Trade questions which are not really discussed. There is another class of subjects, including Votes on Account. I think it is most unfair that the Government should take these enormous sums on account. Formerly, comparatively small amounts were asked for at a time, but latterly the Government say "Let us come forward with most enormous sums," and almost invariably when these are taken, only one single subject can be discussed. If we had two or three Votes on Account there might be opportunity for some discussion. Sometimes that is a way of attacking the Government. It is an indirect way of moving a vote of want of confidence in the Government.

As a matter of fact, I do not think that three days are enough for the Votes on Account. I think that, whatever the number of days set apart for Supply, we ought to have them for the discussion of the Estimates of the year; and that the

Government should take other Votes in their own time and not in the twenty or twenty-five days devoted to the Estimates of the year.

There is another objection to the last paragraph, which limits extra days discussion to Votes for war expenditure. We hear nothing nowadays but war, war, war. But it is said that we are going to have proposals for the reorganisation of the Army, and the enlargement of the Army, and the increase of the Navy: and time ought to be given to these subjects as well as to war expenditure. I say, too, that peace expenditure, on education for instance, is of far greater importance to the country than war-expenditure. I think we have a right to complain that the right hon. Gentleman has not adopted the practice of every previous session, of bringing on this discussion at the beginning instead of at the far end of the sitting, and after having closed a very interesting debate. Much as I desire the Miners Eight Hours Bill to be discussed to-morrow, I cannot resign one single right that I have to express my opinion on these rules; and I hope my friends around me will not resign their rights either. If the Miners Eight Hours Bill is not to be discussed to-morrow, then the responsibility will be on the Government.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I quite agree with several remarks of previous speakers in reference to the important duty which the House of Commons discharges in Committee of Supply. But they have omitted to state that the object of this rule was to increase the control of the House of Commons over expenditure and administration, and to do away with a state of things which older Members of the House know, but of which new Members have no idea. The hon. Member for Rushcliffe Division was rather too lavish in the tribute of admiration he gave to the Leader of the House. This rule, I am bound to say, is not a child of the Leader of the House, although he carried it through the House eventually. But the scheme of having one day in the week for Supply was the proposal of the right hon. the Member for West Monmouth.

MR. DILLON: But not the closure.

\*SIR HENRY FOWLER: I am not talking of the closure. The scheme was proposed by the right hon. the Member for West Monmouth, and I believe the first Friday night it was to come on the Government fell, and no further progress was made with it in that Parliament. As one having no interest in the matter except that of promoting the efficiency of the House, I must say that the rule has, on the whole, worked very well. [Cries of "No" from the Irish benches.] Well, I give the House my opinion.

What is the history of the state of things? If Members will only go back and inquire what the control of the House was over the Executive and the voting of Supply prior to the adoption of this rule, they would see what happened. Now and then the Government asked for a considerable number of Votes on Account, till these Votes on Account became such a serious evil that a special Committee was appointed to consider the practice, for it meant that the Government were taking lump sums without any control or examination by the House of Commons. What happened next? As the session went on, after the slaughter of the innocents had taken place, the Government told the House that they could not get away for their holidays until Supply had been passed. The House then sat night after



night voting money by millions without proper discussion and without any administrative control. Bargains were arranged in and out of the House; If you do so and so, so much earlier will the holidays begin. "Well, the autumn recess is not a thing to be trifled with, and the Government were strong enough to stifle all desire for administrative cross-examination or administrative efficiency. Many Members who interested themselves in financial matters, I believe, came to the conclusion that it was absolutely necessary to have some new scheme in order to provide that the House should have sufficient control over expenditure. A specific day once a week was the proposal of the right hon. the Member for West Monmouth, and was eventually agreed to by the House. The hon. Member for East Mayo said that the closure was not a part of that scheme. But it is substantially part of the scheme, because there must be a limit to the number of days to be devoted to Supply. The Leader of the House knows very well that I have taken exception to the allotment of the limited number of days, and that the present scheme is not the best that can be worked out. I feel considerable dissatisfaction with the mode in which the Civil Service Estimates, for example, have during the last two or three years been treated. I think that the duty of the allocation of the different nights ought to rest upon the Executive Government of the day. The right hon. Gentleman, as we all know, is most courteous and considerate, and I venture to say that he has been, if anything, too yielding in putting off Votes of general interest and in putting down Votes which are of interest only to individual Members. We have at present no system of allocation or distribution, except that one day of the week must be devoted to Supply. I think that the plan can be improved on in many points, but, taking it as it stands, I think that historically and practically the rule has been a great improvement on the state of things that existed before.

COLONEL MILWARD (Warwickshire, Stratford-on-Avon): Although I am of opinion that the new system is much better than the old system, yet I agree with the right hon. Gentleman that the present proposal is capable of improvement. I can quite easily understand that a Leader of the House not so eminently scrupulous as my right hon. friend might very easily burke discussion on subjects which Members of the House

might very strongly desire to discuss. If we had a Committee independent of the Government, such as the Committee of Selection or the Public Accounts Committee, who would choose the order of the day, it would I think be more desirable. The very fact that a particular subject is put down for a particular day indicates that criticism is to be passed on the Government regarding it, but at present it is possible for the Government to put aside a matter which they do not wish to have brought forward in the House. I think that is too dangerous a power to place in the hands of the Executive. I also think that the nineteenth and twentieth days; the days of the closure; are almost a scandal, and at all events extremely undignified as far as the business of the House is concerned. Hon. Gentlemen who take, as I take myself, an interest in the number of divisions that they take part in, come back to the House of Commons and vote in twenty or thirty divisions which are taken on those days, their object being not to take

an intelligent interest in the Estimates but to swell the number of their divisions. Many important Estimates are put forward on the nineteenth and twentieth days of which never a word has been heard. Therefore, while fully admitting that the present practice is an improvement on that of years past, still there are means by which it might be improved, and I hope that in another session the Government will direct their attention to the question of allocation, and also to the absurd system by which many Votes are closed on the last two days of Supply without a word of discussion.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): There is one remark that I desire to make about these rules. I am sure we all recognise that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House always endeavours to approach this matter not from a party standpoint, but in order to make the best arrangements possible. There is one great defect in the system, and that is the automatic closure at the end. Every critic is agreed as to that. Even the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East

Wolverhampton, who defended the rules more stoutly than the Leader of the House, passed very lightly over the question of the automatic closure at the end. In his description of the system which preceded these rules he said that two or three weeks were given to Supply and that the Government had to bargain with Members. I am very fond of these bargains; Members generally get something out of them; but there is no possibility of bargaining under these rules, as everything left over is automatically closed. I think that is a great defect, and I would submit to the right hon. Gentleman that some amendment on this point might be devised. If a longer time were given us; say, even half an hour or an hour; for referring to some of the great questions which are about to be closed it would be an improvement. I believe on one night recently twenty-eight millions were voted, and I question whether a parallel to that could be found under the old system. While we have an advantage in one respect under the new system, we have also the disadvantage of the automatic closure at the end. As the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has explained, the Government have also the right to select the Votes they like best, and the others may be left over to be automatically dealt with in the last two days. I quite frankly admit that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House does everything he can to meet the wishes of hon. Members on this side, but we are as likely to make a mistake as the Government. We cannot think of everything at once, and we may select something which seems desirable to us to discuss, only to find out at the last moment that a still more important subject has to be automatically closed. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will think over this matter and give us a longer buffer, which is what we require. Even a very little added time would be a great help. I do not see any harm in the new point introduced into the rules by the right hon. Gentleman, but I hope he has got nothing up his sleeve with regard to it. So far as I can see it is an improvement, because it gives us longer time. He has left out the rule with reference to Ways and Means, and I would appeal to him not to bring it up again. I am sure;

\*MR. SPEAKER: That hardly arises on this question.

MR. LOUGH: I readily accept your ruling, Sir. Generally, I think, the right hon.

Gentleman has put the matter very plainly to us, and I hope he will be able to state that the severity of the automatic closure at the end will be somewhat mitigated. That would be a great improvement.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I wish to make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House. Many new Members do not understand these elaborate rules. I am in some sense a new Member myself. Although I was a Member of four Parliaments after 1880, still I have been five years out of the House, and I am astonished at the fetters and cramps that the House has placed upon itself during that period with regard to facilities for debate, I find it impossible to take any step without going to the Table to find out whether I would be in order, although five years ago I would be under no such necessity. I think it would be much better if this motion were put down at a time when it could be properly discussed and when Amendments could be placed on the Paper, and I would therefore appeal to the Leader of the House to adjourn the debate until Thursday.

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I wish also to make an appeal to the Leader of the House with regard to a point raised by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton; namely, the allocation of days for various classes of Supply. I agree with the right hon. Gentleman and with my hon. and gallant friend that the allocation of days as between the different classes of Supply is very uncertain and very often very unjust. Questions of very great importance have been, I will not say burked, but have been passed over, and the opportunity for discussing them has been lost because the time of the House has been entirely taken up with some other class of Supply very much less important. Organised parties and sections in this House have a very great advantage in obtaining days over individual Members who may be quite as numerous and equally interested in some subject of great importance. For instance, the Irish party by their activity and organisation always command a very great and perhaps an excessive share of the time allotted for Supply. [Several HON. MEMBERS: No, no&#x0021;] I quite admit Irish Members have a full right to their opinion, and I will not pursue the specialisation of this subject. The particular subject to which I wish to refer is the Foreign Office Vote. In recent years that Vote has been placed very much in the background, I will not say deliberately, but the opportunity for discussing important questions on it has not been given. Take the subject of China, which has been very little discussed during the last few years, although it is a subject of vast importance, and involves greater British interests than any other subject, not even excepting South Africa. That has been burked for season after season. I think the suggestion of my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Stratford-on-Avon; that a special Committee should be appointed to consider with the Government the allocation of the days to be given to Supply as between the different classes; is a very valuable suggestion. I agree with my hon. and gallant friend that this is a question which ought not to be left entirely to the Government of the day. It is not a question which it is quite safe to leave entirely to the Government, and I should like to see a small Committee appointed, consisting of the leaders on both sides and of the various sections

of the House, to consider and report as to the number of days it is, as a rule, desirable to allocate to the different classes of Supply. I do not say that there should be a hard and fast rule without any variation, but at all events it ought to be laid down that such a subject as the Foreign Office Vote should always have at least two days of Supply allotted to it. I hope my right hon. friend the Leader of the House will consider that suggestion.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): This motion has received the imprimatur of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton, as we all expected it would. Indeed, he was more enthusiastic in its favour than the right hon. Gentleman who moved it. but who gave no arguments in favour of it. I put it to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton that the ordinary Members of this House, as distinct from Front Bench men, are more interested in this question of Supply than either of the Front Benches. I would also call his attention to the fact that since this rule has been in operation, and when great questions concerning the Civil Service, Irish affairs, and other different subjects have been under discussion, Gentlemen on the front benches have been conspicuous by their absence; and even when present they sit indolently and perhaps somnolently in their places. Therefore the question of Supply is of much more importance to and much better understood by Gentlemen on the back benches than by right hon. Gentlemen on the front benches.

If there is one class of Members who regard this rule with keen suspicion and great jealousy it is the Irish Members. I have had some experience in connection with the Irish Estimates, and it leads me to the conclusion that since this rule has come into operation a great deal of time is very often spent on comparatively unimportant Votes, and the Votes that really touch Irish administration, which go to the root of the action of the Executive in Ireland, and which alone give Irish Members an opportunity of criticising the Government in Ireland, are passed over sub silentio. Irish Members may have an opportunity of intervening in big debates, but the cross-examination in Supply of the Ministers connected with the Executive in Ireland is of more importance to Irish interests than if we had a full-dress debate once a month. The fact is that in this country any subject which engages public attention, whether it concerns the Army, the Navy, the Civil Service, or the Foreign Office, is discussed in institutions all over the country, as well as in the press, and the necessity of discussing it in this House is not a tenth of the necessity which exists for the discussion of Irish affairs, because subjects of interest in Ireland, and gross abuses of the administration in Ireland, pass comparatively unheeded in this country, and, even if they are taken notice of in the press, they only find lodgment in some obscure corner. Therefore the chief opportunity which the Irish Members have of discussing questions in connection with the administration of Ireland is on the Votes in Supply. When I came to this House fifteen years ago our opportunities for debating Supply were practically unlimited. At any rate, they were much more comprehensive than they are at present. Now the consideration of the Irish Votes in Supply is arbitrarily cut down to three nights. What happens? The Minister does not care a threeneen. Irish Members may get up one after the other, and

speaking a whole night perhaps on the drainage of the river Suck, but the Minister knows very well all the time important Votes affecting administration in Ireland are being put back, and he actually connives; and it is very hard to blame him; at this waste of public time, in order that when his own Department comes to be discussed only an hour or perhaps a few minutes remain to consider matters of importance. I was very much struck by the attempt of my hon. and learned friend the Member for Waterford to draw the present Chief Secretary into some expression of opinion that he would not be the naughty boy that previous Chief Secretaries have been. I noticed when my hon. and learned friend was speaking that a smile spread over the good-looking features of the present Chief Secretary, and when my hon. and learned friend mentioned that the Chief Secretary's Vote had not been discussed last year or the year before, he no doubt mentally rubbed his hands in glee, and said, "I am going to have a jolly fine time of it." But when my hon. and learned friend, in that winning way of his, appealed to the right hon. Gentleman as to whether he would not be more industrious, and whether he would not see that these important Votes would not be scamped, the right hon. Gentleman sat tight and said nothing; but the smile remained. I contend from every point of view that there is no section of Members in this House more interested in this question of Supply than the Irish Members. It is supposed to be a maxim of constitutional law that the redress of grievances should precede Supply, and I suppose that the brightest pages in connection with the constitutional freedom of Great Britain refer to the battles which have been fought between arbitrary monarchs and the Commons on questions of Supply. I contend that the importance of discussions in Supply to this country is not so great as it was a century, or even a few generations ago. You have institutions; the press and debating societies; throughout Great Britain, but in Ireland acts may be committed by the Executive which may be in themselves unconstitutional, and the only chance of redress we have is during the discussion of Votes in Supply affecting Irish matters, and therefore I say any system under which the Irish Votes only get three days works unfairly. After the King's Speech, and with the exception of a little Bill or two we hope to introduce, we shall have practically no opportunity of bringing forward questions affecting our country, except on these Votes of Supply, and I certainly think the Irish Members should strenuously urge that we should at least have five or six days, and that a guarantee to that effect should be given us.

MR. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton claimed the paternity of these rules for the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth. If the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth were present to-night I am not certain that he would be proud of it, because when the rules were proposed for the first time he strongly opposed; and he is the most experienced champion of the rights of the House of Commons; the application of the automatic closure to Supply. Of course, everyone who takes any interest in Supply (and I agree with my hon. friend that the Front Benches are not the most interested in it) agreed with the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth that it would be a good thing if one night each week

were given to Supply; but the right hon. Gentleman never proposed and never assented to the, application of the automatic closure, and when the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton declares that the application of the automatic closure to Supply, which is a scandal and disgrace to this House, was an inseparable part of the scheme proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth I entirely deny it. The right hon. Gentleman stated in his speech that he believed the scheme would work without it, and he appealed to the Government to give the proposal a fair trial. I want to know why such a scheme should not work well. Why could we not give Friday of each week to the discussion of Supply, and let the Votes not discussed on Fridays be taken in the ordinary way? That would be an improvement, and would not place any new difficulty in the path of the Government.

The First Lord of the Treasury, when he made his original proposal, made it in a very insinuating speech. He declared that his object in making it was to improve the position and opportunities of private Members. But how did he improve the opportunities of private Members? Before these rules were introduced we had Fridays and also Tuesdays for private Members' business. He proposed to take away Fridays from private Members for Government business, but he said, in that agreeable and insinuating manner of which he is the master, "I must not take away Fridays for Government business. Supply is private Members' business, and under these rules we are giving private Members an admirable opportunity of bringing forward subjects in which they are interested." I say that in taking Fridays for Supply the right hon. Gentleman was taking away a private Members' night, for which he has given us absolutely nothing in return. Moreover, he has put in force the extraordinary principle of the automatic closure. Now I want to ask the Government a question which I have asked before. Why is this automatic closure to be applied to Supply and not to be applied to Bills? In the debates which took place in 1896 the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth; and no one has a greater knowledge of the House of Commons than he has; expressed it as his deliberate opinion that if you applied the automatic closure

to Supply you would be driven irresistibly by the force of logic to apply it to legislation. I believe that to be true, because every argument in favour of closing Supply applies with greatly increased force to legislation. In Supply there are only two stages; in legislation there are several stages, and also the check of the House of Lords, which does not exist in the case of Supply; and therefore, apart from all other considerations, it is a much more violent proceeding to apply the automatic closure to money Votes in this House than to apply it to Bills. As I have said, these rules give private Members nothing, while depriving them of one of the most effective, I think I might almost say the only, means they have of putting pressure on the Government and of really effectively surveying the action of the Executive. We have seen to-night, ample proof that this Sessional Order is in itself vicious. It proposes to apply to delicate machinery, which is the result of ages of experience, and is the most perfect machinery ever devised by the wit of man to bring the Executive

Government into touch with the people, a strait-jacket which will make it impossible to work, and which will ultimately result in bringing it into absolute inaction. I am perfectly convinced if this system is persisted in that the time will come when even the twenty days which are now allotted for Supply will be more than sufficient, because the discussion of Supply under the operation of these rules will become absolutely unreal and farcical, and hon. Members have a very great dislike to taking part in what they know to be a mockery and a farce. Some among us took the liberty of saying in 1896 that the effect of these rules would be to increase enormously the expenditure of this country. Everyone who has devoted any attention to the subject knows that one of the chief aids which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had in defending himself and the Treasury against the ever-increasing demands of the great Departments of the State, was the dread of passing his Estimates through this House. When you passed these rules you removed from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that great aid. What has been the result? In the whole history of England there has never been such an unheard-of rapidity of increase in the Estimates, and I venture to submit to the House that those of us who prophesied that the result of the introduction of these rules would be a great and unparalleled increase in the expenditure of this country have been fully justified.

There is another matter which has been touched upon lightly in the course of this debate. An hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite said that these rules placed too much power in the hands of the Executive Government. I believe that is true. The working of these rules is only beginning to be understood. Everyone who has any experience of the House of Commons knows that it takes many years before hon. Members can realise what the effect of a great change, in procedure is. These rules enable the Government, if they are so disposed, to withdraw any Vote or group of Votes from the discussion of the House altogether. For instance, they might say that the condition of Ireland was such that it would be better not to discuss Irish Votes at all, or it would be open to them to take the view that the condition of foreign affairs was such that no time was available for the discussion of Irish business. The right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury is at present, and has been for some years, sailing in summer seas with a favourable wind behind him. He has a majority of 130, and an Opposition which takes things so quietly that he gets up occasionally and complains that they will not play the game and give him an interest in the discussions. But we in Ireland have I known the right hon. Gentleman under other circumstances, and we know that if he is pushed into a corner he has claws, although at present they may be with drawn. If Ireland became troublesome again, and if the Irish Members became: a nuisance, I am not so sure that the right hon. Gentleman, however agreeable his speeches may now be, would not closure the Irish Estimates. The law would be with him, and the only right we should have would be dependent on the goodwill of Ministers, and a right which depends on the goodwill of Ministers is practically non-existent. These I rules give the Leader of the House the absolute right, without in the least degree infringing their spirit or their letter, to

closure all the Irish Votes. I think that alone shows that it would be impossible for us to agree to them. I have merely touched upon the fringe of the subject. It is a subject in which I take great interest and which I understand, but as it is only a Sessional Order, and as we shall have another opportunity of discussing it, I do not intend to say all I should like to say now. I will, however, submit an Amendment which I believe I shall be in order in moving at a later stage, in order to further safeguard the rights of Members.

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot speak on the subject again.

MR. DILLON: We were allowed a Second Reading discussion in 1896, in 1897, and 1898, and Amendments were taken afterwards, but it is not a matter of importance, because one of my colleagues will move my Amendment. The Amendment which I desire to move is, "Provided also that not less than six nights shall be allocated for the discussion of Irish Estimates."

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick's): As an Irish Member, I protest most strongly against the motion before the House, because my experience in this House is that the only effective opportunity an Irish Member has of entering a protest against what is called Government in Ireland is on Supply. We have no constitutional Government in Ireland. We are governed by bodies non-elected and irresponsible, and who are not chosen by the people, and the only opportunity given to Irish Members in this House of criticising the action of these bodies who deal with public money collected from the Irish taxpayer is on Votes in Supply. In my opinion this motion is an infringement of the liberties of Irish Members in this House. I also maintain that the right hon. Gentleman ought not to have brought in rules of this kind without notice, and without Members being afforded an opportunity of putting down Amendments. The right hon. Gentleman contends, in that nice language of which he is such a master, that it is for the advantage of private Members that he has introduced these rules. I am surprised that the House has not taken more cognisance of this motion, because, in my opinion, the most sacred privilege which belongs to Members of this House is the right to criticise Supply and Ways and Means. What is the difference between this House and the House of Lords? It is that we can originate money Bills, and are supposed to regulate taxation. The motion of the right hon. Gentleman proposes to limit the power which now resides in private Members, and as an Irish Member I protest most strongly against it, and I hope we will be able to defeat it by the votes of the independent Members of this House. May I briefly point out this fact. Members frequently come over from Ireland to take part in the discussion on Votes in Supply only to find, when they arrive in this House, that the automatic closure has been brought into operation and they might just as well have stayed at home. [HON. MEMBERS laughed.] Hon. Members opposite may think that this a matter of laughter.

\*MR. SPEAKER: It is not relevant to, the question before the House.

MR. FIELD: I was pointing out, Mr. Speaker, the fact that Members coming over from Ireland find that they are prevented from taking part in debate owing to the automatic closure.

\*MR. SPEAKER: That is the irrelevant observation to which I refer.

MR. FIELD: I bow to your ruling, Sir; but when a Member is prevented by



the automatic closure from taking part in debate, that is certainly a very relevant matter for him. I object most strongly to this motion, because, in my opinion; and I am sure my opinion is the opinion of the independent Members of this House; it is an attempt to limit the right which private Members possess at present of criticising Supply. That is one of the most important functions that can be exercised by the House of Commons, and is at the root of all the liberty which England possesses. It is on money questions that the whole Government of this country depends. If you stop supplies you stop the Government, and that is the reason why the right hon. Gentleman is so anxious to have this matter settled without discussion, and that is the reason why right hon. Gentlemen on the two Front Benches want things manipulated according to their own ideas, and object to have questions of Supply debated by independent Members. This is a dangerous proposal, and ought to be resisted not only by Liberal Members, but also by independent Conservative Members, because, as I understand, the Conservative Members are as jealous of their liberties as either Irish or Liberal Members. I trust that when this matter is put to a vote, at least a sufficient number of Members will vote against it to show the public that we are determined to maintain our right, as private Members, to criticise Supply brought before us by the Government.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman who introduced this motion has a majority, and that majority will support him, but some day perhaps hon. Gentlemen opposite who used to be such strong champions of the rights of private Members may realise more than they do now the importance of these rules. With the experience which we have had of the operation of these rules, I am more convinced than ever that they are not in the best interests of the House. Year after year we have been unable, no matter how keenly we may have desired it, to say a single word with regard to several great spending Departments of the State. I can point to case after case, especially affecting Scotland, where we have had no opportunity of saying a word. It has been the same with the Board of Agriculture, the Local Government Board, and many other Departments. What is the result? This House is losing its power. The Departments are becoming your masters. What do they care if you have a grievance in Supply? They know perfectly well that no opportunity will arise for discussing it. We are told that this is really a private Member's motion. Is it not a fact that before these rules were introduced we could discuss Votes on Account, and had still left to us the discussion on the Vote in Supply? It may have been the fault of private Members if they did not avail themselves of this opportunity, but at least they had it. I desire to move an Amendment, and I must complain that no opportunity was given us of putting Amendments on the Paper. I beg to move in line 16 to leave out the word "three" in order to insert the word "five." The result will be to give two more days for Supply, which would certainly be some slight concession to the views we hold on this side of the House, especially as the Foreign Office and the War Office will take more time than usual this session.

Amendment proposed;

"In line 16, to leave out the word 'three, in order to insert the word

'five.'";(Mr. Daziel.)

Question proposed, "That the word three' stand part of the Question."

ME. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): The Amendment appears to me to be one which would to some extent meet the

difficulties which have been pointed out by hon. Members from Ireland. There can be no doubt whatever, no matter how hon. Gentlemen opposite may object, that it is a perfectly reasonable thing for Irish Members to take every opportunity to increase our facilities for discussing Supply with reference to our own country.

The three or four days now allotted to Irish Supply are not nearly enough. I hope the Amendment will be accepted. In my opinion the First Lord of the Treasury has not treated the House fairly in proposing this motion at this time- He knows perfectly well what is expected to take place to-morrow and the state of public business generally, and it would be much better if he deferred the further consideration of the motion until Thursday. But as he has not done so, I hope he will accept this very reasonable Amendment. It is a monstrous thing, apart from the Irish point of view altogether, that the whole Supply of this country must be dealt with in twenty days. That is not nearly enough, and there should be thirty or thirty-five days allotted to Supply. The result of the present system undoubtedly is that Supply cannot be adequately debated. It being midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

#### LEAD POISONING.

Address for "Return of the number of cases of Lead Poisoning reported as occurring (1) in the earthenware and china industry, for each month from January, 1898, to December, 1900, both inclusive, and (2) in all other trades (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 171. of Session 1900).";(Mr. Coghill.)

#### PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Ordered, That the Committee do consist of Fifteen Members.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of;Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Banbury, Mr. Blake Mr. Gibson Bowles, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Cameron Corbett, Sir Thomas Esmonde, Mr. Goddard, Sir Brampton Gurdon, Sir Arthur Hayter, Mr. Brodie Hoare, Mr. Herbert Lewis, Sir Robert Mowbray, and Mr. Pym.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.:(Sir William Walrond.)

#### PUBLIC PETITIONS.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed, to whom shall be referred all Petitions presented to the House, with the exception of such as relate to Private Bills; and that such Committee do classify and prepare abstracts of the same, in such form and manner as shall appear to them best suited to convey to the House all requisite information respecting their contents, and do report the same from time to time to the House and that the Reports of the Committee do set forth the number of signatures to each Petition only in respect to those signatures to which addresses are fixed; and that such Committee have power to direct the printing in extenso of such Petitions, or of such parts of Petitions; as shall appear to require it;And that such Committee have power to report

their opinion and observations thereupon to the House.

The Committee was accordingly nominated of;Mr. Allsopp, Mr. Edward Barry, Mr. Brymer, Sir Charles Dalrymple, Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, General Laurie, Mr. Herbert Lewis, Sir Henry Meysey-Thompson, Mr. Charles Morley, Mr. T. P. O'Connor, Mr. Philipps, Mr. Tollemache, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, and Mr. Henry Joseph Wilson.

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

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve of the clock.