

**<url><https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/jan/23></url>**

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

Wednesday, 23rd January, 1901.

The House met at Four of the clock.

It having pleased Almighty God to take to His mercy our late Most Gracious Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria of blessed memory, who departed this life yesterday between the hours of six and seven of the clock in the evening, at Osborne House, in the Isle of Wight; and Her late Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, and others, having met this day at Saint James's Palace, and having directed that His Royal Highness Albert Edward Prince of Wales be proclaimed King, by the Style and Title of Edward the Seventh,; Mr. Speaker, and several other Members, came to the House of Commons this day, where Mr. Speaker alone, and then the other Members present, took the Oath, and several Members made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn";(Mr. Anstruther);put, and agreed to.

Adjourned at Five minutes after Six of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 24th January, 1901.

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and two other Members made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn";(Mr. Anstruther);put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at ten minutes before Six of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 25th January, 1901.

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and one other Member made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

THE DEATH OF QUEEN VICTORIA.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following Telegrams of Condolence with the British Nation in the loss it had sustained by the death of Her late Majesty;

Telegram, dated Athens,  
23rd January, 1901, 8 p.m.

From the, President of the Chamber of Deputies of the Hellenes, to the Speaker of the House of Commons.

The Chamber of Deputies, respectfully associating itself with the grief and mourning of England, has charged me to transmit to your Excellency, and by your intervention to the House of Commons, its heartfelt and sincere condolence. The Creek people will ever honour, and hold in grateful recollection, the glorious Queen who in their hours of difficulty graciously showed Her sympathy and goodwill.

From the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Roumania, to the Speaker of the House of Commons.

The Chamber of Deputies of Roumania, deeply moved by the calamity which has struck the noble English nation, associates itself with the national grief, and mourns with it the noble Sovereign it has lost.

From the President of the National Assembly of Servia, to the Speaker of the House of Commons.

The Servian National Assembly, sharing in the grief of the English people for the loss of the great, noble, and wise Queen Victoria, has expressed in its sitting of yesterday its very deep respect for the memory of the deceased Sovereign.

MESSAGE FROM THE KING RESPECTING THE DEATH OF HER LATE MAJESTY.

Mr. BALFOUR (at the Bar) acquainted the House that he had a Message from His Majesty the King to this House signed by His Majesty's own hand. And he presented the same to the House, and it was read by Mr. SPEAKER (all the Members of the House being uncovered), and is as followeth::

EDWARD REX.

The King is fully assured that the House of Commons will share in the deep sorrow which has befallen His Majesty and the Nation by the lamented death of His Majesty's mother, the late Queen. Her devotion to the welfare of Her country and Her people, and Her wise and beneficent rule during the sixty-four years of Her glorious reign will ever be held in affectionate memory by Her loyal and devoted subjects throughout the dominions of the British Empire.

ADDRESS IN REPLY TO THE KING'S MESSAGE.

\*THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): The history of this House is not a brief or an uneventful one, but I think it has never met in sadder circumstances than to-day or had the melancholy duty laid more clearly upon it of expressing a universal sorrow; a sorrow extending from one end of the Empire to the other, a sorrow which fills every heart and which every citizen feels, not merely as a national, but also as a personal loss. I do not know how it may seem to others, but, for my own part, I can hardly yet realise the magnitude of the blow which has fallen upon the country; a blow, indeed, sorrowfully expected, but not, on that account, less heavy when it falls. I suppose that, in all the history of the British Monarchy, there never has been a case in which the feeling of national grief was so deep-seated as it is at present, so universal, so spontaneous. And that grief affects us not merely because we have lost a great personality, but because we feel that the end of a great epoch has come upon us; an epoch the beginning of which stretches beyond the memory, I suppose, of any individual whom I am now addressing, and which embraces within its compass sixty-three years, more

important, more crowded with epoch-making change, than almost any other period of like length that could be selected in the history of the world. It is wonderful to reflect that, before these great changes, now familiar and almost vulgarised by constant discussion, were thought of or developed; great industrial inventions, great economic changes, great discoveries in science which are now in all men's mouths;-Queen Victoria reigned over this Empire. Yet, Sir, it is not this reflection, striking though it be, which now moves us most deeply. It is not simply the length of the reign, it is not simply the magnitude of the events with which that reign is filled, which have produced the deep and abiding emotion which stirs every heart throughout this kingdom. The reign of Queen Victoria is no mere chronological landmark. It is no mere convenient division of time, useful to the historian or the chronicler. No, Sir, we feel as we do feel for our great loss because we intimately associate the personality of Queen Victoria with the great succession of events which have filled her reign, with the growth, moral and material, of the Empire over which she ruled. And, in so doing, surely we do well. In my judgment, the importance of the Crown in our Constitution is not a diminishing, but an increasing factor. It increases, and must increase with the development of those free, self-governing communities, those new commonwealths beyond the sea, who are constitutionally linked to us through the person of the Sovereign, the living symbol of Imperial unity. But, Sir, it is not given, it cannot, in ordinary course, be given, to a constitutional Monarch to signalise his reign by any great isolated action. His influence, great as it may be, can only be produced by the slow, constant, and cumulative results of a great ideal and a great example; and in presenting effectively that great ideal and that great example to her people Queen Victoria surely was the first of all constitutional Monarchs whom the world has yet seen. Where shall we find any

ideal so lofty in itself, so constantly and consistently maintained, through two generations, through more than two generations, of her subjects, through many generations of her Ministers and public men?

Sir, it would be almost impertinent for me were I to attempt to express to the House in words the effect which the character of our late Sovereign produced upon all who were in any degree, however remote, brought in contact with her. In the simple dignity, befitting a Monarch of this realm, she could never fail, because it arose from her inherent sense of the fitness of things. And because it was no artificial ornament of office, because it was natural and inevitable, this queenly dignity only served to throw into a stronger relief, into a brighter light those admirable virtues of the wife, the mother, and the woman with which she was so richly endowed. Those kindly graces, those admirable qualities, have endeared her to every class in the community, and are known to all. Perhaps less known was the life of continuous labour which her position as Queen threw upon her. Short as was the interval between the last trembling signature affixed to a public document and the final and perfect rest, it was yet long enough to clog and hamper the wheels of administration; and when I saw the accumulating mass of untouched documents which awaited the attention of the Sovereign, I marvelled at the unostentatious patience which for sixty-three

years, through sorrow, through suffering, in moments of weariness, in moments of despondency, had enabled her to carry on without break or pause her share in the government of this great Empire. For her there was no holiday, to her there was no intermission of toil. Domestic sorrow, domestic sickness, made no difference in her labours, and they were continued from the hour at which she became our Sovereign to within a few days; I had almost said a few hours; of her death. It is easy to chronicle the growth of Empire, the course of discovery, the progress of trade, the triumphs of war, all the events that make history interesting or exciting; but who is there that will dare to weigh in the balance the effect which such an example, con-

tinued over sixty-three years, has produced on the highest life of her people? It was a great life, and surely it had a, happy ending. She found her reward in the undying affection and the passionate devotion of all her subjects, where so ever their lot might be cast. This has not always been the fate of her ancestors. It has not been the fate of some of the greatest among them. It has been their less happy destiny to outlive contemporary fame, to see their people's love grow cold, to find new generations growing up who know them not, and burdens to be lifted too heavy for their aged arms. Their sun, once so bright, has set amid darkening clouds and the muttering of threatening-tempests. Such was not the lot of Queen Victoria. She passed away with her children and her children's children, to the third generation, around her, beloved and cherished of all. She passed away without, I well believe, a single enemy in the world; for even those who loved not England loved her; and she, passed away not only knowing that she was; I had almost said adored by her people, but that their feelings towards her had grown in depth and intensity with every year in which she was spared to rule over them. No such reign, no such ending, can the history of this country show us.

Mr. Speaker, the Message from the King which you have read from the Chair calls forth, according to the immemorial usage of this House, a double response. We condole with His Majesty upon the irreparable loss which he and the country have sustained. We congratulate him upon his accession to the ancient dignities of his House. I suppose at this moment there is no sadder heart in this kingdom than that of its Sovereign; and it may seem therefore to savour of bitter irony that we should offer him on such a melancholy occasion the congratulations of his people. Yet, Sir, it is not so. Each generation must bear its own burdens; and in the course of nature it is right that the burden of Monarchy should fall upon the heir to the Throne. He is, therefore, to be congratulated, as every man is to be congratulated who, in obedience to plain duty, takes upon himself the weight of great responsibilities, filled with the earnest hope of worthily fulfilling his task to the end, or, in his own

words, "while life shall last." It is for us on this occasion, so momentous in the history of the Monarchy, so momentous in the history of the King, to express to him our unfailing confidence that the great interests committed to his charge are safe in his keeping, to assure him of the ungrudging-support which his loyal subjects are ever prepared to give, him, to wish him honour, to wish him long life, to wish him the greatest of all blessings, the blessing of reigning over a

happy and a contented people, and to wish, above all, that his reign may, in the eyes of an envious posterity, fitly compare with that great epoch which has just drawn to a close. Mr. Speaker, I now beg to read the Address which I shall ask you to put from the Chair and to which I shall ask the House to assent. I move; "That a humble Address be presented to His Majesty, to assure His Majesty that this House deeply sympathises in the great sorrow which His Majesty has sustained by the death of our beloved Sovereign, the late Queen, whose unfailing devotion to the duties of Her high estate and to the welfare of Her people will ever cause Her reign to be remembered with reverence and affection: to submit to His Majesty our respectful congratulations on His Accession to the Throne, to assure His Majesty of our loyal attachment to His person, and further to assure Him of our earnest conviction that His reign will be distinguished under the blessing of Providence by an anxious desire to maintain the Laws of the Kingdom, and to promote the happiness and liberty of His subjects."

\*SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Sir, the gracious Message which we have received from His Majesty the King and the Address by which the First Lord of the Treasury proposes that we should make reply to that Message concern themselves with a subject on which, happily for us, the House of Commons forgets all differences of party and of political opinion. If I were to borrow a phrase from the stately Proclamation which yesterday resounded through these islands, I should say that it is "with one voice and consent of tongue and heart" that on these occasions we are accustomed in this country to act. If this is so, if we are all of one mind to-day, it is not merely in giving formal expression to constitutional and traditional loyalty; there is a deeper and stronger chord, a more intimate chord, that has been struck by the events of this week. The ties that bind the people of this country to the Throne and the Royal House have not been created, they are not such as could be created, by the wit or theory of philosopher or statesman; they have been knit by the character and the life of Queen Victoria and the members of Her Royal Family. I am not going to attempt to add; because if I attempted to add to it I should spoil it; to the eloquent panegyric which the right hon. Gentleman has passed upon the great Sovereign whose loss we deplore to-day. One might, of course, enlarge upon many points that were most prominent in her character and conduct, on her ungrudging devotion to duty, on her scrupulous observance of constitutional rules, on the soundness of her judgment, on her unfailing discretion, on the unsullied goodness of her life, and on her singularly quick and watchful sympathy with everything that could bring joy or sorrow to any of her subjects. But there is one thing which strikes me as having, above, all, from the earliest days of Her Majesty's reign, won for her the hearts of her people, and which has increased her hold upon them as the revolving years succeeded each other, and this is a certain homely sincerity of character and life and purpose which, amid all the pomp and dignity of her august position, seemed to make the whole world kin. If we were to attempt to appreciate the light in which Queen Victoria has been regarded, and in which her memory will continue to be regarded by her people at home, and by her subjects within the vast bounds of her Empire; if we were to attempt it; we should search in vain down the long list of epithets expressive of

pride and affection; admired, beloved, revered, even adored; to find one which accurately or adequately conveyed the real sentiment of her people towards her. I believe that this is because there was between them a friendly, tender, almost familiar, mutual understanding which it is impossible to put into words. Who can measure the strength which the existence of a relation such as this between the Sovereign and her

people must have given through all these years to this kingdom and this Empire? We have been so habituated to it that we hardly realise it; and it is now, when the relentless hand of death has taken Her Majesty from us, that we see how much we owed to her. Let me ask how often it must have happened during her long reign that some policy or action on the part of this country, either by fault of ours or not, may have failed to secure the goodwill of other States and nations among our neighbours, and how often may the evil effects of such a state of things have been averted by the knowledge, which was universal in the world, of the Queen's personal and sincere devotion to the cause of peace and freedom and uprightness. It is, therefore, with a deep sense of gratitude for all the happiness and the strength which Her Majesty, by her own personal qualities, has given to her faithful people that we bow the head before the decree of Divine Providence which has put a close to a reign the most beneficent that has been seen in any nation and in any age of the world.

Happily, the grief with which we suffer this irreparable loss is in some degree assuaged by our well-founded confidence that the Monarch who succeeds to the Throne will follow the same line of public conduct and will adhere to the same principles of life as have wrought so much good in the past. It often happens when a new occupant comes to the Throne of a country, that he is an untried Prince, unversed in public affairs; it may be even that he is little known personally to those over whom he is called upon to reign. It is not so with King Edward. For the greater part of his life it has fallen to him not only to discharge a large part of the ceremonial public duty which would naturally fall to be performed by the head of the State, but also to take a leading part in almost every scheme established for the benefit, material or moral, of the people of this country. Religion and charity, the public health, science, literature, and art, education, commerce, agriculture; not one of these objects appealed in vain to His Majesty, while he was Prince of Wales, for strong sympathy and even for personal effort and influence. We know how unselfish he has been in the assiduous discharge of all his public duties, we know with what tact and geniality he has been able to lend his aid to the furtherance of these great objects. Therefore it is, not only that we hope, but that, from our past experience, we know, that His Majesty understands and enters into and appreciates and sympathises with the desires and needs of his people, and that he will devote himself even to a greater degree than he has been able to do in the past to the promotion of their welfare. And in this, perhaps, it may be light to say that it is an additional satisfaction to us to know that His Majesty will have by his side his august Consort, who has reigned in the hearts of the British people ever since she first set foot on our soil. Sir, there will be no discordant voice in this House to-day. If there were, we should not

fittingly represent those who have sent us here. There will be but one universal feeling of sorrow for the lamentable calamity that has befallen the nation, and of hopeful confidence for a happy and prosperous future. I beg to second the motion.

Resolution agreed to, nemine contradicente.

To be presented by Privy Councillors and Members of His Majesty's Household.

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House do now adjourn till Thursday, the 14th February,";(Mr. A. J. Balfour);put, and agreed to.

Adjourned accordingly at ten minutes after Four of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 14th February, 1901.

The House met at a quarter before Two of the clock.

Message to attend His Majesty.

The House went; and, being returned;;

Several other Members took and subscribed the Oath, and several other Members made and subscribed the Affirmation required by Law.

MESSAGE FROM THE KING (DEATH OF HER LATE MAJESTY AND ACCESSION OF HIS MAJESTY)

The COMPTROLLER OF THE HOUSEHOLD reported His Majesty's Answer to the Address [25th January], as followeth;;

"I have received with much gratification your dutiful and affectionate Address.

"I am touched and consoled by your sympathy with My grief at the loss of My beloved Mother, the Queen, to whose unfailing devotion to the welfare of Her people throughout Her long and memorable reign you bear testimony.

"I return you My thanks for the expression of your loyal attachment to My person and your confidence in My desire to promote the happiness and liberty of My subjects; and I fervently join in your prayer that Almighty God will guide and strengthen My councils to that end."

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received the following communications expressing condolence with the British Nation in the loss it had sustained by the death of Her late Majesty;

Budapest, 24th January, 1901.

Right Honourable Mr. Speaker,

The House of Representatives of the Hungarian Parliament has been greatly affected by the cruel loss which the peoples of Great Britain have suffered by the demise of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and in its session held on January 23rd, in giving expression to the grief and profound sympathy of the Hungarian nation it has paid the tribute of its reverent feelings to the memory of the Noble Queen, who during a reign of unexampled duration, always maintained and held sacred the traditions of the constitution and was always surrounded by the enthusiastic love of Her people.

The Hungarian House of Representatives has entrusted me with communicating these sincere feelings of the House to the Parliament (of Great Britain) by your kind mediation.

I beg you, Right Honourable Mr. Speaker, to accept the expression of my sincere respect, and remain,

Yours truly,  
TERIZAL,  
The President of the House of  
Representatives of the Hungarian  
Parliament.

Copy.  
Italian Embassy,  
January 25th, 1901.  
Translation.

Monsieur le Marquis,  
The Italian Chamber of Deputies adjourned its sitting yesterday as a sign of  
mourning for the death of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, charging the Government  
with communicating their condolences to the House of Commons.  
In compliance with the instructions of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, I have  
the honour to notify the above to Your Excellency and to beg you to be good  
enough to acquaint the Speaker with these expressions of the Italian Chamber's  
condolence.

Thanking you for your amiable assistance, I have, &c. (Signed) COSTA.  
His Excellency,  
The Marquis of Lansdowne, K.G.,  
&c., &c., &c.  
To the President of the House of  
Commons, London.

At the request of the Chamber of Representatives I have the honour to approach  
my honourable colleague of the House of Commons to express my sympathy with the  
deep-felt grief of the English nation at the death, of their beloved Queen.

JOSE SALVEDRA,  
President of the Chamber of Deputies  
of the Republic of Uruguay,  
Montevideo.  
NEW WRIT.

For the County of Lancaster (South-East. Lancashire,. Stretford Division), in  
the room of Sir. John William Maclure, baronet, deceased.;(Sir William Walrond.)  
CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER further informed the House that he had received the following  
communications from the Judges appointed to try the several Election Petitions::  
CHRISTCHURCH ELECTION PETITION.

In the High Court of Justice.

The Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868.

The Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Acts, 1883 and 1895.

To the Right Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Election for the Borough of Christ church in the County of Hants, holden on the  
3rd day of October, 1900.

In the matter of an Election Petition for the said Borough presented to His  
Majesty's High Court of Justice (King's Bench Division) on the 20th day of  
October, 1900.



Thomas Allnutt Brassey, Petitioner.

Kenneth Robert Balfour, M.P., Respondent.

We, Sir William Rann Kennedy, Knight, and Sir Arthur Moseley Channell, Knight, two of the Judges of the High Court of Justice, now on the Rota of Judges selected by the said Court to try Parliamentary Election Petitions in England and Wales (presented during the year ending the 24th day of October, 1901), Do hereby Report that an application for liberty to withdraw this Petition was heard before us in open Court on the 4th day of February, 1901.

Having heard 'Counsel on both sides, and read the affidavits sworn and filed by the respective parties to the Petition and others, pursuant to the Statute,

We ordered that the Petitioner should have leave to withdraw his Petition.

We further Report that, in our opinion, the withdrawal of this Petition was not the result of any payment, terms, or undertaking, or in consideration of any payment, or in consideration that the seat should at any time be vacated, or in consideration of the withdrawal of any other Election Petition, or for any other consideration.

Dated this 8th day of February 1901,

WILLIAM RANN KENNEDY.

ARTHUR M. CHANNELL.

PEMBROKE ELECTION PETITION.

To the Right Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons.

In the matter of the Petition relating to the last Election of a Member of Parliament for the Borough of Pembroke and Haverfordwest.

We, Sir Charles John Darling and Sir Arthur Moseley Channell, two of the Judges of the King's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice, and two of the Judges for the time being on the Rota for the trial of Election Petitions in England, do hereby certify that Lieutenant-General John Winburn Laurie was duly elected and returned at the said Election.

We report that no corrupt or illegal practice was proved to have been committed by or with the knowledge or consent of either candidate.

That neither candidate was proved guilty by his agents of any corrupt or illegal practice.

That no particular individuals were proved at the trial to have been guilty of corrupt or illegal practices, and consequently no names can be given.

That there was no reason to believe that corrupt or illegal practices had extensively prevailed at the said Election.

CHARLES J DARLING.

ARTHUR M. CHANNELL.

29th January, 1901.

WICK BURGHS ELECTION PETITION.

Report by the Honourable Lords Kyllachy and Stormonth Darling in the Wick District of Burghs Election Petition.

We, the Honourable Lords Kyllachy and Stormonth Darling, two of the Judges upon the Rota for the trial of Election Petitions, certify to the Right Honourable the speaker of the House of Commons that at an Election Court held by us on the nineteenth day of December nineteen hundred, on the motion of the Petitioners

James Edward Harper, Auctioneer, Pultneytown, in the County of Caithness, and others, in a Petition against the Election of Arthur Bignold, of Lochrosque, in the County of Ross, Gentleman, as Member of Parliament for the Wick District of Burghs, on the ground of bribery and treating before, during, and after the election, we allow the said Petitioners to withdraw from the Petition, and on the motion of Thomas Charles Hunter Hedderwick, of Biggar Park, Lanarkshire, Barrister-at-Law, substituted him as Petitioner in their the said Petitioners' room and place: Further, that at an Election Court held by us on thirtieth January nineteen hundred and one, upon application for leave to withdraw by the said substituted Petitioner, we, in respect of the withdrawal from the Petition of said substituted Petitioner, and no person having appeared after due notice to adopt the Petition, and the Lord Advocate having declined to intervene, dismissed the Petition and found that the said Arthur Bignold had been duly elected Member of Parliament for the said Wick District of Burghs: And we further certify that the withdrawal of the said Petition was not the result of any corrupt arrangement or in consideration of the withdrawal of any other Petition.

Given under our hand at Edinburgh the Fifth day of February nineteen hundred and one years.

W. MACKINTOSH.

MOIR T. STORMONTH DARLING.

To the Right Honourable

William Court Gully,

The Speaker of the House of Commons.

ELECTIONS.

Ordered, That all Members who are returned for two or more places in any part of the United Kingdom do make their election for which of the places they will serve, within one week after it shall appear that there is no question upon the Return for that place; and if any thing shall come in question touching the Return or Election of any Member, he is to withdraw during the time the matter is in debate: and that all Members returned upon double Returns do withdraw till their Returns are determined.

Resolved, That no Peer of the Realm, except such Peers of Ireland as shall for the time being be actually elected, and shall not have declined to serve, for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, hath any light to give his vote in the Election of any Member to serve in Parliament.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to concern himself in the election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament, except only any Peer of Ireland, at such Elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the Election of any Member to serve for the Commons in

Parliament.";(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out from the word 'Kingdom,' in line 2, to the word 'for,' in line 8.";(Mr. James Lowther.)

MR. WHARTON (York, W.R., Ripon) formally seconded the Amendment.

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

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Scotland, Liverpool): With reference to this Sessional Order as to the interference of Peers in the elections, the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman does not deal with the main question. In every session the right hon. Gentleman has pressed his objection to this rule, and upon one occasion I found myself;as much to my own astonishment as to that of the right hon. Gentleman;in the same lobby with him. I have arrived at the conclusion to which I came upon grounds entirely different to those which induced him to propose this Amendment. It is quite evident that a rule of this kind, if it is not observed, should not be on the Statute-book of the country and should not remain an Order of this House. If the law is good it should be obeyed, and if it is bad it should be repealed. I think it was General Grant who laid down the wise dictum that the very best way to get rid of a bad law is that it should be put into operation. This rule has been proved to be inoperative, and I think the breach of the high privileges of this House is in voting that Peers should not be allowed to take part in elections and then allowing the law to be disobeyed. I know that some hon. Gentlemen on this side of the House will not approve of the support I give to the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman. I know that some gentlemen on the opposite side are of opinion that if this rule were abrogated it would be in the interest of the party they represent. I have heard it said that if this rule were repealed, and if Peers were allowed to offer themselves for election to the House of Commons, fifty or sixty constituencies in the country would be certain to be represented by Peers. I am prepared to face a contingency of that kind I cannot understand how anyone who approves of equal political rights can be in favour of a policy of exclusion and disability by which you prevent any citizen of the country from seeking to represent his fellow-citizens. I am sure that the right hon. Gentleman is absolutely impartial in this matter, and I accept his assurance that he does not look for any party advantage. I will be perfectly candid with the right hon. Gentleman and tell him that I regard his motion as anticipatory of more serious and more important movements. It is perfectly impossible that we could have Peers taking part in the election of Mem-

bers to this House and at the same time deprive the people of the right to share in the choice of the Members of another Chamber. It is an anomaly and an anachronism that one man simply by right of birth should have the same rights of legislation and administration as the representative of 100,000citizens of the country. That anomaly would, I think, be made very much more flagrant by the resolution of the right hon. Gentleman. I

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Crombie, John William  
Hambro, Charles Eric  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc, Stroud  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan  
Hardy, Laurance (K'nt, Ashford  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Harris, F. Leverton (Tynemth.)  
Arrol, Sir William  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Harwood, George  
Asher, Alexander  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Haslem, Sir Alfred S.  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Dixon- Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-  
Balcarres, Lord  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A Akers-  
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A.J. (Manch'r)  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G.W. (Leeds)  
Doxford, Sir William T.  
Helder, Augustus  
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch.  
Duke, Edward Henry  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Duncan, James H.  
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Dunn, Sir William

Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M.H.(Bristol  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Elibank, Master of  
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)  
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.  
Elliot, Hon. A. R. Douglas  
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Emmott, Alfred  
Hobhouse, C.E.H. (Bristol, E.)  
Black, Alexander William  
Evans, Samuel T.  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Fiber, George Denison  
Holland, William Henry  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Fardell, Sir T. George  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
Bowles, Capt. H. F.(Middlesex)  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Horner, Frederick William  
Brassey, Albert  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Broadhurst, Henry  
Ferguson, R. C. Munro(Leith)  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r  
Hoult, Joseph  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Ffrench, Peter  
Howard, Capt J. (Kent, Faversham)  
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Howard, J. (Midx., Tottenham)  
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Hozier, Hon. James H. Cecil  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Hudson, George Bickersteth

Burdett-Coutts, W.  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Burt, Thomas  
Flannery, Sir Fortescue  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Flavin, Michael Joseph  
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)  
Caldwell, James  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Jones, William (Carnarvons.)  
Cameron, Robert  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W.(Salop)  
Cautley, Henry Strother  
Garfit, William  
Kimber, Henry  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Gordon, Maj Evans-(T'rHmlets  
Knowles, Lees  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon J.(Birm.  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.  
Chamberlain, J Austen(Worc'r  
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon  
Langley, Batty  
Chamberlayne, T.(S'thampton  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Lawrence, William F.  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry

Grant, Corrie  
Lawson, John Grant  
Chapman, Edward  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Charrington, Spencer  
Greene, Sir E.W. (Bury St. Ed.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H.A.E.  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Lecky, Rt Hon William Edw. H.  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Gretton, John  
Lee, Capt A. H. (Hants, Fareh'm  
Colville, John  
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)  
Leese, Sir Joseph F.(Accrington  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Groves, James Grimble  
Leigh, Sir Joseph (Stockport).  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Gurdon, Sir William Brampton  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Hain, Edward  
Leng, Sir John  
Cremer, William Randal  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Leveson-Gower,. Fredk. N. S.

think it would pave the way for the disappearance of that anomaly. I am in favour of the right hon. Gentleman's Motion, and I will vote for it because I think the best way of getting rid of the privilege is by getting rid of the rule.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 326; Noes, 123. (Division List No. 1.)

Levy, Maurice  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Talbot.Rt.Hn. J.G.(Ox. Univ.)  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Pilkington, Richard

Tennant, Harold John  
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)  
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan,Gow'r  
Lowe, Francis William  
Pretymann, Ernest George  
Thomson, Frederick W.  
Lowther, Rt. Hn. J. W. (Penrith  
Price, Robert John  
Thorburn, Sir Walter  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Purvis, Robert  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Tomkinson, James  
Lucas,ReginaldJ(Portsmouth)  
Radcliffe, R. F.  
Tomlinson, W. Edw. Murray  
Macdonald, John Gumming  
Randles, John S.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Rankin, Sir James  
Tufnell, Col. Edward  
M'Crae, George  
Redmond, John E.(Waterford)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Malcolm, Ian  
Remnant, Jame Farquharson  
Wallace, Robert  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Renshaw, Charles Bine  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Mansfield, Horace Kendall  
Renwick, George  
Wanklyn, James Leslie



Martin, Richard Biddulph  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Maxwell, W.J (Dumfriesshire)  
Ridley, Samuel F. (BethnalGr'n  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Rigg, Richard  
Wason, Eugene(Clackmannan)  
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson  
Wason, Jn. Cathcart (Orkney  
Middlemore, John Throgmor't'n  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Webb, Col. William George  
Mildmay, Francis Bingham  
Roberts, John H. Denbighs.)  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Mitchell, William  
Robson, William Snowden  
White, Luke (York, E.K.)  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye  
Whiteley, Geo. (York, W.R.)  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Whiteley, H.(Ashton-u.-Lyne)  
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)  
Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Round, James  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Rutherford, John  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth  
Moulton, John Fletcher  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)  
Murphy, J.

Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln  
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord  
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.  
Newnes, Sir George  
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)  
Wilson, Chas. Hy. (Hull, W.)  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Norman, Henry  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Wilson, J. W.(Worcestersh. N.)  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Smith, Abel H.(Hertford, East)  
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)  
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)  
Smith, H. C. (NorthumbTynesd  
Wodehouse, Rt Hon E. R.(Bath)  
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)  
Smith, J. Parker (Lanarks.)  
Woodhouse, SirJ T. (Hudd'rsf'd  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Spear, John Ward  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)  
Spencer, Rt Hn C.R. (Northants  
Wylie, Alexander  
Palmer, Gorge W. (Reading)  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Wyndham-Quin, Major W.H  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.  
Partington, Oswald  
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.

Yoxall, James Henry  
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.  
Strachey, Edward  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Stroyan, John  
Sir William Walrond and  
Percy, Earl  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Mr. Anstruther.  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.  
Carew, James Laurence  
Dyke, Rt. Hon Sir William Hart  
Abraham, William (Rhondda)  
Cawley, Frederick  
Ellis, John Edward  
Ambrose, Robert  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Atherley-Jones, L.  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Fenwick, Charles  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Fison, Frederick William  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Barlow, John Emmott  
Crean, Eugene  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Cullinan, J.  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Dalkeith, Earl of  
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)  
Bell, Richard  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Bignold, A.  
Delany, William  
Haldane, Richard Burdon

Blake, Edward  
Dewar, T. R. (Tower Hamlets)  
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil),  
Boland, John  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
Harrington, Timothy  
Bond, Edward  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)  
Dillon, John  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson  
Donelan, Captain A.  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Caine, William Sproston  
Doogan, P. C.  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffi'd, Brightside)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Dully, William J.  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Joicey, Sir James  
Morley, Rt. Hon. J. (Montrose  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Reid, Sir Robert T. (Dumfries  
Joyce, Michael  
Murnaghan, George  
Roche, John  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Kitson, Sir James  
O'Brien, James F. N. (Cork)  
Russell, T. W.  
Labouchere, Henry  
O'Brien, Kendal(Tipper'y, Mid  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Lambert, George  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Laurie, Lieut.-General  
O'Brien, William (Cork)  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Lundon, W.

O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
O'Doherty, William  
Shipman, Dr. John  
M'Calmont, Col. J.(Antrim, E.)  
O'Dowd, John  
Soares, Ernest J.  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Sullivan, Donal  
M'Fadden, Edward  
O'Malley, William  
Tanner, Charles Kearns  
M'Govern, T.  
O'Mara, James  
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower)  
M'Hugh, Patrick A.  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Tully, Jasper  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington  
Vincent, Col. Sir C.E.H.(Shef'd  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Penn, John  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A.C.E. (Tauntn  
Marshall Hall, Edward  
Pickard, Benjamin  
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William  
Pirie, Duncan V.  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Montagu, Won. J Scott(Hants.)  
Pym, C. Guy  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Mooney, John J.  
Reckitt, Harold James  
Mr. James Lowther and Mr. Wharton.  
Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'thsh.  
Reddy, M.  
Main Question put, and agreed to.

Resolved, That it is a high infringement of the liberties and privileges of the Commons of the United Kingdom for any Lord of Parliament, or other Peer or Prelate, not being a Peer of Ireland at the time elected, and not having declined to serve for any county, city, or borough of Great Britain, to concern himself in the election of Members to serve for the Commons in Parliament, except only any Peer of Ireland, at such elections in Great Britain respectively where such Peer shall appear as a candidate, or by himself, or any others, be proposed to be elected; or for any Lord Lieutenant or Governor of any county to avail himself of any authority derived from his Commission, to influence the election of any Member to serve for the Commons in Parliament.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been elected or returned a Member of this House, or endeavoured so to be, by Bribery, or any other corrupt practices, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against all such persons as shall have been wilfully concerned in such Bribery or other corrupt practices.

#### WITNESSES.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath been tampering with any Witness, in respect of his evidence to be given to this House, or any Committee thereof, or directly or indirectly hath endeavoured to deter or hinder any person from appearing or giving evidence, the same is declared to be a high crime or misdemeanor; and this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

Resolved, That if it shall appear that any person hath given false evidence in any case before this House, or any Committee thereof, this House will proceed with the utmost severity against such offender.

#### METROPOLITAN POLICE.

Ordered, That the Commissioners of the Police of the Metropolis do take care that, during the Session of Parliament, the passages through the streets leading to this House be kept free and open, and that no obstruction be permitted to hinder the passage of Member- to and from this House, and that no disorder be allowed in Westminster Hall, or in the passages leading to this House, during the Sitting of Parliament, and that there be no annoyance therein or thereabouts; and that the Serjeant at Arms attending this House do communicate this Order to the Commissioners aforesaid.

#### VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Ordered, That the Votes and Proceedings of this House be printed, being first perused by Mr. Speaker; and that he do appoint the printing thereof; and that no person but such as he shall appoint do presume to print the same.

#### PRIVILEGES.

Ordered, That a Committee of Privileges be appointed.

#### OUTLAWRIES BILL

"For the more effectual preventing Clandestine Outlawries," read the first time; to be read a second time.

#### JOURNAL.

Ordered, That the Journal of this House, from the end of the last Session to the end of the present Session, with an Index thereto, be printed.

Ordered, That 500 copies of the said Journal and Index be printed by the appointment and under the direction of Archibald John Scott Milman, esquire, C.B., the Clerk of this House.

Ordered, That the said Journal and Index be printed by such person as shall be licensed by Mr. Speaker, and that no other person do presume to print the same.

PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS (RECESS).

The following Papers, presented by Royal Command during the Recess, were delivered to the Librarian of the House of Commons during the Recess pursuant to the Standing Order of the 14th August, 1896;

1. Trade Reports (Annual Series).; Copies of Diplomatic, and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2542 to 2553.
2. Trade Reports (Miscellaneous Series). ;Copies of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, Nos. 545 to 547.
3. Treaty Series (No. 1, 1901).;Copy of Agreement between the United Kingdom and Germany relative to China; dated 16th October,"1900.
4. Treaty Series (No. 2, 1901).;Copy of Convention between the United Kingdom and Japan for the protection of the Estates of Deceased Persons. Signed at Tokio, 26th April, 1900. Ratifications exchanged at Tokio, 25th October, 1900.
5. Metric System (Foreign Countries) (Commercial, No. 1, 1901).;Copy of Reports from Her late Majesty's Representatives in Europe on the Metric System, Part II.
6. Africa (No. 1, 1901).;Copy of Return of the Names of the British and American Firms who tendered for the supply of certain Bridges for the Uganda Railway, and the Amounts of the various Tenders.
7. South Africa (Despatches).;Copy of Despatches relating to the War in South Africa.
8. Colonial Reports (Annual).;Copies of Reports Nos. 308 (Leeward Islands, Annual Report for 1899), 309 (St. Helena, Annual Report for 1899), 310 (British Honduras, Annual Report for 1899), 311 (St. Lucia, Annual Report for 1899), 312 (St. Vincent, Annual Report for 1899), 313 (Basutoland, Annual Report for 1899&#x2013;1900), 314 (Hong Kong, Annual Report for 1899), 315 (Southern Nigeria, Annual Report for 1899&#x2013;1900), 316 (Grenada, Annual Report for 1899).
9. Explosions (Gunpowder Factory at Blackbeck, Lancashire).;Copy of Report by Captain A. P. H. Desborough, Her late Majesty's Inspector of Explosives, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Home Department, on the circumstances attending an Explosion which destroyed the Coining House of Messrs F. C. Dickson and Company's Gunpowder Factory at Blackbeck, Haverthwaite, Lancashire, on the 27th August, 1900.
10. Inebriates Acts 1879 to 1899.; Copy of Twentieth Report of the inspectors of Retreats, and the First Report of the Inspector of Certified Reformatories, under the Inebriates Acts, 1879 to 1899, for the year 1899.
11. Mines and Quarries.;Copy of General Report and Statistics for the year 1899, Part IV., Colonial and Foreign Statistics; Statistics relating to Persons employed, Output, and Accidents at Mines and Quarries in the British Colonies and in Foreign Countries.

12. Military Hospitals in South Africa (Royal Commission).;Copy of Report of the Royal Commission appointed to consider and report upon the care and treatment of the sick and wounded during the South African Campaign.
  13. Military Hospitals in South Africa (Royal Commission).;Copy of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission.
  14. Military Hospitals in South Africa (Royal Commission).;Copy of Appendix to Minutes of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission.
  15. Irish Inland Fisheries Commission. ;Copy of Report of the Commissioners.
  16. Irish Inland Fisheries Commission. ;Copy of Appendix to the Report of the Commissioners, Part I., Minutes of Evidence.
  17. Irish Inland Fisheries Commission. ;Copy of Appendix to the Report of the Commissioners, Part II, Documents.
  18. Irish Inland Fisheries Commission. ;Copy of Appendix to the Report of the Commissioners, Part III., Translation of the Report of the Royal Commission on Norwegian Salmon Fisheries, 1896&#x2013;8, and of a Treatise by Mr. Landmark on Hatcheries and the Rearing of Fry.
  19. Merchant Shipping (Mercantile Marine Fund Act, 1898 (Light Dues).; Copy of Report of a Committee appointed by the Board of Trade to examine the claims and suggestions received for exemption from Light Dues, or for alteration of the existing scale or rules. Part II, Appendix.
  20. Railways (Continuous Brakes).; Copy of Return by the Railway Companies of the United Kingdom on the progress made in the use of Continuous Brakes, etc., for the six months ending the 30th June, 1900.
  21. Crofter and Cottar Colonisation Scheme.;Copy of Eleventh Report of the Commissioners appointed to carry out a Scheme of Colonisation in the Dominion of Canada of Crofters and Cottars from the Western Highlands and Islands of Scotland, with Appendices.
  22. Arsenical Poisoning.;Copy of Report to the Local Government Board on recent Epidemic Arsenical Poisoning attributed to Beer, by Dr. George Seaton Buchanan. Ordered, That the said Papers do lie upon the Table.
- RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.
- AGRARIAN OUTRAGES (IRELAND).
- Copy presented, of Return for the quarter ended 31st December, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.
- EVICCTIONS (IRELAND).
- Copy presented, of Return of Evictions in Ireland for the quarter ended 31st December, 1900 [by Command]: to lie upon the Table.
- IRISH LAND COMMISSION (JUDICIAL RENTS).
- Copy presented, of Return of Judicial Rents fixed during the month of May, 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.
- Copy presented, of Return of Judicial Rents fixed during the month of June, 1900 [by Command]: to lie upon the Table.
- LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) ACT, 1898.
- Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 2nd August, 1900; Mr. Maurice Healy]; to lie upon the Table.
- INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND).



Copy presented, of Time-table of Examinations for 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT (IRELAND), 1877.

Copy presented, of Order in Council giving effect to Rules of Court under the Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland), 1877 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order in Council giving effect to a Rule of Court under the Supreme Court of Judicature Act (Ireland), 1877 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION (IRELAND) ACT, 1899 (RULES).

Copy presented, of Rules under Section 3 of the Act [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Amended Rules for the Administration of Loans under the Sea and Coast Fisheries Fund (Ireland) Act, 1884 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of

Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Southampton from Whitchurch and Hurstbourne Stations to Vernhams Dean (Bourne Valley Light Railway Order, 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Southampton from Bishops Waltham to a junction with the authorised Meon Valley Railway near Brock Bridge in the parish of Soberton (Bishops Waltham Light Rail-way Order, 1900) [by Command]: to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Northumberland between Gosforth and Ponteland (Gosforth and Ponteland Light Railway Order, 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Gloucester between Wotton-under-Edge and Charfield (Wotton-under-Edge Light Railway Order, 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the parish and urban district of Rhyl, in the county of Flint, in extension of the Light Railway authorised by the Rhyl and Prestatyn Light Railway Order, 1900 (Rhyl and Prestatyn Light Railway (Extensions) Order, 1900) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the county of Cambridge, in the parishes of Oakington, Westwick, and Cottenham (Oakington and Cottenham Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by; the Light Railway Commissioners, and

confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Suffolk, from Long Melford to Hadleigh (Long Melford and Hadleigh Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the urban district of Sheerness and in the parish of Minster in Sheppey, in the rural district of Sheppey, in the county of Kent (Sheerness and District Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table. EAST INDIA (LOANS RAISED IN INDIA).

Copy presented, of Return of all Loans raised in India, chargeable on the Revenues of India, outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ending on the 30th September, 1900, etc, [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 1.]

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

1. Lunacy.; Copy of Return to the Lord Chancellor of the number of Visits made and the number of Patients seen by the several Commissioners in Lunacy during the six months ending on the 31st December, 1900 [by Act].

2. Supreme. Court (Rules).; Copy of Rules of the Supreme Court, dated 11th January, 1901.

KING'S SPEECH.

Mr. SPEAKER reported His Majesty's Speech, and read it to the House.

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

[FIRST DAY'S DEBATE.]

\*MR. FORSTER (Kent, Sevenoaks): I will not address to the House that appeal which has grown almost to be customary on these occasions, because I have been a Member long enough to know that the House of Commons invariably extends to any one of its Members who is called upon for the first time to fill a position of responsibility the most generous measure of its kindest indulgence, and I am

painfully aware that no one ever needed that kind indulgence more than myself on the present occasion. The House meets at a remarkable time. We are at the commencement of the first ordinary session of a new reign and of a new century, and the occasion is further signalled by the fact that His Majesty the King has opened Parliament in person. I therefore feel it is all the more an honour to have been selected to move the Address on this occasion, and, as I have just said, although I most deeply feel the honour, I am aware that I am but ill-fitted for the task.

I suppose that there is not a Member of this House present to-day whose heart is not filled with two different but kindred emotions, grief and hope; grief that the great lady who for so many years has ruled over us has been taken from us; and hope that our present Sovereign may be spared for many years to come to rule over a happy and contented people. I could not add one word to those two speeches which were delivered by my right hon. friend the Leader of the House and the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition when Parliament met a short time ago. Those, speeches were worthy of the solemn occasion upon which they were delivered, and it is hardly possible to say much more. Perhaps, as I

am the first unofficial Member who has found an opportunity of addressing the House, I might be allowed to associate myself; perhaps the Members of the House would allow me to associate them; with everything that fell from those two right hon. Gentlemen on that occasion. I feel that never has any member of this House given a vote which more fully, truly, and adequately represented the views of his constituency than he gave upon that occasion. Since then we have had a remarkable proof of the respect and esteem in which our late Queen was held in every part of her Empire, but even more striking than the solemn and sorrowing homage which was paid to her memory by all her own subjects has been the striking testimony that we have received from all the world over of the admiration and veneration with which the Queen was regarded in every part of the world. Such a gathering of the rulers and representatives of all foreign nations as that which recently assembled in this country at the funeral of Queen Victoria has seldom been seen, and amongst them there was one whose presence the people of this country have especially valued. Difficulties there may have been, and differences may yet arise between the German people and ourselves, but we shall not lightly forget the part which His Imperial Majesty the German Emperor has taken in the nation's grief. His Majesty may have been animated by personal and not political motives, but who value his presence and his sympathy none the less. Family ties have ever been honoured in this country, and the presence of His Imperial Majesty appealed to the people of this country with a striking force that Ave shall not readily forget. I do not for one moment wish to belittle the presence or sympathy of the rulers and representatives of the other nations. We value their presence and their sympathy, and we treasure their recollection. I cannot but think that such an assembly, upon such a solemn occasion, may well do something to promote a mutual good understanding between the Powers of the world, and may do something to promote the cause of permanent peace. If that is so, then Queen Victoria in death has crowned the work: of her life. We accept to the full the assurance which is conveyed to us in the gracious Speech from the Throne that His Majesty the King intends to follow in the footsteps of our late Sovereign. That assurance is accepted by every subject of His Majesty in the knowledge that it is an absolutely genuine assurance. I cannot but think that it will be grateful to the King to know that all his subjects the world over not only offer him their loyal homage, but that they have a confident and a sure and certain belief that he will be able to approach very closely the high ideal which was set by his revered mother. In another part of the Speech reference is made to the Civil List, and His Majesty informs us that he hands over those hereditary revenues which have been so handed over in the past. We shall, no doubt, on a subsequent occasion be called upon to make suitable provision for the maintenance of the honour and dignity of the Crown. I think we ought not to forget that the position of the Sovereign of the British Empire is not the least proud position amongst the Sovereigns of the world, and I believe that it will be entirely repugnant to the feelings of the people of this country if we approach the question of the Civil List in a niggardly or parsimonious manner.

The Speech expresses regret; a regret which the whole House will share; that it has not yet been possible to bring to a close the war in South Africa. We had all hoped that the policy which was so clearly laid down by my right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary in a speech delivered in this House, I think early in December last, and the Proclamations which were issued in various parts of South Africa, would have had a wider influence in the direction of peace than appears to have been the case. But if the Boers continue deaf to the voice of reason, there is nothing left to us but to promote those warlike operations which are necessary with the utmost possible vigour. In Lord Kitchener the country knows that it has a commander of exceptional capacity. We know that his task is a task of extreme difficulty, and who is prepared to deny it? I think it must support and comfort him in his arduous undertaking to know that he retains the full confidence not only of the people of this country but also of this House. It is satisfactory to know that the reinforcements which Lord Kitchener has asked for are being and have been supplied with every possible rapidity, and the manner in which recruits are coming forward for the Yeomanry and other forces proves that the patriotic fervour which was so noticeable in the earlier stages of the war was no mere wave of emotional excitement or spasm of martial ardour. The call to arms will ever meet with an instant and generous response on the part of all the inhabitants of His Majesty's Empire. I think we may well be proud to know that the fighting value, the military capacity of our brave Volunteer forces is of the highest order. This has been proved recently by the tributes paid to these forces by Lord Roberts in the despatches published last week, for he has given them great praise indeed. We cannot say, and time alone will show, to what extent it may be possible in the future to train and develop these forces which have done such good work in the past. I think who may be certain of this, that neither my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War nor Lord Roberts will forget those services when they are evolving some scheme for increasing the efficiency of the military forces of the country. Our minds and the minds of the people of this country have been so full of other topics recently that attention has been somewhat diverted from the difficult questions which are in course of settlement in China. We all remember with what breathless interest we watched the gallant defence of those who were besieged in the Legation, and how we rejoiced in the success of the combined forces of the Powers. We all remember well how we gloried in the part played in those operations by our Indian troops and by the Naval Brigade. It is very satisfactory to know that China has submitted to the demands made upon her by the Powers. In regard to the negotiations which are at present proceeding, although they may appear to progress somewhat slowly, we can but remember that rapidity is not to be expected where you have negotiating, on the one hand the representatives of six different Powers, and on the other a nation so dilatory and crafty as China. I think it is a remarkable thing that the concert of the Powers has been preserved so long and fully maintained in spite of so many difficulties.

I think the House will be glad to see that such favourable mention has been made in the gracious Speech from the Throne of the campaign in Ashanti. I have no

doubt whatever that if the public mind had been less occupied with other topics, this campaign in Ashanti would have met with a far wider measure of popular esteem, and would have received that amount of appreciation which it undoubtedly deserves. The signal success which attended our arms in that campaign is none the less remarkable because the troops that were engaged were composed, I believe, entirely of those coloured subjects of the Crown whose indomitable courage is only equalled by their loyalty. I feel certain that Sir James Willcocks and his gallant comrades in arms will regard it as a proud honour to have received such favourable mention in the King's Speech.

I have no doubt whatever that the House and the country will be prepared for some material increase in the Estimates, and that they will not grudge the money which is necessary to maintain our military forces upon a proper level of strength and

efficiency. Our Navy must be maintained; as to that I think there can be no question. As for the Army, I think the House and the country will see with satisfaction that special mention has been made of the important topic which has for months past attracted so much attention and interest. I mean, of course, Army reform. There is no reason whatever to doubt the intentions of the Government and of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War or of Lord Roberts to undertake that great and important question in the most serious spirit. We have not the slightest ground for doubting that. Of course, it would be impossible either in the Speech from the Throne or for me to indicate what measures will be proposed. They will, no doubt, be explained at the proper time by my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for War, and under the circumstances, I do not think that the House will be surprised to find that the legislative proposals of the Government are not of a particularly ambitious character. [Opposition laughter.] What would be the use of putting into the Speech from the Throne a large number of measures of the first importance when? everyone knows that the greater part of this Session must necessarily be taken up by the consideration of Supply, the Civil List, and Army reform? consider that it is only businesslike on the part of His Majesty's Government to have adopted this course in regard to the question of proposed legislation.

I feel that I have trespassed too long upon the time of the House already, and I wish to offer to the House with all sincerity my very grateful thanks for the kindness and indulgence which they have shown to me.

\*SIR ANDREW AGNEW (Edinburgh, S.): I beg to second the motion which has been so ably proposed by my hon. friend. We all feel that with a new reign and a new century we have entered upon a new and distinct stage in our history. We have every expectation, however, that the blessings of the late reign will be continued, and that the great improvement in the country which marked Her late Majesty's reign will be maintained and increased. So far as His Majesty the King can promote this we know that

it will be done. We had the assurance given to Parliament to-day and in more than one message to his people, that His Majesty intends to follow in the footsteps of the late Queen in everything that can advance the welfare of the Empire. With such an ideal before him we may be confident that he will not only

prove himself a worthy successor of the Sovereign whom we have just lost, but that he will establish himself in the hearts of his subjects as firmly as his revered predecessor did.

Sir, it is a matter of congratulation that, in spite of his recent bereavement, His Majesty the King has been able to come down and open Parliament himself and to deliver in person the gracious Speech to which it is now my duty to reply. We could have wished that in that speech he had been able to tell us of the conclusion of the war in South Africa. We had all hoped that the war would have been over by now. We are all disappointed that it is still dragging on; but in spite of the disappointment, there is no change in the spirit of the people of the country or in the determination of His Majesty's Ministers, and they are both resolved that this war shall be carried on until our object has been attained. The difficulties have proved even greater than were expected, but our efforts must consequently be greater, and the announcement made a few days ago that 30,000 fresh mounted troops are to be sent out to Lord Kitchener has met with universal approval. And we may earnestly echo the hope which is expressed in His Majesty's Speech that the measures taken by the Commander-in-Chief in South Africa will enable his troops to deal effectually with the forces by which they are still opposed. Sir, the war would very likely have been over by now if it had not been for the false stories and false hopes circulated amongst the men in South Africa who are in arms against us, but who have had no means of ascertaining the truth, and who have therefore been induced to continue fighting in the expectation of wearing out our armies or of regaining their independence through the intervention of foreign Powers. If they had known the real facts, and if they knew the real terms offered to them we can hardly doubt that large numbers of them, at any rate, would have been prepared to lay down their arms. Everybody in this country, excepting a very small party, admits that we cannot restore the independence of the Transvaal or of the Orange River Colony; but short of independence, the Government have always wished to, and expressed their intention of granting the Boers everything that could be asked for, the fullest measure of self-government as soon as they can be trusted with it, and liberty to every man to return in peace to his own farm. These terms have been accepted by large numbers of Boers who have surrendered, and I believe a very large number more would have accepted them had their nature been fully realised by them. But we know the reception which has been given by leaders like De Wet to anyone who dares to explain the conditions of peace to his fellow-countrymen. There is therefore no choice left to us but to continue the war; and since the war is to be continued we desire to see it carried on with vigour, and I am sure that the House will support His Majesty's Ministers in any measures necessary for that purpose. There is one feature of the war which I think we shall always look back upon with satisfaction, and that is the humanity with which it has been conducted. [HON. MEMBERS on Irish Benches: What about the women and children?] There has been nothing done on our side to make it more difficult for Briton and Boer to settle down side by side in peace and tranquillity. No doubt there have been stories told of atrocities committed by our officers and men, but whenever these stories have been investigated they

have turned out to be calumnies. We have not only the testimony of Lord Roberts that the bravery of our troops in the field was only equalled by their humanity and generosity to the people of the occupied States, but we have the admission of those who fought against us that our soldiers in South Africa have shown that war instead of brutalising men may ennoble them. The principal lesson we have no doubt learned from the war is the fact that reforms are necessary to make our Army as efficient as we would wish it to be. This subject has already been alluded to by my hon. friend, and I can only add one word in behalf of the Volunteers.

I hope personally, that when a scheme is formed for reorganising the Army, the Volunteers may occupy a more important and definite place than they have hitherto done. If there had been any doubt as to what kind of soldiers our Volunteers would make, that doubt must have been entirely dispelled by the services rendered by the Volunteers in South Africa; whether infantry, mounted infantry, cavalry or artillery. They have shown that with a very short training they are the very best of soldiers. This country is not prepared for conscription; I do not believe it would agree to any measure of conscription until every other means had been tried and failed; but I believe that the Volunteers could be increased, and now is the time for doing it. There never was a more favourable opportunity in the country than at the present moment, there never was a time when people were so ready to admit that it is the duty of every citizen to take his share in the defence of the country, and therefore I believe that with a little encouragement and assistance, the Volunteers could be increased, and if organised they might be made a most efficient force, which might in fact be relied upon to take a principal part in the defence of these shores if ever they should be threatened with invasion.

I now turn to the paragraph in the King's Speech which announces that the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York to Australia to open the First Parliament of the New Commonwealth is not to be abandoned. That announcement, I am sure, will be received with great satisfaction by this House and the country as well as by Australia. The visit is due in the first instance to the greatness of the occasion, but is due also to the fact that the King has felt, as Her late Majesty felt, that the visit would be a gracious acknowledgment of the loyal help given us by our self-governing colonies in the war in South Africa, and the visit is therefore to be extended to New Zealand and Canada. There can be no doubt of the cordial reception their Royal Highnesses will meet with in Australia, and though under the altered circumstances the occasion may be shorn of some of its outward rejoicing, it will lose none of its deep interest and significance. The experiment which

Australia is making is one full of promise. In union countries nowadays find their strength and their success. This was so in Canada, and now it will be with Australia. The various colonies have noticed that separate Parliaments with separate policies act as an encouragement to jealousies and a hindrance to trade; and that with one Parliament and one policy they will have much greater strength for defence and more efficiency for developing the resources of their vast continent. Since the strength of the mother country increases with the

strength of her loyal sons, the Empire gains by the new departure which the Heir to the Throne is to be permitted to inaugurate. Closely connected with this is the subject of a Court of Final Appeal. The right to claim redress from the Throne is a powerful link binding in obedience to a common authority. I can only say that with the large expansion of the Empire there has been a large increase in the appeals to the Privy Council, and with that increase of business it is natural that there would be a feeling that that Court should be strengthened. It has long been felt that when the occasion came for strengthening it there should be that alteration in its Constitution foreshadowed in some respect in the King's gracious Speech. I am sure that this House will be prepared to aid His Majesty's Ministers in setting up a Court so strong and representative as to win the confidence of the people of all parts of the Empire.

There is only one other topic in the Speech to which I wish to refer in a few words; I mean the provision for the Civil List. I am certain that the House will deal with this matter in no grudging spirit, but will be anxious to make the provision adequate to the honour and dignity of the Crown. We must remember that two generations have passed since the last settlement of the Civil List was made, and that what was adequate sixty-two years ago may not be quite adequate now. Many things have happened during these years. The Empire to-day is a different Empire from that to which Her late Majesty succeeded in 1837; and that is true not only in regard to its extent but to the position it occupies in the world. The people of this country fully realise the fact, and will not hesitate to approve any settlement of the Civil List which will enable the Sovereign of the Empire to fill his position with the dignity which is becoming.

I will not detain the House further, but only thank hon. Members for the indulgent way in which they have listened to one who has had the honour of addressing them to-day for the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "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.)

\*SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): Mr. Speaker, the House of Commons has already had an opportunity of giving solemn expression to its loyal attachment to the Crown, and to the high hopes with which we all of us greet the accession of the King to the throne. That declaration was made, Sir, as you at the time announced, nemine contradicente; and the sincerity and fervour with which we made it was not in any degree diminished, nay, was greatly increased, from the fact that the sentiment to which we were giving utterance was mingled, in its essence as well as in relation of time, with the profoundest sorrow over the loss to our country and to the world of our revered and beloved Sovereign Queen Victoria. To-day, with the gracious Speech from the Throne and the splendid ceremonial by which the delivery of the Speech was accompanied, the new



reign has been publicly opened. What more can we of the faithful Commons do than again tender our humble duty to the King and Queen, with many a wish and many a prayer that their reign may be long, and happy, and beneficent? The hon. Members who have been entrusted with the task of submitting the Address for the approval of the House have discharged their duty, I am sure we shall agree, in an admirable manner. I would especially say this of the hon. Member who moved the Address: that, as we are told the world

knows nothing of its greatest men, the House of Commons often discovers in some dumb and unobtrusive Member one perfectly capable of taking a prominent part in its debates; and the hon. Member displayed that capacity not only in his powerful eloquence, but also, to no small degree, in the manner, which I could not but admire, in which he extenuated and accounted for the somewhat poverty-stricken programme which the Government had put before us. These years of two sessions furnish in a double degree to hon. Gentlemen opposite opportunities of distinguishing themselves in this manner, and we note with satisfaction that there is no apparent lack of duly qualified persons capable of discharging the duty. If I were confidential to the House, I might say I find the stock of complimentary adjectives at the disposal of the Leader of the Opposition, who is expected to express the approval and admiration of the House, almost exhausted, for it would never do to repeat in February a phrase which had done duty in December. All I can say to the two hon. Members, therefore, is that, from its experience of them to-night, the House will hear them gladly, provided always (because I must put some limit to my invitation) that they exercise their privileges with reasonable rarity and, above all, cultivate that Parliamentary virtue of apparent reluctance to engage in debate ;it need not be more than apparent; which more than anything commends to the House of Commons the individual Member.

Now, the hon. Members have referred to a good many topics which are included in the Address; but there is one subject, above all, which weighs upon our thoughts, and it is upon that chiefly that I shall make some observations. It is a dismal, one feels it is almost an ungracious, thing to call away our attention from the themes of joyful anticipation which this day and its events suggest to the heavy cloud which hangs at this moment over our country and Empire. But it is a plain duty to do so, and we must not shrink from it. I did not use words of exaggeration when I spoke of a heavy cloud. What should we gain by blinking the truth or shutting our eyes, even if it were possible for us to do it, to the true gravity and urgency of

the situation in South Africa? We may indeed appeal to our countrymen as *passi graviora*. These are perhaps not, in one sense, the darkest hours; and there is little in the military circumstances of this month of February, 1901, to recall anything of the consternation and alarm which prevailed in many quarters among us in the critical weeks of last winter. Yet I am not sure that many thinking men do not stand even in a greater degree aghast at this present moment, when they contemplate the military necessities with which our gallant officers and soldiers in the field are confronted, and, beyond the military necessities, when they see that those military difficulties extend and run into and lead up to

political issues of the supremest gravity, going far into the future. It is my desire, if the House will allow me, earnestly to invite hon. Members to face the facts of the hour, to put aside our individual prejudices, to forget our old controversies, to consider things as they stand, and, as it were, to rub our eyes and clear our vision. We all accept the war as a fact, and the House of Commons has shown from the first an extraordinary, I would say unprecedented, facility of disposition in voting all the supplies that are required for it.

On this footing, then, let us see how we stand. What are the objects that we have in view in this war? Well, the first and the most important object in any war is, as I take it, the conclusion of peace; that is to say, the successful termination of hostilities, the vindication by arms of the King's authority, the restoration, as I have said, of peace, and the cessation of bloodshed. I invite the House of Commons to consider how this object, in which I am sure we all agree, has fared during the last two or three months. At the General Election the country was told that the war was over. I see that it is now spoken of as being "not yet entirely terminated." I am not going to revive the history; let me use the pleasantest epithet I can find and say the unseemly history; of the recent election, in which the Government sought to make capital for themselves out of the deeds, the prowess, and the successes of our Army, and in which they also sought to palm off as entirely finished a war for the further prosecution of which they are now

sending 30,000 fresh troops to South Africa. Was this intimation of the ending of the war a ludicrous miscalculation or was it a scandalous misrepresentation?

One or the other undoubtedly it was. I am perfectly content to give right hon.

Gentlemen the benefit of the former alternative. And that more amiable alternative commends itself to the Parliamentary judgment, because of all our favourite arguments that which we always consider the strongest is that of precedent; and, as it would be altogether without precedent if the Government in the course of this war were to publish any prognostication which did not turn out to be all wrong, so, also, the fact that this estimate of the position was hopelessly wrong does not prove at all that they did not seriously entertain it.

At all events, Sir, they completely misled the country on this matter. [An HON. MEMBER: No.] Then the war did end in October last? They misled the country at a time when they were seeking constitutionally the judgment of the country. For, whereas, in October, we are told that this was the situation, that the campaign was ended, that there would be nothing before us but certain marauding bands which would be mischievous and troublesome, but might be easily dealt with, and that the time had arrived when the greater generals might come home, and the City of London Volunteers might come home, and the Household Cavalry, and all the illustrious personages who had been stuck about South Africa; while this was said in October, in November summonses were issued to bring Parliament together for the purpose of voting 16 millions sterling for the further prosecution of the war. We all remember the speech in which the Secretary for War introduced that Vote of 16 millions. Those who were of one way of thinking, including myself, said it was frank and manly; those of the other way of thinking said it was dismal, dispiriting, and discouraging. He attributed the error as to the

ending of the war to the misjudgment of the generals on the spot. He said;  
"Those on the spot thought the collapse of the Boer army would lead to the submission of the Boer leaders,"

So that the position of our hapless generals is this;and I think the House may extend some commiseration to them

;that whenever they accomplish successes those successes are to be legitimately employed for the purpose of swelling the support at the polls of the Administration; but when mistakes are made by the Administration at home those mistakes, and the reasons for them, are to be assigned to the blunders of the generals on the spot. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say we were now having to encounter only guerilla warfare. There, at least, is an estimate which we can bring to the test. Has anything ever occurred in history less like guerilla warfare than that which we have seen during the last few months? When large forces, stated in our despatches to number five, or seven, or eight thousand men, well led and fully equipped, separated from each other by leagues and leagues of distance, have been all operating in obvious concert, is that to be called guerilla warfare? If this is indeed guerilla warfare, what a picture the right hon. Gentleman drew of it! We have not forgotten the 400,000 Frenchmen in Spain for five years losing in an ineffectual struggle more heavily than their countrymen did in the Moscow campaign, or the 227,000 Spaniards who, for three years in Cuba, ineffectually endeavoured to keep at bay 30,000 men, none of them useful as soldiers. Why, Sir, out of bitter comes forth sweet, and from the speech of the light hon. Gentleman we have at least been able to derive this advantage: that the making of that speech by the Minister principally concerned has at last put an end, surely for ever, to the silly slander by which those of us who have endeavoured independently to criticise the war and the actions of the Government have been assailed again and again;namely, that by a casual word here and there, by our action in this case and that, we have given encouragement and inspiration to our enemies. If the Government were optimistic and triumphant in October and chastened and apologetic in December, how does their revised estimate bear investigation now? The right hon. Gentleman said he believed we were reaching a climax, and he said;

"Before this House meets in February I trust we may be able at all events to give a, much more satisfactory assurance than we are in a position to give now."

So pleased was the Colonial Secretary with this view taken by his colleague that, if

I remember rightly, he did not exactly promise, but expressed a lively expectation that by the month of February he would be ready with his civil administration. Now these were not mere words or padding introduced into the Speech which ought not, perhaps, to be too closely examined, but this was the opinion deliberately expressed to the House of Commons with a view to inducing the House of Commons to grant the £16,000,000 he was asking for. Upon what special grounds did he entertain that hopeful view? What was the information on which he founded the expectation he expressed? It has certainly not been justified by the event. What we have seen since has been this the invasion of Cape Colony by large bands of men who have got to no very great distance from

the capital itself; indeed, a considerable part of Cape Colony may be said to be in the occupation of these invading bands. They are certainly the dominating military force in the positions they hold. The occupation of the two belligerent States has practically been abandoned except so far as the railways, the larger towns, and certain fortified posts are concerned. The duties imposed upon our brave soldiers of all ranks and branches of the service in these circumstances have been wearing, harassing, and often most perilous. But they have been performed with a patience, courage, and constancy which excite our admiration and deserve our warmest gratitude. As to the generals, for my part, following these occurrences closely, as I try to do, I see no reason whatever to withhold the fullest confidence from our generals in the field, who appear to me to be perfectly qualified to take advantage of every chance of successful action which presents itself. But the area is vast, the country is difficult, the climate is trying, the line of communications is interminable. And here let me refer to the curious expression made use of in the King's Speech, where it says that the enemy's lines of communication are in our possession. I always thought our great difficulty was in defending our own lines of communication, and I was unaware that the Boers troubled themselves about lines of communication in a country in which they are everywhere at home. Disease, as we had every reason to anticipate, has wrought havoc among the ranks of our countrymen. On the other hand, the enemy in the field is inured to the hardships of the life; he is well equipped, ubiquitous, knows the country, is at home in it, and evidently receives from the civil inhabitants, white and coloured, a great deal of assistance which is denied to us. These circumstances, Sir, present the most formidable difficulty before us at the present moment; but neither here nor in South Africa is there the slightest idea of flinching from it. The question agitating many minds among us is rather this; whether the Government at home adequately realise and are making adequate provision for it, and there is nothing to show that it is adequately realised. The second thing which agitates the minds of men is doubt whether the political conduct of the war, as apart from the purely military operations, has been such as to conduce to that early honourable settlement which it is the main desire of us all to secure. For a long time surely it has been evident that our forces on the spot were insufficient. Can it be that the last men in the country to wake up to that fact are precisely those who ought to have seen it first; namely, His Majesty's Government? Would they not have been better employed, when they were going about the country pushing their party interests among the constituencies, or were here talking to us of a finished campaign and mere guerilla warfare, if they had been training and preparing the reinforcements which were required? Was peace likely to be secured, nay, was justice being done to the efforts and sufferings of our gallant soldiers, by the course of fumbling and dribbling and drifting of which we have been for many weeks the spectators? Is it true; we shall, no doubt, be informed; that Lord Kitchener many weeks ago asked for larger reinforcements? Were those reinforcements at once given, and if not, why were they not? And yet it is only now, when Parliament was about to meet, that you set yourselves to scramble together a nondescript force of heterogeneous elements, derived from

various sources, serving under various terms of service, and receiving most disproportionate terms of pay, and some of them, so far as I can see, already required and employed as police, but counted over again as reinforcements for the purpose of swelling

this apparent force of 30,000 men. After all, this new force is not likely to be in the field of action in a state of efficiency for two or three months, and by that time who can tell what heavy losses, at the present rate, may be inflicted on our army in South Africa by the bullet of the enemy or the still more formidable scourge of fever and disease? Let the Government understand this: that there is no reluctance on the part of the House and country to continue to support the despatch of such numbers of troops as shall suffice to clear the colony of invaders and restore the superiority of our arms, if indeed it has been at all invalidated; but that is not all that is required to be done. When this is accomplished, or evidently on the eve of accomplishment, then will be the moment, if it does not come sooner, for addressing to the peoples of the two States a declaration of such terms of settlement as, while securing for the Empire all that we have been contending for, may assuage their fears, save their dignity, restore their personal rights, and thus induce them to lay down their arms. Why was this not done long ago? If it had been done long ago how many lives, how much suffering, how much devastation, how much ruin to innocent persons would have been saved? Take, for instance, such an opportunity as the occupation of Pretoria. Surely the occupation of Pretoria was not an unexpected event? Why, then, was not the general who effected it fortified by the direct instructions of the Government at home authorising him to declare terms of settlement to the Government still in existence in the Transvaal? No; unconditional surrender was our first and last word. Then began that era of punitive burnings and confiscations which we cannot recall with pleasure, and which, so far as my observation has gone; and I have talked with many men who have been out in South Africa, as well as with many who have remained at home; are now universally regarded as having been a mischievous error in policy. I declared in December, and I repeat the declaration now, that I have never given credence to the stories of wanton cruelty on the part of British soldiers; but the whole proceedings were cruel, the whole method was cruel, and officers and men whose military duties

compelled them to give orders for and to execute those acts loathed the work they were engaged upon. We are still without information as to the extent of these punitive operations. I remember in December, in the middle of a speech, the Colonial Secretary said Lord Kitchener had been directed to furnish full particulars, and I trust that they will be furnished to the House of Commons, that we may know what really has been done. This policy of devastation appears to have been put an end to, to have been abandoned altogether, whether in consequence, of debates in this House or because of other reasons I cannot say, but the evil it did lives after it.

I am looking at these events at present from the point of view of our universal desire to bring the war to a conclusion upon terms consistent with success, with honour, and with prosperity and safety in the future, at as early a date as

possible, so as to save suffering all round. Can anyone estimate how much the duration of the war has been extended by these so-called strong measures? And with regard to these strong measures let me say this; that I am not aware that any member of the Government has ever advocated them, or even strongly defended them, but they have been demanded and exulted in by leading organs of the press which support, and sometimes speak as if they inspired and directed, the policy of the Government. When you destroy the home of a brave and resolute enemy because he is your enemy, when you subject his family to privation and the risk of starvation, when you confiscate his property, what effect can this have but to drive him to desperation, to embitter his feeling of hostility, and, above all, to scare him away from the idea of a settlement? If, on the other hand, it is your intention and desire; and I am satisfied it is the desire of the people of this country; to restore him to his old home, to enable him to resume his old life, to invest him with his old civil privileges, to preserve his peculiar and familiar laws and customs, to give him, for instance, the independence enjoyed by a citizen of one of the States of the Australian Commonwealth, and to recognise the dignity and sentiment of the community to which he belongs; if such is your intention and desire, then why, in Heaven's name, do you not announce this openly? While, therefore, I approve and support the despatch of any reinforcements which may be required for military operations at the Cape, I would strongly urge, as a solvent even more effective than military force, that distinct proposals for terms of settlement should at the same time be made. I am not afraid of using the mailed fist, but let the hand that is not mailed hold out the olive branch.

I have been looking at the question hitherto only from the point of view of cessation of war and restoration of peace, but this is after all, although most important, a narrow and ephemeral object, and there is a wider, a greater object beyond. What is this principal and permanent object in all our South African policy whether in war or in peace? Here, again, I hope I may command the assent of hon. Gentlemen on the other side when I say it is to preserve and strengthen the British Imperial power in South Africa, and this not only for our own greater glory, but because we conscientiously and honestly believe it will be the best guarantee for good government and the prosperity and tranquillity of the country. That, surely, is the main end we ought always to look to and keep in view, and any act of policy in peace or war which does not conduce to that end, stands in itself condemned. Now let me carry hon. Members a little step further. This predominant British authority which we are all anxious to maintain, if it is to have any real life and value, must rest on the free will and assent of the people. We hear it glibly said, "Oh, when these troubles are over we shall, to deal with any slumbering discontent, at least maintain garrisons numbering 20,000, 30,000, or 40,000 men, and in that way we shall get over all our troubles," and men shrug their shoulders and shake their heads over the strain and tax this would bring on the resources of the country. But, Sir, such a solution is impossible; it is simply unthinkable. A predominance so upheld over men of European race would be no strength or glory to our Empire; it would be a weakness, a discredit, and a shame upon the very name of Britain.

Federated States, if you like, free colonies if you like, but a dependency never  
With our instincts, our traditions, our pretensions, if we were to attempt to  
maintain our authority in South Africa  
by force over men of European race we should be condemned throughout the world  
as a nation of hypocrites, and the best that our friends could say of us would  
be that we were so blinded by our prejudices that we did not realise the  
hypocrisy who practised. These are elementary truths. It has been the guiding  
principle of our wisest statesmen, upheld by the judgment of our acutest  
critics, that a fundamental condition of success in South Africa is the  
recognition of Dutch opinion, that race being in a clear and inevitably  
increasing majority. This has been the policy pursued not merely for the sake of  
convenience, not that we might have less trouble and to make things work more  
easily, but because it was a necessity of common sense. It was the policy of Sir  
G. Grey and of Sir Hercules Robinson, and approved by such ardent devotees of  
Imperial Britain as Mr. Frondé and Lord Randolph Churchill. If you are to hold  
South Africa you must win the confidence and goodwill of the Dutch  
community; not, of course, to the neglect of our own. You must secure the  
confidence and goodwill of the Dutch community, in which, of course, is included  
our own colonies as of even greater importance than the two belligerent States.  
Let there be no ascendancy of one race over the other, but accept; for it must  
be accepted; this fundamental and vital fact, that the British authority,  
although supreme, must make itself agreeable and acceptable to Dutch feeling.  
That is all I ask the House to agree to; and if you cannot make it in this way  
agreeable, then it is time that the truth should be freely stated; that not all  
the wealth in your Treasury, not all the troops in your Army, not all the nerve  
and skill of your administrators and governors will serve to keep your South  
African Empire.

In view of these facts and doctrines, what judgment are we to pass on the events  
of the last six or eight weeks? All the considerations that I dealt with some  
time ago, on the narrower question of the duration of the war, come in with full  
force here again. Every exasperating act that has been committed, every week of  
unnecessary hostilities is a crime against conciliation, and therefore a crime  
against the ultimate maintenance of solid British authority. And if I appeal to  
the Govern-

ment and to the House of Commons to take such steps as can alone lead to a  
stable and peaceful future, I do so in the name of high Imperial policy, and in  
the name of the British supremacy which you yourselves wish to maintain. We  
shall be told that there are stupendous difficulties; no doubt, but statesmen  
are appointed to overcome difficulties, and not to be overcome by them. We shall  
be told there are no Governments to which to address yourselves. Whose fault is  
that? By your own rashness you have obliterated the Governments. We know that it  
was always a maxim of Prince Bismarck; no puling sentimentalist; that it was  
the first necessity always to maintain in being a Government by dealing with  
which you could conduct negotiations. But if you have no Government, you have  
generals. Sir Redvers Buller had no difficulty in finding means of communication  
with General Christian Botha; one of the most significant and interesting

passages in the whole of the Blue-book recently issued. Sir Redvers Buller had an interview with him, which was of no effect because the door was slammed in their face. But no one can read the passage without seeing how ripe the ground was then for the seed of peace. The Colonial Secretary, in his speech in the month of December, which was received with relief and gratification by everyone, said that nothing would be wanting on the part of the Government to convey the humane and peaceful intentions of the Government. Now, this has been done effectually? What has happened is this: Lord Kitchener, no doubt under directions, called a meeting together of certain burghers and explained to them in a vague way the generally humane and reasonable intentions which he was directed to communicate. He founded these negotiations on a peculiar ground, because he said no doubt they had read the speech of Mr. Chamberlain in the House of Commons. Now, that rather confirms me in the belief that all this was done by instructions from home, because no one, I think, on the spot would have thought of attributing such knowledge to them in that manner.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): Let me tell the right hon. Gentleman that Lord Kitchener's speech was made without any instructions.

\*SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: I was going to remark that there were obviously two possibilities which were disregarded in making such a statement to these burghers. The one was that these unlettered and rude Boers had never heard of this speech, and it is just possible they may not have heard of the House of Commons, or even of Mr. Chamberlain. But there is another possibility, which is even more fatal; that they have heard of other speeches; that, instead of being too ill-informed, may have been too well-informed. They may have had in their minds the speech of the Prime Minister when he said that at the end of all these hostilities "no shred of independence" would be left to them, and the other speech in which the Prime Minister again said that it would be years, - and probably generations, before self-government could be given to them. Now, those speeches came from even higher authority; and when the condition of mind that would be created in them is merely subjected to the beneficent influence of the vague generalities of Lord Kitchener it is not wonderful that the result was not great. What happened upon that? Emissaries were sent to the camps of the Boers, those emissaries were detected, they were ill-treated, some of them were shot, an incident not without precedent in other nations and in other armies than that of the Boers. I have not a word to urge in extenuation, whoever committed it, of a gross piece of cruelty such as this. But, after all, was it a very well-advised step to have taken, and was it a very safe or a very hopeful enterprise to have sent men upon to an armed camp as emissaries to endeavour to detach the rank and file in it from their allegiance to their commander? No, I do not think these were methods from which good results could be obtained. Whatever was done should have been done openly. The difficulty of communicating with the people and getting their ear is no doubt partly due to the well-known obstinacy which is characteristic of their race, but it has been largely created by our own declarations allowing nothing but unconditional surrender. Let it clearly appear that we are animated by a



more generous and reasonable spirit, and the difficulty of communication will in a great measure disappear. In this, as in most other cases, where there is a will there is a way. There are many facts disclosed to us, by our daily observation, by the despatches that have at last been published, and by the Report of the Commission on the hospitals; there are many things on which much will be said, no doubt, and they will be keenly debated in this House. I suppose also that they will be the subject soon of that general public inquiry which the Government have explicitly promised into all the circumstances of the war. And I would ask by the way, in passing, whether the right hon. Gentleman can give us any information as to the time and manner in which that inquiry will be conducted.

But, Sir, in my opinion, the conduct of generals, the efficiency of equipment, the provision of transport, the treatment of the sick and wounded, grave matters as they all of them are, fade at present into insignificance before that which is the question of the hour; namely, what shall be the temper and attitude of our Imperial Government towards the peoples of the two States against which we have been in arms, and towards their kinsfolk among our fellow-citizens in the colonies. Upon this, I solemnly say, in my firm belief the future fate of British South Africa depends. I trust that the Government will not hastily give an unfavourable answer to my appeal. I would implore them, and, indeed, I would implore the House, every part of it, to sink every motive of personal dignity and triumph, to forget the prejudices and interests of party, in dealing with this momentous issue. If this actual moment is inopportune, which it may be (for an outsider like myself not acquainted with the communications constantly received cannot judge) at least let nothing be said or done to prevent the very earliest opportunity being seized, and we need never be afraid that evil will come to our Empire, because we shall have listened to the dictates of prudence, generosity, and humanity.

In other quarters besides South Africa beyond our shores there are presented to us serious events for our consideration. In the first place, there has been a success

ful war in Ashanti, and we all rejoice with His Majesty's Government upon that great achievement. One little criticism I will make. I am very willing to recognise, because I know his merit, the great services of Sir James Willcocks; but it is a rather extraordinary thing that he should be named personally by name in this way when, although we are fighting in so many different places, no other general is named. I can only assume that it is because the Ashanti War is ended, and the other is still not entirely terminated, that this distinction has been drawn. I join, we all join, in congratulating the King and the country on the happy inauguration of the Australian Commonwealth, and the Duke of Cornwall generously fulfils a patriotic duty in undertaking the mission which was entrusted to him. If we turn to China, we find nothing but anxiety and perplexity, and we wait with the deepest interest some explanation of the proceedings that are going on there. At present the British people are in this position; they know neither the policy that is being pursued nor the events that are occurring. There is a concert of the Powers which we are told is in the main

successful. If that is so, it is most satisfactory. It seems to me that difficult as it must be under all circumstances to maintain the concert of the Great Powers, it is especially so with regard to China; for this reason: that the interests of the Powers are not only separated and sometimes conflicting, but they are not even interests similar or analogous. We may regard the Powers having relations in China as of three classes. There are those which have, or may be supposed to have, territorial ambitions. We do not number ourselves among them, though I suspect the world would include us; but in our own conscience and intention we ought not to be so included. Then there are those who, without having any definite territorial ambitions, are deeply interested in the development of commerce and the introduction of Western civilisation. That is where we come in, and therefore our object is to seek for guarantees for the safety of our traders and our missionaries in the prosecution of their separate duties. That is not the case with some of the other Great Powers, and especially with the greatest Power on the spot; namely, Russia, which, I imagine, cares little or nothing for either trade or the propagation of religion, but which is a neighbour with a long conterminous frontier and seeks only to secure and advance that frontier, and to have a settled Government with which to deal. These three categories divide the Powers, and make it more than usually difficult to keep them in harmony. But I must express the hope that the Leader of the House or the noble Lord will be able to tell us that that has been successfully done. One point in connection with China greatly interests a vast number of people in this country, and causes them great concern. Some terrible stories have reached us as to the gross misconduct of the allied troops, ranging from murders and wholesale slaughter and robberies down to petty cruelties and petty meannesses. We have had no refutation given to these terrible stories. We are loth to believe them; we do not believe them; but we have had no refutation given, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be able to give us and the country that refutation, because if these stories were true it would be an ineffaceable blot upon our age and on the name, in fact, not only of this country, but of Europe.

Then with regard to our domestic affairs, my first duty is to recognise gratefully on the part of the House, if I may be allowed to do so, His Majesty's perfectly loyal and correct observance of the established precedent in the relinquishment of the hereditary Crown possessions, and we may be sure that this House will be ready to make ample provision for maintaining the dignity of the Crown. As to legislation, there are only three subjects, apparently, to be certainly introduced. There is an addition to the Court of Appeal, to which I need not refer. There are certain proposals for increasing the efficiency of the military forces of the country; and that is a phrase which may mean anything or nothing, and I am obliged to leave it in its native vagueness. Then we are told that there is to be a measure for dealing with the law of education, and again there is the same charming vagueness. For myself, I am one who holds that we shall not fulfil the destiny of the nation, nor, indeed, shall we be able to maintain our position among the nations, until a new spirit is breathed not only into our system of edu-

cation; primary education, secondary education, University education, technical, general, literary, and scientific education ;but what is more important, until a new spirit is breathed into the public sentiment regarding education. That being my feeling, I hope that this will be a large and sweeping measure, and the more drastic and progressive the changes it makes the more hearty support I shall give it. There are other measures mentioned. We sometimes hear of what are called innocent measures, and there is a day at the end of the session when there occurs what is called the massacre of the innocents; but these measures have not even reached the stage of being innocent. What astonishes us to find is that, even in this embryonic catalogue, there are no proofs of the legislative powers of the Government such as we should expect. We should have thought that there would have been some attempt, even in this hypothetical way, to fulfil their pledges. The Government method of dealing with great questions is to appoint Royal Commissions. When one Royal Commission has reported there is always forthcoming good reason for following it up by requiring another Commission; and when this process has gone on for some time very often we have seen a Select Committee of the House of Commons appointed to sweep up all the fragments of what all the Royal Commissions have left. So we have seen with old-age pensions, which began by being so simple that any Liberal Unionist agent could explain all about it. And so we have with regard to temperance. There is, indeed, a measure spoken of here; some small police measure; dealing with drunkenness in the street. But that is not what the people of the country are asking for. They wish for something which will have some influence in lessening the temptations which lead up to the evils of which they complain. Then we have had the Royal Commission on Rating and Local Taxation. We have had five years of inquiry there, and all that has been done has been to pick out of the subject two little points that were supposed to be beneficial to certain well-known classes of supporters of the Government. They have been dealt with, and all the rest has been left alone. Then we have been told, on the highest authority, that the housing question is the question of the day. The Secretary for the Home Department scouted the idea of temperance, with licensing reform, being at all in the forefront. The real key to the situation, he said, was in the improvement of housing, and he is supported by the Prime Minister, who brings in another argument, perhaps even a stronger one. He argued that the Government should deal with housing because it would be the most popular thing with the classes resident in certain constituencies among whom the Government have the largest number of supporters. These are very good reasons, but there is not a word of housing in this programme. May I put in a word in my original, I may say my aboriginal, capacity as a Scotsman that there is not, from the beginning to the end of the Speech, the slightest mention of my native country? They say; *inter arma silent leges*, and that while you are engaged in a war you cannot legislate. But the Government are not all directing armies or instructing Governors. There is the President of the Board of Trade, the President of the Local Government Board, and there is the Home Secretary, free for legislative work, and we know how well the President of the Local Government Board, certainly, can carry a measure through

the House; and as to the Home Secretary, he is still more accomplished, because we have seen him introduce and carry great measures, and we have seen also the dexterity with which he can drop them. The truth is the Government do not know what to do on these great questions. Why? Because they are in a dreadful dilemma. They have to please the powers of reaction and privilege, and yet they must satisfy popular sentiment and popular demands. They have trusted to the respite given to them by Royal Commissions, and they hoped that those Royal Commissions would find for them some way of reconciling these irreconcilable forces. They are now found out, and the country will judge from the barrenness of this programme, in addition to its former experience, that it is not from the gentlemen on that bench that the great reforms desired by the people are likely to be obtained.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Mr. Speaker, before I deal with the right hon. Gentleman's lengthy, but not too lengthy, speech, may I join with him and the rest of the House in offering my congratulations to my two hon. friends on the manner in which they have carried out the difficult and delicate task entrusted to them. My two hon. friends have spoken on this occasion, which is the beginning of the first Parliament of the reign and the first year of the century. This occasion has suggested to them naturally and necessarily topics of the greatest general interest, and I think everybody will admit that they treated this great theme with tact, delicacy, and judgment.

The right hon. Gentleman began his speech to-night by a very amiably turned sarcasm at something which fell from my hon. friend the Member for Sevenoaks, who moved the Address, as regards his dexterity in explaining and apologising for what the right hon. Gentleman described as the beggarly poverty of our legislative programme; and as the right hon. Gentleman began his speech in that way, so I think it was the last proposition which engaged him before he resumed his speech. I do not think this attack comes very well from the right hon.

Gentleman. He seems to take it that the business of a Government is to bring in a flaming scheme of domestic and progressive legislation, and that when a scheme is brought in all their duties in connection with it come to an end; for I well remember during the three years tenure of office by the right hon. Gentleman and his friends there never were Queen's Speeches richer in promises, and there never were sessions poorer in performance. [Opposition cries of "Oh, oh." I fear that statement does not meet with approval from hon. Gentlemen opposite but luckily this is a question not of opinion, but of fact. It is very easy to see how well justified was the classical phrase of "ploughing the sands" used by one of the Members of that Administration ;how well justified that was with regard to their legislative performances. [Opposition cries of "House of Lords."]] I am comparing promises of legislation with performances of legislation. I daresay it was the fault of the other House; possibly we may have talked too much. I am not discussing causes or excuses; I am sure the right hon. Gentleman will always find excuses. I am talking about

results; and I say that while no Government had richer promises in their Queen's Speeches, no Government, even by their own admission was less fortunate in

bringing those promises to any certain fruition. If the right hon. Gentleman had to frame our King's Speeches for us, I have not the slightest doubt they would be very different from what they are. He wants, in addition to the important and not very small list of measures we have put down, an Education Bill, which, if I understand him rightly, is to sweep away the whole of our existing elementary system, the whole of our existing secondary system, the whole of our existing technical education, and the whole of our University education; and he wants, in addition to that, to have a Bill dealing with what is called the temperance question, which is to carry out, I presume, all the recommendations of the majority and all the recommendations of the minority of the Commission and to embody them in law. In addition to that, we are to have a great scheme dealing with the housing of the working classes. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman, who has framed Queen's Speeches, is, if he has again to frame them, going to frame them on that sketch model; but I seriously warn him that if he does he will raise a good many expectations that will be doomed to a very bitter disappointment; and when he tells us, among other things, that we ought to have brought in a great scheme of licensing reform, I remember his own efforts to 'bring in a great scheme of licensing reform, and I remember the result. I remember the amount of support they received in the House and the succeeding verdict of the country upon them. I do not know that the example is an encouraging one.

Then the right hon. Gentleman alluded, I think in very proper and becoming terms, to the subject of the Civil List, which is mentioned in His Majesty's Speech. The right hon. Gentleman assured us; and we hardly required his assurance; that this subject would not be treated by his friends in a party or controversial sense. There have been times when the consideration of the Sovereign's Civil List was embarrassed by many difficult political questions. No such political questions can, I believe, be raised on the present occasion.

There have been times when

the discussion was rendered more difficult by the fact that the country was called upon not only to provide a Civil List for the future needs of the Crown, but to deal with debts contracted by the Sovereign before his accession. No such embarrassments will occur on the present occasion. There are no debts; and I feel certain that on both sides of the House we shall all be anxious to approach the consideration of this subject with an earnest desire to provide adequately for the needs of the Sovereign of this great Empire.

The right hon. Gentleman asked me two questions; I think only two; apart from the important subject he raised in connection with the war. The first question was as to any information we had with regard to the behaviour of our troops in China. The only troops for which I am called upon to answer on this or any other occasion are the troops under the command of British officers and who serve the Sovereign of these realms. I believe the conduct of those troops has been exemplary, and all the arrangements; as far as I know them; which have been made in regard to their transport, their provisioning, and their discipline reflect the very highest credit upon the Indian military organisation, upon the officers in command, and upon the troops themselves. Then the only other question the

right hon. Gentleman asked was when the commission of inquiry into the war was to take place. I am afraid it is premature; I am sorry it should be; to discuss that question. We are occupied not in diminishing, but in increasing the amount of our forces in South Africa; and until we see our way more clearly to a termination of hostilities, I presume everybody would think it premature to appoint that commission of inquiry which has to discuss the conduct of the war. I think I have dismissed all what I may call the subsidiary garnishings of the right hon. Gentleman's speech, and I come to his central criticism, which dealt with a topic which undoubtedly is the one which most deeply occupies us at the present time; namely, the South African War. The right hon. Gentleman began his observations upon that subject by saying that the last thing he desired to do was to revive the old controversies which had been raised at the General Election.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BAXNERMAN: That is as to the origin of the war.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The conduct of the election, I thought he said. At all events, if the right hon. Gentleman did begin with those good intentions, as I thought he had done, they soon, like other good intentions, were forgotten; and he plunged up to the very lips in the whole of that controversy which I have no objection to seeing revived, but which I should have thought now he might have regarded as belonging to past history. The right hon. Gentleman repeated over and over again that who had misled the country as to the conclusion of the war, that we had; I suppose he implied, though I do not know that he said it; deliberately gone to the country with a sort of false and doctored account of the position in South Africa, that we had, on the strength of that false and doctored account, got the suffrages of the electors by false pretences, and that we were now; profiting by the result. I do not believe there is the smallest foundation for that statement. It is perfectly true that in September last the Government thought, as I believe our military advisers thought, and as the country at large thought, that the main military operations had drawn very near their conclusion, and? the right hon. Gentleman seems to think who invented that story; but I would remind him that he was one of the very first persons to address the country after the dissolution was announced. I remember his address coming out in two or three columns of The Times at that period, and, unless I am greatly mistaken, in the very first sentence of that address occurs the following statement;

"And now, among other questions, men will ask themselves how far does this war, now happily so near its conclusion;"

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: It only shows that you misled me. If the right hon. Gentleman will allow me, I include myself in the country.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: How did I mislead him? His address was in the hands of an enraptured electorate long before mine. I never told him the war was coming to an end. It was he who told us before anybody else. I think he was almost the first to address the country. Though the conclusion proves to be erroneous, I do not blame him, for I shared it, believing that the war, to use his own phrase, was then happily near its conclusion. The right hon. Gentleman was mistaken, and the Government was

mistaken, and our military advisers, who had the best means of information, were mistaken also; and I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman, or the Government, or anybody else, was much to blame for the mistake. You can prophesy with a certain amount of assurance with regard to great military operations directed against organised forces; but you cannot prophesy with the same assurance as to the course to be pursued against unorganised forces, against the guerilla attacks to which we are being now subjected; and there was no ground for believing at that time; I am not aware that there could have been any ground for believing; that the Boer forces, these guerilla forces under Generals De Wet and Botha, would take a course which, however embarrassing to us, is incomparably more destructive to the interests of their own fellow-countrymen than it can be to ourselves, and which is more detrimental and disastrous to the interests of which they should be the first guardians than any of the greater military operations of which I have been speaking. The prophecy we all made was a false one. It was a false prophecy because we did not foresee, and could not foresee, that these leaders would be so ill-advised in their own interests, and in the highest interests of their own people, as to pursue the course which they have pursued. I pass from the barren field of past controversy to the more insistent, pressing, and important question of the course which the Government are now taking in order to bring this war to a conclusion. I am sorry that the right hon. Gentleman thought it necessary in that part of his speech to minimise those efforts, to imply that we were suffering under great difficulties in carrying out the requirements of our generals, that we were lagging behind their demands, and that as a matter of fact it would be, I think he said, two or three months before the force that was now being organised could leave the shores of this country or take part in any military operation.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: What I said was "could be efficiently present on the field of action."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not remember that phrase falling from the right hon. Gentleman, but many of these troops have left already, others are actually leaving, and the estimate of two or three months of the right hon. Gentleman I believe to be most unduly pessimistic. We have not lagged behind the demands of our generals, and it may interest the House to know that during the months of December and January the military stores and equipment sent out from this country were in excess of those sent out during any preceding two months since the war commenced. My right hon. friend the Secretary for War will, if it is desired, give further details as to the arrangements made by the War Office during the last two months; but it may suffice for the present occasion if I assure the House that we have been pressing forward in every possible way the military reinforcements, and that we have exceeded rather than fallen short of the demands of Lord Kitchener.

I turn from that to what is, after all, the most important part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech; a part of the speech which he delivered with great feeling and great earnestness, but which, nevertheless, left upon my mind an uneasy sensation that, behind the somewhat ambiguous phrases which he from time to time used, he was not absolutely at one with His Majesty's Government as to

the end which we must never rest until we attain ;the end, namely, of absolute supremacy, of absolute and complete conquest and control of all these territories. The right hon. Gentleman has again and again told the House that if we had taken a little more trouble to make the terms of peace known to the Boer leaders those leaders would long ago have come to some arrangement with us. The right hon. Gentleman, in support of that theory, has told us inaccurately, though unintentionally inaccurately, the story of Sir Redvers Buller's negotiations with General Botha. What happened between Sir Redvers Buller and General Botha I understand to be this;that General Botha suggested an armistice to discuss the question of peace. Sir Redvers Buller granted the armistice, and then General Botha said he had himself no terms to propose. There was a suggestion made by Sir Redvers Buller to General Botha, which, of course, he could not conclude without consulting Lord Roberts. He consulted Lord Roberts, but before the answer came General Botha refused the terms. [An HON. MEMBER: That is not in the despatches.] I do not remember whether it is or not, but I am telling the House what I believe to be the true story of what occurred. General Botha re-fused the terms; the armistice came to an end, and I believe that one result of it was that General Botha got off with two guns that would otherwise probably have been captured. The leaders of the Boers know perfectly well that if they were to lay down their arms they could do so at any moment with the certainty that their property and their persons would be respected, with the certainty that equal rights would be granted to the inhabitants of the two colonies, and with the certainty that when it became possible autonomy, free institutions, would also be granted.

Now, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman over and over again made use of phrases, which I can only interpret as meaning that if he had control of the policy of the country at the present time he would go to those generals and say, "Lay down, your arms to-morrow, and the day after to-morrow you shall have the full, free, Parliamentary Constitution of an English colony." Is that the right hon. Gentleman's policy, or is it not? I listened, I can assure the right hon. Gentleman, with, no desire to misinterpret him; but over and over again, when he came to the critical point of his recommendations, ambiguities of language crept in which compelled me, though not of a suspicious character, to imagine that his policy would be to promise instantly on the cessation of hostilities and the clearing of the country of British soldiers the establishment of full representative institutions on the model of New Zealand, . Australia, or the Cape. The right hon. Gentleman does not take the opportunity which, of course, he might of saying whether I misinterpret him. If I am not misinterpreting him, the sooner we know it and state it explicitly the better that the Government do not believe that that is a possible or a safe policy. We believe it would be absolute insanity, while the effects of war are still visible to every eye and fresh in every recollection, while the memory of the hostilities between the two races is the dominant thought in every heart, to hand over to a community so constituted institutions beneficent indeed where they can be applied, but pernicious and fatal where they only lead to internecine conflict or to external war. If ever there was a



country in which that policy could have been carried out, one would think effectively, and where there was every inducement to carry it out, it would have been in the Southern States of America at the termination of the Civil War. But even in America, with the huge dominating power of the North coercing and controlling the relatively small population of the South, even there, with the same race and with the same language, it was found absolutely impossible immediately to restore to the Southern provinces their full rights as free citizens of the great community. Let there be no suggestion or pretence that the leaders do not know the conditions which we are prepared to give. The right hon. Gentleman over and over again complained of the fact that we always said that "unconditional surrender" was the necessary preliminary to peace. It was unconditional surrender, not of the individual, but unconditional abandonment of the idea of an independent Government of the Transvaal or Orange Free State; unconditional as applied not to the individual, but to the institutions; and I do not think that that can be too clearly understood. I am sorry that the right hon. Gentleman should have thought it desirable to assert of British generals, or even of a British Government, that it had favoured the policy of the burning of the farms of their enemies because they were their enemies; a most unhappy phrase which I hope fell from the right hon. Gentleman in a moment of in cautiousness, and to which he would not adhere in cold blood. There can be no grosser misrepresentation of anything that has occurred in the Transvaal. Never was it suggested, never could it be suggested that these men who were our enemies, fighting us honourably in open warfare, were, because they were our enemies, and for no other reason, to have their property destroyed. That never was the policy of the Government; it never was the policy of Lord Roberts; it never was the policy of any single one of our military officers responsible in South Africa. I do not know, Sir, that there is, any other point in the right hon. Gentleman's speech to which it is necessary for me to advert, and I do not wish, in dealing with this subject, to make any harsh criticism or commentary upon those Boer generals who are still carrying on a hopeless resistance in the field. They are men of courage, they are men of patriotism; and where courage and patriotism are concerned I am very loth to use language which could seem to condemn efforts for which, in a certain sense, everybody must feel sympathy. But when I hear of these men, approached by emissaries to discuss peace, treating those emissaries with the most brutal cruelty; when I hear of one man being flogged and of another man being shot, for no other reason than that they had pleaded for the country now suffering under all the horrors of warfare, then I say courage has degenerated into something very like recklessness, and patriotism is not unstained by brutality. But after all it is not my business; it would be an unpleasant business at the best; to criticise those who are in arms against us; but I feel that my criticism should be reserved for those who intentionally or carelessly, by hasty words or ill-considered phrases, or with deliberate intent, use language and defend a policy in this country which can have no effect in South Africa but to prolong this miserable war. If we are justified, as I think we are, on the highest grounds of humanity in condemning the conduct of the Boer

generals, they, at all events, are risking their lives, sacrificing their ease, and incurring danger and hardship for the cause in which they believe. Those gentlemen who sit at home at ease in this country, who, either by their cheers or their speeches, do what they can to encourage and keep alive the dying embers of this struggle; what a responsibility rests upon them! I remember that my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in his speech on December 7\*, a speech

\* See The Parliamentary Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. lxxxviii., page 248. which was received with general approval on both sides of the House; with regard to the making of peace, made a most conciliatory statement. That statement was immediately perverted in South Africa by the South African Press into a sign of flinching on the part of my right hon. friend and of the Government. His language was twisted into the language of weakness; and what was intended for conciliation, what was intended to bring the war to a more rapid end, was perverted by this misplaced ingenuity into an additional motive for continuing the struggle. I hope that every Gentleman in this House; and I include the right hon. Gentleman as, perhaps, one of those who have sinned against my canon; will be careful to say nothing that can be twisted in South Africa even by the most ingenious controversialist into the suggestion that this country means to abandon the struggle in which it is engaged. We have put our hand to the plough and we will not withdraw it. Those who know South Africa, whether -as soldiers or politicians, and who form their expectations upon certain episodes in our past colonial policy and think that because in the general complication of Imperial affairs we may seem here and there to have gone back upon a declared policy, and who found upon that view the notion that the country is going to become sick of the war, disgusted with the war, anxious to bring the war on any terms to a conclusion; those men are sadly mistaken. Their mistake would matter nothing if it did not lead to the continuation of bloodshed. We could afford to smile at their ignorance of the true position of affairs had it not this disastrous practical effect upon the conduct of their soldiers and their statesmen. That they are mistaken I do not think a single man in this House doubts. This country will never withdraw from the task which it has set itself to accomplish. I have often been reproached, my colleagues have often been reproached, with indulging in prophecy. But I will indulge in no prophecy on the present occasion as to when this struggle will come to a conclusion; but it will be continued till it comes to the only possible conclusion consistent with our honour and our existence in South Africa; that I do declare; and I earnestly hope that no

party, no section of a party, no individual in this House; whatever view they take of the cause of the war or the conduct of the war; will allow any phrase to escape their lips which would give any stimulus to those who at so great a cost to their country and to themselves are continuing this hopeless struggle in South Africa.

MR. PHILIPPS (Pembrokeshire): I am one of those hon. Members on this side of the House who believe that, whatever the merits of this quarrel may have been at the beginning, now it is begun we are bound to fight it out and see it through.

Holding that view, as I do strongly, for my own part I would rather see in office in this country a Government of peace-at-any-price men than I would see a war entered upon and conducted with that want of preparation and forethought which the Government have displayed in this war. In the Speech which has been read to us to-day we have been told that measures have been taken to enable our troops to deal effectively with the forces opposing them. The right hon.

Gentleman has just told us that during the last two or three months the Government have sent out even more stores and equipments than the generals on the spot have asked for. I will put this question to the right hon. Gentleman: Does that include horses?

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Yes.

MR. PHILIPPS: I want to speak about horses to-night. A year ago, when this war began, admittedly we had not got enough horses in South Africa. The Government immediately sent out buyers all over the world, and they bought horses in great numbers in Hungary, the United States, and the Argentine. We now hear again that there are not enough horses in South Africa. And why is this? Have the horses all died? I can understand that in warlike operations there must be an immense waste of horseflesh, but it is the duty of the Government to keep that waste supplied. Nobody has ever said that the Boers are short of horses, or that they are not able to move about quickly. Why cannot our troops get about in the same way, and why can-

not we have horses as well as the Boers? We have had the greater part of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State in our hands for some time. At the beginning of the war, after the capture of Pretoria, undoubtedly in marching through the Orange Free State our generals must have had the same opportunities of getting horses as the Boers. We have had chances of getting horses in Cape Colony and Natal, and we have had the whole of Europe and America, North and South, and why is it that this country cannot get enough horses while the Boers can get plenty?

I ask the Government whose fault is it? We are generally told that it is the fault of the nature of things or of the system, but if a Boer in the Transvaal can get a horse why cannot His Majesty's Government? I want to put three questions to the Secretary of State for War. I want him to tell us, first, how many horses have been bought in Great Britain and how many in other countries? Then I want him to tell me what has been the cost in the different countries, and I should like him specially to tell me what has been the price the Government have paid on the spot in the Argentine Republic. I have just come from that country, and I am in a position to know what the owners got for their horses. As those horses have not been a success in South Africa, I want to know what the official reports from the front are as to their behaviour, and how they stood the work. Those are the three questions which I should like answered.

In my humble opinion it is a great pity that at the beginning of the war there were not a great many more horses bought in Great Britain, and I will give my reasons. Horses of more than four years of age in Great Britain must be in some sort of condition. When they have been ridden, driven, or hunted, they must be in some sort of condition, and their muscles must have been developed. When the Government sent to buy horses in the Argentine they certainly got a horse with

four legs, a head, and a tail, but for military purposes you want something more; you want condition, or, in other words, you want some muscle. If you go to the Argentine Republic and buy a horse off a ranch, that has never been worked, it cannot be fit for hard work for months to come. If you take such an animal on a voyage of some weeks over the sea it must be in a miserable condition when it lands. What I believe the fault of the Government has been is that they have not had any store of horses in South Africa, and they have simply gone on buying horses from hand to mouth, and when they got these wretched animals on the spot they were sent to the front and were practically useless. That was not business, and it was nothing short of horse murder. It was simply killing horses which, if they had been purchased three months earlier, might have done good service to our forces in South Africa in the field. It may be said, if you bought these horses in England they could not have been in condition, and that they would have wanted a few weeks work before going to the front. It should be remembered that a horse once having had condition will get into condition again much more quickly than a horse bought off a ranch.

Now, Sir, I want to go into a second branch of this subject, and that is in regard to the way in which the purchases have been made. I do not feel at all satisfied that reasonable care has been taken in the buying of these horses. I am not going to mention any loose gossip, but amongst the people of this country there are endless tales going about of men who sold horses to the Government and who have got rich in doing it. I want to allude to the case of a gentleman who some six or eight months ago wanted to help the Government and the farmers in this country upon this question. He told all the farmers around that if they would send their horses to his stable he would only charge them something like £;1 a week for their keep, and he would get the Government to send a buyer down and thus give the authorities a chance of getting good horses and the farmers a chance of selling them. What happened? An officer came down from the War Department, and he looked at six or eight horses. Out of that number he bought five or six, and never had the other horses out of the stable. A complaint was made to the Government. I know that the man who got the horses together is one of the best judges of horses in England. Somebody came down a second time from the Government and did the same thing. Six or eight were chosen, and the man did not have the others out at all. Anybody who knows anything about the buying and selling of horses knows that this is a very suspicious matter, and it makes people ask questions as to the way in which the horses are bought. I wish to say a few words about the Argentine horses, because that is a thing upon which I have had exceptional opportunities of forming an opinion. A great many of the Argentine horses are rather small, with poor shoulders, and the great bulk of them would not be fit for military purposes. You could have got from the Argentine 10,000 or 15,000 extremely useful horses. I have heard in the Argentine of man after man; I know their names; who have made a great deal of money from selling horses to the Government, and I have seen thousands of horses admirably suited for military purposes; but I ask the Government, what is this precious system under which they have taken the bad horses and have never bought the good horses? I do not know whether it is the fault of the Government or of

their buyers. If the Government told their buyers that they did not want horses out of condition, or old horses, or horses which had never done any work, then it was the fault of the buyers and the buyers ought to be changed. I believe that the Government could get dozens of men who are perhaps too old to serve their country in the field, but who would be very glad to go abroad and buy the horses wanted. From what I have seen of the results of the Government buying these horses, they have got the wrong men. It will no doubt be said that this was not the fault of the Government, but the fault of the system which they have inherited. I think the House is getting somewhat tired of hearing, when blame is cast on a system, the reply that the system is going to be changed. Ever since 1886 this Government, with the exception of three years, has been in office. If a man were put into a private business to manage it, and if at the end of twelve months it was found that the business was a fiasco, and that robbery was being carried on, or that it was being managed with extravagance, the manager and not the system would be blamed, and he would be dismissed. And yet the Government have been going on saying for twelve out of fifteen years that it is the fault of the

system, for which the Government is in no way responsible. I trust that the Government is not going to inquire into the system, but into the way it is being carried on. I speak as one who believes in prosecuting the war with vigour, but I am far from satisfied that any vigour is being shown by the Government, except in words or on election platforms. I should like to see vigour not in words only, but in actions. I hope that the House will set inquiry into the conduct of the war into motion at once; and I am sure that it will be found that investigation as to the circumstances under which horses are purchased abroad is most urgently needed.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I should not venture to criticise the most gracious Speech from the Throne in the slightest degree if it were not for the fact that it is a Speech for which His Majesty's Government is alone and entirely responsible. There is evidence of that in to-day's paper, in the fact that the Duke of Devonshire waited on the King yesterday, and submitted for approval the Speech His Majesty has made to-day. There are in my opinion several very striking and grave omissions in the gracious Speech from the Throne, but before I deal with them I should like to make an observation with regard to the part which refers to the war in South Africa. In doing so, I should like to congratulate the Financial Secretary to the War Office upon his safe return from the seat of war, and upon the distinguished services he rendered in the course of the campaign. The mention of the services of the colonial forces in the King's Speech meets, I am quite certain, with a very ready echo in the heart of every individual in this country and one can only regret that Lord Strathcona's corps, a force formed and raised at the expense entirely of the Canadian High Commissioner in this country, arrives in this country at a time when it will be difficult to show them all those outward expressions of the gratitude we feel for their services. I must, however, confess I am rather surprised that no mention is made in the King's Speech of the services, that have been rendered by the Reservists, the Militia, the Yeomanry, and the Volunteers; but I am content

to believe that the services of these men are recognised and included in the term "my troops," because all who belong to these forces only desire to be acknowledged as members of His Majesty's Army. But considering the call that has been made on the Reservists, a greater call than anybody could have anticipated, and the serious call made on the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteers, venture to think those services demand some special word of recognition by the Government. The services of the Volunteers have been somewhat remarkable. It is impossible to say how many members of the Volunteer force have gone to reinforce the field army in South. &#x0021; Africa; but taking all the sources of information, I do not think it can be put down at less than 10,000 or 20,000 men, which is a very large contribution indeed;a contribution which, except from motives of patriotism, the Volunteer's were not compelled to give.

But I wish to refer to one matter of current interest;the raising of drafts of Imperial Yeomanry for service in South Africa, and the drafts to reinforce the service companies of Volunteers. The Government and the Secretary of State for War have, I think, acted in a very wise manner in offering a far more liberal rate of pay with regard to the Yeomanry. A company sergeant-major gets 9s. 6d., and a quartermaster-sergeant, 8s. 6d.; but these rates are incomparably higher than those offered to the Volunteer drafts, who are offered only the pay of the Regular Army, with a natural consequence that a large number of the Volunteers have drifted into the Yeomanry. I make this no matter of complaint against the Yeomanry staff', because few men have done more for the country than the men who have raised the Imperial Yeomanry; but those who composed the Yeomanry in South Africa belonged to the Yeomanry cavalry in this country, and now only one in six of those in South Africa belong to the Yeomanry cavalry. I very much fear that some difficulty may occur owing to the varying rates of pay in the field force in South Africa, and that some dissatisfaction will arise. The Financial Secretary to the War Office being in his place, I should like to call his attention to the case of a civilian artificer, a civil farrier, who was engaged to assist in the shoeing of horses, and who wrote to me in effect;I am sorry I have

not his letter here, but I did not know I should have this opportunity of drawing attention to this case to-night;that he was engaged, with others, for the year at 2s. 6d. a day. The year is about to expire, and he has applied to remain out there at the same rate of pay as that which is to be given to the Yeomanry artificers, which I think is 7s. 6d. a day; but he has been told that his term has expired, and he must return to England and be relieved by those coming out from this country. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will send him the letter in question.

My hon. friend the Member for Pembroke, in his speech just now, referred to the supply of horses for South Africa. Now, I was for some time in a remount depot in Cape Colony, and anyone who has any conception of the immense demand for horses out there, would recognise the absolute impossibility of allowing time for the horses to get hard in time for service. I do not think any department has done more difficult or thankless work than the remount department in Cape

Colony. I wish I could say that the horses were all of the best, but not the least thing that proved detrimental to them was the change from the good feed of this country to the inferior feed out there. Anybody who knows anything about this matter, knows the extreme difficulty in buying horses for the cavalry, and those who saw the horses of the Hussars outside the House condemned them. Upwards of 70,000 horses have been shipped to South Africa, and I think, generally, they gave satisfaction. With regard to this the direction of the reform must be a very great difference in the power of the Government to obtain horses from the horse-owners of this country.

Now I must call attention to the Intelligence Department. I do urge a thorough reorganisation of that department at the earliest possible moment. Lord Wolseley complained that he was not kept fully informed, and we had statements the other day from the oldest general in the field complaining of the maps. Now the publication of the maps of a country with which we are likely to be at war at any time is the work of the Intelligence Department, but topographical work of this character is quite foreign to obtaining intelligence of foreign armies.

There is one other thing I would urge on

the right hon. Gentleman; the reorganisation of the staff of the Army. There is not in this country anything like the general staff of the army in Berlin, which consists of about 120 members, whose duty it is to do everything possible to prepare the army for war. In the case of our general staff the work is mixed up with administrative duties, which prevents the staff doing its duty as a military staff.

Without dealing further with military matters, I am anxious to call attention to the extraordinary absence from the King's Speech of any reference to some of those serious social problems to which the Unionist party pledged themselves in 1895. I quite recognise what the First Lord of the Treasury said just now as to its being foolish to put in the Speech from the Throne a great amount of matter which has no chance of being dealt with, and which would only raise false expectations and lead to difficulties; but the character of those matters mentioned in the most gracious Speech from the Throne is so peculiar that the mover of the Address in reply described it as "proposals of legislation of not too ambitious a character" I need not read them. They are in the possession of every Member. Representing as I do an industrial constituency and a large number of working men, I am astonished that His Majesty's Government come before Parliament directly after a General Election and say nothing whatever upon trade and commercial matters. A great many hon. Members do not agree with the views I hold as regards commercial policy, but they will allow me to mention a matter of importance. My constituents at the present time are greatly troubled in their minds with regard to the threatened increase of the duties on the part of certain foreign Governments affecting the steel and iron industry of this country. Now, what has the President of the Board of Trade done at the Table of the House to-day? He has given notice of his intention to introduce a Bill. I at any rate thought it would be a notice having something to do with the trade and industry of the country; but what was it? Notice of a Bill for amending the law of literary copyright. That may be a matter of interest to a large

number, but it is not a matter that concerns millions and millions of workers in this country. Remembering the services of the colonial forces of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand in South Africa last year, surely there never was a better time not only to have recognised that the colonies had given us their best blood and much of their treasure to assist us in the Boer War, but also to state the intention of His Majesty's Government in developing the trade and commercial intercourse between the mother country and her colonial possessions. It is perfectly evident to everyone that the great trade future lies within the British Empire. There is a feeling at the present time, not alone in Canada and Australia but among large masses of the people of this country, in favour of developing trade within the British Empire on mutually advantageous terms. I think that if this were done, threatened as we are with high and increased duties, and by trade restrictions of every sort, it would do something to give us markets within our own Empire. But there is not a word on this subject. I think the Colonial Secretary not long ago made a speech, which was reprinted by thousands and tens of thousands, in which he suggested that the aim of the Empire should be commercial peace. I have no desire to press unduly on His Majesty's Government, but these are matters that will not be delayed. If I may refer to a crucial instance, I would mention the disaster in the West Indies on account of the sugar bounties in France, Austria, and elsewhere. There were rumours of an intention on the part of France to do away with these bounties. The Government said in December that they had no official knowledge of the matter. These are matters of grave importance to large masses of the people of this country.

It is not only with regard to commercial union, the increase of duties by foreign Powers, and sugar bounties by which foreign Governments greatly prejudice the trade of the colonies, that the Government are entirely silent. They are silent upon many other matters of importance affecting the interests of the people of this country. There is the question of old age pensions. There is also a matter which can be and must be dealt with; one upon which the late President of the Local Government Board made an earnest speech recently at the Cutlers' Feast in Sheffield. He spoke of the absolute necessity of an immediate measure for the better housing of the working classes. That is a matter of most pressing interest and importance in all large towns, and especially in the East End of London. Now if there is one subject on which His Majesty's Government have made repeated declarations it is as regards alien immigration. This is a matter of the utmost importance in connection with the housing of the working classes. It is surprising that upon this matter, in which the Sovereign has shown repeatedly his deep and great interest, no mention is made in the Speech from the Throne. Only yesterday, in addressing a deputation of the London County Council, His Majesty said;

"In the discharge of your onerous duties, which closely concern the welfare of millions of my people, I am confident that you will not slacken in the efforts which you have made and are making for dealing satisfactorily with the many difficult questions which await your consideration, and especially with that of the proper housing of the working classes, which is one in which we have always



felt the deepest personal interest."

That being so it is amazing that His Majesty's Government have not given any indication in the Speech from the Throne of their intention to deal with the matter. I hold in my hand a report which was made to the Toynbee Trustees. The Toynbee Institute, as many hon. Members know, is an institution which does incalculable good in the East End of London, and, seeing the pressing importance of this matter, they appointed a delegation to study the matter from an entirely impartial point of view. They appointed a young man of brilliant ability, Mr. Russell, who had no connection with London and no personal interest in the matter, and Mr. H. S. Lewis, a member of the Hebrew faith, as commissioners, in order to obtain the necessary information on the subject. Whatever I do in the course of this or other sessions, I wish to disclaim the slightest intention of importing into the discussion any vestige of religious feeling or prejudice. I have not the slightest feeling as to the Jews as Jews. In the last four years there was the enormous immigration of 200,000 persons, 50 per cent. of whom settled in the East End of London, and, seeing the enormous prejudice this brings to our population, I cannot but mention the religion of: the people. I will ask your permission to read two extracts from the report made by Mr. Russell to the Toynbee Trustees;

"Streets that a few years ago were English and non-Jewish, have now a number of Jews; and the gradual process of the substitution of a Jewish family for a former occupant, is transforming the neighbourhood, whilst if a Jewish family remove, the key of the house will certainly be sold to a co-religionist."

Mr. Lewis says quite independently;

"The foreigner has been an important factor in raising rents in many parts of East London, and his willingness to overcrowd is patently injurious to all his neighbours."

Is it not extraordinary that with a state of affairs such as this, intimately connected with the active work of the Sovereign himself, and intimately connected with the welfare of the working classes, His Majesty's Government are completely silent on the point? On the Treasury Bench there is now a London representative, and I cannot understand how he does not insist on a matter so vital and important being dealt with. What did the Home Secretary, when President of the Board of Trade, state at that table on behalf of the Government of which he was then and is now a prominent member? He said;

"Not only individual Members, but the Government as a whole, are pledged to some legislation on the subject. We do not desire to depart one iota from the pledges we have given. We adhere to every pledge, and I hope at no distant time to propose in Parliament legislation in the direction desired."

That is over four years ago, and three-sessions have passed and he does absolutely nothing on the subject. I am a loyal supporter of His Majesty's Government. In the recent General Election I made as many speeches on behalf of the Government in my own constituency and in other places as any supporter of the Government, but I cannot do otherwise than call attention to what I consider, and what I believe my constituents will consider, serious omissions from His Majesty's Speech. I admit that the session is likely to be a busy and

interesting one, if not indeed historical, but I consider with regard to matters such as those to which I have called the attention of the Government that it is disappointing, it is almost heart-breaking, to see nothing whatever done.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): The hon. Member who has just addressed the House is in almost as bad a humour with His Majesty's Government as an Irish Member might be expected to be. It would be interesting for one to thoroughly understand what is the reason of the hon. Gentleman, who hitherto has been such a strong supporter of His Majesty's Government, for the attack he now makes upon them at this hour. The hon. Gentleman's attack no doubt will disturb to a considerable extent His Majesty's Government, and I, for one, after some considerable experience of the House, and having listened to similar attacks by hon. Members against the party to which they are supposed to belong, will not be surprised if His Majesty's Government have the wisdom and the grace for the future to call the hon. Member into their counsels. If they only do that there is no doubt that the next speech his Majesty delivers will be of a different character, and one wholly satisfactory to the House. The hon. Gentleman rather surprised me in the references he made to the East End of London. He delivered what appeared to me and what, I think, will appear to most people who read the speech, a rather embittered and envenomed attack upon the Jewish population.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I specially disclaimed that.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: The hon. Gentleman certainly drew a strong contrast between the conditions existing where the Jewish immigrants live in London and the conditions existing where what he called the Christian or English population live. I know very little of East London, but of this much I am convinced: that the terms "Christian" and "English" are not by any means synonymous. I do not think the foreign population in the East End of London, many of whom support themselves by the hardest of toil and labour, make worse citizens than those roughs of the East End of whom we hear from time to time in the police courts. The hon. Member for Central Sheffield has found fault because of the neglect to make reference in the King's Speech to matters of social reform on which he has dealt. He has pointedly referred to the complete absence of any reference whatever to old-age pensions. All I have got to say on that point is that as long as the hon. Member and the rank and file of the Conservative party allow themselves to be led and controlled by the Member for West Birmingham, let them not be surprised in the future, as in the past, at any inconsistency the Government may commit. Before the Colonial Secretary turned his attention to Imperial matters and the development of the Empire in Africa he was great on the question of old-age pensions. At the General Election in 1895 it was stated that one of the leading questions to be dealt with was old-age pensions. I was myself a member of a Committee appointed to inquire into the feasibility of granting old-age pensions, but the Committee came to the conclusion that the few millions per annum which the scheme would cost could not be afforded, and the Committee ceased to do any further work. The Committee made a Report, and the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary dropped the subject because the expense would be too great, and so we heard no more of old-age pensions. Very shortly afterwards the Government launched into a war which has cost up to the present

time, apart from the enormous charge yet to be incurred, three or four times as much as would be necessary to establish in this country a satisfactory system of old-age pensions such as exists in many of the colonies of the Empire at the present time.

If the hon. Member found fault with the Government for the omission of these reforms from the Speech, what complaint might not be made by the Irish Members?

In the first Speech of the King there is an almost entire absence of reference to the conditions existing in Ireland at the present time. We are told in the Speech that there will be a measure introduced to facilitate the voluntary purchase and sale of land in Ireland. It is a most extraordinary thing that the Governments of the last hundred years by some perverse fate have always been destined to be completely behind the times, and to offer to the Irish people not what they stand in need of, but something they do not require and which would be absolutely useless to them. At present, from north

to south and from east to west there is amongst Catholics and Protestants the most profound unanimity of feeling as to the absolute desirability of introducing a system of compulsory purchase and sale of land in Ireland. That is admitted everywhere, and yet the people are told that they will get a voluntary scheme of land purchase which is useless to them, and has been proved to be useless to them for the past ten years. In Ireland there is a lack of industry and enterprise, there are misery and starvation on every side, and we come here and do not receive a single word of hope or encouragement in the Speech delivered by His Majesty. Not one promise is made to our people, and we are expected to be loyal. Why, it is the old story: the Irish people are promised nothing: their miseries and needs and destitution are passed over in silence.

I did not intend to refer to these matters at all. I have been induced to do so by the speech of the hon. Member for Central Sheffield. I rose to say one or two words on the danger dealt with by the First Lord of the Treasury when he made reference to the war. What did the First Lord of the Treasury say? He warned hon. Members in this House and he warned people outside not to dare or to attempt to say one word of opposition to the proceedings now going on in South Africa, "because," he said, "if you protest or object to anything that occurs, it will be taken as an encouragement by the Boers to continue this hopeless war." I say that an argument of that kind coming from the First Lord is unworthy of his position, and it is an unfair argument to the House. What does it mean? It means that if Englishmen or Scotchmen, as well as Irishmen, who have their hearts filled with indignation when they read of the ruthless and cowardly persecution to which women and children have been subjected from one end of South Africa to another, when they read of the burning of the homesteads of people whose only crime was that they fought for their country, object to these things, they are to be told that they are encouraging the Boers in their resistance. It is these very things of which we complain; this house-burning, this wanton destruction of property, and this persecution of defenceless women and children; which steel the hearts of the Boers and encourage them to fight; and if under these circumstances they do continue this war, I say you have to blame not any advice given in this country, but the barbarous and

infamous proceedings which have been done; and done, as I believe, wrong fully; in the name of this country at the present time. The First Lord of the Treasury said it was impossible to prophesy as to what would occur in regard to such a war as is now raging in South Africa. My answer to that is that all that has taken place in South Africa; the cost of money, the spilling of blood, and the waste of material ; was prophesied with absolute accuracy a year and a half ago. The terrible dangers that were confronting you were prophesied not only by Members of this House, but, I believe, if the despatches were published, it would be seen that Sir William Butler also prophesied them. It is my proudest boast, after eighteen years in this House, that I in a humble way amongst the Irish Members, having had some information as to the true state of affairs, when you asked for £13,000,000, warned you that the war would cost £100,000,000; you will find it in Hansard; when you said the war would be over in six months (you can refer to Hansard again), we warned you that it would probably take two years, and that the animosity and the bitter race hatred caused by the war would probably last as long as any man in this House will live. We are proud to be able to boast that, whoever may be responsible for the injustice, misery, and bloodshed of the war, the Irish Members spoke the truth, and in face of the terrible war fever then rampant in this country, they did their duty, and therefore have no share in the blood-guiltiness which undoubtedly rests upon the heads of those who supported this war some time ago. We sometimes hear of boycotting in Ireland, or of cases in which men have been unfairly excluded from public life; we are told that the Irish are ungenerous and intolerant; but where in the history of the country can you find a case of intolerance more glaring and outrageous, or of ingratitude blacker, than the case presented by the treatment of the late Members for Plymouth and Bodmin? They are men who for the best part of their lives served their country and their people in this House; men who were opposed to the national claim of Ireland, and therefore have no particular claim upon my sympathy—honourable and upright men, men of ability, of single-minded purpose and genius; but where are they now? Their places are empty; they have been hunted from public life; they have been persecuted, derided, and ridiculed; and why? Simply because at a time when it was not popular to do so they had the courage and honour to stand up and endeavour to win the people of England from the policy which was leading them to this lamentable, miserable, unjust, and costly war. I feel convinced that so long as this impossible effort is continued to impose your will upon a reluctant people, so long will the struggle continue. Reference has been made to the mother country and the colonies. In the colonies there are large bodies of men who are willing to embark upon the duties which you require to be performed in South Africa if you pay them well enough; but I will believe in their devotion to this country and their sympathy with this war when I see the United Parliament of the Australian Commonwealth or the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada voting £1,000,000 towards the war expenses. But they will not vote £100,000 for that purpose, though there are a certain number of men who will fight for you on the terms upon which you are now enlisting the Yeomanry ; five shillings a day and all found. It is a monstrous piece of injustice that the

Fusiliers and the men from Scotland, England, and Ireland, who have behaved most bravely and suffered most severely, should get only a shilling a day, while these others are getting five shillings to prove their devotion to the mother country. The whole proceedings in connection with the war are so repugnant and detestable to the feelings of the Irish people that it is no wonder we make this protest, and if I have seemed somewhat presumptuous in speaking thus early in the session, I feel that I am entitled to do so because I was one of the Members who eighteen months ago raised their voices in deprecation of the war, and in warning the people of this country of the inevitable results of the policy then adopted.

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): The hon. Gentleman who has just spoken seemed very much-impressed with the injustice of the English electorate towards two gentlemen who were distinguished Members of this House. I for one very much regret that the hon. Gentleman who represented Plymouth is no longer a Member of this House, and I hope he may soon return to take the interesting and instructive part he always occupied in our debates. With regard to the right hon. Gentleman the late Member for Bodmin, I always thought, and still think, that if he returns; and I have no objection to his return; he ought to take his seat on the opposite benches rather than on this side of the House. But the hon. Gentleman based his charge of ingratitude on the fact that the English people declined to return two gentlemen who actively opposed one of the most important policies of the party to which they belonged. Such a result is not an unusual occurrence, nor is it confined to England. The hon. Gentleman once called himself a Parnellite, and I remember a certain amount of ingratitude on the part of the Irish nation towards Mr. Parnell and his faithful followers; quite as striking as that which has been referred to. But that is not a very important question. An important charge, however, was that of maltreatment and atrocity with regard to Boer women and children brought against British troops. Vague statements of that sort are very easily made, but I challenge the hon. Member to prove any of those cases.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): We accept the challenge.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Perhaps; the hon. Gentleman will allow me to say, so far as I am concerned, exactly what I meant. If he means that I charged the British troops with personal assaults or outrages upon women, I have heard of such cases, but I am not prepared to substantiate them myself. The charge of brutality of which I spoke; and I do not blame the British troops; they but carried out their orders; was in connection with the Boer women and children being taken from their homes and herded in camps without sufficient food or accommodation, and being treated in every respect as prisoners.

\*SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I am glad I referred to the charge, because we have obtained from the hon. Member a distinct disclaimer of the charges of personal outrage against women and children; and that is very important. What he means is that a certain number of the non-combatant Boer population have been taken from outlying farms and villages and placed in laagers, where they are well looked after by the British. The answer to that is that the greater number of those persons have been removed at their own desire, because they have been

perpetually robbed by these Boer guerillas, or banditti, or whatever you like to call them: and I venture to say that nine-tenths of those people would be willing, if asked to do so, to sign a declaration of gratitude to the British officers for their protection.

Then I cannot but regret the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. It was, in my opinion, as mischievous a speech as could have been made by a Member of this House, especially by one holding so great a position as that held by the light hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman said he was most anxious to see an early end to this war, that it was our duty to bring the struggle to a speedy conclusion, and that the bulk of his supporters would not be backward in voting the necessary supplies with that object. But after making those premises, the right hon. Gentleman leads the world to believe that the Government have neglected, in their political treatment of the Boer population since the war began, some important steps which might have secured an earlier surrender of the Boer forces. He did not give any proof of that except a rather uncertain version of an interview between one of the generals Botha and Sir Redvers Buller; and the Government are certainly not responsible for the consequent action taken by the Commander-in-Chief, excepting in so far as they are generally responsible for the acts of all the generals; that is, they were not responsible in an inspiring and directing sense. The right hon. Gentleman would also lead the country to believe that the Government have it in their power now to go to the Boer belligerents and offer such and such terms. The right hon. Gentleman, if he has studied the course of the war as closely as he appears to have done, must know that no such offer would have the slightest effect at the present stage. The only result would be to persuade the Boers that we were afraid of them, and to confirm them in the idea which has been unfortunately rooted in their minds ever since the disastrous and infamous surrender of 1881; that they are better men than we are, and that they have only to continue fighting in order to get all they want. I believe, with the right hon. Gentleman opposite, that the Boers in the field, though acting with reckless madness, are fighting courageously and well; and as they are experienced in guerilla warfare they may protract the contest for a few weeks or months, but ultimate success is impossible. Every month and week of delay adds to the loss of killed and wounded and increases the ruin which this course of procedure is inflicting upon the whole of the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies. Hon. Members who take the line adopted by hon. Gentlemen opposite are not real friends of the cause they profess to advocate. The most disastrous thing that could happen would be for the Boers, or any section of them, to think that there is any party or leader in this country who believes the Boers have the smallest chance of success. The right hon. Gentleman made another statement which I think is much to be deplored. He gave some colour to the idea that cruelty of a very serious kind had been inflicted by our troops in the burning of Boer houses. In the case of warlike operations extending over so vast a country, and under so many isolated commands, it is impossible to guarantee that there may not have been some few farmhouses destroyed unnecessarily; but the enormous proportion of these farms were destroyed not because they belonged to

men who had been fighting against us, but because they afforded most dangerous points d'appui for the enemy in a treacherous kind of warfare. I have not heard a word said about the bombardment by the Boers of inhabited towns, such as Kimberley, and Mafeking, and Lady-smith, during this war. I am not going to complain of that, but when Members complain of the burning of Boer farmhouses, they should remember the other side also.

The right hon. Gentleman made a third serious error in his speech. It is no doubt of the utmost importance that in the long run the Dutch element in South Africa should be conciliated and fairly treated; nobody in this House wishes any other course to be followed; but at this time the one thing to persuade the whole of South Africa is not that the Dutch have to be conciliated, but that British supremacy is to be established and maintained. That is the crucial fact in the whole situation; and once that is recognised, as it will be recognised before long, by the whole of the Boer population you will have the ground clear for a policy of just, kind, and even generous treatment. I should like to say one word with regard to the conduct of the war by the Government as distinguished from the references I have made to those who attack the policy of the Government. I should like to know if the Government have, at the earliest moment, followed the advice and satisfied the demands of those who are responsible for the military operations in South Africa. We heard about three weeks ago of 5 000 Yeomanry being sent out; we now hear of 10,000. Are these what Lord Kitchener has asked for, and are they being sent out as soon as he asked for them? We have a right to know that, and the Government cannot on the one side boast of the conduct of the war and of their determination to maintain British supremacy and to put an early end to the military operations, and at the same time withhold the reinforcements which those who are best able to judge of the necessities of the case demand. I do not say they have held them back but there is a rather suspicious interval between the assumption of the chief command by Lord Kitchener and the despatch of reinforcements, which we all know to be absolutely necessary. The hon. Member for Pembroke made a very interesting and practical speech on some of our military deficiencies, and he criticised the way in which our Army had been kept short of horses. I believe that three-fourths of our failures in South Africa have been due to the insufficient supply of horses. In Cape Colony and in Natal there was, I believe, an enormous supply of the most useful horses which was for long never drawn upon, I do not know why; but certainly the Argentine horses were the worst horses for the kind of work for which they were required. The right hon. Gentleman also derided the Secretary of State for speaking of the present operations as guerilla warfare. There never was an example more correctly described as guerilla warfare than that at present existing in South Africa. Guerilla warfare is warfare in which the enemy divide themselves into a great number of small bands, avoid combats in the open and in large numbers, take advantage of the mountainous or marshy country, and dash about inflicting all the damage they can upon their opponents without risking a general engagement. That is guerilla warfare pure and simple, and that is exactly what is being carried on in South Africa. I know of only one engagement during the past year

which might be described as ordinary warfare, and that was the attack upon General Clements' force, the success of which seems to have been entirely due to the carelessness of certain officers in not entrenching the position at Nooitgedacht.

With regard to the campaign in China, the Leader of the Opposition very properly asked the Leader of the House whether it was true that great crimes in the way of massacres and outrage of every kind had been committed by the Allied forces in China. The First Lord rather parried that question, and said that our Indian troops had conducted themselves well. I believe it is true that no case of serious outrage has been proved against the troops which fought under British leadership in China; but that is not the case with regard to our allies, and the Government are very responsible for what has happened. Massacres and outrages of a most atrocious and almost unparalleled character have been inflicted upon the Chinese non-combatant population, because our Government committed the terrible mistake of going with what they called the Concert of Europe into a military expedition into China. Nothing could possibly have turned out worse. It is true that we rescued the legations, but we have gained no credit or advantage from the operations in China. Other Powers have gained, and we have lost and we have inflicted upon the Chinese a sense of Christian cruelty and barbarity which I do not think can be wiped out in the course of centuries. I think the Government ought to make some expression of regret, at all events, if not of horror, at the deeds which have been committed upon harmless non-combatants in China by the forces of the Powers with whom they were acting, and I shall never lose an opportunity of making this protest, because I think that the wholesale massacres by the Russians in Manchuria, and by the contingents of several Powers in Chi-le, constitute one of the most deplorable, disgraceful events which occurred in the course of the last century.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I think that in the last words of the hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division the House generally will be inclined to concur, but into his previous discussion as to the academic point of the meaning of the term "guerilla warfare" I shall not enter. I remember a distinguished German general, who was employed by another Power with the consent of his own Government, telling me; to give me an idea of the futility of the military methods pursued outside his own country; that a most distinguished staff student was once asked by him to compose a column and conduct it from one place to another upon the map, and to explain how he would do it, and the man began by asking whether it was a defensive or an offensive operation. I confess that it seems to me that we have to look at the essence of the war in which we are engaged and not to engage in discussions as to the particular meaning of words which may be employed. I desire to refer to the nature of the military operations in which we have been recently engaged. It appears to me to be a point peculiarly worthy of consideration on this occasion as compared with those which may be raised by Amendments which will be moved to-morrow, and on subsequent days of the debate. When we get the Army Estimates we shall discuss larger Army questions; but this, it seems to me, is the proper, necessary, and practically only opportunity for discussing those events which have occurred



since we last met, and which we have our first opportunity of criticising here to-day.

What has happened since we were here

in December last? There has been an invasion of the remaining portion of Cape Colony, an invasion on a geographical scale which the country has perhaps hardly realised of our old colony of territory which has been completely British since 1806, and where the invaders have reached and occupied for a considerable period districts which were settled with British settlers in 1820. That has been described by Government speakers as a mere raid, and the invaders have been termed "raiders." Lord Kitchener has used that phrase. No reference whatever is made in the King's Speech to that invasion; the Speech refers only to the war as not yet entirely terminated, and states that the capitals of the enemy and the principal lines of communication are in our possession. The country will hardly realise from those words that Sir Alfred Milner has been making speeches at Cape Town to guards raised for the defence of the capital, in which he has stated that an attack upon the capital itself is by no means outside the realms of possibility. Also since we last met a great deal of information has been afforded with regard to the details of matters which have previously occurred in the war, and which have been subjects of discussion, but as to which no official information has been vouchsafed up to the present time. As an example of the knowledge which has come to us of late, and of the necessity for that larger inquiry of which we have been told; an inquiry which, however, I fear will come after all the interest has departed and the value of the lessons to be learnt from these occurrences has evaporated and passed away; I may take the long-ago case of what happened at Waterval Drift. We have lately had a Blue-book laid before the House, which I suppose embodies, in the opinion of the Government and the generals, a sufficient and final account of that business. There is no reference whatever either to the magnitude of the losses which we suffered on that occasion or to the consequences of that loss. According to one account there were taken at Waterval Drift 173, and according to another account 175 loaded store wagons, 3,000 trek oxen, and 1,000,000 days rations for the Army. Will the House believe that not the slightest information has ever been given to us

officially as to the nature of that loss and its results on the position of the Army; results which may be imagined by those who have any acquaintance with military matters?

Then there is another matter. In reply to a question with regard to the necessity for inquiry, it was put forward, and assented to by the Under Secretary of State for War, that a reason for the inquiry was the bearing which such knowledge would have, not upon the satisfaction of idle curiosity, but upon the recruiting and training of the Army. That was a ground for the inquiry, and the ground upon which the inquiry was assented to. I suppose it has been found necessary; and if that is alleged I shall yield to that necessity; to profess officially that the conduct of battalions all through has been uniform; that is to say, that there has been little to choose between battalion and battalion in this war. But if we are to have knowledge upon which we can really discuss the

recruiting and training of the Army, we must deal with that delicate question of the differences which the war has shown between battalion and battalion. It is, of course, a very delicate question, and if I turn to the account given in these dispatches of the attack on Long Hill in the course of the battle at Lombard's Kop, and when I remember letters in my possession from officers who were present in that engagement, and are mentioned for gallantry in the dispatches, but have since been killed; and when I read the account of that attack given by Sir George White and passed by Sir Redvers Buller, Lord Roberts, and the Government, and laid before this House as the complete and, except for anything we may probe afterwards, the final account of this engagement, I find it impossible to believe that there is any intention of giving us any information to distinguish the battalions. I hear a Member opposite suggesting that it is a difference in commanding officers. That may be alleged with regard to some of the operations, but I am certain that on this occasion that explanation cannot be given as a reason for the difference between the various infantry battalions engaged. As far as I am concerned, if that attitude is held to be necessary for the Army, I shall accept that view, and I shall not

press for information on these subjects which the Government deliberately think it contrary to the interests of the Army to give. But I note the fact that when we have frequently before discussed these matters in this House we have always been told that we were right in maintaining that for our knowledge of the recruiting and training of the Army it is necessary that these things should be gone into. We now find they have not been gone into in the dispatches; I believe they never will be, and I shall accept that if the Government say it is necessary.

What is really new since we last met? We have had a continued succession of those disasters on a small scale which marked the earlier stages of the war. Some have been officially brought before us in letters and telegrams; some have not been mentioned, but have become known through the casualty lists. There have been constantly repeated captures of convoys in every portion of the field of operations, and we have the event at Helvetia on 31st December, the second affair at Lindley, and on 30th January the affair at Modderfontein. There have been a succession of similar incidents in Cape Colony itself. What has been the position in Cape Colony since we separated? When we were first told that the raiders had crossed the Orange River we were also told that they were being pursued, and that there was every probability that they would be either headed back, stopped, or captured. That invasion went on, on the contrary, for six weeks. Two columns of invaders crossed the whole of Cape Colony from the one end to the other; one column marched 300 miles to the west coast, and another column marched 400 miles to the south coast. They were sitting for six weeks in the centre of the grain-growing districts of the colony, and I do not believe they will be driven out by the reinforcements now being dispatched; but I do not believe they would have been there for those six weeks if the reasonable preparations had been made in advance which any reasonable men would have made. I was asked just now to what districts I was referring when I said the invaders had come to districts settled by the British in 1820. The hon. Member who asked

will find that Uniondale, in the district of Port Elizabeth, where the Boer raiders penetrated for 400 miles from the Orange State, 400 miles across territory indisputably British since 1806, is in a district settled by the British in 1820. Let us take what has occurred for a longer period, what has been continuing, and what was already the case when we were here in December as regards a large portion of Cape Colony. Does the House realise; I am quite certain the country does not; what has been for months the position in the British Colony of the Cape, in Griqualand, and in Southern Bechuanaland? In Griqualand and in Southern Bechuanaland we hold only two or three spots here and there at distances averaging 80 or 90 miles apart. Every one of those spots is practically besieged; they can have food and ammunition sent them only by armed and guarded convoys. Those convoys have been captured over and over again, and those who are responsible are in this position: that they have the greatest difficulty in supplying food and ammunition, and they can only afford to employ the best mounted troops for the purpose; because otherwise the convoys are too slow or too large, and cannot be adequately guarded. These posts are constantly summoned to surrender, and some do surrender, and their relief is a matter of the greatest difficulty. The reason for naming this, and the importance of the matter, is that it points to the absolute necessity of having such troops as are sent to these sterile districts efficient in the highest possible degree. You require not only mounted men, but something more than merely men with horses; you require men, if you can get them, who are the equals of the Boers. It is difficult to get these men; it is a matter of time to get them. The Australians and the New Zealanders have given us the best material of that class, and it is a matter of time to get them; and what this House ought to ask is whether the Government acted upon the information they had, whether they acted as reasonable men upon the probabilities of the case, whether they did as they were asked and as they were told, and whether they did it promptly and at the earliest moment, and whether they began to train the men; who are worse than useless without being trained- for purposes of this kind. I want to ask whether the House is really aware of the position of a large portion of the enormous territories of South Africa. Generals have to deal with districts in some cases 300 by 120 miles in extent; they have five or six garrisons dotted about; they have this small force of mounted troops; they have to be perpetually sending these small convoys with food and ammunition, and their men and horses are worn out beyond all belief. The strain and the wear and tear upon them, as they themselves describe it, is impossible for us to realise.

I wish to ask the Government these definite questions: When did Lord Kitchener first ask for reinforcements of mounted men; for what number did he ask; and did he merely say "mounted men"? Because every letter that I receive from South Africa, and everything that I read about the campaign, leads me to imagine; what we had arrived at for ourselves; that it is of the highest importance in these sterile districts not to have useful men only, but men of first-class efficiency; not men who can hardly sit a horse, who are wholly untrained, who have not their wits about them, and who are not of a very high physical standard. These men are worse than useless, and only cause an additional strain

on our resources. They are the men who may surrender too easily, while others would hold on to the bitter end. Such men are in every way an encumbrance. I feel certain that if Lord Kitchener asked for this larger number of mounted men, he did not mean so many men and so many horses, but competent men capable of holding the field against the Boers. I cannot imagine what can be the use of untrained mounted men at the present time. Untrained infantry, I confess, may be of some use, for you have many officers of experience and old soldiers who could make them fit for service while holding garrisons. But I cannot conceive what the use of untrained mounted men can be. Only men of the highest possible standard of training can be of any utility at all. Now, when did the Government prepare for replacing the wounded and the stale men at present in South Africa? We know from the casualty list what the waste has been; we know from the admissions of the Government themselves, and from letters from the seat of war, what the wear and tear and strain has been, and we know their admitted anxiety to relieve portions of the force in the field. But what we want to know is, to what extent and when they began to prepare and train these reinforcements? In the official despatches we have a certain source of information which we can use before this House, apart from private letters signed by the writers. We have also articles which have been written by officers of high distinction, with their names attached. We do not know whether these officers have written with the leave of the Adjutant General or not. I know that this leave has been asked for in some cases, and I believe that in some cases it has been given. But when an officer who has been on the Headquarters Staff, and, in two or three other cases, officers who have held high position, men mentioned in the despatches, write deliberately and calmly about the war, I think the House ought to pay a good deal of attention to what they say. A most distinguished officer on Sir Redvers Buller's Headquarters Staff thus writes: "We have been short of mounted men throughout the war." That is the mistake the Government have made. It means that we have been short of trained mounted men throughout the war. The House has a right to know what preparation the Government have made for filling up the gaps in the trained mounted men, and also for supplying the reinforcements required. I take it that Lord Kitchener means reinforcements, and the Government themselves admitted that in the statement they made in January last. Now, it is doubtful whether in this war we have been able to keep up to our own standard of high efficiency. Making every allowance for the character of the country, I doubt whether we have kept up to the records of the marching and horse-mastership of the Indian Mutiny. I doubt whether the cavalry standard has not been unduly low judged by our own standard, and certainly comparing it with the great French War, with Prussian and Austrian and other recent experience. If we are right in thinking, as I do, that the Government have been sending out recently, at haphazard, hasty reinforcements not confined to trained men, then I think the responsibility they have incurred, in face of the invasion of Cape Colony, is very great indeed. What I want to know is what Lord Kitchener asked for, and what the Government did. On 15th January they announced, they were preparing 5,000 Yeomanry "to make good casualties," and, as we know, "to

relieve some men now in the ranks." The Government run the risk in offering the high rate of pay alluded to on a previous occasion, of placing great difficulties in the way of recruiting the ordinary cavalry. On this question of the difference of standard, have the Government kept up the Yeomanry standard, so as to justify them in paying the high rate of pay they are now offering to the Yeomanry? Now, one fact which, I think, goes to show that there was, a decline in the standard when the Government decided to raise 5,000 more Yeomanry-was that the riding test was made less complete than it was formerly. In the case of the first Yeomanry sent out the riding test varied much: in some counties it was very high, in other counties it was; very far less high. But in the last case the Government themselves announced that the jump test for riding was abolished. I believe that was explained on the ground that jumping was not wanted in South Africa. But the jump test is the test that a man can really ride. There is; something more wanted than mere riding, or mere shooting in order to justify the high pay you are giving to those men you are sending out to South Africa. You must have not only good riding, but a high average of general intelligence and that horse-mastership which does not now prevail. And what about the jump from 5,000 to 30,000 which was suddenly announced on the night of 6th February? After the invasion of the southern part of Cape Colony had been going on for six months, suddenly the Government jumped from a demand for 5,000 to 30,000 mounted men. But they include in that 30,000 the original 5,000, the whole of the men for the police, so far as these have been raised, and all the Colonial forces for which credit had previously been taken, and also Mounted Infantry reliefs from home and a certain-number of cavalry;which I understood to mean "heavy cavalry." Now, we were told that the reason why the Household' Cavalry were brought home was that heavy cavalry were least fitted to perform the work of mounted troops in South Africa. That may or may not be the case, but at all events the cavalry sent out now are heavy cavalry, or I suppose so, for they are the only cavalry we have to send. If that be so, and if the Army has really come to the end of its tether, if there is nothing left in the way of mounted men to send out, all the more need was there for the Government to foresee that state of things;that the invasion of the Cape Colony was not a mere raid; not to shut their eyes to the facts of the case, but to prepare months, not weeks ago for drafts and reinforcements of trained mounted men which, to my mind, there is no evidence they have yet prepared.

These are the only questions which I wish to ask to-night, because it appears to me that it is far more important to press them on this occasion than to indulge in a general discussion on Army reform. It is very doubtful whether such a discussion will be any more fruitful this session than it was the last, when it was postponed till the war should be at an end. It is now a question of, at the end of the war, recreating an army which will then have ceased to exist; because everyone knows that the position of our army in India is such that you have to set to work to recreate it. But that is not a matter which will be adequately dealt with this session. What we can do, however, is to press upon and force upon the Government, if the House of Commons does its duty, to give an answer to this question: How has the Government faced the emergency which has arisen since

the invasion of Cape Colony began? I have spoken with a deep sense of responsibility in regard to every word I have said. One does not wish to quote or use the information which comes to one from those on whom the strain of this war is pressing very heavily at this time. Their judgment is not what it should be under present circumstances; but there has been given to me the opinion of the very highest military authority on this subject, whose name, of course, I cannot give to the House of Commons; and he says;

"I doubt much the value of the half-trained, hastily-thrown together units now being hurried out to South Africa."

But I can quote a less great authority, and give his name, as to the mischief which occurred in an earlier portion of the campaign, when the system of the War Office was much less open to criticism than that now adopted. Major-General Mackinnon, who commanded the City of London Imperial Volunteers in South Africa, has published his views on the subject and he uses these words;

"soon after our arrival the mounted infantry went to the front&#x2026;The sending of Volunteers straight into action is a proceeding which I hope will not be regarded as a precedent&#x2026;They have not sufficient practice in the art of war to, enable them to take their place straight away in the first line&#x2026;They cannot possibly be lit to do immediate duty alongside Regular troops."

Major-General Mackinnon, in fact, blames the Government for having sent these mounted men straight into the field; and if the facts before me are true;if they are facts at all;far worse things are being risked or done now by despatching men who are not even Volunteers, but mere civilians and untrained recruits in many cases, out to South Africa, with the view of sending them at once into the field. To answer the appeal of Lord Kitchener for men to repel the invasion of Cape Colony by sending men whom he will not be able to use for two or three months is a merely illusory answer. The Government answer Lord Kitchener's request by sending men who are worse and less trained than the men mentioned by Major-General Mackinnon. The half-trained mounted men of the Imperial City Regiment sent straight into the field were at least Volunteers; I but the men you are now sending are hardly as well chosen as the first; and everyone in the House knows that money-is being spent in paying these men, who are but raw recruits, at the rate of officers, and that they are being enlisted in competition with the Regular Army, and that naturally the effect on the regular recruiting must be disastrous.

It is useless for us to engage in discussions on general matters of Army reform. This question must be dealt with at once; the others must wait. I do not think, moreover, that the present Minister of War is an ardent Army reformer. He may be a hard-working official in administrative work, but not the man which the occasion deserves or requires. I do not believe that we shall get from the present

Government, under his auspices, that root and branch reform of the Army which we most of us think necessary. But that can wait. The matter before us now is to deal with the invasion of the Cape Colony and of Griqualand and Bechuanaland and, whatever may be our opinions in other respects, all must agree that it is

the first duty of the Government to deal with this considerable invasion, which has been going on for months in one portion of the Cape Colony, and for many weeks in another, and which they have made no adequate preparation to repel. CAPTAIN MILDMAY (Devonshire, Totnes): Amid the flow of eloquent testimony to the magnitude of the loss we have sustained by the death of our beloved Queen, silence on such a subject would seem most becoming in those who can add nothing to what has already been so well said; yet so ever present is our sense of grief, so completely does it fill our minds and for a time blot out all else, that it is not possible to refrain from at least faintly echoing the wail which has gone up from the whole nation. The nation rejoices in the belief that His Majesty the King inherits many of those qualities which conduced to make the reign of his mother memorable above all others; and that he may be given health and strength to discharge the difficult duties of his position, and long to reign over us, is our earnest prayer.

All absorbing as is our sense of the loss we have sustained, we must turn to other matters which claim our attention, and primarily to the fact that war still continues. There is one class of critics; not, I fear, a small class; who are little deserving of sympathy; I mean those who, as long as things go right, are full of loud-voiced confidence in the justice of their cause, only to become doubters and petulant critics in times of difficulty. Forgetful of the difficulty; I had almost said the impossibility; of tackling opposing forces which never wait, never make a stand, in a tract of country as big as Europe, every remote corner of which is known to them by heart; forces which, in face of any difficulty, can melt away only to reassemble at some predetermined spot whence looting operations can again be begun; forgetful of the inherent difficulties of the South African situation; these petulant critics, with amusing assumption of self-confidence, abuse in no measured terms the War Office and the Headquarters Staff, and blame the Government that the war is not over.

It will be remembered that, in answer to complaints by the Opposition leaders of the disfranchising results of a dissolution in the autumn, it was pointed out by supporters of the Government that the absence of so many of their adherents at the front would tell heavily against them. The rejoinder was that so inept had been the management of the war by the Government that, to a man, those at the front would vote to expel them from office. Let hon. Members disabuse their minds of any such impression. Returning from South Africa, one reads a good many extraordinary accounts from the front which cause one to smile. Desperate efforts have been made to blame Lord Lansdowne, and, through Lord Lansdowne, to throw discredit on the Government, for hardships which even those who have undergone them have felt to be more or less inseparable from a state of war. Now, of course, there was great shortness of supplies from time to time, but I return from South Africa impressed with the marvellous work of those connected with this department. It must be remembered that the German military authorities said that the supply of so large an army in the field at such a distance from its base, over a single line of rails, was impossible. In apportioning our praise and blame, do not let us forget the valuable services of the Army Service

Corps, who made this impossibility possible. There is another body of men who are in danger of being forgotten. I allude to the officials of the Cape railways. Without the most self-sacrificing devotion to duty on their part, the German prediction might well have been fulfilled. As I have said, I am not concerned to deny the shortness of food supplies at times. I have got good reason to know, for I served with General Rundle's division, concerning which a question was asked in the House. So short were we at one time that guardsmen used to come into our lines in the early morning and offer a shilling for a biscuit. But does the House suppose that on this account the men went about whining, howling, and abusing the Government, as some would have us believe? No; they took the rough with the smooth as every good soldier ought to do, and every good soldier did do. They did not know whether the shortness was due to miscalculations of a supply officer, or to the inherent difficulty of the country in which we were operating; but, at any rate, it never crossed their minds to lay the blame on a parsimonious Government, mindful, as they were, of the masses of stores we had seen piled up in endless profusion at every part of our advance up the country. We read in the papers of a great many gallant actions by individuals. Certain regiments have earned undying fame, but do not let us forget that the same spirit permeated every soldier of the Queen in South Africa, though to all was not given the same opportunity of showing it. There were some in South Africa whose work has not been much before the public, but who have contributed in no small degree to the success of our arms. I allude, amongst others, to those to whom was entrusted the duty of guarding the lines of communication. They had no chance of distinguishing themselves, in the sense that their doings did not appear in print. But, none the less, they had a very hard, a very anxious, and a very dangerous time of it. Then, I do not think that it is realised the extent to which the success of an army in the field depends upon efficient management at the base. On our arrival at Cape Town we saw immense quantities of stores piled up, mountains high, in all directions. These stores were being removed by mule teams and mule wagons, by tramways, trains, and traction engines, and it struck one how capable must be the master-mind to control all that, and to evolve order out of what looked like chaos. For whatever may be said, I shall always maintain that the management of this department was a model of orderly efficiency.

After all, the thing which above all others impressed itself on those who were at the front was the irreproachable behaviour of the rank and file. A great deal has been said about it in the press and by the Commander-in-Chief, but I doubt whether even now those at home realise of how high a quality was their courage. It was not merely a dashing courage; what the French call *bravoure*; they had plenty of that and to spare; but it was rather a calm and deliberate courage, a courage which calculates the danger, keeps its head cool and goes doggedly through with the business on hand. That sort of courage is far rarer; but it prevailed amongst our troops to a degree that called for the admiration of all the foreign attaches. And then, with what uncomplaining patience was suffering endured; that was always being brought home to one. I



remember one action in particular, at Biddulphsberg, in which two battalions of Guards suffered very severely in killed and wounded. To add to the horrors of the situation of the latter a veldt fire broke out from which, for them, there was no means of escape, and by which in many cases they were severely burned and scorched as they lay. Add to all this the fact that there was a severe frost that night; 13 to 15 degrees I think it was; and that many of these wounded were not brought into the Field Hospital until 3 a.m., when so severe was the frost that the ice had frequently to be broken in the pails at the dressing tent; The House can realise what suffering this involved. The principal medical officer afterwards gave me a vivid description of the scene. Never, said he, had he seen intense suffering so nobly borne. The same patient endurance was characteristic of the whole Army in South Africa. It is impossible to speak too highly of the material of which the Yeomanry was composed. Not only was their behaviour exemplary in times of danger, but they could be trusted to discharge any duties confided to them with intelligence, all power of individual initiative not having been crushed out of them by drill-book methods. They were always cheerful, always ready to volunteer for any dangerous work, always anxious to ensure the safety of their officers at any risk to themselves. What wonder that one became deeply attached to such men. What wonder that on one's return one feels indignation at the culpable readiness of a certain section of this House to believe evil against those who are doing the nation's work in South Africa; the same section which approaches the consideration of any international question with the preconception that their own country must be in the wrong. Do not they realise that by leaving no stone unturned to blacken the character of our soldiers they are doing all they possibly can to increase the bitterness between Boer and Briton and to make it more lasting? As to the publications of that precious Conciliation Committee, it would appear there is no anonymous nonsense which they are not prepared to swallow, so long as it is derogatory to the British soldier. Where do they get their tales from? Where do they hear of the scandalous treatment of women, and the gutting of the churches? We never heard anything about it in South Africa, and I am glad to think that in the face of the deliberate declaration of Lord Roberts that never was the conduct of an Army in the field so exemplary, very little credence will be attached to them by the general public.

Then there was another charge against the Yeomanry and the Volunteers, to which the Member for Battersea gave circulation. To them, he said, the whole campaign was a picnic; they received exceptional treatment; they had not shares in the hardships of others, and, to use his own words, "this preferential treatment had created a profound feeling of dissatisfaction, amounting in some cases to positive jealousy." At the moment when that charge was made I pointed out how baseless it was, and said that if there was one thing more than another of which the Yeoman was proud it was that he had been treated exactly in the same way as the Regulars. They performed the most menial duties, what I may call the most revolting duties of camp life, cheerfully, without grumbling; they were even happy in the doing of them. As far as food was concerned, they had the same

rations as the Regulars, and very short they were at times. With them they were reduced to half-rations, and even quarter-rations. Our officers' mess had no tinned stores from home. We drew the same rations of meat and biscuit as the men. The House can now judge what justification there was for the assertion of the hon. Member for Battersea that the Yeomen "sheltered behind zerebas of Fortnum and Mason's delicacies and tinned food." In one respect the Yeomen were far

worse off than the Regulars, I means with regard to fresh supplies of clothing. These reached the Regulars, but never a chance did the Yeoman have of renewing his wardrobe. I have a vivid recollection of the appearance of my own men in the course of the operations which resulted in the capture of General Prinsloo's forces. Their tunics were hanging in rags, their bare legs showing through the rents of their breeches, and in some cases they wound their putties round their boots in a vain endeavour to keep sole and uppers together. I do not know what we should have done but for the kindness of General Clements' brigade major, who took pity on us and handed over to us some "British-warm" coats which had been sent up country for the Malta Mounted Infantry. Unfortunately, the Regulars had absorbed all his stock of boots, so that all, we could do was to replace such boots as would no longer hold together by some Boer lawn-tennis shoes made of canvas. But in spite of serious hardships; want of food, want of clothing, having only one blanket whereas the Regulars had two; a very serious deficiency in view of the great cold at nights; the Yeoman was always cheerful, always whistling as he turned out of his hoar-frosty blanket in the early morning before sunrise.

Now, in all seriousness, does not the Member for Battersea owe some sort of apology to these Yeomen, who, after all, have done their very best to do their work as good soldiers should? As a recompense for his thoughtless assertions, I do not wish him a more serious punishment than for a month to be subjected to such a diet of attenuated trek ox as we had to put up with. I do not think that after it he would be quite so; well, comfortable-looking as he was when last I saw him. I have denied that there was any jealousy between the Yeomanry and the Regulars, and cannot hon. Members understand that in face of such work as has to be done out there there is no room for petty jealousies of this kind? We have always heard a great deal of the tendency war has to make men hard, to brutalise them; but to my surprise, as was said by the seconder of the Address to the Crown, war would seem to have an exactly

opposite effect. It seemed to soften the men, to make them feel for others, to make them forgetful of self in their anxiety to help those around them. It is true that one saw sights out there upon which one could hardly bear to look at home, but they only seemed to fill the men with infinite pity and to increase what I can only call the feeling of brotherhood by which all at the front were animated. Having served with such men, the House will realise with what warmth one would wish to repudiate the aspersions which have been made upon them. Amid the constant flow of criticism on all that goes on all he front, one finds some complaints of the severity of the methods by which the war has been waged, complaints which have been voiced by the so-called Conciliation Committee. It is, I think, universally admitted that nothing could have been more humane, I

more gentle, than Lord Roberts's treatment of our opponents as we advanced up the Free State. Any he handed in their arms and gave in their submission were given passes to return to their farms, on taking the oath of neutrality. We were not allowed to take their horses; their property was respected, guards were even put over it. And urgent as was our need of remounts, the wisdom of such a conciliatory course then appeared to be plain. Unfortunately, experience has given us a clearer insight into the Boer character. We know something now of the importance attached by our opponents to the oath of neutrality. Everyone who has been brought into contact with the Boers, who has had frequent opportunity, as I have had, of conversing with Boer prisoners, will know; I say it advisedly; will know that, taking the generality of the Boers, there is no such word as honour in their vocabulary; honour. I mean, as we define it. To be successful by dishonourable means, to be cleverly dishonourable; to use their own word, to be "slim"; is to command their admiration. It would seem that they do not believe in any motive but that of self-interest. To be swayed by considerations of justice or mercy is, in their opinion, to show weakness, and that is why they never could understand our surrender of the Transvaal after Majuba in the sense we intended. So far from looking upon our conduct as magnanimous and putting it down to our sense of justice, they were convinced that it was only-fear which dictated it, and it but added contempt to their previous dislike to us. So, in the present instance, after much conversation with Boer prisoners, I am convinced that, so far from conciliating them thereby, they have the greatest contempt for our humane treatment of them, and honestly attribute it to despicable weakness of character. As I have said, believing in the word of the Boers who surrendered, we allowed them their liberty and thereby enormously increased our difficulties. What has happened has been graphically described by one who was fighting with the Boers, and has published a book in Paris. He calls himself a subaltern of Villebois Mareuil. I translate his words;

"How is it possible to get at and crush adversaries who continually decline to fight and who halt as soon as a blow is dealt at them? Are they too closely pressed? each goes off as he likes in a different direction, and the commando of 500 men which yesterday attacked a small convoy is to-day melted away before a column of 2,000 men sent to capture. If one of these men is too near the English lines, the first farm that he comes across offers him a refuge; his rifle is slipped under a plank, his horse put out to graze, the white flag floats over the house, and Her Majesty the Queen has no more inoffensive servant than our burgher for twenty-four hours. Then, if the English authority is still too near, an old gun is carried to it as a sign of submission and the oath of neutrality is taken. As soon as the English are gone, the good rifle is brought out, the horse is mounted and once more en route."

This is remarkable testimony from one who has fought with the Boers, and it is corroborated by the fact that the Boers who have recently fallen into our hands have in some cases had no less than half-a-dozen passes upon their persons, involving an oath six times taken. There is no truer axiom in war than that "Stern methods are the most humane," as likely the sooner to put an end to such war. We now know that the Boer has no regard for the sanctity of an oath; and

will anyone deny the justice of the steps which have been taken, steps necessarily involving hardship to many, to remove the impression that the neutrality pass issued to our conquered foe is to be used as a pass to the first com-

mando which comes along? We still have a heavy job in hand, requiring steadfast patience; but we shall not weary of the task, because, though the way is long, we know it to be the right way. I had the honour to sit in this House with Mr. John Bright for two Parliaments. Now there must be many sitting on this side who could not always see eye to eye with John Bright, but at any rate they will admit this of him: they will admit that when once he had made up his mind what was the right view of a question to take, when once he had satisfied himself of the righteousness of his view, he stuck to that view through thick and thin. That is what we intend to do. The overwhelming majority of the nation is satisfied of the justice of the course which we are pursuing, and Englishmen all the world over mean to see this thing through.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): I do not rise for the purpose of expressing any opposition to the Gentleman who has just sat down. I have no doubt he showed all that gallantry and spirit one would expect from him. We all know, also, and I quite agree with him, that we have heard comparatively few complaints. I think there has never been a war whose sufferings and hardships have been less redeemed by excitement. It has been a dull and dreary war, and it is all the more to the credit of the troops that they have borne the hardships in the way they have done. I do think that the hon. Member has chosen a very singular example to illustrate the case when he introduced the name of John Bright, because there is nothing for which we remember John Bright better, and honour him more, than the way in which, in a far smaller minority than that in which those who object to the war stand now, he stood up in defiance of unpopularity and abuse and protested against the war in the Crimea. Before I part with the hon. Member, I must express my regret that, after vindicating as he has well done the Yeomanry, he should have allowed himself to indulge in an attack on the Boers not only contrary to the evidence as we have it from people who know the Boers

thoroughly; Mr. Selous, and men who have lived with them for many years; but also contrary to the testimony of a number of distinguished British officers like General Porter, that the conduct of the Boers has been quite up to the average conduct of troops in time of war. I regret that the language of the hon. Gentleman did not do credit to the chivalrous spirit which ought to animate an opponent.

I rose because it seemed to me that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury required a few words of notice. This is an important occasion. Parliament meets in the middle of a war which has been prolonged beyond our expectations, and an opportunity is given for the Government to state their views, and if possible to cheer the country, and at any rate to tell the country what they think of the position in which the country finds itself. I must say that I never listened to a speech of the right hon. Gentleman with more disappointment. He appeared to me to have very little sense of the gravity of

our present position. He threw no light on the present state of things, and indicated no policy for the future. He merely confined himself to barren phrases we have heard so often before, and did not give us any reason to believe that the Government realised the gravity of the position, nor, on the other hand, that he would take any steps to shorten the war by negotiation. The speech of my right hon. friend the Member for the Stirling Burghs was couched, I think everyone will admit, in a spirit of seriousness of thought, and it contained a great many points which were well worthy of consideration. The right hon. Gentleman did not try to answer these.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is exactly what I did do.

MR. BRYCE: I can only say; it may be my fault I failed to discover in the tu quoques of the right hon. Gentleman any serious arguments in reply to my right hon. friend. We were told nearly two years ago, before the war broke out, that every speech made here would be an encouragement to the Boers to persevere in resisting the demands made by the Government, and we have been told ever since that every word said here in condemnation of the war or of the methods by which it is being conducted would be an encouragement to the enemy. There is not the slightest evidence that any word spoken here has ever had the slightest influence with the Boers. It is an idea of the right hon. Gentleman, which he continually throws out here for the purpose of silencing criticism. I submit that this House is not to be silenced in that way. It is our duty in the great council of the nation to say what we think about the state of things and the conduct of the war, and we cannot prevent what is said here from going abroad. But is that any reason why we should not tell the people what we believe to be right? The right hon. Gentleman cited a speech made by the Colonial Secretary, and he seemed to imply that the right hon. Gentleman ought not to have made that speech, because, forsooth, some paper in South Africa misrepresented him. Is that an argument to be addressed to the House of Commons? If that argument is to be used, much more might be said of the speech of the Secretary of State for War. That was a speech that might have given encouragement to the Boers to hold out longer against us. The position is a very grave one, and I cannot say that the light way the Government take it lightens our sense of the gravity. What confidence can we place in them for the future, seeing that all their past predictions have been wrong? They thought the Transvaal would submit; they thought £10,000,000 would be sufficient for the war; they thought that the war would be over in three months: and even as late as last September they said the war was practically over. The right hon. Gentleman endeavoured to shelter himself behind the statement that the same impression prevailed in other quarters. Does the right hon. Gentleman say that the Cabinet last September knew no more than the man in the street? Had he no information in September which was not shared by the whole country? ["No."] Then he ought to have had. It is a scandal that the Government should not possess better information. There were certain facts which were pretty patent. The lines of communications were of enormous length, and the Government must have known how many men were required for them. They ought also to have known the rate at which the men and the horses were

wearing out, and they must have known something about the plans of the Boers. From June last the Boers continued to say that even after the capitals were occupied the war was not at an end, but only beginning. It was thought that this was an empty brag, but we know now that the Boers had a plan, and in carrying that plan out they have made the second portion of the war more painful, more weary, and more exhausting than the first part.

It appears to me that we have nothing but a record of error to look back upon. Nothing more inconsistent was ever published by the generals of an invading army than the list of proclamations. The policy of farm-burning is now admitted to be a hideous blunder. It appears to me that the Government are simply drifting. They do not seem to realise; either the necessity of sending out proper reinforcements or the desirableness of bringing the war to an end. In the meantime there is a serious wastage of men and a piling up of debt going on. There are two policies open. One is to persevere in the demand for unconditional surrender. I confess I was not able to follow the subtleties of the right hon. Gentleman. People with arms in their hands are to throw down their arms. I think that was a most unwise policy. That is what unconditional surrender means.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is not what is asked for. It is in the Papers.

MR. BRYCE: There are no two proclamations that agree. I defy you to state from the proclamations what the policy of the Government is. They may spend more money and send out more men. That may go on for a time, the length of which we cannot possibly foresee. I have no doubt that we shall wear out the Boers in the long run. But what will it come to? It will not be peace; it would be merely, an intermission of war, a suspension of hostilities. The Boer armies will in all probability not make any regular or formal surrender, but, like the rivers of their own country, will vanish into the ground. They will scatter into remote parts of their own territory, and some into the territories of Portugal and Germany. You will not have secured peace. You will have secured a temporary truce. That was one of the dangers of the situation, and that is why I think it was a fatal mistake to reject the proposals for negotiations which were made by the Republics last spring. The Government ought to have taken that opportunity to enter into negotiations and to have announced a policy.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Unconditional surrender of the Governments; that is the point; it is not of individuals.

MR. BRYCE: That is not so.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I would like to make the point clear. Lord Roberts, in his letter in answer to Sir Redvers Buller, explained clearly. He said that what he asked for was, as regards the Governments, unconditional surrender, and that he would require with regard to individual soldiers that they should be willing to lay down their arms, 'to take the oath of neutrality, and to go back to their farms, and their property would be respected. That was the idea of unconditional surrender, which meant the abandonment of the idea of separate political independence.

MR. BRYCE: That is not a declaration of policy applicable to the Boers in general. That is a letter from Lord Roberts to Sir Redvers Buller.

\*THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): It is exactly in the same terms in which he sent it to the other generals in the field.

MR. BRYCE: If that is the case, I think it is very unfortunate that it does not appear in the despatches. I say that a demand for the unconditional surrender of the Governments was asking the Governments to leave themselves absolutely to your mercy. The right hon. Gentleman says that what was meant was merely that they could not in future have any independence as Republics. That is a totally different thing. I perfectly understand it was open to His Majesty's Government to say, "We will not allow you to retain absolute independence." But if the Government intended to adopt a policy of that kind, and to offer terms which merely excluded the future independence of the two Republics, it was their duty to have made that dear, and to have thrown on the Republics the responsibility of rejecting their offer, which I submit had never been properly made. What the Government has done is, I think, to drive to despair an enemy whose bravery deserves greater respect. All their homes have been burnt, their sons and brothers have perished in the war, their wives and children have been scattered, and they have nothing left to live for except a desire for revenge and their passion for independence. You, have driven them to despair, and it is for you to try and bring them back from that state. Even if they are not capable ;as I believe they are not; of ultimately resisting, they are nevertheless capable of inflicting great future injury upon us. You will prevail in the end, but you will prevail at a cost of a great further loss of valuable lives and a great further loss of money, and then when the Boers have disappeared into the ground they will reserve themselves with dogged patience until their turn comes some day. Meantime you have devastated the country, you have alienated the Dutch in Cape Colony, and you have the possibility before you of having to hold not only the two Republics, but also Cape Colony, with a garrison estimated at from 30,000 to 50,000 men, costing five millions a year.

That is the prospect before you if you persevere in your policy of unconditional surrender. I believe the only alternative to that policy is the policy of offering terms to the generals in the field against you. [HON. MEMBERS: What terms?] It is not for me to say what terms, but I will indicate what terms I believe to be good. However, my first point is that you should endeavour to get into negotiation with the generals in the field instead of adopting the plan of sending men who are called peace envoys, but who are, as I believe, and as far as I can make out, really emissaries intended to seduce the troops from their loyalty, and to draw away individual soldiers from these generals. If your pride will not allow you to open communication with the generals, and to state in the clearest possible way what terms you are prepared to offer, there is another plan which I and many others think should be adopted. They are not the terms which the Government would give, nevertheless I will tell the House what they are. In matters of this kind one must not be afraid of being in a minority; we have the interests of the country to consider, and that ought to unlock all our lips. I have always said that it would be far safer if instead of annexing the two Republics we turned them into Protected States, strictly

disarmed, deprived of all foreign relations, and rendered helpless for any kind of mischief, but not making them Crown colonies. I know that that is an idea that the Government will not entertain, and I will acknowledge also that I believe that it is an idea which the country does not desire.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): May I ask how you would disarm them?

MR. BRYCE: I really cannot enter into a discussion on every interruption across the floor of the House. But there is another plan much better than that proposed by the Government, and that is to endeavour, if we can, to secure to these States something like the freedom enjoyed in Canada and Australia, subject to the general supremacy of Great Britain, subject to the British flag, and to complete control by British officers in all matters in which control is necessary. I believe, in other words, that what we ought to avoid is what are called Crown colonies. I believe that Crown colony government is about the worst thing that you can try, because the Boers have recollections of the way in which they were governed between

1877 and 1880. They remember Sir Owen Lanyon, and all that went on in those days, and they would be most unwilling to be put at the mercy of irresponsible officers in a Crown colony. Again, you would have under the Crown colony system a maximum of friction with the British residents, and I venture to believe that you would not hold these countries for five years without making such a government most unpopular with the British element. Natal has been mentioned, but Natal was then a small place growing up. The right hon. Gentleman alluded to the ease of the military occupation of the Southern States of America, but there is something more to be said about that. He cited it as an instance of the necessity of maintaining military government. The truth is that the maintenance of military government and the disfranchisement of the whites in the Southern States was a very bad policy. It worked very ill, and produced a crop of hideous outrages, and the best day that dawned for the Southern States was when the military forces of the United States were withdrawn in 1877. It was not the maintenance of military government but the withdrawal of it that made those States reconciled. I do not for a moment say that immediately the last arm is laid down you can establish self-government in these countries. I have never said that. Clearly the countries must be pacified, but you must also remember how Crown colony government is known to these people, and that, in the words of the Prime Minister, it may last for generations. Moreover, it will excite disgust and suspicion in the minds of the Dutch in South Africa. Therefore I do suggest to the Government that they should make a new departure and offer much better terms and a much better guarantee than has yet been offered to these people that they would be governed according to their own ideas. [Several HON. MEMBERS: "No" and "Never."]

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): You say "Never"; all right?

MR. BRYCE: I do not follow these interruptions, but my own point of view is that you must in some way or other convey to the inhabitants of these two Republics that you are not going to subject them to an indefinite continuance of autocratic government, but that you are prepared to promise them self-governing institutions in a very short time; institutions under which they may have all the



freedom that is compatible with the prevention of future insurrection. The only limitation that I would put upon the measure of self-government to be given to them is that there should be no possibility of a future rising against the British Crown. I believe in that plan you will find a far better chance of peace in the future than in the policy of unconditional surrender. If you offer terms to these people that they can accept, you will have some chance at least that they will endeavour to work the new system, and that they will enter into it in a loyal spirit. If, on the other hand, you insist on the opposite policy, you will be only preparing for future trouble.

I do most earnestly wish that right hon. Gentlemen opposite would realise that whatever we say on this subject we are animated not by any desire to criticise them, but solely by a desire to avoid those evils we see in the future of South Africa. We do not wish to have these territories governed by force, or the people, hitherto free, ruled as by tyrants, and by the expenditure of immense sums annually in maintaining a garrison, with the danger of insurrection when we are in difficulty in any part of the world. We believe that it is only by a conciliatory policy that we have any chance of re-establishing permanent government in the two Republics, and, what is not less important, of recovering the good will of the people at the Cape. I believe that if we persist in the policy so far indicated we will be only increasing our difficulties and prolonging the period when our hands will be fettered and our power of action weakened in every other part of the world where there are British interests.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I desire to associate myself with the expressions of sorrow which have been so freely expressed on the loss the country has sustained by the death of our most gracious and loved Queen—Having said that, I must say that my satisfaction is, I believe, shared very generally throughout the House, and most certainly by Gentlemen sitting on this side of the House, at the speech delivered by my hon. and gallant friend the Member for the Totnes Division of Devon, who has played such a gallant and important part in the proceedings in South Africa. The House listened with the greatest satisfaction to that speech, as coming from a man who himself has been present throughout a great part of this war, who has shared in its hardships, and who has witnessed for himself the heroism of our gallant soldiers, and the House generally heard with the greatest satisfaction his indignant repudiation of the reflections cast upon them by some hon. Members in this House. I desire also to take this opportunity of saying how thoroughly and entirely I endorse the view expressed by my right hon. friend the Leader of the House with reference to our future policy and our future conduct in bringing this war to a conclusion. I do not desire to make any observations on that subject, but I trust that the difficulties of the past will be recognised by His Majesty's Government, and that ample and sufficient preparation, even in addition to that already made, if it be necessary, will be steadily pressed forward by the Government, with a view; whatever may be the difficulties of the case; of bringing this war to as rapid a conclusion as may be.

And now, with the permission of the House, I pass from these observations in

order to refer to a subject which has not yet been mentioned in the speeches delivered this evening. It was with disappointment and regret I saw that neither in the gracious Speech from the Throne nor in the utterances of Ministers themselves was there the slightest indication of any intention whatever on the part of His Majesty's Government to take action with reference to a subject which is undoubtedly of the utmost importance at the present time. I refer to the startling and serious epidemic at Manchester and other parts of the country by which so many of His Majesty's subjects have suffered most grievous sickness and a good many of them have been killed, and which has spread such consternation and alarm throughout the country. It is estimated by the Manchester Sanitary Committee themselves that during the last six months in Manchester the deaths which have resulted from this epidemic have been little less than 100, and, although we have no definite figures submitted to us, I have no doubt that at least some four thousand to five thousand people have been affected by this epidemic. No one can deny that this is a very grave and very startling state of affairs, and that it deserves the attention of the Government; and the Government cannot be surprised if, on my part and on the part of other hon. Members, and also on the part of a large section of the public, there will be great disappointment and great regret that up to the present, apparently, so far as future action is concerned, there is no intention of legislating with regard to this matter. His Majesty's Government appear to have ignored it. We know from our experience in this House that the Government have often found it convenient and sometimes urgently necessary to take action with regard to questions which have not been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. My object to-night is to press on the Government not only the importance, but, in my humble judgment, the extreme urgency of this question; a question which undoubtedly affects very closely the lives and health of a great portion of the community. I desire also, if I can by any means succeed in doing so, to elicit from the Government some definite assurance that during the present session they will introduce, and do their utmost to carry, such a measure or measures as may be needed in reference to this question, and which will have the effect of preventing a possibility of danger or even apprehension of danger in the future. I am perfectly well aware that His Majesty's Government have appointed a Royal Commission to inquire into this question, and to inquire also into a great many other questions. First of all, the Commission is appointed to ascertain the amount of sickness and death attributable to poisoning by arsenic during this epidemic. It is further to find out whether such sickness and death was due to arsenic in beer, or in other articles of food and drink. Then it is to inquire through what ingredients and by what way arsenic was conveyed, and also in what way such ingredients became arsenicated. What I am about to submit to the House is that with regard to all these points of inquiry, so far as poisoning by arsenic in beer at Manchester and elsewhere is concerned, inquiry by a Royal Commission is altogether belated. I may be told; I daresay in the course of this debate I shall be told; that it is wholly unusual for any Government to introduce legislation with reference to a subject regarding which a Royal Commission has been

appointed, before that Commission has made its report. I frankly admit it is, or so it would be, with reference to any ordinary subject regarding which a Royal Commission had been appointed. But my reply to that statement is, that this is not an ordinary case; that the Commission, is not appointed ad rem; and that so far as this particular epidemic is concerned, I shall be able to show to the House that this inquiry is altogether belated. The Commission is also appointed to inquire as to whether we are subject to danger from arsenic in the foods we daily consume, and this inquiry is to extend over England and Wales, and is to embrace every article of food and drink consumed by man. We can easily understand that that is a very wide and extensive and difficult task which has been entrusted to the Royal Commission, and that a great deal of time will be required for its due fulfilment. For myself, I would say that if the Government really consider that such an inquiry is necessary, by all means let it be made. They have information not in our possession at the present time, and I have no word of complaint as to the scope of the inquiry on that ground. But as regards the epidemic in Manchester, by which so many people have met their deaths, and very many more have suffered illness, I affirm that the facts are ascertained, that the case has been proved, and that what we want now is not further inquiry, but a measure for making such a state of affairs impossible in the future

Perhaps the House will allow me to show them the ground on which I make these assertions. I shall point

to the testimony which is to be found in four different quarters in support of the statements which I have made, and I believe that the House will agree with me that that testimony is more than ample. In the first place, as soon as there was any reason to believe that the epidemic was due to poisoning by arsenic in beer, the Manchester Brewers' Association appointed a committee of experts to inquire into the whole question. The Manchester Brewers' Association are of course very deeply interested, and it would be greatly to their satisfaction and greatly to their interest if they had been able to show by the examination they had instituted that the idea that arsenic in beer was the cause of the epidemic was all nonsense, instead of that they were obliged to admit

in their report; where it was frankly stated; that it was clearly established that the arsenic found in deleterious quantities in beer was solely due to the sugar used in its manufacture and supplied by a particular firm; and secondly, that the arsenic in the sugar was derived from the sulphuric acid used in its preparation;

It being midnight, the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

Adjourned at one minute after Twelve of the clock.