

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/may/23>

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 23rd May, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the following Bill, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:

Local Government Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time To-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS PETITIONS (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That in the case of the Petition for the following Bill the Standing Orders have not been complied with, viz.:

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway (New Cross and Waterford Extension).

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

BRISTOL, CLIFTON, AND WEST OF ENGLAND ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without Amendment.

DORKING GAS BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

KINGSTON-UPON-HULL CORPORATION BILL.

King's Consent signified; read the third time, and passed.

DUBLIN CORPORATION (MARKETS, ETC.) (RE-COMMITTED) BILL.

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

BIGGLESWADE WATER BOARD BILL.

"To constitute a Joint Board representative of the Biggleswade Urban and Rural District Councils with power to construct waterworks and to make provision for the supply of water within the districts of those councils; and for other purposes," read the first time; to be read a second time.

BELFAST AND NORTHERN COUNTIES RAILWAY BILL.

"To provide for the purchase by the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway Company of the Derry Central Railway from the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.

So much of the Report of the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords and the Chairman of Ways and Means [ordered 21st May] as relates to the Loch Leven Water Power Order, read.

Loch Leven Water Power (Substituted) Bill, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Nicol and Mr. John Dewar.

NORTH BRITISH AND MERCANTILE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

Considered, under Section 7, Sub-section (2), of the Private Legislation Procedure (Scotland) Act, 1899; Bill to be read the third time upon Thursday, 6th June.

MILITARY LANDS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2).

Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Secretary of State under the Military Lands Act, 1892, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Secretary Brodrick and Lord Stanley.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Does this Bill affect Ireland?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): No, Sir.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Then you may go ahead with it.

MILITARY LANDS PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Secretary of State under the Military Lands Act, 1892," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed.

[Bill 202.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER (GAS) BILL.

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

Bill to be read the third time tomorrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

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

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

COMMONS REGULATION AND INCLOSURE (SKIPWITH) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

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

Bill to be read the third time tomorrow.

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (ORPINGTON) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

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

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

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

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

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

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

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

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

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

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

Reported, with an Amendment [Provisional Orders confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

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

NOTTING HILL ELECTRIC LIGHTING BILL.

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

CROMER WATER BILL.

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

LONDON AND INDIA DOCKS (NEW WORKS) BILL.

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

BATH GAS LIGHT AND COKE BILL [Lords].

Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

OAKHAM WATER BILL [Lords].

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

ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE BILL [Lords].

Reported, without Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

Bill to be read the third time.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).

Mr. BILL reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills, That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Monday the 10th day of June, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

SOUTH YORKSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Reported [Parties do not proceed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP J).

Sir WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH reported from the Committee on Group J of Private Bills, That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Tuesday, 11th June, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

BRADFORD CORPORATION BILL.

ECCLES CORPORATION BILL.

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

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K).

Mr. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE reported from the Committee on Group K of Private Bills, That, for the convenience of parties, the Committee had adjourned till Monday, 10th June, at half-past Eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

PETITIONS.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Carlinghow, and Huntspill; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Ashton; Ashton-under-Lyne; Highbridge; Bacup; Glossop; Oxford; Pedwell; Bath Burtle; Stockport; Higham Ferrers; Eccles; South Molton (two); Wigan (two); Godmanchester; Folkestone; Rochdale, and Kennethmont; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

CENSUS OF ENGLAND AND WALES, 1901.

Copy presented, of Preliminary Report and Tables of the Population and Houses enumerated in England and Wales and in the Islands in the British Seas on 1st

April, 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

DECLARATIONS OF HEADS OF STATES.

Return presented, relative thereto [Address 19th February; Colonel Nolan]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 188.]

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS WARNED.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 29th April; Sir Francis Powell]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 189.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual series, Nos. 2605 to 2608 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

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

1. Charitable Endowments (London);,Further Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August, 1894; Mr. Francis Stevenson]; to be printed. [No. 190.]

2. Inquiry into Charities (Administrative County of Durham);,Further Return relative thereto [ordered 14th February, 1900; Mr. Grant Lawson]; to be printed. [No. 191.]

EXPERIMENTS ON LIVING ANIMALS.

Address for "Return showing the number of experiments performed on living animals during the year 1900 under licences granted under the Act 39 and 40 Vic., c. 77, distinguishing Painless from Painful Experiments (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 211, of Session 1900).";(Mr. Jesse Collings.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;FEVER AND PLAGUE STATISTICS.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the number of cases of typhoid fever, and the number of deaths, among the forces in South Africa during the month of April, and also the number of cases of plague, and the number of deaths from that disease, up to the latest advices, among the soldiers and others engaged in the campaign.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The returns for April only take up to the 19th; there had been then 1,052 admissions for enteric and 140 deaths. The number of cases of plague have, according to latest advices, been as follows:;Fourteen soldiers, twenty native drivers, and eight other employees; of seven deaths reported none are stated to have occurred among soldiers.

SECOND WORCESTERS;SICK LIST.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the number of sick in the Second Worcesters at Bloemfontein between 4th and 27th April, 1900, what were the total of enteric cases, and what the ratio of mortality was up to 31st May.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The number of sick admitted to hospital between the 4th and 27th April, 1900, was ninety-four. It is not possible to differentiate the cases of enteric fever from the information at the disposal of the War Office but up to the 31st May there were fifteen deaths from enteric.

FARM BURNING.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can

state what Department is responsible for the issue of the Return of Buildings Burnt by the Troops in South Africa; and on what authority the statement is made that the houses burnt in

Ventersburg, in the Orange Free State, were destroyed because the district was being used as a military base for the enemy's operations; and can he explain why the official reason alleged in the Return mentioned is that the owners were on commando.

MR. BRODRICK: The information given in the Return is as received from South Africa. As stated in the Return, the district of Ventersburg (including, of course, the town of Ventersburg) was laid waste because it was being used as a base by the enemy.

MR. FLYNN: Is not that reason a mere after-thought? Is not the reason given in the Return, "that the owners are on commando"?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir; the reasons are given under different headings.

CATTLE LOOTING BY ZULUS UNDER BRITISH AUTHORITY.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): On behalf of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been directed to the statements made by Mr. Brunner, member for the Eshowe district of Zululand in the Legislative Assembly of Natal, as to the raiding of cattle by Zulus under the instructions of military officers in the Vryheid districts of the Transvaal, and in particular to the statement that thousands of head of Boer cattle were brought in and handed to one officer, the Zulus being allowed ten per cent. of all the plunder; whether the Prime Minister of Natal has protested to the military authorities against the action taken by British officers in this matter; and whether he is now in a position to produce the correspondence between the military authorities in Natal and the Natal Administrator and Natal Government upon this subject; and, if not, whether that correspondence has been asked for and when it may be expected to arrive.

MR. BRODRICK: I have seen the telegram addressed by Mr. Brunner to the Prime Minister of Natal, and the reply to it, dated 3rd April, in which the Prime Minister said that he believed Colonel Bottomley had exceeded the instructions given in his original orders dated 25th March, and that the matter was in course of being put right. The Prime Minister of Natal protested specially against Colonel Bottomley and his agents acting without reference to the magistrates of the districts, and against the idea of allowing armed Zulus to cross the border on their own account, but after the receipt of Lord Kitchener's telegram of 5th April, which I read to the House on the 13th instant, the Prime Minister, though still objecting to Zulus from Zululand being permitted to loot cattle within or without Zululand, accepted the course of proceeding indicated in Lord Kitchener's telegram, which appeared to remove the principal matters of protest. My latest information is that since the completion of General French's operations the attention of Lord Kitchener has again been called by the Governor of Natal to the views of the Natal Ministers, to which I am sure he will give due weight. The complete correspondence on the subject has not yet been received, and I am not therefore at present able to make any statement as to publication.

STRENGTH OF REGIMENTS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): On behalf of the noble Lord the Member for South Kensington, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can say what is the present strength in the field of the 2nd Scots Guards, 2nd Grenadier Guards, 1st Leinster Regiment, 2nd Manchester Regiment, 1st South Staffordshire Regiment, 2nd Hampshire Regiment, and 1st Yorkshire Regiment; and whether any of them exceed 700 men fit for service.

MR. BRODRICK: The 2nd Scots Guards at the time of the last report had 912 men in South Africa and 200 on passage; 2nd Grenadiers, 1,067; 1st. Leinster, 1,237; 2nd Manchester, 1,166; 1st Staffordshire, 1,479; 2nd Hampshire, 1,163; 1st Yorkshire, 927 and 113 on passage. The total number of the seven regiments was 8,264, and of these 1,349 were sick by last Return. This would leave, if correct, on the average, 988 fit for service per regiment.

ARMY REORGANISATION;ARMY CORPS COMMANDERS AND DISTRICTS.

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER (Walsall): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the new Army scheme, the officers commanding army corps in Scotland and Ireland will merely replace the present officers commanding, inasmuch as the latter already command the whole of the troops in those countries; whether the army corps commander at Aldershot will replace the general commanding the division; whether the army corps at Salisbury will include the south-western district; and whether the London garrison, with the Militia and Volunteers, will be included in the command of the general commanding the army corps at Colchester, or of the officer commanding the home district.

MR. BRODRICK: The details of the scheme are not quite complete. When completed they will be published in the usual manner. In any case, the officers who command the army corps will be given far more extended powers than those they replace.

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER: May I ask whether there will be commanders-in-chief in Scotland and Ireland besides the officers commanding army corps?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir. Of course the post of commander-in-chief will be superseded, or rather merged in that of the commander of the army corps.

MILITIA;AGE REGULATIONS.

SIR JAMES RANKIN (Herefordshire, Leominster): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Militiamen have been and are being sent out to serve in South Africa at the age of eighteen years, whereas linesmen are not sent until the age of twenty years; and if this is so, is it because the Militia recruits are stronger men than the linesmen, or for what other reason.

LORD STANLEY: Militiamen are sent out at the age of eighteen and linesmen at twenty, though in some cases the latter limit has been reduced to nineteen and a half. Militiamen are intended primarily for the lines of communication, and have been for the most part so employed; no question of physique is involved.

COMPASSIONATE ALLOWANCES;CASE OF PRIVATE HANNAH.

DR. FARQUHARSON: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been directed to the case of Private William Hannah, late 91st Foot, who has been recommended for some form of compassionate allowance by the

officer commanding the 91st Regimental District and the officer commanding the Aberdeen district; and whether, in consideration of the fact that this veteran is over sixty-one years of age, is partially paralysed, and subject to rheumatism and bronchitis, that he has almost entirely to support a wife and four children on sixpence a day of deferred pension, some means can be found for relieving his present destitute state.

LORD STANLEY: I have inquired into this case, and find that the Regulations do not admit of any other grant in addition to his present deferred pension of sixpence a day. It is, however, possible that some slight temporary assistance might be obtained for him from other than public funds, and I will see if he can be recommended.

ROYAL GARRISON BATTALIONS.

MR. COURTENAY WARNER (Staffordshire, Lichfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he could say what the number of desertions from the two Royal Garrison Battalions has been, and what the percentage of desertions has been up to now in the Royal Garrison Regiments.

MR. BRODRICK: I am not aware of any desertions having taken place.

TIME EXPIRED MEN IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. YERBURGH (Chester): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can say how many men now serving in South Africa will be entitled to their discharge to the Reserve at the close of the present year.

MR. BRODRICK: Excluding mobilised Reservists and Militia Reservists, the total number is estimated at 11,045.

TIME-EXPIRED MEN IN INDIA.

MR. YERBURGH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the total number of men now required for the Indian reliefs to set free all men in that country who have completed their period of colour service.

MR. BRODRICK: Taking the period up to September next, about 11,000 would be required for all the units not due for relief.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY; PHYSICAL TESTS.

MR. NUSSEY (Pontefract): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if officers appointed to Lovat's Scouts and other irregular corps for active service in South Africa undergo the usual physical tests required by War Office Regulations.

LORD STANLEY: Officers appointed to Imperial Yeomanry, including those now being appointed to Lovat's Scouts, undergo the usual physical tests. I am not aware what tests officers appointed to other corps undergo.

GOLD PRODUCTION IN THE TRANSVAAL.

MR. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he can furnish to the House the quantity of gold produced in the Transvaal for the years 1897, 1898, and 1899 respectively.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): For 1897 the total gold output of the Transvaal was valued at £11,653,000. For 1898 the total output was valued at £16,044,000. For the first nine months of 1899 the total output was about fourteen and a half million pounds in value.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION; NEW FAST CRUISERS.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether it has been brought to his notice that the Russian Government are now in possession of a cruiser, the "Varyag," with a speed of from 24 to 25 knots, and that two sister ships designed for 18,000 horse power to steam 23 knots for twelve hours continuously are on the point of completion, and that the French Government will shortly have two cruisers of a similar speed also built as commerce destroyers; and whether he can state if we have anything built or building equal to those vessels in point of power, speed, and ability to keep the sea for a considerable length of time.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): It is believed that the mean speed attained by the "Varyag" for twelve hours was 23½ knots. It was after due examination of these and the other ships referred to in the question that the fast cruisers of the "Monmouth" type were approved for the Royal Navy, and it is believed that they will prove adequate for the services required of them.

INDIA; LIGHT RAILWAY SCHEMES.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether the Government of India pursuant to Lord Curzon's wish to extend economically constructed lines in the rural districts, has signified its willingness to accept the co-operation of local Indian capitalists in the promotion of such light railways, and also in the construction of district and village works for water storage and irrigation channels has it been brought to his notice that early in 1899 a company or syndicate applied to the Indian Government for sanction to construct several light railway lines in or adjoining the district of Ganjam in the northern portion of the Madras Presidency, most of which lines would serve as feeders to the East Coast Railway, and, seeing that revised estimates amounting to 14 lakhs for the construction of one of these projected lines, forty-seven miles in length, intended to connect Russeli-coonda with Ganjam near the coast, were submitted many months ago, will he explain why the Government approval or disapproval has been delayed; and, in view of the fact that one such light railway has been laid already by a local zemindar up to the limits of his own domain the syndicate being willing to extend it further, can he say when a decision upon these proposals may be expected.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): The Government of India are undoubtedly willing to accept the co-operation of local capitalists for the purposes described in the question. As regards the particular case referred to, I have no recent information as to the position of the negotiations, but I will make inquiry and let the hon. Member know the result.

POPPY CULTIVATION IN INDIA.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH (Flintshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the number of acres under poppy cultivation in Bengal during 1898-9 was 564,000, being the largest in the decade, and an increase of 24,000 on the previous year; that the number of chests of opium manufactured in the Bengal Government factories in 1898-9 was 54,192 as

against 46,834 in 1897;8, being larger than any other year in the decade; and that the payments made to cultivators of the poppy in Bengal by the Indian Government in the same year amounted to Rx. 2,217,786 as against Rx. 2,021,536 in the previous year, being the largest amount in the decade; and, seeing that the pass duty on opium exported from the Malwa States was lowered in 1897 to Rs.500 per chest, being the lowest figure at which it has stood for nearly forty years, in order to overcome the competition of other crops and prevent the poppy from being driven out of cultivation in those States, whether he proposes to take any steps to discourage the increased growth and manufacture of opium in India.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I am aware that the area under poppy cultivation in Bengal in 1898;9 was larger than in any other year of the decade, and that the quantity of opium produced was considerably larger than it was in the preceding year, mainly owing to a good agricultural season. But the production of 1898;9 was greatly below that of several successive years of the preceding

decade, nor was the quantity of opium manufactured for export and for internal consumption in 1898;9 as great as the average quantity annually exported during 1898;1890. As the production of opium in India varies greatly from year to year, and has not increased, but diminished on a comparison of the decade ending 1899 with the decade ending 1889, I see no reason for taking such action as is suggested.

AFGHAN TRIBAL FEUDS.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): On behalf of the hon. Member for West Derbyshire, I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he has received any official report as to an attack made upon a party of South Waziri Militia on the road between Kajurikach and Khasmir Kar, and whether the attacking party were tribesmen of the same Pathan race as the militia regiment under British officers which was attacked; and whether he can give an assurance that, under the military arrangements for the trans-frontier portion of the new province recently created, care will be taken to avert the danger of these Afghan levies under the Political Department being entangled in tribal and other blood feuds which necessitate military expeditions into these regions.

LORD G. HAMILTON: I have received a report of the incident to which the hon. Member refers. The attacking and the attacked party were of different tribes, but both were Pathans. The hon. Gentleman may be sure that every care is taken to avoid entanglement in tribal warfare, and that the recent military arrangements tend to diminish this danger.

CHINA;DEFENCE AND RELIEF OF THE LEGATIONS;WAR HONOURS.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether it has been proposed by any Foreign Government that an International decoration should be granted to the troops of the various nations who have taken part in the recent operations in China, or that a star should be given for the defence of Peking; and whether His Majesty's Government propose to give any medal for Admiral Seymour's march, the defence of the Legations, or relief of Peking.

LORD G. HAMILTON: His Majesty's Government do propose to give a medal to all who have been engaged either in the operations leading to the relief of Peking or in its defence. The project of an International decoration is under consideration, but it has not assumed such a form as to enable me to make any statement about it.

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS IN ROUMANIAN PORTS.

*MR. HAIN (Cornwall, St. Ives): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that British steamers on arrival at Roumanian ports, although not from any infected place, have recently been placed under quarantine for ten days because they had passed Constantinople without taking sanitary guards on board; and that this new Roumanian regulation was quite unknown to shipping agents at Constantinople; and whether, having regard to the detention of British vessels and to the cost imposed (£14 per steamer) for so-called sanitary fees, he will cause representations to be made to the Roumanian Government with a view to these restrictions being abolished.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): Certain British steamers were placed in quarantine at Sulina under the circumstances stated, but were subsequently released on representations being made by His Majesty's Minister, by direction of the Foreign Office. It is not known whether shipping agents at Constantinople were aware of these quarantine regulations. The quarantine at Sulina against Constantinople has now been abolished.

BONDED WAREHOUSES; FORTIFYING WINE.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, when wine becomes bad in bond, the trader is allowed to fortify it with proof spirit; if so, is the spirit so used liable to a duty of 11s. per proof gallon; whether the full duty is charged upon it when it is used to fortify deteriorated wine, and, if not, how much duty per gallon is charged; whether he is aware that the wines more liable to become bad in bond are of an inferior class, and can he state to what degree traders are permitted to add alcohol to wines in bond.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Under the Warehousing Code, traders may, on application, fortify wine in a bonded warehouse, by the addition of spirit to an amount not exceeding 10 per cent., provided that the wine, if entered for home consumption, is not raised to a greater strength than 40 per cent. of proof spirit. It is not for the revenue authority to say whether the wine has deteriorated. The operation being performed in bond, no duty is charged on the spirit used, but the wine duty of 1s. 3d. or 3s. a gallon, according to the percentage of proof spirit, is charged on the whole quantity of the fortified wine when it is delivered for home consumption. I believe that the general opinion is that inferior wines are naturally more liable to deterioration, either in or after leaving bond, than those of a superior class.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): Is it not the fact that the spirit very often used for this purpose is German spirit, worth about 8d. per gallon?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I think not.

TAXATION;COLLECTIONS IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

MR. M'CRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, having regard to the fact that of the total amount of income-tax, inhabited house duty, and land tax leviable for the year ended 31st March, 1901, only 32 per cent. of the amount levied in England was recovered by 31st January, as against 67 per cent. of the amount levied being recovered in Scotland, and that at 28th February only 53 per cent. had been recovered in England, as against 93 per cent. collected in Scotland, he can state what action he intends to take to remedy this inequality of treatment of the two nationalities, and to prevent in future the loss which the Exchequer has annually sustained.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The comparative slowness of the collection in England is due to the difference in the system of collection, and it could not be assimilated to the system in Scotland without material changes in the law. There is no reason to suppose that the delay in getting in the taxes in England, as compared with Scotland, results in any ultimate loss to the revenue.

DEATH DUTIES ON OFFICERS' ESTATES.

THE MASTER OF ELIBANK (Midlothian): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the sums accruing to the State from death duties levied on the estates of officers of the Regular and Auxiliary forces who have died on active service, he will so amend the Finance Act that a rebate calculated on an actuarial basis be granted in respect of these duties; and, if so, whether he will consent to make such alteration in the Act retrospective as regards the last two years.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No, Sir, I am not prepared to propose such an Amendment as is suggested in the question. The subject was dealt with only last year by a clause which was unanimously accepted.

In reply to a further question;

SIR M. HICKS BEACH said that if the hon. Gentleman would refer back to the debate he would get all the information he required. He was not prepared to propose any amendment to the law.

WELSH GOLD-MINING ROYALTIES.

MR. MOSS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state what was the amount of royalty first charged by the Government to Mr. Pritchard Morgan when the Gwynfynydd Gold Mine, situated near Dolgelly, North Wales, was first opened; and what is the amount of the royalties paid in the aggregate to Government upon that mine.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The royalty first charged on the Gwynfynydd Gold Mine was one-thirtieth, or 3⅓ per cent. It was subsequently reduced to one-fiftieth, or 2 per cent., in common with all other gold mines on lands within which the Crown does not own the base metals. The aggregate royalties paid to the Crown on that mine since it was opened, being a period of thirteen and a quarter years, amount to £2,242 16s. 5d.

MR. MOSS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state what is the total amount paid to the Government for fees, take notes, and leases of gold mining properties in North Wales other than the Gwynfynydd Gold Mine, and what is the total product of gold in North Wales.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The total amount paid to the Crown in the year to 31st March last for fees was £;141 9s. 6d., and for dead rents and royalties, £;2,131 16s. 2d. The total product of gold for that year was 11,609½ ounces. Nothing was received from the Gwynfynydd Mine for the year in question.

CENSUS;LIVERPOOL POPULATION ESTIMATE.

MR. WARR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to the statement in the annual summary, published by the authority of the Registrar General, that the death rate in Liverpool during 1900 was 25·7, and that in Cardiff 13·8, these places being referred to as having respectively the highest and lowest death rate, and whether he is aware that this statement is contained in a report, dated the 28th March, 1901, although the attention of the Registrar General had previously been called by the Liverpool Corporation to errors in his method of estimating populations; and, seeing that the result of the Census taken three days after the date of the report shows that the Registrar General has made an error of upwards of 30 per cent. in the estimation of the population of the two places, whether he will direct that in making future estimates the Registrar General shall take into consideration information given to him by the Liverpool authorities in order to prevent a recurrence of such mistakes.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I am aware of the facts referred to in the first paragraph of the question. I may observe, however, that the Registrar General gave the estimates of population under reservation. He informs me that he is always willing to give consideration to the representations of local authorities with respect to estimates of population, but that he could not undertake to estimate the population for any particular town on the basis prescribed by the local authority concerned.

CENSUS;CLASSIFICATION OF LONDON.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he can arrange that, in the Census Reports and in other statistical Returns relating to local government areas, the administrative county of London shall be classified with the large towns rather than with the other administrative counties, so as (as far as possible) to distinguish between urban and rural populations.

MR. WALTER LONG: In any returns of the kind referred to in the question the administrative county of London must, I think, be treated as an administrative county; but in the summary tables of the Census Report particulars with regard to London will be shown separately from those with regard to other administrative counties. This will admit of its being readily classified with the county boroughs. In the statistical Returns issued by the Local Government Board, particulars as to the administrative county of London are also separately given.

TUBERCULOSIS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that the late medical officer of health for the City of London stated in his annual report to the Corporation, 1900, that he

would condemn all carcasses affected by localised tuberculosis; and, in view of the statement of the Royal Commission on tuberculosis that such meat may be eaten with impunity, and seeing that the late medical officer of health for the City of London was paid part of his salary by the Local Government Board, will he state what steps the Board will take.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am aware of the statements made on this subject by the late medical officer of health for the City of London in his report for 1899, but I am not responsible for the views which he entertained. I may add that no part of his salary was paid by the Local Government Board.

COAL MINING STATISTICS.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, with regard to the Paper recently circulated, numbered 179, and entitled Statistics relating to Coal Mining, he can state on what principle of calculation the estimated number of persons employed in coal mining, stated for various years on page 4, is arrived at; whether it is an estimate of the total number of individuals who may have been employed for any period in each year; whether it is an estimate of the number of individuals employed throughout the whole year, or whether it is an estimate of the number of individuals who would have been required if each of them had been employed throughout the whole year.

MR. WALTER LONG (for Mr. GERALD BALFOUR): As stated in the Return, the estimate is based on the statistics published by the Home Office of persons employed under the Coal Mines Regulation Act after making a deduction for those engaged in raising minerals other than coal. I am informed by the Home Office that their statistics are obtained from the coal owners, who are required by the Coal Mines Regulation Act to make an annual return of the number "ordinarily employed during the year."

SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION IN DOVER.

*MR. GRAY (West Ham, N.): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been called to the fact that notice was published in Dover in December last that the Board of Education considered that 950 additional school places were required in that borough; and, seeing that numbers of children are unable to find accommodation in any one of the voluntary schools of the borough, whether he can state what steps are being taken to provide education for these children.

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): Notice was issued as stated in the question, and the Board of Education are of opinion that the necessary accommodation is being supplied.

ST. JOHN'S CULVERT SCHOOLS, DARWEN.

*MR. GRAY: I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that it is alleged that in the last statement of accounts made by the managers of St. John's Culvert Schools, Darwen, the salary of the teacher was entered as £;25 in excess of that really received by him as teacher, and that this £;25 represents the amount paid for services as organist and choirmaster; whether the inclusion of the salary of organist in the school account is contrary to the explicit instructions contained on the form in question and also a misuse of the school income; and whether he will cause

inquiry to be made in this case, and also instruct the auditors of school accounts to inquire into the validity of the vouchers submitted to them.

SIR J. GORST: No; the accounts contain no such statement. The answer to the second paragraph is in the affirmative. In reply to the third paragraph, I have to say that there does not appear to be any ground for inquiry. The accounts were audited by a chartered accountant.

*MR. GRAY: May I ask on what the right hon. Gentleman bases his statement as to the first part of the question? Has any attempt been made to verify or otherwise the allegations?

SIR J. GORST: My reply is based on the accounts themselves. They contain no such statement.

ALL SAINTS' SCHOOL, BRADFORD.

MR. WANKLYN (Bradford, Central): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he will state on what grounds the accommodation of the All Saints' School in Bradford is now recognised for 816 by the Board of Education instead of 746 as formerly.

SIR J. GORST: The Bradford All Saints' School has for some years been recognised for 797 children, not 746 as has been alleged by the Bradford School Board. Last February the Scheduled accommodation came up for revision in the ordinary course, and as the numbers were found to have been incorrectly calculated the recognised accommodation was revised accordingly, and the usual formal notification was sent to the Bradford School Board.

BOLTON PUPIL TEACHERS' CENTRAL CLASSES.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he has now made further inquiry into the refusal of the Board of Education to pay evening school rates for subjects other than chemistry taken at the Bolton Pupil Teachers' Central Classes, notwithstanding that under date 29th September, 1899, the Board of Education sanctioned, under paragraph 14 (a) of the Science and Art Directory, a scheme for payment at evening rates; and, if so, what is the result of that inquiry.

SIR J. GORST: Yes, I have made inquiry; and I find that payment at rates of evening attendance was only allowed, in accordance with the Regulations of the Board of Education, in the case of such teachers and pupil teachers as had received practical instruction in a subject in which they were also receiving theoretical instruction.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT; DUTIES OF CONSULTING ARCHITECT.

MR. STANLEY WILSON (Yorkshire, E. R., Holderness): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been called to the fact that the Education Department hold that it is no part of the duty of their consulting architect to grant interviews to persons submitting plans for the approval of the Department, and whether he will arrange that, in future, interviews shall be granted when required to any person or public bodies submitting plans to the department, in order to facilitate the approval of the plans and the erection of schools in accordance therewith.

SIR J. GORST: The arrangement is that persons submitting plans see one of the assistant secretaries, who calls in the architect if his advice is required.

SCOTTISH BOARD SCHOOLS;PRIZES FROM PUBLIC FUNDS.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, in view of the fact that the money expended in the purchase of prizes by Scottish school boards for children attending board schools is exigible from the general community in the form of school rates, is it in accordance with the Scottish Education Code that children attending Government inspected denominational schools should be denied a share of these prizes or a proportion of the money annually allocated for that purpose.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): While school boards are, so far as I am aware, entitled to provide prizes for children in attendance at schools under their own management, there is nothing in the Education Code or the Acts upon which it is founded which would entitle them to provide such prizes for children in schools not under their management, or to allocate any portion of the school fund for that purpose.

SASINE OFFICE, EDINBURGH.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, having regard to the fact that the Departmental Committee which was appointed to inquire into the registration system adopted in the Sasine Office, Register House, Edinburgh, reported in October, 1897, that the Search Sheet, which, when introduced, was estimated to effect an annual saving of £;2,405, had actually resulted in an annual loss of £;2,700, will he say whether he will take steps to reorganise the work so as to prevent this loss; and will he state the number of deeds annually registered by the public, and consider the advisability of reducing the charge made for registration.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Report mentioned does not bear out the allegation made in the first paragraph of the question. I am informed by the keeper of the Sasine Office that the Search Sheet has effected the saving originally contemplated as the four official searchers, with their staff of clerks, have been abolished, and searchers are now issued by means of the Search Sheet by the ordinary established staff, which has also been reduced from ninety-two clerks to seventy-five, notwithstanding a great increase of business. Nor is it accurate to represent as loss the cost of the Search Sheet, which has other valuable advantages beyond its function in facilitating the issue of a search to a private individual. The answer to the first paragraph is therefore in the negative. The number of deeds recorded is published annually in the Judicial Statistics. There is no proposal to revise the charges for registration, which are very moderate, and have been acquiesced in by the legal profession without objection for several years.

ROADS IN ROSS-SHIRE.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether the Congested Districts Board has received from the Ross-shire County Council an application for a grant for the construction of a road at Badluachrach, Little Lochbroom and, seeing that the people of the district have already constructed a portion of the road by free labour, will the request for a grant receive the Board's favourable consideration.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I understand from the Congested Districts Board that in November last they received a local application for a grant of the whole cost of the road referred to by the hon. Member, and that they suggested that the case should be laid before the county council. Since then the county council have made no communication to the Board on the subject, and until they do so, no decision can be arrived at, as responsibility for further maintenance cannot be secured otherwise than by co-operation of the county council.

SCOTTISH CONGESTED DISTRICTS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether he is aware that the cottars and crofters of the townships of Snishvale, Howbeg, and Howmore held a meeting on the 14th inst. to consider what steps should be taken to secure land from the extensive farms of the South Uist estates, and that on a subsequent date they proceeded to the farm of Bornish, tenanted by a non-resident, which they marked out for crofts and house sites, and expressed their determination to take possession of the land unless otherwise acquired for them; is he aware that this tenant is also tenant of the farm of Ormielate, on the same estate, and that the late proprietor of South Uist had promised to give the people the farm of Bornish prior to his death; will he say whether the Congested Districts Board have made any efforts to acquire any part of these lands for the purpose of settling the landless cottars and crofters of the above townships; and will he consider the expediency of sending a member of the Crofters Commission to the district, as well as to Bernera, Island of Lewis, for the purpose of making inquiry into the condition of the people.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The answer to the first two paragraphs of the hon. Member's question is in the affirmative, except that I have no knowledge of the promise by the late proprietor which is referred to. As regards the last two paragraphs, I can only repeat what I have already said in this House, that such steps will be taken by the Secretary for Scotland, in consultation with the Congested Districts Board, as he thinks expedient, but he cannot undertake any exceptional measures for the benefit of those who are either breaking the law or threatening to do so.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether he is aware that for several years it has been the practice of the Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to visit the congested districts for the purpose of personally inquiring into the condition of the people; and, seeing that good has resulted from these visits, will the Secretary for Scotland visit the western islands of Scotland during the Whitsuntide recess, so that he may become personally acquainted with the conditions of life among the landless cottars, crofters, and fishermen who have for some time past been agitating for land at fair rentals.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I am unable to state what are the personal arrangements of the Secretary for Scotland for the Whitsuntide recess.

MR. WEIR: Will the Lord Advocate himself go?

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Personally, I have made other arrangements.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Is the hon. Member in order in stating in a question that good

has resulted from visits of the Chief Secretary to the West of Irelandh?

CHARITY COMMISSIONERS;RETURNS OF SALES OF REAL PROPERTY.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: I beg to ask the Member for Tunbridge, as representing the Charity Commissioners, if he can state how the £;530,898 obtained during the year 1900 by the sale of real property of charities is made up, giving the number of acres of land sold and the amount realised by the sale of house property, building land, and agricultural land separately.

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

The sum of £;530,898 referred to by the hon. Member represents the aggregate amount produced by 302 sales of real property in the year 1900. About two-thirds of this total was realised by twenty-four sales, including that of the school for the indigent blind in Southwark for £;140,000. The further particulars asked for by the hon. Member could only be ascertained by a detailed analysis of the contents of the files of papers relating to each sale order, the preparation of which would require very considerable time and labour, and the materials for which are not in all cases in the office.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: May I ask whether the hon. Member will be willing to have a Return of the matter mentioned in the last paragraph of the question made?

MR. GRIFFITH BOSCAWEN: No. The Commissioners cannot assent to such a Return, as it would involve the expenditure of much time and cause a diversion of part of the staff of the office from their regular duties.

PROMOTIONS TO POSTMASTERSHIPS;POWERS OF SUPERVISORS.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether all established officers have the right of applying for vacant postmaster-ships through the medium of their immediate supervisors; and whether, if such supervisors have the power to select the papers of certain candidates and to refuse to forward the others to headquarters, the Postmaster General will direct in future that all candidates' names and qualifications shall be submitted by the local officials.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): Any established officer of the Post Office is entitled to apply through his superior officer for any postmastership which is notified to be vacant, and all such applications are forwarded to headquarters for decision.

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS IN THE POST OFFICE.

MR. HAY (Shoreditch, Hoxton): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether telegraphists in the employ of the Post Office are to be granted a day's leave on 24th May, in common with the rest of civil servants; and whether, as telegraph offices cannot be closed, some arrangements will be made so that those operators who are compelled to remain on duty on the day in question may be compensated by receiving a day in lieu during the forthcoming summer.

The following questions also appeared on the Paper on the same subject::

SIR FRANCIS EVANS (Maidstone): To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can explain why postal telegraph clerks are not to receive the day's leave granted to all Government servants on 24th May, 1901, by the King; and whether the Postmaster General will direct that

all operators shall receive a day's leave of absence, either on 24th May or on some subsequent day during the summer of 1901.

CAPTAIN NORTON: To ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the King's Decree that 24th May is to be observed as a holiday in all public offices, post office servants who are required to attend on that day will be given a day in lieu thereof, instead of receiving payment as was the case on National Mourning Day.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Only those officers of the department will enjoy the privilege of a holiday on the 24th instant who can be spared from their duties without inconvenience to the public service. It has never been possible to grant this privilege to the telegraphists and other members of the operative staff, whose attendance is required on the day in question; nor has it been customary to give them another day's holiday in lieu, and it is not intended to make any change on this occasion.

MEAL RELIEFS IN THE CENTRAL TELEGRAPH OFFICE.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that during the week ending 11th May a clerk was employed in the Central Telegraph Office, London, on the fourth Dublin wire from 4 p.m. to 11. 45 p.m., during which period he received no relief for meals, having to eat his food whilst engaged in the transmission of messages; and, seeing that this clerk, being away from home from 3 p.m. to 1 a.m., had no proper meal time during this period, whether the Postmaster General will take steps to provide a system of relief clerks, so that men performing duties from 3 p.m. to 11 p.m. and 4 p.m. to 11.45 p.m. may have an opportunity to eat their meals.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir, the Postmaster General is aware of the facts stated, and he has under consideration a scheme for providing relief for meals on the late evening duties.

POSTAL CLERKS' DEPUTATION TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state when it is his intention to give his decision upon the points brought under his notice by a deputation of two sorting clerks, representing the United Kingdom Postal Clerks' Association, on the 31st July, 1900; and whether he will take steps to have that decision conveyed to the staff.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: A reply will shortly be sent to the members of the deputation.

NEW POSTAGE STAMP DESIGNS.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH (Anglesey): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether the designs for the new postage stamps have been entrusted to an Austrian sculptor; and, if so, whether this is due to the fact that there is no British artist competent for the work.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is the case that the portrait of His Majesty which has been used in the preparation of the designs to appear on the new postage stamps is by a foreign artist, there being in existence an excellent profile portrait executed only last year by an Austrian sculptor, Mr. Fuchs, who is now

resident in London. It is not to be inferred that no British artist was considered to be competent for the work.

MR. ELLIS GRIFFITH: Who had the right of selecting the artist?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I must have notice of that question.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): What form of inquiry or competition took place by which the un-suitability of British artists was determined?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have expressly stated already that the unsuitability of British artists is not to be inferred from the choice made.

DR. FARQUHARSON: Was the opinion of the president of the Royal Academy or other leaders of the artistic profession taken before the selection was made?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have already said twice that I must have notice of any further questions.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Do foreign Courts employ British artists?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order !

SUNDAY OPENING OF MUSEUMS;ENGAGEMENT OF OFFICIALS.

COLONEL MILWARD (Warwickshire Stratford-upon-Avon): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the condition under which the national museums and art galleries in London were opened on Sundays, which was to the effect that no officer shall be required to attend on more than six days per week and that anyone who may have conscientious objections shall be exempt from Sunday duty, has been in practice adhered to.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The condition referred to was communicated to the heads of the several museums and galleries at the time that the Sunday opening was agreed to, and no instance has been brought to my notice of that condition not being observed.

FEMALE TYPISTS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether his attention has been directed to a memorandum, dated 14th September last, attached by the Civil Service Commissioners to the form of application for female typewriters in the Civil Service, stating that an official nomination is required for these situations, but that the Civil Service Commissioners can give no information as to the persons from whom, or the means by which, such information may be obtained: and will he state the meaning of this statement, and how such nominations are made.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Candidates for the post of female typist are nominated by the head of the particular Department in which a vacancy occurs, and the persons so nominated are then submitted to the Civil Service Commissioners for examination. I am communicating with the Civil Service Commissioners as to the wording of the notices issued by them.

IRISH LAND ADMINISTRATION;EVICTION NOTICES.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the Return of the number of eviction notices, under Section 7 of the Act of 1887, for the quarter ending 31st March, 1901; whether he is aware that of the total number, 619, 27 were filed in Kerry, 22 in Galway, 51 in Cavan, 43 in Donegal, and 120 in Mayo; and, in view of such figures, whether the Bill recently introduced by the Government will be extended

so far as to confer on the Congested Districts Board the right of compulsory purchase in regard to estates which cannot be acquired at reasonable prices under the present law.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): No, Sir, I do not think the Bill can be extended in that direction.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, in view of the recent Return showing that during the quarter ending 31st March there were 619 eviction notices filed under Section 7 of the Land Act of 1887, he will consider the wisdom of inserting a clause in the new Bill repealing this section.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

ARRANMORE ISLAND LAND APPEALS.

MR. BOYLE (Donegal, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the sittings of the Land Court for hearing the land cases listed for hearing from Arranmore Island, county Donegal, have been fixed at Dungloe, and that the tenants will have to come a distance of four miles to the nearest port, Burtonport, and thence have to walk a distance of four miles by road to Dungloe; and whether, seeing the inconvenience and expense this will entail on the tenants, and considering that there is a petty sessions court in the Island of Arranmore for the holding of monthly petty sessions, steps will be taken in the interest of these tenants to have the place for hearing the land cases altered from Dungloe to the Island of Arranmore.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Land Commissioners inform me that Dungloe has hitherto been found to be, and is, the most convenient place for hearing cases arising in the district mentioned in the question, having regard to the convenience of all parties concerned. If the hon. Gentleman wishes to make any further representation I will look into it.

SIR W. STYLE'S ESTATE IN CO. DONEGAL.

MR. BOYLE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in the sale by Sir William H. M. Style of his land in Cloghan, county Donegal, to his tenants under the Land Acts, the landlord undertook to pay all the tenants' costs in reference to the sale and purchase, and that the Irish Land Commission now seek to charge each tenant a sum of 10s. before issuing a land certificate; and whether, considering that the landlord was to pay all costs, steps will be taken to have these land certificates issued to the tenants, and to have the cost of the same deducted from the purchase money payable to the landlord.

MR. WYNDHAM: The fee of 10s. is prescribed by the rules issued under the Local Registration of Title Act, 1891, and is not included in the costs and expenses of a sale under the Land Purchase Acts. The fee is only incurred if the tenant purchaser requires a land certificate.

STREET PREACHING IN GALWAY.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain why Mr. M' Clung, a clerk in Galway Gaol, who has had to be cautioned more than once for attending street preaching in Galway which led to riots, and refused to obey the orders of the department, has been

removed to Mountjoy Prison, Dublin; will Mr. M'Clung now be allowed to attend similar meetings in the Phoenix Park and elsewhere; and why have the Government overlooked this man's disobedience to orders.

MR. WYNDHAM: Mr. M'Clung was transferred to Mountjoy Prison because he disobeyed an order to abstain, for obvious reasons, from taking part in such services in Galway. So far as the prison authorities are aware he has not taken part in similar services in Dublin, but any such action must be judged in each case with a regard to the circumstances. It would not be proper to forecast the view the authorities would take.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Why was not this gentleman dismissed?

MR. WYNDHAM: We considered the punishment of transferring him was quite sufficient for the offence. In other respects he is a very zealous and capable officer.

CHILD GUARDIANSHIP;CASE OF CATHERINE MILLER.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if his attention has been called to an application at the Newtownstewart petty sessions, on 16th May, by the Reverend Peter Tracy, for the committal of Catherine Miller, aged 7, to Strabane Industrial School, on the ground that she was wandering about and under improper guardianship; whether he is aware that the applicant deposed that the child lived alone with her grandfather, who was unable to look after her; that she spent her time wandering about in a filthy state; and that this evidence was corroborated by Constable Burns; and seeing that the magistrates declined to grant the application, whether he will direct the magistrates to formally commit the child at the next petty sessions.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that the hearing of the application to commit this child to an industrial school was adjourned by the magistrates to the next petty sessions to enable the Reverend Mr. Tracy to produce further evidence in support of his application. The Government cannot give any directions to the magistrates, as suggested.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY;RETIREMENTS ON PENSION.

MR. M'DERMOTT (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state whether the Inspector General of the Royal Irish Constabulary has any, and, if so, what powers to enable him to compel constables who are of good character and are still able and willing to serve in the force to retire on pensions.

MR. WYNDHAM: Under Section 3 (b) of the 46 and 47 Vict. cap. 14, the Inspector General may require a constable who has completed a service of twenty-five years to retire on pension, if he considers such retirement necessary in the interests of the service.

MR. FLAVIN: But if a man is in good health, has good character, and no charges are made against him, ought he to be compelled to retire?

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot interfere with the discretion of the Inspector General in the matter.

MR. FLAVIN: Does it not happen that in the case I have in mind the man so retired is a Catholic?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!
STRANGFORD DISPENSARY DISTRICT.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the action of the Downpatrick Board of Guardians, who, though informed by the medical officer of the Strangford dispensary district that a woman had died after childbirth from want of being attended by a properly qualified midwife, still refuse to make such appointment; and whether the Local Government Board will take steps to prevent a recurrence of such an event by compelling the guardians to provide a properly qualified midwife for the Strangford district.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The Board has frequently urged the guardians to appoint a midwife for this district, but the guardians have not so far complied with that advice. The Board will again insist on the propriety and urgency of making such an appointment.

CAVAN FAIR RENT APPEAL.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state how many fair rent appeals from the county of Cavan are now pending in the Irish Land Commission Court; when did the Chief Land Commission hold a court in Cavan; and when does it again intend to hold a court there for the purpose of hearing appeals.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first inquiry is, 636, and to the second, 24th April, 1900. No date has been fixed for the next appeal sitting at Cavan.

CASE OF DANIEL MORONY.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the circumstances attending the arrest and imprisonment of Daniel Morony, of Caher, Feakle, county Clare, on 20th May.

MR. WYNDHAM: Daniel Morony was arrested in January last for the offence of endeavouring to kill salmon with an illegal instrument. He was convicted at Feakle Petty Sessions on the 18th January and required to pay a fine of £;4 with costs, or, in default, to undergo two months imprisonment. He lodged an appeal to quarter sessions, but failed to prosecute it, and, having refused to pay the fine, he has been lodged in prison.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman take into consideration the fact that this man is very poor, and that he has a large family dependent on him? Will he consider the advisability of mitigating this very long sentence?

MR. WYNDHAM: Any representation put forward will be considered. But the offence is a very serious one.

ALLOTMENTS IN IRISH URBAN DISTRICTS.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that no law at present exists in Ireland for providing allotments for artisans and workers living in towns, he will take steps to place those living in cities and towns in Ireland in as good a position in this matter as those living in cities and towns in Great Britain.

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot undertake to introduce legislation on the subject this session.

IRISH RURAL AUXILIARIES AND LABOURERS' COTTAGES.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S. E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether auxiliary rural postmen in receipt of the small sum of 2s. 6d. or 3s. per week, but who spend the greater portion of their time at agricultural labour, are entitled to apply for cottages under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts.

MR. WYNDHAM: A person temporarily employed as a postman, and mainly on agricultural work, would appear to come within the very wide definition of "agricultural labourer" contained in Section 4 of the Labourers Act of 1886.

MEDICAL FEES AT IRISH INQUESTS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the Local Government Board scale of fees for medical men attending inquests; whether Dr. Synnott only received one guinea for attending several days at two inquiries regarding the Dodder mystery case; and whether he will cause the matter to be reconsidered.

MR. WYNDHAM: No scale of fees is prescribed by the Local Government Board in such cases. The fee of one guinea paid to Dr. Synnott for his services at the post-mortem examination is fixed by the Coroners Act of 1847, which expressly charges such fees upon local rates, and any alteration in the scale of fees could only be effected by legislation. The Government has no power to supplement these fees out of public funds.

DAVID FINLAY'S ESTATE, CO. CAVAN.

MR. M'GOVERN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state by whose authority the receiver and solicitor on the estate of the late David Finlay, in the county of Cavan, entered into provisional agreements with the tenants to purchase their holdings through the Irish Land Commission over four years ago, and under what authority these agreements to purchase were to be carried out; and has the receiver or solicitor been asked for any explanation as to why the sales were not proceeded with, and can he explain the cause of the delay in Judge Ross's Court of bringing this and other estates to the sale during the past ten years.

MR. WYNDHAM: The receivers in all such cases act on their own initiative, but in accordance with the known desire of the Land Judge to facilitate sales. The tenants on the Finlay Estate signed provisional agreements to purchase their holdings about three years ago, but since these agreements were signed considerable difficulty has been experienced in the equitable distribution of turbary. The receiver and surveyor are at present engaged in endeavouring to carry this through. Every effort is being used to expedite the matter.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE, IRELAND.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether any regulations have been made by the Judges of the High Court in Ireland under the provisions of the Judicature Acts for the distribution of business.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): The distribution of business in the high court in Ireland is, where not otherwise regulated by statute, regulated by the rules of court made on the recommendation of the judges in 1891. These rules have been laid before Parliament. Further rules are in course of preparation.

CHARITABLE LOANS (IRELAND) ACT, 1900.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he is aware that at Dromore, county Tyrone, the resident magistrate in proceedings for recovery of debt under the Charitable Loans (Ireland) Act, 1900, habitually orders the clerk to calculate amount due at seven and a half per cent. interest on amount of bill at last renewal; that in making out account the overcharges for the six years period mentioned in the Act are not deducted from amount of the note; and that the bench refuses in all cases to allow the amount for which decree is given to be paid in instalments as provided in the Act; and whether he can give a copy of the instructions given to the clerk to guide him in making out accounts in these cases.

MR. ATKINSON: No instructions have been issued by the Loan Fund Board to the clerks of these societies of the nature indicated in the question. The Board have refused to express any opinion to these clerks as to the interpretation of the statute, this being a matter upon which each society must, if necessary, consult its own legal adviser. If the magistrates in any particular case are considered to have acted illegally or exceeded their jurisdiction, the party aggrieved has his remedy.

MR. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman has completely misunderstood my question, which was as to the action of the resident magistrate, and not that of the Loan Board.

MR. ATKINSON: Yes; I misapprehended the nature of the question. I am not aware that the magistrate has given any instruction to the clerk in regard to the mode in which he should proceed in making out the accounts.

MR. DILLON: I will repeat the question, because I have not been told if seven and a half per cent. is charged, and whether the allowances mentioned in this particular instance were made.

DUBLIN POST OFFICE; SALARIES OF TELEPHONE OPERATORS.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the two female telephone operators who were transferred from the National Telephone Company's central office in Dublin to the General Post Office in May, 1897, have since that time received but two increments of salary, and being still without established appointments have no right of pension; and that their work is as important as that in large English towns, where operators, similarly transferred, have received increases of salary, and have therefore been selected for exceptional treatment; and whether, in view of the fact that the salaries of the two operators mentioned are 13s. and 14s. per week respectively, and lower than that received by female telegraphists who entered the service since the date mentioned, and than that of operators who have from time to time assisted them, he will, pending the settlement of the question of pay for telephone operators, at once grant these officers, an increase which shall be retrospective.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is aware of the position of the two female telephone operators referred to by the hon. Member, but it is not the case that their work is as important as that of operators similarly transferred

who have received larger increases of salary. Such larger increases have been granted only to telephone operators; whether in England, Ireland, or Scotland; who are regularly performing supervising duties. As recently stated in this House, the general question of the pay and position of telephone operators is under consideration, and will be settled very shortly. In the meanwhile the Postmaster General cannot deal with the case of the two young women in question apart from the rest of the staff, or make any promise at the present moment regarding their position.

NENAGH STAMP DISTRIBUTOR.

MR. P. J. O'BRIEN (Tipperary, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state the cause of the delay in the appointment of stamp distributor for Nenagh, North Tipperary; whether he is aware that for several months past stamps can only be obtained from the office of the officer of Excise during two hours of the day, causing inconvenience to traders and professional men, as also the public; whether any application has been received by the Department from a suitable person for the appointment; and if he will take steps to have the vacancy filled without further delay.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: This appointment rests with the Treasury. I regret the delay which has unavoidably occurred in making the necessary inquiries, and I hope that the vacancy will be filled up very shortly.

IRISH GIRL CLERKS IN THE POSTAL SERVICE.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware of the hardship inflicted on Irish girls who succeed in winning places as clerks in the Post Office by being compelled to come to London while the same training and work can be had in Dublin; and, seeing that those girls if they wish to go back to their own country are reduced £10 in their yearly income while they do exactly the same work in Dublin as in London, whether he will take their case into consideration.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The work on which women clerks are employed is of necessity to a great extent performed at headquarters; and Irish candidates who accept such appointments are under no disability which does not apply equally to all those whose home is elsewhere than in London. The appointments for women clerks at Dublin and Edinburgh are filled by transfer from the London establishment; and those who apply to be thus transferred have as a matter of course to accept the Dublin and Edinburgh scale, the maximum of which is slightly lower than in London, in view of the lower cost of living.

MR. FLAVIN: By what ingenious method of calculation have the Post Office Authorities ascertained that London air is purer than that of Dublin?

QUEEN'S COUNTY POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

DR. MACDONNELL (Queen's County, Leix): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the delay in the delivery of letters in the Newtown district of Queen's County; whether the alleged grievance has been acknowledged by the postal authorities; and, can he state when arrangements to remove this defective

service will be completed.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has lately authorised an arrangement under which Newtown and the neighbourhood will be served by mail car instead of, as hitherto, by postmen on foot. Under the arrangement, which will be carried out as soon as the contractor has provided a suitable car, the morning delivery will be made nearly two hours earlier and the afternoon despatch an hour and a half later.

IRISH POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK BUSINESS.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will explain why the money spent in looking after the business of Irish depositors in the Savings Bank Department of the General Post Office is not spent in Dublin instead of in London; and, whether he will take steps to transfer this Department with its staff of clerks to Dublin in the near future.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: By keeping the Irish Post Office Savings Bank accounts in London together with the English and Scotch accounts, it is possible, with very little delay and trouble, to allow money to be deposited in and withdrawn from these accounts in any part of the United Kingdom. The diminution of this facility, which would arise from transferring the Irish accounts to Dublin, would give rise to much dissatisfaction, and the Postmaster General does not propose to take any steps in that direction.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOPS BILL.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, W. R., Shipley): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he has received a representation from Members of this House, jointly with the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Council, in favour of an early day being fixed for the Second Reading of the Factory and Workshops Bill, and whether he can now state approximately the date for the Second Reading.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have received the representation referred to in the question. I should hope that on a comparatively early day an opportunity may be afforded to send this Bill to the Grand Committee, but, of course, it will be quite impossible for the Bill to pass this year if it is to occupy any length of time. As far as I can ascertain, it is not likely to be discussed at length.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: In the House?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. T. M. HEALY said there was strong objection to the laundry clauses.

LICENSING LEGISLATION.

MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is proposed to give facilities for the passing into law of the Bill to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors to children under sixteen years of age.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have considered whether it would be more convenient to make a statement on this subject now or when I ask for further facilities for Government business, as I shall have to do after the Whitsuntide holidays. I have come to the conclusion that it would be more convenient to follow the

latter course, and when I move the motion on an early day after the House reassembles I shall be prepared to make a statement on this and kindred subjects.

SCHOOL TEACHERS; SECURITY OF TENURE; LEGISLATION.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state when he hopes to redeem his partial pledge, given in August, 1900, with respect to the introduction of legislation for giving security of tenure to teachers in public elementary schools, whose grievance has been increased by the passage of the Superannuation Act.

MR. TAYLOR: I beg also to ask the right hon. Gentleman a similar question which stands in my name.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: As I have said, I can make no statement on this subject now.

DECLARATIONS OF HEADS OF STATES.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state the reason for the delay in furnishing the Return of the Declarations of Heads of States, ordered by this House 20th February.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, Sir, the information has been received, and I hope the Return will be presented in a very few days.

METRIC SYSTEM.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W. R., Keighley): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he has noticed the Report of the Consul of La Rochelle, in which it is said that the neglect of the metric system is a great stumbling block to many branches of trade with the United Kingdom, and whether he will assist to bring about such changes in our system of weights and measures as are suggested in the Report referred to.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Act of 1897 removes the restrictions which formerly existed on trade weights and measures, and the use in trade of the metric system. A number of metric standards have been already approved by an Order in Council of May, 1898, after being verified by the Board of Trade.

NEW MEMBER SWORN.

Daniel Daniel Sheehan, esquire, for the County of Cork (Mid-Cork Division).

PUBLIC LIBRARIES BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 10th June, and to be printed. [Bill 203.]

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE (WHITSUNTIDE).

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I have to move; "That to-morrow the House at its rising do adjourn till Thursday, the 6th of June, and that at the conclusion of Government business Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without question put." I do not think this is a motion which requires any very long defence, but perhaps a few words of explanation may shorten the discussion. It has been suggested that the holidays should not extend to Thursday week, but that the House should reassemble on Monday week. In view of the fact that we have a great deal to do before the session comes to an end, I have considered very carefully whether that proposal would be for the convenience of the House, and I have come to the conclusion that it would not be. In the first place, Monday is not a very convenient day to fix for the

reassembling of the House, and it is specially inconvenient for those Members who live far from London and who go to Scotland or Ireland, or even further afield, for their holidays. Then, from the point of view of Government business, by meeting on the Monday instead of Thursday we should sacrifice three days of the holidays and only get at most a day and a half of Government time. I say a day

and a half because no doubt we should have a right to the Tuesday sitting, but a part of that would certainly be taken up by a motion to adjourn over the Derby. In view of the nature of the business that stands for the Wednesday, I am not sure that we should not be witnesses of the unwonted spectacle of the motion for the adjournment over Derby Day being moved from a very unexpected quarter on this side of the House, whether from those who want to go to the Derby or those who want to avoid discussing the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill. It is certain that part of Tuesday's sitting would be expended in that most unprofitable discussion, and that the sacrifice of three days holidays would only result in a relatively small modicum of gain for the conduct of Government business.

Therefore there is no case on that side of the question for meeting on Monday.

There remains the question whether we should or should not meet on Wednesday, or at such a period that Wednesday would be a day on which private Members' business could be discussed. The only precedent I am aware of is that in connection with an Education Bill, which was brought in by the hon. Member for Sunderland, and which met with universal acceptance from both sides of the House, and passed without serious discussion or controversial debate on the first Wednesday after the holidays. It is quite evident that that Wednesday was employed in practical legislation. It is equally evident that next Wednesday week would not be employed in practical legislation at all. One of my hon. friends asked me whether we might not meet on Wednesday in order that the second Order of the day, which has reference to Church discipline, might be discussed, but whatever else happens on that day the second Order certainly will not be reached. I may go further and say that all who are familiar with the movement and currents of Parliamentary business are perfectly aware that the first Order on that Wednesday will not be concluded at 5.30 p.m. There are already forty-five Amendments on the Paper, and that at a period when no one supposed that the Bill was coming on; and if it becomes a practical certainty that the Bill is to come on, I

should be surprised if these Amendments do not show an extreme facility for multiplication, and there would be no chance of the Bill being got through. If it did not get through on that day there would be no chance of its passing into law this session, because there are other private Bills before it, which would make it absolutely out of the question that further progress could be made with the Bill. Therefore I think nothing will be gained for private Members by meeting before Thursday week. For the reasons which I have given I think that the proposal to meet on Thursday week is one which will commend itself to all parts of the House, and in these circumstances I have no hesitation in moving the motion which stands in my name.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, to-morrow, the House at its rising do

adjourn till Thursday the 6th of June, and that at the conclusion of Government business Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put.";(Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON (Norfolk, N.): I rise to protest against this continued invasion of the rights of private Members. A few weeks ago we might naturally have expected that the House would adjourn on Tuesday last until this day week. That would have enabled hon. Members to avoid the holiday traffic both before and after Whitsuntide, and gentlemen who wished to attend the Derby or the Oaks could have returned to town for the purpose. I had made arrangements in the belief that yesterday would have been the first day of the holidays, and I daresay many hon. Members did the same. The Sale of Intoxicating Liquor to Children Bill, the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, and the Church Discipline Bill are all down for Wednesday, June 5th, None of these Bills are party Bills in any sense of the word. I should be sorry to claim for any one party a monopoly of the principle involved in the Sale of Intoxicating Liquor to Children Bill. The Deceased Wife's Sister Bill has the support of a large majority of hon. Members on the other side of the House, and the Church Discipline Bill has also got friends on

both sides. Unfortunately, these Bills are very strongly opposed by a small section of the House representing the English Church Union, which seems to assume to itself the whole business of the country, and in order that these Bills may be postponed the whole House have been put to the inconvenience of sitting until Friday, and going to their homes in the traffic preceding the bank holiday. We heard a great deal from the right hon. Gentleman as to the continuous pressure of work. I should have thought that would have been a reason for meeting on Monday week instead of Thursday week. I think I may speak for hon. Members on both sides when I say that our desire is to get through the work of the session as quickly as possible, and get away early in August. I do not believe that the House cares for these prolonged cheap trip holidays. Whatever the front benches may think, I am of opinion that hon. Members sitting on the back benches do not care to spend their holidays at Margate or Bosherville Gardens, but would rather get home as early as possible in August. The right hon. Gentleman has said that there is no use proceeding with the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, but I do not think that he has read that Bill or the Amendments to it. It is in a form which has not been previously submitted to the House; it has been very carefully modified and carried to the extreme verge of conciliation, and has been read a third time in the House of Lords. If the right hon.

Gentleman will look at the Amendments on the Paper he will see that they can hardly be regarded as bona fide Amendments. I think most of them would be ruled out of order, and it would be perfectly easy to get that Bill through Committee on the first Wednesday after the recess. If such a Bill has no chance of getting through, then no private Member's Bill can ever be carried through the House. I ask the House if that is right or constitutional. The First Lord of the Treasury spoke with some contempt of private Members' Bills, and he said it was hopeless for any Member to put down a Bill if it did not get through Committee before Whitsuntide. But right hon. Gentlemen on the front benches should leave private

Members to make a House for themselves, and to go on with Bills that are demanded by the country. I think that is a very moderate request to make. I will move an Amendment that the words "Wednesday, 5th," be substituted for "Thursday, 6th," but I do not wish to press it if the right hon. Gentleman will give me an assurance that he will not take Wednesdays after Whitsuntide until, say, the middle of July. I do hope I shall get some satisfactory assurance from the First Lord of the Treasury. I am not asking for any advantage. I am only asking that private Members should be allowed to put their Bills before the House, and have them discussed on their merits. I beg to move my Amendment.

MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I rise to second the Amendment, as a protest against the action of the Government in depriving private Members of the opportunity of bringing forward subjects which, I venture to say, are of great importance at the present time. Two reasons have been given for the proposal to extend the Whitsuntide holidays over a day on which various subjects of importance are set down for discussion. The first is that it is a private Members' day, and the second is that it is Derby day. I do not wish to say anything objectionable of that great opportunity for national sport, but I think there are a sufficient number of Members in the House of Commons who would sacrifice pleasure on that occasion to attend, if opportunity were given them, to urgent measures. The First Lord of the Treasury, perhaps quite unintentionally, discounted the importance of private Members' business, but the business to be brought forward on that particular Wednesday affects matters of temperance and Church government, matters which enter very deeply into the social life of the people, and compare very favourably even with the measures which have been occupying the time of the House during the present session. You may multiply the Fleet and the Army, and raise vast sums for national expenditure, but if you neglect the social life of the people, allow the religious sense of the people to become impaired, their respect for law and order to be undermined, and allow our national character to deteriorate, you are permitting evils which none of these measures can prevent or avoid. That is the work which is being done, I regret to say, by a large section of the Church of England at the present moment, and the Church Discipline Bill is intended to prevent it. I may direct attention to the abortive attempts which have been made to bring this subject before the House. The hon. Member for Flintshire brought forward an Amendment which would enable it to be discussed, but that was blocked. At a later period an hon. Member brought in a Bill, but the date of the Second Reading was included in the Easter holidays in the same way as the date on which this Bill is down is included in the Whitsun recess. I would remind the House that on the 10th May, 1899, the Church Discipline Bill, in a form very similar although not identical with the Bill of this present session, was brought before this House for Second Reading, and the Attorney General of that day, now Lord Alverstone, put forward this Amendment;

"That this House, while not prepared to accept a measure which creates fresh offences and ignores the authority of the bishops in maintaining the discipline

of the Church, is of opinion that, if the efforts now being made by the archbishops and bishops to secure the due obedience of the clergy are not speedily effectual, further legislation will be required to maintain the observance of the existing laws of the Church and Realm."

Who can say for a moment that the efforts of the bishops and archbishops have been successful? I quite admit that they have made some efforts, and that some success has attended their efforts, but on the other hand I say, notwithstanding all, that the evil is a growing one.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is now discussing the merits of a Bill upon the Order Paper. That is a thing he is not entitled to do.

MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR: Of course, I defer to your ruling, Sir, but I hope I am in order in giving the reasons why I think it is a matter of urgency that this matter should be dealt with, and that if it is not dealt with great danger will arise.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member may express an opinion that the matter is urgent and ask the House to adopt that opinion, but he cannot for that purpose speak on the merits of a Bill and argue the necessity of it.

MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR: I will not attempt to do more, Sir, than to state the case in a general way. My reasons are these;

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Gentleman appears now to be going into the very matters which I have said cannot be discussed upon this motion.

MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR: Then I will omit all I intended to say on the subject. I regret that I cannot give the House the reasons for the urgency of this measure, and I regret that the Government do not see their way to give us the opportunity of discussing the Church Discipline Bill. May I just say that at the present time the people are looking to Parliament to deal with this matter. They have lost confidence in the bishops, but they have still confidence in this House, which they look to to put an end to what is really becoming a national scandal. Amendment proposed;

"To leave out the words 'Thursday, the 6th of June,' and insert the words 'Wednesday, the 5th of June.'"; (Sir Brampton Gurdon); instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'Thursday, the 6th of June,' stand part of the question."

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): As the Bill to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquor to children stands second on the Paper for Wednesday, 5th June, I may perhaps be allowed shortly to state what the position of that Bill is. No Bill, whether introduced by Liberals or Conservatives, has ever been received by the House with more confidence. The Bill is a non-party bill, and it cannot be made a party measure except by some unwise action on the part of the Leader of the House, which I do not think is likely to take place. This Bill passed its Second Reading after a very full debate on Wednesday, by the unprecedented majority of 118. The ordinary Opposition behind me all voted for the Bill; the overwhelming majority of the hon. Members on the Irish benches voted for it, and although it is true that the whole opposition to it came from the Conservative side of the House, so great was the feeling upon those benches in favour of it that if everybody on this side had abstained from voting the Bill would still

have been carried by a majority of four to one. So great was the number of hon. Members who took part in the division that it took forty minutes to get through the lobbies, and then it was impossible to send the Bill upstairs. I am not an old parliamentary hand, and I do not pride myself upon my ability to pilot a Bill through the House, but I have taken advice upon this subject, and I am told that the only way to get a Bill like this through the House is to send it upstairs. How does the Bill stand at present? It will be second Order on Wednesday, the 5th of June. The Order before it is the Church Discipline Bill, which might be got through and sent upstairs in half a hour. I admit it is a forlorn hope at best, but it is the last hope we have of passing this Bill, and no doubt the Government takes considerable pleasure in depriving us of our only remaining opportunity. What am I to do under these circumstances? I have said that, a great majority of hon. Members opposite are in favour of this Bill, and I might go further and say that a considerable number of hon. Gentlemen opposite are determined that it shall pass into law. I have only to mention the names of the hon. Members for Norwood, Manchester, and others, to show that there is this determination, but what is my position? Am I going to ask them to vote against the Government now in order to preserve this forlorn hope? I do not think I can, and I will give the reason why. I very much wish that the Leader of the House had seen his way to make a statement, but he has told us it is inconvenient, and he is the best judge of the convenience of the House. I do not wish to press him further, but for my part I have been nine years in this House, and I have sat opposite to the right hon. Gentleman both when he has been Leader of the House and when he has been Leader of the Opposition, and, although I disagree with him in political matters, I will say I never saw him do anything that would mislead the House of Commons. He has given no pledge that the Government is going to take up this Bill, but there is an understanding on both sides of the House that the Government is going to do something, and, in the face of such an understanding I do not believe, the right hon. Gentleman would deprive us of our last opportunity of doing something. That being so, I could not ask hon. Gentlemen to vote against his motion. I shall vote for him, but on general grounds I think it is a most inconvenient thing for the House of Commons to have these short holidays at Whitsuntide and Easter. I myself would far rather see those holidays shortened, and the general period of the session curtailed at either the beginning or the end.

MR. SETON-KARR (St. Helens): I am going to support the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman on general grounds. First of all, because I think it is rather a longer holiday than the usual;

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not at all.

MR. SETON-KARR: I am speaking to the best of my recollection. I think there has been a tendency on the part of the Government to encroach upon the time of private Members, and upon that ground I support the amendment. To come to particular matters, on Wednesday, the 5th, there are some very important Bills to be dealt with. In the first place, there is this minor reproach against the Government that they have adjourned over the 5th because they want to go to the

Derby. I do not believe myself that the right hon. Gentleman himself is animated by any such reason, although that may be the reason adopted by hon. Members opposite, but, passing over that, I happen to have a Bill down for Second Reading on that day; the Salmon Fisheries (Ireland) Bill. If the House sits it may not come on, but if the House does not sit it cannot possibly be reached. I have frequently introduced that Bill to the House during the last ten years, and this is the first occasion

that I have ever secured anything like a first place, and I am very sorry to think that by the action of the Government my one opportunity for bringing it on for discussion is now to be taken away. It is not a private Bill in the ordinary sense, because it is a Bill the outcome of the Report of a Select Committee, and I venture to think that the prevention of its discussion will inflict an injustice on Ireland. With regard to the Church Discipline Bill, I am very sorry indeed, because, although it is unlikely that that Bill would have been reached on the 5th if the House sat, I think it is a matter on which the Government should take the earliest opportunity of stating their views. I happened to be down in Lancashire ten days ago, and had the honour to preside at a large meeting, when a resolution was passed by 400 delegates by no means hostile to the Government, but calling attention to the principles of the Bill and urging upon the Government the advisability of some action being taken. I mention this fact in order that His Majesty's Government may understand that there is a very ardent desire amongst a large body of electors, a great number of whom are supporters of the Government, to have a precise statement of the intentions of the Government with regard to this Bill. For these reasons I feel compelled, much against my will, to support the Amendment which has been moved with the object of shortening the proposed holiday. I think on general grounds it is necessary for private Members on both sides to protest; although usually it does not amount to much as far as results are concerned; when we think our time is being unduly taken from us by the action of right hon. Gentlemen on the front bench. The two front benches are always in league on this subject when it is a question of a private Member's Bill as against the exigencies, of public business. I submit that this is not a party question at all. The main fault very often lies in the fact that the Government of the day try to pass more measures than there is time for. It is perfectly clear to anybody who examines the records of our legislation that many of the most useful and valuable Acts have been passed on the initiative of private Members. I have ventured to protest against the proposed prolonged holiday not because we do not want a holiday, but because it cuts out some extremely important measures from the serious consideration of the House.

*MR. PURVIS (Peterborough): I wish to address to the Government a few words on the belated condition of the Beer Bill, which passed its Second Reading two months ago by a majority of 112. On almost every night since the 27th March I have tried to raise the lid of the stony sarcophagus in which this Bill is being suffocated in order that it might escape to life in the Committee on Trade upstairs. Last Tuesday, in reply to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sleaford, the First Lord of the Treasury said the time had not arrived for

making any definite statement as to the fate of the Bill.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question before the House is that of substituting "Wednesday, the 5th," for "Thursday, the 6th June," in the motion. The Beer Bill is not down for Wednesday, the 5th of June, and the hon. Member will not be in order in referring to it.

*MR. PURVIS: To seek intentionally to infringe the rule of the House would be the last thing I should think of doing. My object is to show that, if the House met on the Wednesday, the Government might perhaps grant an hour of the time at their disposal in order to facilitate the progress of this Bill.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member will not be in order in pursuing that subject.

*MR. PURVIS: Then, Sir, I will not pursue it further than to say that the people of the country are becoming from day to day more earnest in their inquiries as to the fate of this Bill. The Government will be doing a great;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; Any reference to the Beer Bill is irrelevant to this Amendment.

*MR. PURVIS: Then I will not make any further remarks.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The principal matter of regret, it seems to me, is that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House has deferred until after Whitsuntide making any statement at all of the intention of the Government in regard to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill. No one can doubt, not only from what has happened in this House, but from the state of feeling which we all know to exist in the country that this measure is one of first-rate importance, and one in which the most intense interest is felt. Considering the number of weeks which have elapsed since the Bill went through its previous stage, the right hon. Gentleman might by this time have made up his mind as to the course of the Government with regard to it. As my hon. friend in charge of the Bill has pointed out, supposing the whole Opposition had gone out, the Bill would still have been carried by a majority of four to one of Members sitting on the Government side of the House. That fact alone takes the measure entirely out of the region of party controversies and jealousies, and, considering the number of weeks which have passed since then, I regret the right hon. Gentleman did not see his way to make the statement for which we are anxiously awaiting as to the fate of the Bill. With regard to this particular question of the Wednesday, which affects that Bill indirectly, the first Order to come under the consideration of the House would be the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill. The right hon. Gentleman has pointed out, with considerable naïveté, that there are forty-five Amendments to that Bill on the Paper, and that, therefore, the Bill has no chance of being passed. But is it not a remarkable fact that out of those forty-five Amendments no fewer than twenty-six or twenty-seven are in the names of two Members; the noble Lords the Member for Greenwich and the Member for South Kensington? Those two Members are to be able, therefore, to obstruct the business of the House because of the natural affection for them of the Leader of the House, or some other reason, and their eccentric and exaggerated action, designed for this very purpose, is to be the means of compelling the House to abandon the opportunity of utilising this particular day. I am one of those who think it is high time we

were done with this farce of adjourning over Derby Day. The general sense of the House has condemned the practice, and surely there is no virtue in Derby Day that it should be regarded as holy or sacrosanct. Here is an opportunity of transacting useful business without interfering with Government business, of getting something out of the way, whether it be the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill, if it is rationally treated, or the Children's Bill, and of making some advance in our business in this session, when so little advance has been made in business of any kind, and I regret very much that the Government will not help us. I am not going into the merits or the extraordinary history of the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill. I have been thirty-two years in this House, and I remember that the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill was a popular article of diet for the House night after night thirty-two years ago. It has been affirmed and reaffirmed, and still it hangs in the wind. Let us, then, make the great sacrifice of actually sitting on Derby Day, abandon the altogether exploded and discredited holiday on Derby Day, and devote the time to pushing forward a measure on which the favourable mind of the House has been expressed times without number.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I must have been very unfortunate in my mode of expressing myself to-night, because, although I attempted to explain exactly how business stood, and the reasons for the course the Government have pursued, I apparently made no impression on the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition. He seems to think that the reason why we are adjourning for ten days is that there is a Derby Day. That is not the case. In my opinion ten days is an ordinary and fair holiday. Those ten days, it has been suggested, might have begun on Tuesday last and ended on Monday week. That, no doubt, would have saved Wednesday, 5th June, but last Wednesday would have been sacrificed, and it would have made no earthly difference, so far as the general body of the House is concerned, which of the two Wednesdays was taken.

SIR BRAMPTON GURDON: It would have been after Whitsuntide.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I may tell the hon. Gentleman that the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill certainly would not have been the first Order on that day. If there was any idea that the House was not going to adjourn over that day other Bills would have had precedence, and the hon. Gentleman would not even have had the place which he thinks might have led to the passing of the Bill. Let hon. Members, therefore, put entirely out of their minds the idea that the motion has anything to do with the Derby Day, except this; that by historical tradition of the House, whenever the Derby Day falls as it does this year, a certain amount of time is taken up in discussing whether the House should or should not adjourn over the Derby Day. Such a discussion is a great waste of time, and it is avoided by the course I have adopted. Had the ten days run as the right hon. Gentleman desires, from the Tuesday to the Monday week, that waste of time would have been permitted. Therefore, I think there is a distinct advantage. The right hon. Gentleman complains that I have not made a statement about the Bill relating to the sale of intoxicating liquor to children. In the course of my parliamentary experience I have never heard a statement made by any Government with reference to a private Bill until after the Whitsuntide holidays. I should have thought that the House might have waited until I came down to the House on Monday

fortnight before pressing this question. This proposal is wholly unprecedented at this period of the session. It has never been made, and I do not think it is convenient that it should be made now. The right hon. Gentleman seems to think that the Government are somehow standing in the way of this legislation on Wednesday week. If the House adjourns for ten days, two Wednesdays must be sacrificed. The House might meet on the Wednesday, but it has not been the practice. It has met once only in my experience for a Bill about which there was a general agreement, and I challenge the right hon. Gentleman, who has been thirty-three years in the House, to say whether he remembers any Government returning for work on a Wednesday, except on one occasion, when we returned to deal with the Member for Sunderland's Bill. [AN

HON. MEMBER: There was another occasion.] If there was, I know the occasions are very few and very rare indeed. The course which I am asking the House to pursue is that which has been endorsed by every Leader of the House, to whichever party he belonged, and by no one more consistently than by the Leaders of the party to which the right hon. Gentleman belongs. I hope that under the circumstances the House will settle this question at once, as the Government are most desirous to enter on the discussion of the Budget, which is the main business of the evening.

MR. CHAPLIN (Lincolnshire, Sleaford): I desired to say a word or two on the subject raised by the hon. Member for Peterborough, but I understand it would now be out of order, and, therefore, will raise it upon the main question. I should not have said a word upon this question if the Leader of the Opposition had not referred to what he called "the discreditable practice of adjourning for the Derby Day." I think that requires some explanation, and I will submit to the House one or two reasons for my belief that the right hon. Gentleman was not well advised in regard to the language he used in reference to that festive occasion. I have heard the adjournment for the Derby Day moved by the Leaders of both sides of the House. I would remind the right hon. Gentleman that Mr. Gladstone spoke of the Derby Day in very different terms from those employed this day by the Leader of the Opposition. The right hon. Gentleman may urge that the Derby to-day is a very different thing from what it was in days gone by. It is different in two respects only. I do not think that the horses are quite so good as they used to be, and I am certain that the betting is much less than it used to be many years ago. I do not know whether this reason is an improvement or the reverse in the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, but when the right hon. Gentleman spoke of the Derby Day and its associations in the way he did, I differ from him, and I am delighted to think that my view is supported by the opinion of men in the Liberal party more representative than the Leader of the Opposition himself.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I do not know why the subject of the Derby Day has been raised upon this occasion. It happens that frequently the Derby Day discussion has not had precedence, and consequently the question could not be raised. I think, Mr. Speaker, that that has been your ruling.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am not aware that I have given any ruling on the point. I think I am right in saying that there was an occasion recently upon which the

adjournment was not moved, but I do not think I have given any ruling.

MR. M'KENNA: Upon one occasion the motion was down, but it was not given precedence, and it did not come up for discussion. The First Lord of the Treasury has stated that this holiday is the usual length. Whether that statement is accurate or not; I do not mean to say that it is intentionally inaccurate; depends upon the meaning given to the word "usual." If he means by "usual" that so long as he has been Leader of the House he has always given the House long holidays his statement is strictly accurate, but if we go back to the time when Mr. Gladstone led this House we find that so far from giving long holidays' of this kind at Easter and Whitsuntide, if a long holiday was given at Easter a short holiday was given at Whitsuntide. The right hon. Gentleman has invariably given these long holidays. Now what are the reasons which the right hon. Gentleman stated in his opening observations as to why these holidays should be so long? He said that if we met earlier we should have to spend time in taking the Tuesdays and Wednesdays.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I never said that.

MR. M'KENNA: We know very well that hardly any of the Bills introduced by private Members have the least chance of passing. Nevertheless, we adhere to our parliamentary rights, and insist upon having as much parliamentary time as possible. What reason is there for giving this long holiday, except the reason given by the right hon. Gentleman

that this long holiday is for the convenience of the House? The convenience of the House in this case means the convenience of the Ministers. [Ministerial cries of "No, no."] That is so, and we are to have long holidays in order that Ministers shall not be at the pains of doing their work in this House. ["No, no."] We met this year later than is customary for this House to meet. We had an excessively long holiday at Easter time, and we are having an excessively long holiday now, having regard to the length of the Easter holidays. Under the leadership of the right hon. Gentleman we are fast losing the habits of business which characterised this House under former leaders, and why we are told now that it is for the convenience of the House to have long holidays I cannot understand. I trust my hon. friend will go to a division.

DR. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I do not wish to appear ungrateful to the right hon. Gentleman after his liberal treatment, but I support this Amendment because I have come to the conclusion that these long holidays are upsetting the mental equilibrium of hon. Members. No sooner do we get back from one set of holidays than we are called upon to go away to enjoy or endure another set, and I am bound to say that these continuous holidays are extremely unsettling to my own mental condition. I should like to point out how the matter stands. As my hon. friend who has just spoken told us, we have met this year later than usual. We met on 14th February, and sat for thirty-one days. We then went for our Easter holidays, when the weather was damp and cold and dreary, and when holiday making was very unpleasant. We got back again, and we have sat for twenty-five days more, after which period we are so exhausted that we are compelled to come now and ask the House to give us another fortnight, and yet we are told that we are pressed with work. We have had continually the suspension of the Twelve

o'clock Rule, and the time of private Members has been filched from them upon almost every occasion. I suppose we shall soon have what is called "the massacre of the innocents,"

and we shall probably be kept here till the middle of September. It would be very much better for us to finish our work, and break up earlier. I have no doubt that Ministers are hard worked. I think our friends below the gangway, who are carrying out what they consider to be their duty in this House, work very hard, but I am sure that the ordinary rank and file of this House cannot complain of a demoralised mental condition from sitting here looking on lazily while all the work is done by others, and it is very difficult for us to keep up this delusion before our constituencies under the circumstances. How is it possible for us to keep up the delusion of being hard worked when we are obliged to have these continuous holidays, instead of getting through with the work of the House?

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): If this House is disposed to meet too late and separate too early, and to multiply holidays, it follows that His Majesty's Government have to resort to the obvious method of the closure, and that the credit of this House will suffer more in the future than it has suffered in the past. When Members come into this House they should resolve to do their duty by the House, and should not seize with such avidity at every excuse for taking what are called holidays; holidays not from their own work, but the work of the country. The "massacre of the innocents," of which the hon. Member has spoken, will not take place this year. There are no innocents to massacre. As to the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill and the Sale of Liquors to Children Bill, they have already been massacred in advance by the Leader of the House. They were not his own offspring. I must make one remark as to the way in which my right hon. friend proceeded to dispose of the Bills. He demonstrated that the House could not pass them, and consequently came to the conclusion that they should not be discussed. My belief is that the Bill that does most good in the House is not the Bill that is passed but the Bill that is discussed. If you pass a Bill you may make many blunders, but if you discuss a Bill you inform the country as to the legislation which is proposed. But it is a very important matter that the Minister in charge of the business of this House should give us time to do the business we are required to do. I do say that this has not been the case in this instance. I say that we have been called upon to do business we could not do in the time the Minister has left us to do it in. The result has been, firstly, an odious resort to the closure; secondly, the constant suspension of the Twelve o'clock Rule; the Twelve o'clock Rule may be said almost to have ceased to exist; and, thirdly, as I have already said, the very great discredit of this House. I ask hon. Members who are impatient at these remarks to remember that this House has been the great security of good government in this country, and if the House is to allow His Majesty's Government

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Denny, Colonel
Kenyon, James (Lines., Bury)
Allsopp, Hon. George
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Kimber, Henry
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Lawson, John Grant
Arrol, Sir William
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Austin, Sir John
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Duke, Henry Edward
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Fardell, Sir T. George
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Baird, John George Alex.
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent
Balcarres, Lord
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum. Penr.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manc'r
Fisher, William Hayes
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Fitz Gerald, Sir Rbt. Penrose-
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch.)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Banbury, Frederick George
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison
Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)

Fletcher, Sir Henry
Macdona, John Cumming
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Flower, Ernest
Maconochie, A. W.
Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B (Hants
Forster, Henry William
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Galloway, William Johnson
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Bill, Charles
Garfit, William
Malcolm, Ian
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Gibbs, Hn, A. G. H. (Cy. of Lond.
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Brassey, Albert
Gordon, Hn. J E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Maxwell Rt Hn Sir H E. (Wigt'n
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Milward, Colonel Victor
Brymer, William Ernest
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Mitchell, William
Bullard, Sir Harry
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'ry
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Butcher, John George
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Gretton, John
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Groves, James Grimble

Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Hain, Edward
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Hall, Edward Marshall
Mount, William Arthur
Cecil, Evelyn, (Aston Manor)
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry)
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd)
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Myers, William Henry
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Heaton, John Henniker
Parker, Gilbert
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Parkes, Ebenezer
Cranborne, Viscount
Hope, J. F. (Sh'ffd, Brightside)
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Howard, John (Kent, F'versh'm)
Pemberton, John S. G.
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Penn, John
Crossley, Sir Savile
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Percy, Earl
Dairymple, Sir Charles
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick

to take all its own time, and in addition to that, to give it power to withdraw from the control of the House questions of finance, as in the case of the death duties, the result will be a more discredited and less powerful House of Commons, and a more powerful Ministry, in a position to control the revenues. The final tendency of that will be, especially with conscription looming in the distance, to do away with the House of Commons, and leave the Ministry in full power in the country. The tendency will be to have a military despotism, or an absolute, not monarchy, but ministry.

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 196; Noes, 166. (Division List, No. 201.)

Plummer, Walter R.

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunt'n

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Simeon, Sir Barrington

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

Pretymann, Ernest George

Smith, H. C. (North'mb. Tyn's'de

Whiteley, H. (Asht'n-und-Lyne

Purvis, Robert

Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)

Whitmore, Charles Algernon

Handley, John S.

Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)

Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)

Rankin, Sir James

Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)

Wills, Sir Frederick

Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart

Wilson, Arthur S. (York, E. R.)

Ratcliffe, R. F.

Stock, James Henry

Wilson, John (Glasgow)

Remnant, James Farquharson

Stone, Sir Benjamin

Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)

Renshaw, Charles Bine

Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley

Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath

Renwick, George

Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier

Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green

Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. (Oxf. Univ.

Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Ropner, Col. Robert
Valentia, Viscount
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Round, James
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Walker, Col. William Hall
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln
Webb, Colonel William George
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Flynn, James Christopher
Moss, Samuel
Abraham, Wm. (Rhondda)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Murphy, J
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud
Fuller, J. M. F.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Gilhooly, James
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Atherley-Jones, L.
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herb. John
Norman, Henry
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Bell, Richard
Grant, Corrie
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Blake, Edward

Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Boland, John
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Boyle, James
Harwood, George
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Brigg, John
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.
Broadhurst, Henry
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Healy, Timothy Michael
O'Dowd, John
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Higginbottom, S. W.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Burt, Thomas
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Malley, William
Caldwell, James
Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Horniman, Frederick John
Partington, Oswald
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Paulton, James Mellor
Carew, James Laurence
Jacoby, James Alfred
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Joicey, Sir James
Power, Patrick Joseph
Causton, Richard Knight
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a

Price, Robert John
Channing, Francis Allston
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Priestley, Arthur
Clancy John Joseph
Joyce, Michael
Rea, Russell
Cogan, Denis J.
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U.
Reckitt, Harold James
Colville, John
Kitson, Sir James
Reddy, M.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Labouchere, Henry
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Lambert, George
Redmond, William (Clare)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Langley, Batty
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Cremer, William Randal
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Crombie, John William
Leamy, Edmund
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Cullinan, J.
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Davies, M. Vaughan (Cardigan
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington)
Russell, T. W.
Delany, William
Lloyd-George, David
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Lough, Thomas
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Lundon, W.
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.
Dillon, John
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Smith, Samuel (Flint)

Donelan, Captain A.
MacIver, David (Liverpool)
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Doogan, P. C.
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
M'Crae, George
Sullivan, Donal
Dunn, Sir William
M'Dermott, Patrick
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Edwards, Frank
M'Govern, T.
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Elibank, Master of
M'Kenna, Reginald
Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Emmott, Alfred
Mappin, Sir Frederick T.
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n N
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Mather, William
Thornton, Percy M.
Fenwick, Charles
Mooney, John J.
Tomkinson, James
Ffrench, Peter
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose
Wallace, Robert
Flavin, Michael Joseph
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir Brampton Gurdon and Mr. Charles M'Arthur.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Weir, James Galloway
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)

White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North
Yoxall, James Henry

Main Question again proposed.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): I wish to call attention to the recent action of the Attorney General in regard to the demolition of certain huts in county Mayo. In view of the fact that one of my colleagues has already a notice on the Paper in regard to this subject, and also in view of the fact that the motion of the hon. Member for West Waterford cannot come on until after the holidays, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether I would be in order in bringing the subject before the House on the motion for adjournment.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot deal with that subject on the present motion because of the notice upon the same subject which stands in the name of the hon. Member for West Waterford. It is quite true that if this motion were carried, that hon. Member's motion would be practically wiped off the Paper, but I am not able to assert that it will be carried, or to treat it as if carried.

The hon. Member will not be in order in discussing the subject embodied in the motion in the Notice Paper.

MR. CONOR O'KELLY: May I ask, if the hon. Member for West Waterford were to withdraw the motion which now stands in his name, would I be in order in referring to the subject?

*MR. SPEAKER: No; it has been frequently ruled that if a notice of motion stands on the Notice Paper on a particular day, it cannot be withdrawn for the purposes of that day.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I be allowed to put a question on a point of order. We are all well acquainted with the repeated rulings from the Chair that motions standing on the Notice Paper prevent the subject matter of that motion being discussed on the motion for the adjournment of the House after questions. But I

wish to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether there ever has been a ruling that that practice shall apply to a motion for adjournment over the holidays such as the motion we are now discussing. The immemorial practice has been that on the motion for adjournment over the holidays it has been open to Members to discuss practically everything. Of course, I am only speaking from my own, no doubt, imperfect recollection and limited experience, but I do not recall any occasion on which it has been ruled that a notice on the Paper is a bar to the discussion of any particular subject on the motion for the adjournment over the holidays. I ask, Mr. Speaker, if your ruling is based on precedent, or is an absolutely new ruling?

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): On a question of order, if the motion were for the adjournment over the recess at the end of the session of Parliament, and a notice were on the Paper for the discussion of any particular subject at an "early day," would that prevent a Member in the discussion from alluding to the subject matter of that motion?

*MR. SPEAKER: This is no new ruling. I myself have ruled in precisely the same

way on the occasion of a motion for adjournment over a short recess; and I believe that in doing so I acted in accordance with precedent.

*MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I rise to call the attention of the House to what I venture to think is a matter of grave national concern, and a matter about which great surprise, and I think I may add, considerable alarm have been felt in the country. I allude to the state of the reserve of small-arm ammunition at a recent period. The reserve of small-arm ammunition has played rather a prominent role in recent political history. It will be in the recollection of the House that six years ago there was a discovery which occasioned so much horror and dismay on the part of right hon. Gentlemen who were then in opposition, but are now in office, that it resulted in the overthrow of the Government. But I think that even greater surprise and much greater alarm was occasioned in the mind of that perspicuous friend of the First Lord of the Treasury; the man in the street when he opened his daily newspaper and found that after the Unionist Government had been four years in office, and nearly four months at war, the sum total of the reserve of small-arm ammunition in this country consisted of 3,300 individual cartridges. A more startling and extraordinary revelation was never made in this country upon such a subject. I suppose the House realises what a reserve of 3,300 cartridges is. According to the equipment regulations, every rifle in the country, whether in use or in store, should be provided, I believe, with 400 rounds of ammunition, so that the reserve at the time represented an equipment of just about eight rifles; a corporal's guard. [Cries of "Oh!"] That is to say, that in a time of war the total reserve of ammunition for the safety of the British Empire could have been placed, I believe, in one of the despatch boxes on the Table of the House. In 1895 the reserve of ammunition consisted of ninety-two millions of rounds, and at that time we were at peace with all the world, and had the expectation of peace. Moreover, in the minds of experts, there was very considerable doubt about the keeping qualities of the cordite then being used, and the right hon. Gentleman, now the Leader of the Opposition, had the full support of his military advisers for the amount of cartridges that it was deemed necessary to have in stock. I think a comparison of these facts is sufficient to justify me in calling the attention of the House to the matter.

But did such a state of affairs as a reserve of 3,300 cartridges really exist? I do not mean was the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury true in the letter, because, of course it was, but was it true in the spirit? Was it true that, in spite of anything that could be done, in spite of the best technical advice, and the most patriotic and devoted efforts of the members of the Government, and in spite of all the factories working seven days a week, and twenty-four hours a day, it was unavoidable, it could not be helped, that the reserve stock of ammunition of this country could be put in one of these despatch boxes? I think I can show that it was not so, but rather that human nature and political controversy being what they are, such a statement is more likely to have been made for the purpose of causing those who heard it or read it to be ready to

alter their political action, by playing perhaps upon their patriotic fears. It could hardly have been made in order to induce the country to place greater confidence in those who had left it in that position. Such reasoning seems to me to be of such a topsy-turvy character that I, for my part, cannot understand it. It would be on a par with a physician who asked us to place ourselves under his care because he had killed his previous patients, or an engineer who should seek a contract on the ground that his previous bridges had broken down. To prove that I am right in my suggestion that the statement was not true in the spirit, I think I shall be correct in saying that the Small Arms Factory at Woolwich is capable of turning out four millions rounds a week, Kynoch's three million rounds, and other smaller services can supply five millions more, making a total of from ten to twelve million rounds. If the reserve stood at 3,300 rounds at a certain time it was necessary to know; not only the day and the hour, but even the minute at which it stood. Because if that statement were true at 2·15 on any day, it was not true at 2·16. If at 2·15 there were only 3,300 rounds in reserve, a minute afterwards there would be 4,750; at 3·15 there would be 85,550, at dinner time 435,000, and next day at the same hour there would be one and three quarter millions. Now, I say, we must look behind the actual literal statement that the reserve was only 3,300 cartridges in order to understand with what purpose such a startling statement was made to the country. If that statement was true in the letter, as I am quite sure it was, why was it true? Was it true because the huge reserve of 170 millions cartridges was insufficient? Was it true because the demands of the war were infinitely greater than all the sources of supply?

That is what we want to know. Was it not, on the other hand, because the Government had pinned its faith to a species of ammunition which was known to be technically unsuccessful and which was repudiated by the growing humanitarian sentiment of the time? That is the real question, I venture to think, at the bottom of this matter of the deficiency of the small arm ammunition reserve. Was there not in existence a huge reserve of Mark IV. ammunition? Was not South Africa supplied with Mark IV. ammunition and almost only with Mark IV. ammunition shortly before the outbreak of the war? Was not Mark IV. ammunition sent out to South Africa after the outbreak of the war, and were not millions and millions of rounds of Mark IV. ammunition brought back from South Africa after the war had broken out? Was it not for that reason, and that reason alone, that the country was denuded of ammunition, that the equipment regulations were perforce set at defiance, that from one end of the country to the other every little source of supply; almost every handful; of cartridges had to be called in, to be sent to the front? Was it not because the authorities had pinned their faith to a bullet which, on the one hand, had shown a perverse tendency to expand in the barrel of the rifle rather than in the body of the enemy, and secondly because the Government had not foreseen, even after The Hague Conference, that when they proposed to use this ammunition there would be such an outcry that they would be compelled to withdraw it for ever?

With all respect, I venture to think that an explanation; a considerable explanation; is due on that point. I tried to get that explanation by question on

Monday to the Secretary of State for War, but it proved impossible for me to do so. I also wished to ask him whether confidential departmental information might be used controversially for a purely party purpose in a debate in the House, and at the same time not be a fitting subject for a bona fide request for information across the floor of the House. He replied that it would not be advantageous in the public interest to make any statement on this point, that is to say, he sheltered himself behind

the familiar plea of official secrecy. Now the right hon. Gentleman, I hasten to add, has himself been entirely consistent in this matter. During the debate which resulted in the fall of the last Liberal Government he did not ask for information on this point. But there is a higher authority in this House, and in it at the present moment, than the right hon. Gentleman. The First Lord of the Treasury, speaking in the debate on June 21st, 1895, said;

"The discussion had shown that little was to be gained by hiding facts which embarrassed nobody but the critics of the Government, and least of all foreign nations;"

and the right hon. Gentleman added;

"He thought the right hon. Gentleman (now the Leader of the Opposition) might on this occasion very properly break through the traditions of the War Office with regard to this secrecy; traditions which he did not invent and for which he was not responsible; and give the Committee some further information. By doing that he would tend to quiet men's minds, and at the same time put the Committee in possession of facts which were necessary to enable them to criticise the acts of the Government—He had no desire that it should be thought that he was casting discredit on the right hon. Gentleman or his officials when he said that he entertained some suspicion with regard to the facts which were concealed from parliamentary criticism."

That is precisely the attitude which I am venturing to take to-day, and I shield myself, I hope not unsuccessfully, behind the very high and parliamentary authority of the right hon. the First Lord of the Treasury. That is precisely my demand; I hope I may say our demand; on this occasion. We want him to "break through the traditions of the War Office, traditions which he did not invent and for which he is not responsible." We want him "to quiet men's minds and put the House in possession of facts which are necessary to enable them to criticise the acts of the Government." We, too, "entertain some suspicion with regard to facts which are concealed from parliamentary criticism." Therefore I venture to appeal to the Secretary of State for War, reminding him of his own remark at that time, that to have practically no reserve of ammunition is the height of impolicy. I appeal to him to tell the House frankly when, how, and why this lamentable collapse occurred, and, above all, I venture to appeal to the First Lord of the Treasury to make it clear to the House, once for all, that departmental information which is not too sacred or too secret to be used to score a party point shall also not be too sacred or too secret to be frankly explained to the House and the country.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W. R., Elland): I hope the House will allow me to keep it from a final decision on this motion for a few minutes while I raise a

limited part of a great question. I want to speak for a few minutes about the 20,000 Boer prisoners that we have now got in our safe keeping, and what I have to say will be rather by way of interrogation than by way of criticism. The question of the way we are treating the Boer prisoners has never been discussed at any length in the House. I think the reason is that in the opinion of the people of this country we are treating these prisoners of war; as far as all questions of their material condition is concerned; better than prisoners of war have ever been treated before. Compared with the way the French prisoners were treated by the Germans, above all compared with the way in which the Northern Americans were treated in the horrible prisons of the South, we give to the Boers in the matter of food, in the matter of shelter, and in the matter of medical attendance more than prisoners of war ever had before. But there are one or two very evil rumours afloat, and I want to ask the Government one or two questions regarding them. There has been a rumour with reference to the shooting of a prisoner at St. Helena. It has been said that that prisoner was shot unnecessarily; but I am aware that the Government have answered that the prisoner was shot at St. Helena endeavouring to climb over a fence before daylight, I wish to ask the Government whether they would mind publishing the verdict of the coroner's jury at St. Helena on the matter, because it is rumoured on good authority that that was not the reason why the prisoner was shot.

There is another subject I desire to mention. I am afraid we are risking the loss of our reputation for the comparatively good treatment of our prisoners of war hitherto. In St.

Helena and Ceylon the prisoners live in healthy countries, under comparatively healthy conditions; but within the last few weeks the Government have determined to send a large number of prisoners to stations in India, which have been chosen apparently for no other reason than that they are the hottest that can be found.

I should like to ask the Government if they can give us information as to what the ordinary temperature of these stations is, and their level above the sea. It is, no doubt, not impossible for white men to live in these places, and the Government have said that British regiments have lived there. Under what conditions? Under every attention that can be paid to them, and in well-built barracks. Yet there is a difficulty in keeping British soldiers there. Why, then, choose to confine Boer prisoners in places where it is difficult for white men to live healthily? Why choose places where it is difficult for men to live, the hottest places you can find in the whole of the Empire, which has got within it all the temperate countries? I think one place is as near the Equator as it could well be. I ask why this danger should be incurred of sending white people to tropical countries? We are running a very serious risk. It is perfectly true that it may be a successful experiment, and that many of these prisoners may not die, but where men's lives, for which we are responsible, are concerned, we ought to send them where there is a certainty of their living healthy lives, and we ought not to run the chance of what may be the greatest disgrace to this country. There is another side to this question to which I wish to refer, and that is the way in which the prisoners are occupying their time. I believe that

the Government have recently undertaken to give them certain opportunities for education, a large number of them being utterly ignorant rustics. That is a very valuable advantage, and I am glad the Government are doing it; but I do wish that the Government could see their way, now that the war is not over, and that the prisoners will not be incarcerated merely for a short period while the war is being finished, as we at first supposed, but may be confined for another year, to give them full occupation for their hands. The Government may be doing that; but, if they are, I wish they would take the country a little more into their confidence. There is no reason for secrecy in the matter. I do not think the country at large wishes to be over critical, but they do want to know what is the character of the treatment which is being given to these prisoners. Of course, this country is determined to give no promise whatever with reference to the object for which the Boers are fighting; that is to say, to give them back their independence. But I do ask the Government whether they cannot try and meet them in another way. These men are most of them farmers, and if they are not assisted when they go back to South Africa they will be absolutely ruined men. They know that their farms are mostly burnt, that their stock is gone, and that they will fall into the hands of money-lenders if they are not assisted. Now, the Government have, by their dealings with General Botha, shown that they realise the importance of the economic resettlement of the country. They have practically declared it to be their policy to resettle the country after the conclusion of the war, and I ask whether it would not be a good thing to let these men, who are eating out their hearts in captivity, know that, although they cannot get the political idea for which they fought, they will be assisted to start again without suffering the economic ruin which many of them now regard as inevitable. We have a great opportunity. We have two-thirds of the male part of the population of these two countries in our safe keeping, and we have a great opportunity of teaching them before they return to their own countries that we are determined to treat them fairly in the matter of government and in the matter of the economic conditions of their country. I think it would be unfortunate if we did not do everything we could to show them that it is the desire of the Government to send them back with good prospects.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): The hon. Member who has just sat down has been theorising in his usual way, more especially as regards geography, but I may tell him that the Boer prisoners are infinitely better treated than our own men. My object in rising is to say a few words in support of the suggestion of the hon. Member for South Wolverhampton. I think the House is indebted to the First Lord of the Treasury and to the hon. Member for having brought the question of our reserve of ammunition before it. What is the situation? When Lord Lansdowne had been Secretary of State for War for four years, when he could do everything he liked at the War Office, he said that it struck him that we were £4,000,000 worth of stores deficient. What are stores? They are not merely nails or biscuits. They are waggons, accoutrements, rifles, guns; in fact, everything needed for the upkeep of an army. Now we are told that there was a deficiency of ammunition, and that there were only 3,300 rounds in reserve on a certain day in 1899, which was as much as half a battalion of infantry would use

in a couple of hours. I do not wish to labour the subject, but I will say that I feel I owe a sort of apology to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, because in this House, in June, 1895, I took a certain course which led me into the lobby in the train of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Guildford. The right hon. Gentleman, I am perfectly certain, must feel that it is rather hard that the noble Lord the Secretary of State could steal a horse while he himself was not allowed to look at over the fence. But I never could understand the ways, of the War Office. Even the scheme of the Secretary of State for War fades into insignificance as compared with the quantity of reserve ammunition two and a half years ago, which I think is full worthy of the consideration of the House.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I would not venture to intrude on the House were it not for the importance of the subject which I desire to bring before it. It is the question of the slaughtering of cattle in South Africa. At the present time winter is approaching, and if the cattle which have been used for breeding purposes in South Africa are slaughtered for food, naturally, when the war comes to an end, there will be no cattle left, and the country will have to be restocked. I asked a question on the 19th April of the Financial Secretary to the War Office as to what consideration was being given to the importance of keeping a stock of climatised cattle in South Africa. The noble Lord replied that the local authorities were alive to the importance of the question, and that Government stock farms were being established. I had a communication from the Transvaal, dated the 26th April, which stated that no stock farms had been established at that date, which was seven days after I had received the reply I have referred to. My informant may have been mistaken, but at any rate the point is of very considerable importance, and I hope instructions will be sent to South Africa that these stock farms, if not already established, should be established. If cattle are being slaughtered for the food of the troops, I cannot imagine a more deplorable state of affairs than will exist when the war is over, and the Boers come home to their farms. Everyone who has any experience of cattle knows that it takes a very considerable time to acclimatise cattle, and I believe that in the Transvaal it is even more difficult than in other parts of South Africa. A statement has been made in the public press that if you want to bring cattle from a neighbouring colony into the Transvaal, the loss through death will be about 20 per cent., and if you take them from this country the loss will be something between 50 per cent. and 80 per cent. I understand also that the military authorities are selecting the best conditioned cattle for slaughter, and they are often the most useful for breeding purposes. I am told also on extremely good authority; that of an Englishman who has been in the Transvaal for twenty years; that lung sickness and pleuro-pneumonia are very prevalent, and that healthy and diseased cattle are herded together. We all know how infectious pleuro-pneumonia is, and if healthy cattle are herded with diseased cattle they will all share the same fate. I am also informed that the Boers in winter used to bring their cattle down from the high districts to the low districts for the purpose of keeping them alive, and that this is not being done at the present time. All the stock captured is now

being kept in Johannesburg and the vicinity, and I am informed that if they do not succumb to lung sickness they will all die of cold and starvation. I do not blame the military authorities or Lord Kitchener. After all, he has enough to do to look after the military affairs of the country. In fact, he seems to have more than he can do. I hope these matters will be put under the control of some practical person who understands stock. Military officers do not understand stock, and I cannot blame them for that lack of knowledge. In my opinion it is more important that stock should be cared for than that the gold mines should be opened. Gold can be extracted at any time, but if the stock is allowed to die you will hardly ever be able to replace it. I cannot conceive any question more important to the future of South Africa than to keep alive its stock in order that the Boers on their return may be able to resume their ordinary avocation. Hon. Gentlemen opposite will agree that nothing more disastrous could happen than that the country should be denuded of its stock. Therefore I venture to bring the subject before the House, and I hope the Government will give it immediate attention.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): As the Secretary of State for War will no doubt answer the points that have been mentioned, I will refer to one matter, with reference to which I should be glad to have an assurance from him. It relates to the employment of armed bands of Zulus to raid territories on the borders of Zululand. I had better read to the House a short statement made on the subject by Mr. Brunner, the member for Zululand in the Legislative Assembly, which appeared in Saturday's newspapers. He says;

"Steps have been taken with the cognisance of the highest military authorities in the country to let loose the natives upon the already demoralised enemy, permission being given to them to loot and plunder. The natives of Zululand have been instructed by military officers to arm and invade the Vryheid district. Thousands of head of Boer cattle were brought in and handed over to Colonel Bottomley, and the Zulus were allowed 10 per cent. of all the plunder. As a result of this action the Dinizulu and Usibebu tribes are again upon the war path. Telegrams of protest have been sent to the Prime Minister, and the latter replied that he had sent protest after protest to the military authorities, but believed Colonel Bottomley had greatly exceeded the instructions given in the original order."

I put a question to the right hon. Gentleman upon this subject, and I understand that by his answer he carried the matter somewhat farther than he did at first, and showed that Lord Kitchener and the War Office are becoming alive to the danger of this matter. It is quite evident that a serious error has been committed. Who is to blame for that error is a matter we shall be able to determine when we receive the correspondence which I hope there will be no disinclination on the part of the Government to produce; but the point I wish to have some information upon now is whether these proceedings have been stopped, and that no officers are authorising or encouraging the Zulus to raid the country, or, if it is going on now, whether instructions will not be sent at once to put a stop to it. The reason I attach so much importance to the matter is this. One of the greatest efforts that have been made by both combatants in

this war has been to keep the natives out of it, and those efforts have been attended by success; and it is only due to our officers to say that they have done their best to make our position, already deplorable as it is, better by not bringing the Zulus into this war. The action to which I refer has excited a strained feeling among the loyal British subjects. They deplore this action, because in the first place they feel that it is certain to excite very bitter sentiments between both parties in the colonies, and that racial passions will be far more excited if black men are allowed to take part in military operations, if only to the extent of raiding cattle. In the next place, there is another danger which will be apparent to all those who know something of the past history of Zululand. Zululand is divided among a number of chiefs, and the Zulus, of all the South African races, are the most warlike and the fiercest in their wars. Under the wise administration of Sir Marshall Clarke and other British officers, Zulus have been brought to abandon their warlike habits, and the greatest peace and tranquillity has reigned there for a great number of years. To arm the Zulus again, and send them out to raid the country, is perfectly certain to rekindle the old war fire, and to endanger the safety of Zululand. I think it is this, quite as much as anything else, that has so alarmed the peaceful and loyal inhabitants of Natal, and has made them resent the proceedings reported to us. As I understand, the Prime Minister of Natal has done his best to stop these proceedings, and, in a telegram that was sent by the Prime Minister, it is stated that the Natal Government would not rest until the utilisation of the Zulus has been satisfactorily explained. I earnestly hope that the right hon. Gentleman will be able to tell us that these proceedings are entirely stopped, or that, if that is not the case, he will see to it that nothing of the kind is allowed to take place in future.

*SIR ALFRED HICKMAN (Wolverhampton, W.) said he rose to call attention to the large purchases of materials which were being made by railways under the control of the British Government. He thought he would be able to show that these purchases had not been made on business principles, and that there had not been due regard to efficiency, to public safety, or real economy. In the first place he desired to refer to the purchase of locomotive engines by the Burmese Railway Company. This company had guarantees from the Indian Government, and had covenanted to equip the railway with rolling stock, plant, and machinery to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State, who might from time to time alter or improve the equipment. The half-year's report of the locomotive department for 9th May, 1900, speaking of twenty new engines purchased from the Baldwin Works, Philadelphia, says;

"Some of their details are beginning to show early signs of wear and want of strength, and that cheapness in first cost is not true economy. The coupler bars are made of the same treacherous stuff, and two have already broken and caused train-partings."

The senior Government inspector, on 5th August, 1900, reported of the same engines;

"Some of the details show want of strength, and parts supposed of cast steel proved of very inferior metal and workmanship Repairs had

been required much in excess of what was necessary with locomotives received from English makers."

Mr. Johnson, acting for the locomotive superintendent, said on 10th September, 1900;

"We have increased fuel fence on the tenders of most of the Moghals (Baldwin locos), to enable them to take sufficient wood to last between wood-fuelling stations. The Moghals burnt 35½ per cent. more per train mile, and 23½ per cent. more per vehicle mile than the 'F.' class (English). This was for five months on all services. We continue to be troubled with the result of cheap work in these engines. Seven coupler bars have broken during the half year."

Similar experiences had arisen in regard to Belgian engines which had been bought for the Egyptian railway. The chief engineer reported;

"In the locomotives of British make the boiler tubes ran on the average 252,000 miles against only 146,000 of the Belgian engines, attended to by the same men and using the same coal and water. The price of the Belgian engines was £45 each less than the British, but the repairs in material alone, besides labour, had cost £382 per engine more. It will be readily understood how short-sighted has been the policy of accepting the lowest offer."

These independent reports, one from Egypt and the other from India, had been received, and yet these purchases were still going on. Only last month the Calcutta Port Commissioners bought a parcel of nine locomotives of the Pittsburg Locomotive Company. The English price was £1,549, and the American price £1,378. He submitted that no English railway company or anybody with experience would suppose that the American locomotives were the cheapest. He could only suppose that one Government Department did not see the reports sent home by the other. He did not think that English manufacturers always had a fair chance. An inquiry was sent out from the Burmese Railway for 1,247 sets of wheels and axles. The tests stipulated for were of an almost impossible character; chemical and mechanical, even prescribing the mode of manufacture. The prices quoted for these wheels and axles were no doubt high prices, and no doubt a considerable time was required to make them; but the order was given to an American firm, and the Americans were allowed to supply common steel, with their own tests, and even cast iron wheels. The English

manufacturer was asked to supply material of a far superior character to anything required by any English railway company, and the material accepted was such as no English railway company would suffer to run on their line.

He desired to tell the House the story of the Gokteik Viaduct which had recently been erected on the Burma Railway by an American firm. The prices quoted by the American firm were lower and the time for erection less. So far as the time had gone there had been no complaint. A gentleman appointed to inspect the erection of this viaduct reported on 4th September, 1900, that he had only examined 40,000 rivets out of 100,000. He tested a portion of Bent No. 23 and found the rivetting was not so good as previously. From the end of June until September he said that he had had little or no time available to test rivets. This viaduct was the highest in the world. The whole structure of the bridge rested upon what

appeared to be a most slender support composed entirely of steel, and the photos of the bridge made it look more like a spider's web across a great gorge than anything else. At this time a new inspector was appointed named Constable, and he found that the rivetting was being done by coolies of the cow-keeping class. He said that these men were not only entirely inexperienced for the work, but were physically incapable of doing what was required of them. He reported this to his superior and marked certain portions of the viaduct which he found to be bad. In the meantime the bad work was going on. Failing to obtain any redress whatever, he stopped the work going on, and he was then superseded. Mr. Constable, having been superseded, came to this country, and he said he would pledge his professional reputation that he would prove that this bridge was unsafe and such as no engineer ought to pass. He offered to go out there without fee or reward to prove the charges he had made. The American record of bridge building was a very bad one, and yet we went on buying American bridges. Having regard to the awful results, not only in money but human life, involved in the safety of these bridges, it seemed a small thing indeed to appoint someone to investigate Mr. Constable's

report, and he hoped the Secretary of State for India would see his way to grant the application, and see his way to publish these reports, so that every Government department might know what was going on. He hoped the noble Lord would also endeavour to impress on his subordinates the fact that low prices were not necessarily true economy.†

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester): Before the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War replies, may I ask whether, having regard to the fact of the enormous services rendered in South Africa by the railway servants, drivers, firemen, and guards, any arrangement has been made for the suitable acknowledgment of those great services, and whether honours will be conferred upon them of a similar character to the honours conferred on the other forces in the field, and if any substantial reward of material value will be given them. I think we all agree that these men deserve the highest recognition for the services they have rendered, and I trust the Government will, if they have not already done so, work out some scheme so that these men shall have full, complete, and equitable recognition of the risks they ran daily in the discharge of these very important duties. Without the discharge of those duties the operations of the Army in various parts would have been impossible. Therefore, if the hon. Gentleman has not yet considered the question, I hope he will go into the subject and consider it and make a statement with regard to it at a later period of the session. While on my feet I would also like to ask a question of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. I read the other day a statement to the effect that some kind of syndicate was being formed in the colonies to obtain black labour for the mines on the Rand, which is to be distributed very much in the manner of coal, according to the proportion of payment made. If that be the fact, I appeal to the Secretary of State for the Colonies to exercise his great authority to prevent anything

† In The Times of the 1st June, page 13, appears a letter addressed by the Secretary of State for India to Sir Alfred Hickman, replying to the speech

here reported.

like the re-establishment of slavery in that part of the world. It is a matter of considerable importance to labour, and I think it is a matter which seriously requires the attention of the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. BRODRICK rose, but gave place to.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN, who said: I imagine and hope the right hon. Gentleman rose for the purpose of endeavouring to close the discussion upon this branch, or at any rate to deal with the discussion that has passed upon the various questions arising out of South Africa. I do not know whether he or the Colonial Secretary would be able on the present occasion to make a statement upon the general state of affairs in South Africa, as to the position we are in and the progress made, and to give some explanation of recent events, and give some indication of the policy and objects of the authorities in South Africa with regard to the prosecution of the war. What I mean is this. This is one of the occasions upon which we may ask for information of this kind. I do not think there ever has been a war on a great scale in which the general public has been so little informed. Whether it is necessary or not, we will not now inquire, but I think the people of this country have been extremely patient and have shown a great deal of forbearance and restraint in remaining for weeks and months with such imperfect information. The same observation applies to China, though it is more limited in its scope. The other day we had a statement from a responsible Minister of the Crown upon the subject of China. I do not know whether the right hon. Gentleman could make a similar statement on this occasion. If not, I hope we shall not remain week after week in the same condition of ignorance in which we are, and that some opportunity will be taken to give some explanation and indication of the course of conduct pursued by those in office in South Africa, and some indication of the Government's general view of the prospects.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): A number of questions have been

asked me as to the situation in South Africa, and I think in dealing with them, I had perhaps better commence with the smallest first. With regard to the questions of the hon. Member for Leicester, I hope no section of individuals who have borne a share in the war will be forgotten when the time comes to give rewards. But, at the same time, I must call attention to the fact that an enormous number of men have been engaged on the lines of communication in various capacities in connection with so large an army as we have in South Africa.

MR. BROADHURST: Not a large number of engine-drivers.

*MR. BRODRICK: No; but a large number of individuals, and anything we do for any particular class must bear some relation to what we can do as a whole. The efforts made and the strain placed on the class of railway servants to whom the hon. Member alludes will not be forgotten, and will receive full recognition.

Now, Sir, this discussion was opened by the hon. Member for South Wolverhampton, who seemed to attach undue importance to certain aspects of the question as to the supply of cartridges, to which allusion was made by the First Lord of the Treasury the other day. Let me clear away an idea that seems to permeate the

hon. Gentleman's mind, that the object of introducing the subject was to make party use of it. All those who remember what passed on that occasion will know that the First Lord of the Treasury was advocating the necessity of our giving full attention, not only to the increased supplies which might be necessary for the defence of the Empire, but also to the maintenance of the reserve of stores, and he, one by one, took the chief items of increase which have raised our Army Estimates from £18,000,000 to £30,000,000, and justifying them in the gross asked the House whether, in each item as he brought it forward, it was necessary to make a reduction. In the course of that review he came to the question of stores, and mentioned that we were brought to a low ebb at one period of the war by unexpected

demands. I do not think that anything which had to do with party was introduced into the debate. But the right hon. Gentleman opposite thought it right to interject an observation with regard to the state of affairs in 1895. That undoubtedly led us into some little party discussion, but I look upon the matter as one that has nothing to do with party at all. [Cheers.]

As I am challenged by that cheer, let me remind the House that before ever I brought this subject forward in the House, in the time of the Liberal Government, I submitted the whole of the facts in a private letter to the right hon. Gentleman, who was then at the War Office, and which I quoted. Whatever I did in the matter at that time was from a sense of public duty. But that is not what I rose to say. I thought it right to answer the right hon. Gentleman upon this point. But the hon. Member for South Wolverhampton said we had been guilty of manufacturing; what was technically known as Mark IV. ammunition with a soft-nosed bullet, but that we had not used this ammunition in South Africa. That is true. We withdrew it from South Africa, first, because in 1899 the bullet was found to some extent to strip in the barrel, and secondly, because bullets which could be brought in any degree under the term "explosive bullets" were censured by The Hague Conference. That kind of cartridge was consequently withdrawn from South Africa and elsewhere. The Leader of the House truly stated the other day that, having regard to these withdrawals, the supply of ammunition was brought to a very low ebb. But there is a large amount of that ammunition remaining which is available for practice, and has been, and is being, used for that purpose. In this connection I may remind the House that we had a campaign in Chitral in which it was found that the bullet did not stop the enemy; it was necessary to find a bullet which would stop the enemy. In the present war our antagonists have had to act in a similar way, I presume, from the same reasons, but in a greater number of cases pouches have been taken containing bullets the heads of which had been cut off for that purpose.

MR. DILLON: The enemy took them in great numbers from your troops.

*MR. BRODRICK: Of whom a good many were Irish; But this sort of suggestion at the expense of British soldiers is not worthy to occupy the attention of the House. But, on the main point, we have been attacked because, as it has been said, the late Government having been turned out on a Parliamentary Vote, we followed in the wake of the late Government. The hon. Member for the Chelmsford division of Essex said he felt he ought almost to make

an apology to the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition for having voted against him on that occasion. I am sure he need not make any such apology, because, no matter what Government happens to be in power, if the division is on an Army subject, my hon. friend is always found on the side opposed to the Government.

MAJOR RASCH: Not always.

*MR. BRODRICK: Well, nearly always. When he attacked Lord Lansdowne for following in the wake of the late Government he ignored the fact which has been brought before the House on more than one occasion; that Lord Lansdowne accumulated a store of ammunition nearly double in amount of that accumulated by the late Government, and yet, owing to the withdrawal of Mark IV., we found a difficulty in keeping up the supply.

MR. NORMAN: I am sorry to interrupt, but the right hon. Gentleman misconceives my point. I do not recollect that the First Lord of the Treasury said in his speech that the smallness of supply was due to the withdrawals. The right hon. Gentleman said that the smallness of the quantity was in spite of the fact that factories were working twenty-four hours a day and seven days a week. I believe the suggestion that it was due to withdrawals was first made by myself this afternoon.

*MR. BRODRICK: That is so, but the hon. Member has most exaggerated views as to what factories and private firms can produce. He said ten or twelve millions a week, but that cannot

be done; and, what is more, it takes many months before factories can arrive at their full output. All I can say is this; I believe the Government laid in a store of ammunition which, tested by any table or standard, must be considered adequate. Then we entered upon a campaign which has been far beyond anybody's expectations. The First Lord of the Treasury was well advised, I think, in calling attention to the fact that it is not a time to be grudging a large expenditure for Army supplies when we so recently found ourselves running short. That was my right hon. friend's point. In order that the hon. Gentleman may have the anxiety he professes allayed as to the present condition, I have great satisfaction in telling him that, in spite of the demands of the war, despite all the claims of South Africa, we have in the country a considerably larger reserve now than we had at the commencement of the war, and that reserve is being increased by several million rounds a week, at a pace that will build up such a reserve as we have never had in the country before.

One word on the remarks of the hon. Member for Elland with regard to the Boer prisoners. I need hardly reply at any length, for he admitted that the general treatment of the prisoners was all that could be desired, but he made attack upon our sending prisoners to Ahmednagar, accusing us of selecting the hottest place in India. Well, the Equator cannot be moved to suit our convenience. I do not know whether the hon. Member is a great traveller, but with my own small experience of travel I could undertake to find many places from which he would be very glad to find himself transferred to Ahmednagar. I can only say that the Government of India, with the fullest desire to do their best for the prisoners, and to save a long journey from the coast at the hot time of the year, chose

Ahmednagar as a healthy and appropriate place. I sincerely hope it will prove to be so. Then the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen made an attack upon us with regard to Zulu raids for cattle.

MR. BRYCE: I asked a question; I did not make an attack.

*MR. BRODRICK: Then the right hon. Gentleman's manner when he asks a question is so very like his manner when he makes an attack that I was unable to detect the difference. I have not the advantage of speaking from Papers, for I only heard this afternoon that the right hon. Gentleman intended to raise the subject. If I recollect the telegrams aright, the Zulus who were allowed to collect stock in the neighbourhood of their border were unarmed. If that be so; as I believe it is; the whole case which the right hon. Gentleman makes out of armed Zulus being encouraged to raid Boer territory falls to the ground. He talked of letting loose natives on an already demoralised enemy. There is no question of the kind.

MR. BRYCE: Those are not my words. I quoted those as being words that appeared in The Times, as spoken by a member of the Legislative Assembly of Natal; they were not my own words at all.

*MR. BRODRICK: The right hon. Gentleman is very fond of giving us quotations. We have had three speeches during the session in which there have been a series of quotations which he has not been able to make good.

MR. BRYCE: As the right hon. Gentleman makes such a statement I must ask him to substantiate it. [Cries of "Withdraw."]

*MR. BRODRICK: I cannot without referring to the right hon. Gentleman's speeches, and I cannot be expected to have references to the right hon. Gentleman's speeches ready. I simply give my recollection. The right hon. Gentleman has made two or three very strong speeches during this session on the state of affairs in South Africa, and he has not always been able to make good the statements therein contained.

MR. BRYCE: But give the proof.

*MR. BRODRICK: The right hon. Gentleman will find that I am correct by referring to Hansard. Some of the statements I have refuted myself. But what I desire to say with reference to the Zulus is this. We are discussing the matter, as I informed the right hon. Gentleman this afternoon, in the absence of correspondence and solely upon the few telegrams which have passed, and from these we find that what occurred was this. The Zulus were allowed to protect their own border against incursions by stray Boer bands, and they were allowed by British officers to assist, unarmed, in collecting stock outside their frontier. This was objected to by the Prime Minister of Natal, and Lord Kitchener took action in the matter. Whether that action gave complete satisfaction or not I do not yet know, but, at all events, it appears to have given satisfaction. He appears to have considered the matter with great care so that Zulus should not be encouraged in raiding. I cannot help saying before I leave this subject that we in this country have great reason to be proud of the way in which our officers and men have behaved in regard to the natives and the manner in which they have kept natives out of any active participation in hostilities.

MR. BRYCE: That is exactly what I said.

*MR. BRODRICK: I think the right hon. Gentleman put a good deal more stress on the other side, and seemed to have a disposition to dwell on any occasion there might be for criticism, rather than to express the satisfaction we feel that the British standard of conduct with regard to natives has been maintained under very great difficulties in all parts of South Africa.

Then, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition has asked for a statement upon the general course of the war. It is quite reasonable that at intervals-Parliament should ask for an assurance that every effort is being made to bring the war to a conclusion, and that it should be made aware of any special steps which the Government may have taken at a particular moment to that end. But the moment chosen for the inquiry is not a very useful one, and for this reason. Sir A.

Milner is expected hourly in this country, and naturally it is the desire of the Government to communicate with him, their chief administrative officer in South Africa; and what may pass between the Government and Sir A. Milner will no doubt be important, while the information we obtain from him in conversation will be much greater than we can receive by telegraph. So far as the War Office is concerned, every communication from Lord Kitchener proves that he is satisfied that steady progress is being made. The great area of the war, the great dispersion of the Boers in small parties, undoubtedly tends to the prolongation of operations, but I ask the House to note that these operations have been conducted on our part within the last few weeks with a minimum of loss; that in itself is satisfactory; and also that the number of Boers who have surrendered is out of all proportion to the number killed or wounded. Stores and ammunition taken and the destruction or capture of guns from the enemy indicate that the process of exhaustion, on which a great deal must depend, is going forward, and with some rapidity. At the same time we are fully aware of the desirability, mentioned by the hon. Member for South Molton, of avoiding the depletion of stock in the country, so that we may lay a foundation for the future return of the population. But if the right hon. Gentleman will defer his question for a short period we shall be in a much better position to give the information for which he asks. It is the winter season, and the operations of the various columns, with their equipment, by Lord Kitchener must, of course, have very important results in the conduct of the war. Those new columns have only recently been formed. I am glad to say the new troops which have arrived, in Lord Kitchener's opinion, more than justify any anticipation that might have been formed of them, and I am myself satisfied that, while everything has been done which lies in the power of the Government to support Lord Kitchener, there is every disposition on his part, by a most judicious treatment of the heavy administrative affairs which now lie on him, to do all that he can towards a rapid conclusion of the war. I trust that the House of Commons will, therefore, continue to us for a brief measure the confidence which must be placed in the Government in these circumstances, and will believe that although the reports we are able to give are meagre, yet that operations have reached the phase in which reports necessarily cannot be very full or very exciting. We have given substantially to the House of Commons almost all the information which has been given to us as regards the progress of

the war; we desire to make no concealment; we have given a very full statement of the whole progress of events in South Africa, and in those circumstances I trust we shall be accorded that measure of confidence which is necessary to us to prosecute the war.

MR. M'KENNA: I rise for the purpose of calling attention to the appointment of a Birmingham doctor as one of His Majesty's inspectors of schools. [Cries of "Oh, oh" and "Divide."] If hon. Members will allow me to continue, I can assure them they will be very interested in this case before it is finished.

They will discover, as in most things which happen in Birmingham, there is a good deal behind it. This is the case of a doctor; Dr. Henry Ward Irvine, who was brought before the General Medical Council on a charge which I will read, because it will enable the House to understand at once the position of affairs.

[The hon. Member read the charge, which was to the effect that Dr. Irvine had accepted the office of consulting physician to an institution at Birmingham, and approved of or acquiesced in extensive advertisements by that institution setting forth his qualifications and special ability, and inviting the public to consult him at a reduced fee.]

The House will immediately understand that in so doing this medical practitioner had committed a serious offence against the rules laid down by the medical profession. He was doing something which is considered to be beneath the dignity of the profession, namely, he was touting for practice by means of advertisements. His conduct was brought before the Medical Council, and after hearing evidence for and against this Dr. Irvine, the Council came to the following conclusion;

"The President informed Dr. Irvine that the charge which he had been required to answer had been proved to the satisfaction of the Council; that the further consideration of the charge proved against him had been adjourned until the May session; that the Council regarded the conduct complained of as being of a serious character; and that in adjourning the case it gave him an opportunity to reconsider his position."

I am quoting from the report of the General Medical Council, and the proceedings to which I have referred took place on November 29th, 1900, and will be found recorded at page 119. The House will perceive that the situation at this moment was this: A medical practitioner had been suspended; I think that is the correct word to use; at any rate, the case against him had been adjourned until the May session, in order to allow him to clear his character of the charge made against him. The charge was a serious one. The body which brought the charge against him, and which had adjudicated in the case, is a statutory authority, with power given to it by Parliament to adjudge in cases of this kind. The gentleman is a medical man, properly qualified, and, if we may rely upon the advertisement issued in Birmingham, of considerable medical attainments. What happened? During the period between the hearing of the case and the time fixed for its further consideration, this gentleman withdraws from the medical profession, and is appointed one of His Majesty's inspectors of schools.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?

MR. M'KENNA: I will tell the House why not. His Majesty's inspectors of schools

ought not to be appointed from doctors who are under a charge of delinquency. Have we no greater regard for our schools than that we are content to put in the prominent post of inspector of schools a man who is qualified as a doctor and not as a school inspector, and a man who, in his own profession, has been brought under the ban of the properly-constituted authority, and is practically suspended for the time being? Is that as sufficient answer to the hon. Gentleman who asked me "Why not"? I might more properly ask this House, Why was the gentleman appointed as a school inspector; why is it the moment you touch a case from Birmingham you always;["Oh, oh!"];

yes, you always have to inquire more deeply into the causes which lead to this or that preferment or promotion? I should be glad if the Vice-President will tell me whether, when this appointment was made, he was aware that this gentleman was a doctor who had been brought before the General Medical Council for conduct which they regarded as being of a serious character;

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley): Might I ask whether there was any other charge against this doctor than that of advertising?

MR. M'KENNA: It is within the recollection of the House that in opening my observations I read the charge from beginning to end. If the hon. Gentleman wishes to reply to me he will have an opportunity of so doing, but he cannot suggest that I have concealed anything from the House in this matter. It is true there is one thing I have not mentioned; I have not given the names of the persons who were interested in this doctor, nor have I referred to any name in that connection, and I do not see that there is any reason for my doing so.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I think you had better. As the whole speech is an insinuation, I think we had better have the charge with the names.

MR. M'KENNA: I am astonished that the right hon. Gentleman is so sensitive. He has not hesitated on any occasion to charge a number of us with being traitors, and, for my part, I confess that, having been charged by the right hon.

Gentleman with being a pro-Boer, Little Englander, and traitor; charges of which the right hon. Gentleman has not the least shadowy substance of proof; I am not very concerned as to what he says, whether as to the names he wishes me to read or as to the charges he brings against me. But if the House is anxious to have the names of the witnesses called in defence of this doctor I am perfectly willing to read them. The first witness, as far as I can gather from the proceedings, called in defence of Dr. Irvine, was Mr. William Cooke, J. P., Alderman of

the city of Birmingham, Chairman of the Hospital Saturday Fund.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: And Chairman of the Liberal Association.

MR. M'KENNA: That piece of information is not given me in this book. The next witness was Mr. W. S. Aston, A. C. A., hon. secretary to the Institution.

Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman can give us some further information as to him. The third witness was Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, J. P. There is no other description given of him. Those are, so far as I know, the only three witnesses who were called in defence of Dr. Henry Ward Irvine, but I have no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman, as he seems to be familiar with the persons who were

called as witnesses in the case, will be able to give the House some explanation as to who recommended this medical officer for the post of school inspector, and how it was that the President or the Vice-President of the Council ever heard of the name of this Birmingham doctor as qualified for the post. I have no doubt that either the right hon. Gentleman or the Vice-President of the Council will be able to give the House the fullest information on this very delicate case.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: We have listened to a speech which is characteristic both of the hon. Gentleman who has made it and of the quarter of the House from which it proceeds. The hon. Gentleman, displaying in his face the awful sign of serious emotion, asked the House to deal with a mystery which required the deepest and closest investigation. He pointed out to the House that, as it concerned Birmingham, it would be a matter of the greatest interest, and that the most attentive consideration would be required of the influences connected with that city. In the course of his speech he stated that there were names which he might have mentioned, but which he was willing to withhold, in connection with this extraordinary conspiracy, and from beginning to end there was an insinuation by the hon. Gentleman, which I cannot characterise in parliamentary terms, that something underhand and wrong had been done at Birmingham, and, of course, the Member for West Birmingham was concerned.

I knew nothing about any intention to introduce this matter. The hon. Gentleman when he desires to attack me of course never gives me notice, but in the present instance I know something of the matter, and I shall be very glad to give the facts to the House. I know nothing whatever about this gentleman, Dr. Irvine; whom I have never seen, whom I have never spoken to in my life; except what the hon. Gentleman has said as to his being appointed inspector of schools. I have never recommended him or suggested him, nor had I even heard of his name until the hon. Gentleman introduced it. My right hon. friend the Vice-President of the Council will explain this part of the matter, and will no doubt state to the House why this Gentleman was appointed inspector of schools. But now as to the story. It is unfortunate, really, that hon. Gentlemen below the gangway cannot attack the Secretary of State for the Colonies without attacking other people. After all, the Secretary of State for the Colonies does not mind, but it is a distinct abuse, in my opinion, of the privileges of the House to bring in the names of people who are in no way connected with the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and, in attacking the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to level charges and insinuations against other persons. What has the hon. Gentleman done with respect to Dr. Irvine? He represents to the House of Commons that Dr. Irvine is under a ban, that his character is under consideration by the Medical Council. There is not an atom of foundation for that. If the hon. Gentleman had made the slightest inquiry he would know that the only charge against the gentleman is that of having infringed what I may call the trade union rule of the medical profession. He would have known that there was absolutely nothing against his private character.

MR. M'KENNA: I never alleged it. The right hon. Gentleman has stated that I used the phrase "under a ban." I never used that phrase. I repeated the exact charge in the words of the charge, and I added not one jot or one tittle to the charge.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The interruption of the hon. Gentleman only shows with how little care he brings his charges. The hon. Gentleman forgets what he said himself.

MR. M'KENNA: No, I do not.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I am in the recollection of the House. The hon. Gentleman spoke of this doctor as being a delinquent. He spoke distinctly of his character having been inquired into by the Medical Council, he spoke of him as being suspended. It is perfectly ridiculous under those circumstances now to say that if I had allowed this charge to remain unanswered this gentleman would not have been under suspicion of having done something unworthy of his profession or his character as a gentleman. Now what is the history? The history is this. Certain gentlemen in Birmingham, among whom were prominent my brother, Mr. Arthur Chamberlain, and Mr. Alderman Cooke, the chairman of the Liberal Association, and other gentlemen of all politics in Birmingham, devised a new charity for Birmingham, as to which I will say nothing, except that at all events it was devised absolutely and entirely from philanthropic and charitable motives, and the object was to secure for the working classes of Birmingham the advantages of consultation with eminent practitioners which they could not get under existing circumstances without payment beyond their means. The object was to secure a gentleman of high professional reputation as consulting physician to whom this charitable institution would be able to send the working people who might be in need of his services. Dr. Irvine was chosen. The mere fact that he was chosen by such a society is, I think, in itself some indication of his professional standing. The moment he was chosen the greatest possible objection was taken on behalf of the medical profession. I do not wish to go into these matters, but it must be evident to the House that the appointment of a gentleman to a position of this kind might have the effect of injuring the business of other private practitioners, of those, in fact, who up to that time had been receiving higher fees for similar work. I think it is not at all unnatural that that complaint should be

made. The complaint was carried to the Medical Council, and the Council, as I understand, gave as their decision that if this gentleman did not retire from the position to which he had been appointed in connection with this charitable association they would do something; I suppose strike him off the list. I have forgotten exactly what it was. There is the whole charge against this gentleman, and there is the whole punishment that could by any possibility have been inflicted upon him. What I know to have been the case is this; that Dr. Irvine, for good reasons no doubt, thought it his duty to bow to the decision of the Medical Council, and he did give notice to the association that he would be unable to continue his services to the charity, and I believe he has retired from this appointment. I believe the association has either already appointed, or intends to appoint, another gentleman of professional eminence, and I hope they will find someone who will carry out the eminently beneficial objects they have in view. There is the whole story. It is in connection with a story like this, a story of a charity in which men of all classes and all politics in Birmingham are concerned, that the hon. Gentleman gets up and with an air of

mystery wishes to make the House believe that he has discovered a plot in which the Secretary of State for the Colonies is concerned.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): In a matter of this kind, which amounts almost to a serious scandal, we ought not to be led astray upon a personal issue. In opening this case my hon. friend below the gangway simply brought forward an instance without making any personal references. [Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh";] Well, I was here all the time and I did not hear any. He mentioned no names, but upon this point I am within the recollection of the House. He mentioned no names except to bring forward this fact, that a member of the medical profession, by a statutory judicial body, had been placed in the position of being struck off the register of an honourable profession for conduct;

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: He was not struck off.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: Well, he was in a position to be struck off. Practically he is yet a prisoner under remand. [Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh";] I must ask, Mr. Speaker, the House to give me an opportunity of putting this matter right. I do not know Dr. Irvine, and I am, in this respect, in the same position as the right hon. Gentleman opposite. But I have an advantage as an old member of the General Medical Council which only one other Member of this House has. There is another Member of this House who is a member of the General Medical Council. I allude to the Member for the University of Edinburgh, who, I have no doubt, will tell us the views of the General Medical Council on this question. The Medical Council has power under the Medical Act to inquire into the conduct of medical men, and this is an important duty, not only in the interests of the profession, but still more in the interests of the public. They are bound to keep the medical profession pure, and any man brought before them has to be charged with infamous conduct in a professional sense. [Cries of "No, no";] I think we shall get to close quarters in a moment. The Act says that if any registered medical practitioner should be convicted in England or Ireland of any felony or misdemeanour, or in Scotland of any crime or offence, or should after due inquiry; which has been held in this case; be judged by the General Council to have been guilty of infamous conduct in any professional respect, certain consequences should follow. Those are the words of the statute. MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Does the hon. Gentleman say that to take lower fees than are usual is "infamous conduct"?

SIR WALTER FOSTER: It does not lie in my power to give any definition of infamous conduct. The definition is given by thirty eminent men, five representing the Crown, and including representatives of each University, and they have to define what infamous conduct is. They have defined it in this case, and they have found the man guilty. [AN HON. MEMBER: What was he guilty of?] He was guilty of what the General

Medical Council considered to be unprofessional conduct. Under this section of the Act of Parliament the Medical Council may direct the registrar to erase anybody's name from the medical register. That is the state of the law, and if the law is bad then it is the duty of the Government to alter it. This Act has not only been on the Statute-book since the year 1858, but it has been amended

over and over again since that time, and there has never been any attempt to strike these words out. What happens? This gentleman goes to Birmingham, where he accepts an appointment. I say nothing about the institution, for that is not my business, but the business of the General Medical Council. The General Medical Council, after due inquiry, considered that the charges made against this doctor of unprofessional conduct were proved, and they stated in their judgment that they were proved. I heard of this trial, and I heard the result afterwards. What happened? Out of kindness for this gentleman the General Medical Council, as is their practice in some cases, did not proceed to exact the full penalty of striking his name off the register. They remanded him, as it were, to come up for judgment in six months. I am myself largely responsible for this mode of action, because I think a summary decision in a case of this kind sometimes does an injustice, and it occasionally happens that the Council go back on their decision out of pity or kindness, or after further consideration of the evidence brought before them. You have in this case a judicial body coming to a conclusion, and they demand, as it were, that this gentleman shall come up in six months for judgment. That is the decision of a judicial body and a very high authority. It is such a high authority that no judge in the land has ever attempted to question their decision. Over and over again the judgments of the Medical Council have been challenged in the law courts, and no judge has ever justified any attempt to upset their decisions. On the contrary, the strongest judges in the land have upheld these decisions, and they have said that the Medical Council are the judges of what infamous conduct is in the profession, and that you cannot go behind the judgment of the General Medical Council. This is the General Medical Council of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and it lays down a standard of conduct for the profession. While any man is before that Council with charges against him proved, and while he is waiting for judgment, I say he is under the ban of one of the highest judicial tribunals of the country. This is a position that I am sorry for any man to be placed in. I am not going to argue about his case, for I have nothing to do with that, but I do say that it is not right, in the interests of the country, that a man in this position, before his character is cleared, should be selected as an inspector of schools.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: His character?

SIR WALTER FOSTER: Yes, in a professional sense. You have got to have this matter cleared up by the General Medical Council, and you do not know yet what may be the judgment of the Council. The Council will meet, and this gentleman will be summoned to appear before it, and in what capacity does he now go before the Council? He does not go before the Council as a simple medical practitioner, but as one of His Majesty's inspectors of schools. Is that a position in which an inspector of schools ought to be placed? He will have to come before the judges of his profession;

*MR. BUTCHER (York): May I ask, for the information of the House, what is the infamous conduct which is alleged against this gentleman?

SIR WALTER FOSTER: The hon. and learned Gentleman is trying to confuse the issue. The definition of his conduct is not with me, but with the General

Medical Council.

*MR. BUTCHER: I should be exceedingly obliged if the right hon. Gentleman could tell the House what the infamous conduct is which has been alleged against this gentleman.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: I have nothing to do with that. I have quoted a judicial body whose judgment has been maintained in courts of law over and over again. The Medical Council, having found this gentleman guilty of charges, have power to strike his name off the register. Out of mercy they did not do it, and they ask him to come up for judgment in six months time. I contend, purely on public grounds, that no man in such a position as this doctor, awaiting the judgment of the General Medical Council on a charge of which he had been found guilty, ought to have been appointed to high public office, especially as the body which made the appointment, the Privy Council, rules the General Medical Council. And so you have this scandal; that the Privy Council, which has the control of the General Medical Council, takes a person found guilty by the General Medical Council, and whose character has not been cleared in a professional sense, and they give him an appointment outside his own profession under the Privy Council of the country. I say that that is a position in which the Privy Council ought not to be placed. It is a position in which the King, who signs the appointments of inspectors of schools, should not have been placed. [Ministerial cries of "Order."]

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

SIR WALTER FOSTER: I withdraw the expression referring to His Majesty. It is an elementary principle in public patronage that you should select persons against whom there is nothing of this kind hanging over their heads. I do not for a moment introduce the question of fitness for the appointment, but I think that, in the interests of the administration of any public department, no person has a right to select a man for a public official position who at that time has to have a charge cleared up; a charge which has appeared in all the papers, and which is known to the whole country. Such a man ought not to be selected for a high official position. On these grounds I think this is a scandal, which does not redound to the credit of the Privy Council, and it is a case which I think my hon. friend was perfectly justified in bringing forward.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I do not want to

prolong the debate, but this is a question upon which I should like to say a few words. Dr. Irvine was selected from a large number of candidates for the appointment of inspector of schools by my noble friend the Lord President of the Council. He was selected because he had very exceptional qualifications, and because, in the opinion of my noble friend, he was the most fit person upon the list of candidates to receive such an appointment. Dr. Irvine has a very distinguished degree of Trinity College, Dublin, and, not being a man of great means, he supported himself before and after he took his medical degree by acting as a teacher and master in several secondary schools in Ireland.

Therefore, it will be seen that Dr. Irvine has had a very large teaching experience, and his degree was of a very first-rate character. At the time the

appointment was made my noble friend the Lord President of the Council and myself had not heard of this charge against Dr. Irvine. [Opposition cries of "Oh."] How could they have heard of it?

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Hain, Edward
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Hambro, Charles Eric
Arrol, Sir William
Cranborne, Viscount
Hamilton, Rt Hn L'd G (Midd'x
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Austin, Sir John
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Bain, Col. James Robert
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Balcarres, Lord
Dalkeith, Earl of
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Heaton, John Henniker
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds
Denny, Colonel
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Higginbottom, S. W.
Banbury, Frederick George
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead

Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Hogg, Lindsay
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Doxford, Sir William T.
Hope, J. F. (Sheffi'd, Brightside)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Duke, Henry Edward
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B. (Hants
Faber, George Denison
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Bigwood, James
Fardell, Sir T. George
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Bill, Charles
Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury).
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Finch, George H.
Keswick, William
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Fisher, William Hayes
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Brymer, William Ernest
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.
Law, Andrew Bonar
Bull, William James
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Butcher, John George
Forster, Henry William
Lawson, John Grant
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Foster, Sir M. (London Univ.)
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. E. H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Garfit, William
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William

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

Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Long, Rt. Hon. W. (Bristol, S.

Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Loyd, Archie Kirkman

Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm

Goschen, Hon. George J.

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft

Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r

Green, Walford D (Wednesbury

Macdona, John Cumming

Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry

Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)

MacIver, David (Liverpool)

Chapman, Edward

Gretton, John

Maconochie, A. W.

Charrington, Spencer

Groves, James Grimble

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

SIR WALTER FOSTER: You receive the minutes of the General Medical Council at the Privy Council.

SIR J. GORST: Neither my noble friend the Lord President of the Council nor myself have sufficient leisure to acquaint ourselves with the proceedings, of the General Medical Council. But, even if the matters alleged in the course of the debate had been brought to the notice of the Board of Education, we should not have seen in them any reason whatever for reconsidering their decision.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) rose to continue the discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put."

Question put, "That the Question be now put."

The House divided:;Ayes, 191; Noes, 121. (Division List No. 202.)

M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.

Rankin, Sir James

Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)

M'Killop, James (Stirlingsh.)

Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

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

Malcolm, Ian

Ratcliffe, R. F.

Thornton, Percy M.

Martin, Richard Biddulph

Remnant, James Farquharson

Tollemache, Henry James
Mitchell, William
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Renwick, George
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Valentia, Viscount
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Walker, Col. William Hall
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Rutherford, John
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Mount, William Arthur
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Webb, Colonel William George
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd
Muntz, Philip A.
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Whiteley, H. (Asht'n-und. Lyne
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Myers, William Henry
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Seton-Karr, Henry
Wills, Sir Frederick
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath

Parkes, Ebenezer
Smith, H. C. (N'rth'mb Tyneside
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Peel, Hn. W. Robert Wellesley
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Pemberton, John S. G.
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Plummer, Walter R.
Stock, James Henry
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Pretymen, Ernest George
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Purvis, Robert
Stroyan, John
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Pym, C. Guy
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Randles, John S.
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Allen, C. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Ambrose, Robert
Fuller, J. M. F.
O'Malley, William
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Gilhooly, James
O'Mara, James
Blake, Edward
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Boland, John
Grant, Corrie
Partington, Oswald
Boyle, James
Griffith, Ellis J.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Brigg, John
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Price, Robert John
Broadhurst, Henry
Harwood, George
Priestley, Arthur
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Hayden, John Patrick
Reddy, M.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Burke, E. Haviland
Healy, Timothy Michael
Redmond, William (Clare)
Burt, Thomas
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Horniman, Frederick John
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Caldwell, James
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Joyce, Michael
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Causton, Richard Knight
Labouchere, Henry
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Channing, Francis Allston
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Smith, Samuel (Flint)
Clancy, John Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Cogan, Denis J.

Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants
Colville, John
Lloyd-George, David
Stevenson, Francis S.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lundon, W.
Sullivan, Donal
Crean, Eugene
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Cremer, William Randal
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Cullinan, J.
M'Crae, George
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Dermott, Patrick
Thompson, Dr. EC (Monagh'n, N
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
M'Govern, T.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.
Delany, William
Mooney, John J.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)
Wallace, Robert
Dillon, John
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Weir, James Galloway
Donelan, Captain A.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Doogan, P. C.
Moss, Samuel
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)
Murphy, J.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Edwards, Frank
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Emmott, Alfred
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.

Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Lough and Mr. M'Kenna.

Farquharson, Dr. Robert

Norman, Henry

Fenwick, Charles

O'Brien, Kendal (T'pper'ry Mid

Ffrench, Peter

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Question put accordingly, and agreed to.

Resolved, That, To-morrow, the House at its rising do adjourn till Thursday, the 6th of June, and that at the conclusion of Government Business Mr. Speaker do adjourn the House without Question put.

FINANCE BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [20th May], "That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed; Debate resumed.

*MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said that this Finance Bill was the most important introduced into the House of Commons for a century, and he had endeavoured to understand its leading features. In the discussion it had been assumed that steps should be taken to reform the national system of finance, because it was not really sufficient for the needs of the nation. No fact had been brought out more strikingly than the statement about what the normal income of the country would have been without any increase of taxation this year or last. When the present Government came into office six years ago they enjoyed from their predecessors a surplus of no less than £4,500,000. If to that surplus was added the natural increase of the taxes that then existed, the amount that had been diverted to give the doles to the landlords in connection with the agricultural rates, and the amount that had been obtained by suspending the Sinking Fund, they found that the income of the country to-day would be twenty-three millions more than it was six years ago. When they found that with the income tax at 8d. instead of 1s. 2d., without the new sugar duty, which would be so oppressive, and without the coal export duty, they would have enjoyed an income of twenty-three millions more than six years ago; that was a fact which ought to sink into the mind of the nation. How had the difficulties in finance arisen? They had arisen from the extravagance of the Government. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had pleaded that the Government had been supported by the House in every extravagant proposal they had made. He doubted many of those broad statements. They had been told that not a voice had been raised in favour of economy; but that was not the case. Constant voices had been raised both inside and outside the House in favour of economy, but the Government paid no attention to them. Now, all this extravagance was really confined to one Department, although an attempt had been made to spread it over all the Departments of the State. It had been said that there had been extravagance in the Civil Service. One feature of the Civil Service which had not been noticed in the House was

that a great portion of that increase was due to war expenditure, and it was a most extraordinary thing that war expenditure had thus crept into the Civil Service Estimates; such as the cost of the wars on the West Coast of Africa and in Uganda as well as the cost of the Uganda Railway. Apart from that, they could lay their finger upon one point of extravagance, namely, the great increase in warlike expenditure. The Chancellor of the Exchequer told them that he would borrow twenty millions more than was absolutely necessary for contingencies. Since that statement was made the twenty millions had been borrowed, and there was nothing more certain than that these twenty millions would be spent this year. In the statement he was going to make to the House he would therefore add that twenty millions to the admitted expenditure. In the year 1895, the year before the Government came into office, the total warlike expenditure, excluding the items in the Civil Service Estimates and the Indian expenditure, was thirty-five millions. Four years afterwards, in 1899, it had increased to forty-four millions. In 1900 it amounted to sixty-nine millions, in 1901 to 120 millions, and in 1902 to 141 millions. Now, these were the most extraordinary figures ever submitted to the House. Within six years the warlike expenditure on the Army and Navy had increased from 35 millions to 141 millions. He maintained that no nation could stand such extravagant expenditure without suffering very great inconvenience, or, indeed, disasters of the worst character. It was said this was a normal increase; but he did not regard it as normal. It was too late to cry over spilt milk; they had got now to find the money. They had had a most ingenious and eloquent speech from the hon. Member for Exeter, but his little plans and ingenious suggestions would he no use whatever unless the House resolved to cut down the expenditure all round. They could not get back to a proper state without cutting down expenditure in every Department. The taunt was constantly flung at them about the necessity of having a strong Navy; but the question was what did a strong Navy mean as to cost? The expenditure on the Navy six years ago was 14 millions; and it had gradually advanced to 30 millions; and why might it not go on from 30 millions to 40 millions, or from forty millions to fifty millions?

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

*MR. LOUGH (resuming) said that the Naval Estimates had always been divided into two broad sections, one for maintenance and the other for new construction. It was the new construction which ran the country into expense. Ten millions were put down this year for new construction, and he thought that they ought to have gone more slowly and cut the item down to perhaps five millions. The present First Lord of the Admiralty had only been in office a few months, and yet he put before the House of Commons a larger sum for new construction than had ever been proposed by the most experienced First Lord of the Admiralty in the whole history of the House. There was a large field in the expenditure on the Navy, as well as on the Army, in which economy could be practised, for it would not be wise to continue this war-like expenditure on such a large scale. It had been stated that we were a rich nation, and that we could stand the expenditure, and that it

was a good investment. The previous night they had been assured again how rich we were, and that the nation could easily bear this burden of taxation. That was not so. We were rich, but we could not easily bear a sudden increase of taxation. He felt convinced that at the beginning of the last century, say in 1815, the nation was in many respects more able to find a great deal of ready money for new purposes than it was to-day. At that period money was hoarded in stockings, and was readily forthcoming; and that was the secret of the success of the tremendous efforts which the country then made. But to-day things were very different. The nation was rich, but its money was invested in other spheres, and it could not be got quickly to meet an enormous war expenditure which was unprofitable. That was the reason why he was apprehensive of this enormous weight of taxation. Why had there been such a great fall in the national securities? Consols had fallen 20 per cent. more than they had ever fallen in so short a period; and credit was shaken. In these days of keen competition no business could be successfully carried on without putting a large amount of capital into it. A hundred years ago there were no municipalities, comparatively speaking. Now hundreds of new municipalities were asking for capital, and that added to the rates. A great deal of money could be raised, no doubt, but if a sudden demand were made for money to a large amount there was sure to be a collapse, which would entail a great deal of suffering. He felt assured that if the Government had approached their Estimates in a spirit of economy they would not have needed the large amount of money they now asked for. The argument of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was that we were in a mess, and that we had got to find the money to get out of it; but that was no reason why the House should adopt the proposals of the Government without criticism. It was the business of the Opposition to find fault with the proposals of the Government, but not their business to make suggestions of other financial proposals to take their place. He wished the Opposition were, in fact, a great deal more

vigorous than they were in arguing the case against the Government. When industries were being destroyed, and securities were falling, it was the business of the Opposition to examine the Government proposals with care. We were only raising £10,000,000 by fresh taxation, and we required £70,000,000, so that we were raising one seventh by taxation and six sevenths by loan. He did not think one seventh was a sufficient proportion to raise by taxation.

The proposals of the Government embodied the maximum interference with the trade of this country. It had been said that there were only two fresh taxes. That was true; but what was the importance of the articles which were taxed? What was the history with regard to the coal trade for the last sixteen years? From the Return with which they had been supplied by the courtesy of the Financial Secretary to the Treasury he found that the capital employed was £110,000,000. There were five years when the interest on the capital was only 1 per cent., and the average for eleven out of the sixteen years was only 3½ per cent., and taking the whole of the sixteen years the profit shown upon this very speculative industry was only 6½ per cent. That was the history of the trade upon which the Government levied a new export duty; of the trade at which

they had aimed this heavy blow. The Government had generalised on one fact, they had taken the profits of a single year, when the profit was £40,000,000, and imposed an export duty on this important article which all great statesmen who had previously sat on the Treasury Bench had hesitated to touch. He thought the Government were making a great mistake. It was true that the tax did not touch Ireland, and in regard to that matter the Government was teaching the country that in the selection of the article to be taxed was to be found the solution of the problem of Irish taxation. He also protested against the sugar tax. The article selected in that case was an article of food largely used in this country, and also employed in many manufactures and minor industries, and that was one reason why it was a bad article to select; but the real objection was that in the case of that tax, also, there was the maximum interference with trade combined with a large measure of protection. The House might be willing to give the Government a sugar tax if it was fairly imposed, but this one was not. In this tax the Government had imposed twenty-three taxes on sugar. Many persons seemed to have forgotten the meaning of the words "free trade." Some had an idea that it had some connection with the corn laws, but they had no such connection except indirectly. The meaning of the words "free trade" meant that there should be no shackles of any kind imposed upon trade, and that merchants should not be asked to expose their invoices or say where they did their trade and tell their trade secrets. The most serious evil in the tax upon sugar was that it hit many very small industries. Very little interference was sufficient to destroy such industries in this country and transfer them to another, and it was a great pity that any blow should be given to them. But the Budget also applied to Ireland, and it was the business of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to bring in proposals which were just with regard to Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman had, he admitted, remembered Ireland on this occasion. It was almost the first time for sixty or eighty years that an article of great consumption had been taxed in England and not in Ireland. Such a thing showed that there was a tardy awakening on the part of the British Treasury. They were beginning to see that with one exchequer a fairer selection of the articles for taxation was a solution of the Irish financial problem. By the selection of one article Ireland was not hit at all, but in the selection of another (sugar) Ireland was hit very heavily. By the selection of certain articles the Government could ruin Ireland altogether. Seven years ago Ireland was paying £7,500,000, and its population was larger than it was at present. The taxation had now increased to £9,500,000. The Census returns showed that while England and Scotland were increasing in population and in wealth Ireland was moving in another direction. While Great Britain was getting greater and richer Ireland was getting poorer and her population decreasing. The crime of the House consisted in this; that it wrung almost the same increase of taxation out of the growing poverty of Ireland as it did out of the growing wealth of Great Britain. Including the proposals of the present Budget an additional two and three-quarter millions of taxation was being imposed on Ireland since 1893, although the country was then declared to be overtaxed to the extent of two and three-quarter millions. Such a state of

things must come to an end shortly, because if the House was constantly increasing the burdens of Ireland while her strength was constantly diminishing she would be crushed out of existence. Many of the proposals in the Budget were greatly to be deplored, and he hoped that they would be opposed at every stage. MR. FLOWER (Bradford, W.) said he shared to a great extent the views of the hon. Member on the question of financial relations, in fact he was the only one of the Unionist Members who last year gave the effective assistance of his vote when the question was before the House. On this occasion, however, he desired to claim the adherence of the hon. Gentleman on behalf of another part of the Empire also suffering from financial depression. A great opportunity he felt had been lost by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with regard to the sugar tax, of dealing in a satisfactory manner with the existing distress of our West Indian colonies. The financial assistance rendered last year to the West Indies amounted in all to no less than £320,000, £82,000 of which was for the relief of the distress caused by the hurricane in 1898. He could not help thinking that it was unfortunate that the right hon. Gentleman in his Budget did not see his way to granting equality of opportunity in the markets of the mother country to the West Indies. The question was, could the Government do that by this Budget? One could not strike a mathematical balance in these matters. The open bounties could be fought by a countervailing duty, but the bounties that were given by railway companies and others in the shape of reduced freights could not be estimated. He believed that giving colonial sugar a preference tariff would go far to minimise that evil. He would probably be told that we must wait until the time of the International Conference at Brussels, when the question could be discussed. But why should we wait until then? The sugar bounties did not represent the whole aid which foreign sugar got in competition with the colonial sugar, and even if it did, the removal of the bounty would not now give equal opportunity to the colonial sugar trade, which had been beaten down by the treatment meted out to it, while the foreign trade, fed by bounties, had grown luxuriously, and had an immense advantage. The work of the bounty had been done, and that was the reason why some Governments were now willing to withdraw the bounty. The colonies ought, on the other hand, to have some compensation for the damage which had already been done. Put on counter-vailing duties by all means, but give a preference beyond that. For the purposes of revenue countervailing duties were worse than useless; they were measures of reprisal; and though they would secure the withdrawal of bounties they would bring nothing into the Exchequer. The Chancellor of the Exchequer wanted revenue, and as he could not count on the countervailing duties for the purpose, we were thrown back on preference tariffs. He had been told that it would be exceedingly difficult to give a rebate on colonial sugar, because it would be difficult to earmark it, but the system of marking the packages, he imagined, would get rid of that difficulty. The Government having already accepted the principle of inter-Imperial preferential trade, had done much, and it was impossible now to argue against a preferential tariff for colonial sugar. Australia was at the parting of the ways. She was preparing the way for a new tariff, and she desired to include the mother country in the inter-Imperial

preference, but she hesitated to do so because there was no reciprocity in this country, and she would not enter into a policy of "all give and no take." He hoped the Government would see its way to come to some arrangement on the Committee stage which would not involve a serious loss of revenue, but would be of assistance to the colonies, and particularly the West Indies, in this matter, and that some scheme would be arrived at which would build up again an industry that was rapidly slipping away, and which would at the same time be an earnest of the desire of the Government of the mother country to forward the movement of the federation of the colonies.

*MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport): In common, I believe, with every Member who has the honour of a seat in this House, during the past six or seven years I have listened with great pleasure and admiration to the six Budget speeches of the Chancellor of the Exchequer because of the wisdom that was contained in them. We have heard during the past six years the wisest possible advice with regard to the virtue of economy and the soundness of free trade; but the unfortunate thing is this; that the Budget speeches of the right hon. Gentleman have not corresponded with his Budgets. I have never listened to any Budget speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer without being reminded of the saying of Mr. Sheridan when on one occasion addressing an audience from the hustings. Seated next to him on the opposite side of the wooden barrier was his opponent, and while Mr. Sheridan was addressing the audience he was hit in the mouth by an egg; and an electioneering egg at that; the man who threw it immediately shouted out, "I beg your pardon, I meant it for your opponent," and Mr. Sheridan replied, "I wish to Heaven you had meant it for me and had hit him." I take the same view with regard to the Budget speeches. I would do with a little less advice if we could have a little better Budget.

We have to meet an enormous expenditure not only in consequence of the war, but by the growth of the ordinary expenditure of the country. In order to meet this the Chancellor of the Exchequer has proposed an export duty on coal, an import duty on sugar, an increase on the income tax, and a vast increase of the Debt. To three out of those four proposals I absolutely object. I have an objection to his proposal with regard to the increase of the income tax, which does not however go down to the root of the matter; but I want to take these proposals in order, and I want to draw attention to some things that I have seen with regard to these proposals, and I want to say this, that the only sound principle of finance is that you take out of the pocket of the taxpayer the money you want; that is to say, direct taxation. The moment you commence indirect taxation you never know where you are. Now on the 18th April last the Chancellor of the Exchequer made his Budget speech; early on the morning of the 19th I went to Newport, Mon., and this is what I found. At midnight between the 18th and 19th an order had come down to Newport, a town of 62,000 inhabitants, which subsists entirely upon the export of coal, that no coal was to be exported until a duty of 1s. a ton had been paid upon it. The effect of that order was that the whole of the dock labourers were out of employment; before twelve o'clock noon the whole of the coal trucks which bring the coal from North Monmouth were crowded at the sidings, waiting at the tips unable to unload their coal; and

after twelve o'clock noon you had the whole of the railway men out of employment; by six o'clock at night you had mine managers issuing notices to the men that their services would not be required next day because they had no trucks to carry away the coal which they had got up, that the whole of the dumping grounds at the pits' mouths were occupied by the coal which they had put there. So that within twenty-four hours of the making of the Budget speech you had three industries paralysed in one small district.

Now, I hoped to have had an opportunity to address the House on the Report stage, and, knowing I was going to speak, I got a telegram. This is no anonymous communication such as those of the President of the Board of Agriculture. I am going to give the name of the person who sent it;

"Export trade stopped from midnight 18th to morning 23rd, except duty paid, when vessels only required small quantity to finish. Our firm's accumulation about 40,000 tons, others similar experience. Collieries and railways partially stopped three days; sidings contained probably 200,000 tons when work recommenced."

Signed Pyman, of Messrs. Pyman and

Watson, one of the biggest export firms we have. Now I do not know whether hon. Members are aware of the terms of the order which was sent down by the Treasury to the Customs House officers. I have the actual words of the order which went down to this same place; Newport. It is headed, "Concessions to British Contractors re Still Current Contracts";

CONCESSIONS TO BRITISH CONTRACTORS RE STILL CURRENT CONTRACTS.

With reference to telegram on the annexed form the following directions are issued for the guidance of contractors for the export of coal, etc., as to the nature of the information to be furnished in support of their claims, and which should, if possible, accompany the contracts themselves::

1. The contractor should understand that he should produce evidence to prove how much coal has already been supplied by him, and the contract, and how much remains to be so supplied.
2. To prove that the consignee or buyer abroad declines either to forego the contract or to allow the addition of the export duty to the price.
3. To prove the loss that would be entailed upon himself by his failing to fulfil his contract, e.g., loss of sums still due to him for coal already supplied under the contracts or forfeiture on deposit account.
4. It is to be explained that if either breaking or continuing to fulfil a contract involves nothing more than a non-realisation of previously expected profit, no concession must be expected.
5. Telegram received 7.3 p.m., 20th inst., contractors should be instructed to disclose and prove their margin of profits.

(By order)

M. J. HARTE,
Cardiff, 22nd April.
Collector.

What is the effect of that order? That very firm, whose name I have mentioned, under the direction of that order, did send to a firm in Paris with whom they

had a large contract for export of coal, previously made, a telegram to say that by order of the British Government they were obliged to ask them to pay them 1s. a ton more than they had contracted for, and this is the answer which they got. I give the actual words of the Paris firm;

"I certainly will not ask the buyers to now pay a higher price than that stipulated in accordance with your instructions in your telegram of the 17th inst.

"As long as I have been in business I have not broken my word yet, and the moment will not come when I shall do so. If the British Government chooses to insert a clause in the Coal Export Tax Bill that secures for your coal-masters and exporters an indemnity for breach of contract, your country has to decide whether it is wise or foolish to follow their lead. As far as I am concerned I must just bear the consequences for the small contract entered into with you as well as for a further 300,000 tons closed elsewhere, but I will maintain my reputation and uphold the honest name my firm has preserved now in the third generation."

A pretty sort of thing to have sent from a foreign country to an English firm; That is the position in which we are landed by this terrible "out tax," which is the beginning of a method of taxation which leads you, as I have said, you do not know where. Now, a large part of the South Wales coal is exported to Genoa to work the railways of North Italy, which bring food stuffs to England. What is the effect of this tax there? The freights on these railways will be raised, and consequently you will have the price of food raised in this country. That, I think, is a thing that has not yet been noticed.

I do not claim to be an expert with regard to coal in Northumberland, but twenty years ago I was interested in an educational movement there which brought me into contact with the miners, and I know something about the condition of the miners in that country. The figures are these, and I do not think they have been mentioned before. The total output of the mines is 11,000,000 tons a year, of which 7,600,000 go to north Germany. In north Germany you have, as was indicated by the hon. Member for Chester-le-Street, a sort of frontier inside the coast-line up to which Northumberland coal can be exported at a profit, but beyond which it comes into competition with Westphalian coal. The result of this 1s. a ton will be that that frontier line will be moved northward, and you will have a strip of land which now takes Northumberland coal which will cease to take it in the future. There are a number of pits in Northumberland which are working at a very narrow margin of profit, or at none at all. I have the honour to know a great many coal-owners, and they are not amongst the least humane of employers of labour in this country. If these men are millionaires they are keeping the pits working

because they do not want to discharge the men. What will be the effect of this Bill? I was asked that question in conversation a few days ago by an hon. friend, and I said a large number of breadwinners would be discharged. I was asked how many, and I said 6,000. The hon. Member for Wansbeck was asked the same question the day after, and he, not knowing what I had said, gave exactly the same figure. Does not such a state of things condemn the whole policy of

this tax? The most extraordinary arguments are used in favour of this tax. The Chancellor of the Exchequer says the foreigners are going to pay it, and the argument of his supporters is that it will come out of the coal-owners. It will not come out of the coal-owners. It is the colliery owners who are going to pay, not the men who own the royalties. Those are the men I should like to get at. Now, I want to refer to the sugar tax. I have not the honour of the acquaintance of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and, therefore, am not prejudiced in anything I may say. I have listened to him for nine years in the House, and I have watched his career for nearly thirty years. I have a very great respect for him, and therefore I hope he will see that in what I am going to say no disrespect towards him is intended. He said something in his Budget speech, which I know he was honest in saying, but which was so extraordinary a thing that, if it had been anybody else who had said it, I should scarcely have believed it was honestly said. He said that Mr. Gladstone would have voted for these proposals with regard to the taxation on sugar.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I only said that I thought so.

*MR. E. J. C. MORTON: That was all I meant to convey. But the point to remember is this, that Mr. Gladstone's speech to which the Chancellor of the Exchequer referred was made forty years ago, when sugar was a luxury. A change has happened since then, and sugar has become a staple article of food of the people. Mr. Gladstone would never have consented to tax the food of the people. I want the House seriously to consider one other thing, because, after all, these questions of finance are the primal and most important functions of Members of the House of Commons. The Chancellor of the Exchequer made in his Budget speech an extraordinary statement which I cannot at all understand. He said that the cost of the collection of this £5,100,000 which he expects to get out of the sugar duty is going to be only £40,000 a year, how are you going to catch this sugar at the ports? You are going to do it by polariscopes. I know something about polariscopes, and I can tell the House that within the last ten years the price of Iceland spar has gone up to fifteen times its previous amount, and I doubt whether you could get a polariscope now for less than £25. The Chancellor of the Exchequer told us that there were only three ports; or, at any rate, a very small number; in the United Kingdom at which sugar was imported.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Oh, no. Raw sugar.

*MR. E. J. C. MORTON: Is not that the sugar you are testing with polariscopes?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: There is no question of testing refined sugar. That will be entered on the invoice as refined sugar. And that statement will be accepted with an occasional test.

*MR. E. J. C. MORTON: You will have this result, that there will be a number of ports other than those you have at present into which sugar, both refined and unrefined, will be introduced.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It is all being carried out now with the greatest ease.

*MR. E. J. C. MORTON: But you have to look to the future. It takes a little time to produce the results of bad taxation. It will not take place immediately, but within six months you will have to have at all the ports of the United Kingdom

an entirely reorganised system of customs house officers; officers who are experts in this question, and how you are going to do that on £40,000 a year I do not know. But the principal argument I want to put with regard to sugar is this. Supposing at the time when we had a large number of sugar refineries in this country you had had a proposal to meet the action of foreign countries in giving bounties, it might have been argued that you had a great amount of capital sunk in those various refineries, and that that capital would be lost if the refineries were destroyed. But the actual fact now is that the refineries in this country have already been destroyed by the cheapness of sugar. They have been destroyed not only by the foreign bounties, but also by the removal of the last trace of taxation upon sugar in this country in 1874. With regard to the cheapness of sugar, you have two facts; that during the last twenty-six years sugar has become one of the staple articles of food of the people of this country, and that that cheapness of sugar has given rise to industries, such as the jam, confectionery, and other trades, which now employ five times the number of people that were ever employed at one time by all the sugar refineries in the country. I am not taking the point that this is a protective tax. The Chancellor of the Exchequer argues that it is not protective, and I acknowledge that he is right. It is the cheapness of sugar that is the foundation of these industries. Not only do we get our sugar cheaper because of the action of foreign countries, but we export jam and make a profit out of foreigners in that way. All that is going to be hit by this sugar duty.

I want now to refer to what I regard as the very worst point in connection with the finance of this Government, namely, the enormous increase of the National Debt. Some Members may think that this is an academic argument. I wish to goodness I could get them to read about twenty pages in one chapter of the second volume of Mill's "Political Economy." I know the point is dangerously near the one mistake Mill made in his political economy, namely, his wage fund theory, but there is not a single economist of any school in the world who has ever controverted it. The point is contained in the chapter on "National Finance," and the conclusion of the argument is that wherever you incur an increase of the debt that has been incurred by an unremunerative expenditure, such as upon a war, and when that debt has caused an increase in the rate of interest, the whole incidence of that falls upon labour. Moreover, he mentions it as the worst tax you can possibly make, because the sacrifice made by labour in meeting that tax does not accrue to the national exchequer but entirely to the capitalists who live upon the income from their investments, and the measure of the amount that accrues to them is the increase in the rate of interest. What is the condition of the finance of this Government in regard to that question? Before the war began they could borrow at 2½ per cent., and, according to a return that I hold in my hand, they had within the last year borrowed at 4½ per cent. That increase in the rate of interest accrues entirely for the benefit of the capitalist, and the incidence of it falls entirely upon labour. In regard to this question of the Debt, I hold here a Return, ordered by the House to be

printed on the 11th March last, and it professes to be a statement of the position of the Unfunded Debt as it stood on the 27th February last. There are seven items in this statement. The three last are "Treasury Bills," and the three items preceding "Treasury Bills" are "Exchequer Bonds." That undoubtedly is Unfunded Debt. I have never been able to get any definition that clearly differentiates Funded from Unfunded Debt, excepting this; that Funded Debt is inscribed on the books of the Bank of England, and the script, whatever it is that represents it, is transferable like a bill of exchange from hand to hand, whereas Unfunded Debt is not so inscribed and can be transferred. The first item, however, is the largest. The amount is £;30,000,000, and it is described as "National War Loan Stock and Bonds." I have ascertained that that is inscribed on the books of the Bank of England, and that the stock and bonds are not negotiable like bills of exchange. Therefore, I ask, why in the world is it put down as part of the Unfunded Debt? I can give the answer. It is because the Chancellor of the Exchequer at the time when the debt was contracted did not think he would have to come on the taxpayers of this country for it. He thought he was going to get it out of the mines in the Transvaal. But on the 18th April last, in his Budget speech, the right hon. Gentleman declared;

"When we met last December I held out hopes to the Committee that I should be able, on the occasion of this Budget, to say something definite as to a proposal for obtaining from the Transvaal some contribution towards the cost of the war. I informed the Committee that we had appointed Sir David Barbour to visit the Transvaal and to report upon the financial situation and upon the prospects of such a contribution. Sir David Barbour undertook the commission, but I need not say the prolongation of the war has very much hindered and deterred him in his work. It has been practically impossible for him to complete the inquiry in the time which I had anticipated, and therefore I have no report from him at the present moment."

How comes it that the right hon. Gentleman issues this Return as to the condition of the Debt on 27th February, and makes that speech on 18th April? Surely, by the 27th February he knew perfectly well Sir David Barbour's opinion. Why, then, does he put this £;30,000,000 down as part of the Unfunded Debt?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The distinction which has generally been recognised between funded and unfunded debt is that in regard to funded debt, like consols, payment cannot be demanded by the holder of the security. Unfunded debt is debt the payment of which can be demanded by the holder of the security at fixed times; such as Treasury Bills or the War Loan. It has nothing whatever to do with Sir David Barbour or the Transvaal.

*MR. E. J. C. MORTON: I should like to have some other expert opinion upon that point. I very much doubt whether the right hon. Gentleman would be borne out by his own Department in his view. But, however that may be, I object to all the taxation of this Government, and, above all, I object to their debt. I may therefore be asked, "Supposing the Liberals came into office to-morrow, and had to meet these demands, what is your alternative?" I have two alternative propositions. I hold that in any sound method of finance there should be some relation between our great direct tax upon capital and our

direct tax upon income. Our direct tax upon income is, of course, the income tax, and the direct tax upon capital is the death duty. The death duties stand almost exactly where they did when they were established in 1894. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire said at the time that there ought to be some relation between the amount raised by the death duties and the amount raised by the income tax, and he made his estimate with regard to the death duties upon the basis of an 8d. income tax. The income tax, since then, has been increased by 6d., and I say that the death duties ought to be raised in the same proportion. By that means you would probably raise £10,000,000 a year more in taxation than you at present do. The other suggestion I have to make is that we ought to tax the enormously inflated value of the land in towns. If you take that, and the mining royalties, and the way leaves, you have an income of £120,000,000 a year, which at present is absolutely untaxed, except by way of income tax and death duties, both of which taxes are paid by any man who earns £160 a year and who leaves £500 when he dies. There surely is a source from which you might not only get the cost of this war, but also the money for social reforms which you have promised, and in regard to which you have deceived the people by not carrying them out. There is a source of income we want to get at, and I say that it is a source which you ought to tax.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I desire to thank the House for having listened to me for so long. And yet I make no apology for having detained the House on this question. For it is the original, primal, and essential function and duty of Members of this House of Commons, and of Members of this House of Commons alone, to decide what supplies shall be granted to the Sovereign to carry on the government of the country and to uphold the position of the Empire before the world. It is their function and duty to criticise and direct the appropriation of the supplies they have voted, and, above all, it is their function and duty to initiate and determine the taxation that should be imposed upon

the people to meet the cost of these supplies. When a Minister of the Crown comes down to this House and in Committee of Supply proposes Estimates for the maintenance of the Department which he has in charge, he does so as a Minister of the Crown; he in effect is the hearer of a message from the King to the House of Commons. But when the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Committee of Ways and Means proposes the taxation necessary to meet the cost of these Estimates, he does so, not in his capacity as Minister of the Crown, but simply and solely in his capacity as an ordinary Member of the House of Commons.

I cannot help feeling that the rank and file of Members of the House of Commons have forgotten in recent years their duty in this respect. They have come to think that their whole business is to register the decrees of Ministers, if they happen to sit on that side of the House, or to support blindly and unquestioningly the criticisms of those who have been Ministers, if they happen to sit on this side of the House, and the result is a diminution of the efficiency, the credit, and the dignity of the House of Commons in the constitution of the Empire. I appeal to all Members of the House to resume their ancient functions. We all of us feel the most inspiring pride; you on that side

are not the most backward in expressing your pride; in the great Empire which our fathers have built up, But remember this; however majestic the edifice may be, it is doomed to destruction if it is founded on the sand. It can only endure if it is founded upon the rock of the freedom, the happiness, the education, the intelligence, and the well-being of every one of the humblest and the poorest of our citizens.

During the past sixty years we have laid deep and strong the foundation of our Empire upon this rock, but it has been owing to the life work of three of the greatest financial statesmen that ever served a nation. It has been owing to the life work of Peel, of Cobden, and, greatest of all, of Gladstone. Ah, Mr.

Speaker, could we but raise from the dead one supremely great man who is now resting in the great Abbey, and for five minutes he could re-enter this House which he dominated for a period of time

extending over two generations of human life, and if, even without listening to the magic of his divine voice, we could look upon the light in his eyes, there are men on both front benches who would not dare say the things, and give the votes, and abstain from giving the votes, as they have been doing during the last three weeks. It is because I see in the reckless and reactionary finance of the past six years the beginning of the process of sapping, undermining, wasting away, and weakening the foundations on which our power and our Empire rest, that I appeal even to hon. Members opposite to bring pressure to bear on the Government which cannot exist without their support, and to put a stop to the heedless and headlong course which they are pursuing. Am I to find that it is hopeless to make such an appeal? I pray it may not be so. But if it is so; if you will not listen to our appeal, if you will not put patriotism before party, and principles before personalities, then be assured we shall appeal to that power which lies behind this House of Commons; to that power from which alone even the House of Commons itself receives its whole authority, we shall appeal to the electorate, to the people of this country, we shall appeal to the nation itself, and I am confident we shall not appeal in vain.

*MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): It is not my intention to follow up the line of argument advanced by the hon. Member who has just sat down, which seems to be that one set of persons should find the money for others to spend, but I wish to say a few words with regard to the general principles of this financial scheme. This is indeed a memorable Budget. It is memorable for the reason that for the first time during the thirty-five years I have sat in Parliament a Chancellor of the Exchequer has come down and boldly admitted that our much-vaunted financial system has broken down. We were told that our financial system would be equal to any strain. The Member for West Monmouthshire is never tired of telling us that the system of placing taxes upon a few articles is a sound policy. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, however, has boldly admitted that our financial system has broken down. I say emphatically that it has not broken down in consequence of the strain of the war, but it is our normal expenditure, rather than the strain of the war, which has exposed the weakness of our fiscal system. I dare say that I shall be told that my views are not popular, but I say that this false and one-sided system of so-called free trade which we have pursued

for so many years has been discarded by the whole world, and we are the only survivors who retain those opinions, and principles which have admittedly now completely broken down. Does anyone deny that this system has proved unequal to meet the emergencies of the country? We have been told a great deal about the bloated Estimates presented to Parliament. I do not apply this term to the real requirements of this country, although I do say that economy has entirely ceased to be adopted seriously in this House. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton, in his very moderate speech, dealt very fairly with the question as a whole, but even he did not suggest any bona fide economy. He hinted at cutting off a certain number of men from the Army, and adopting some small reductions which would probably take the shape of reducing our supply of cordite and that sort of thing, while at the same time he said that he would vote for any naval Estimates which a responsible Government said were necessary for the safety of the country. He vaguely talked of reducing certain Estimates, but when we come to analyse his suggestions it only amounts to the criticism that greater caution should be taken with regard to the money spent, as distinguished from any bona fide attempt to reduce the total of the national expenditure. What is to become of the money saved by those reduced Estimates? Is it to be saved? No; the suggestion is that it should be devoted to other purposes. Whether you turn to the defensive Estimates or to the Civil Service, nobody has any practical policy of economy to advance. In the Civil Service Estimates the army of inspectors has doubled and trebled, and, as I have myself vainly urged upon the House of Commons, our educational expenditure might be largely reduced.

As regards the taxes which the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposes, I certainly welcome the new taxes as being steps towards a sounder financial system. I admit that, as regards the coal duty, I do not like an export duty. I think that is an unsound principle, but my right hon. friend certainly consoled me by expressing his conviction that the foreigner would pay it. This is a great advance, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer has always been regarded as the foreigner's friend. If the foreigner is found to pay this coal-tax it will continue. If it is found that the foreigner does not pay it, it will have to go, and that at no very distant date. Perhaps I may be permitted to express my approval of the sugar duty. While I approve of this duty I must say that I do not regard sugar so much as an essential necessary of life. I believe that greater economy in the use of sugar would, in many respects, be a very good thing, especially for the rising generation, to whom unlimited lollipops are scarcely an unmixed advantage. I would point out to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that, in introducing this sugar duty, he has once more missed a grand opportunity of performing an act which would have been welcomed, not only by the great mass of the people of this country, but also by all our fellow-subjects in our loyal colonies and dependencies. My right hon. friend has missed a grand opportunity of giving preferential advantages to our colonies and dependencies. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has had his attention called prominently to the suggestion which has been made from important colonial sources with regard to the preferential system of trade within the Empire. The Colonial Conference held at Ottawa in 1894

unanimously adopted a resolution in favour of preferential trade within the Empire, on which occasion the representatives of all the colonies and the dependencies of the Crown strongly urged a Customs arrangement by which the trade within the Empire could be placed on a more favourable footing than that carried on with foreign countries. A resolution to this effect was subsequently unanimously adopted in 1897, during the last Jubilee year, by the conference of the Premiers of all the colonies which was held in London. At that conference the representatives of the colonies undertook to confer with their colleagues to see whether such a view could not be carried out in regard to the products in the United Kingdom. I will not follow up this question, but I think it only right to add that the Australian Premiers, in view of the establishment of the Commonwealth, passed a resolution in similar terms as recently as 1898. In one quarter especially words have been followed by practical deeds, and it is worth noting that the Liberal Prime Minister of Canada; Sir Wilfrid Laurier; is a member of the Cobden Club, and he was specially decorated by that club with their gold medal, notwithstanding the fact that he had just recently passed through the Canadian Legislature a preferential rate of 25 per cent. to British goods. Nevertheless the Cobden Club overlooked that, and gave him the gold medal. Fortified by the opinion of his fellow colonists he has since changed that 25 per cent. into no less than a 33½ per cent. preference with regard to goods coming within the limits of this Empire. That is a proof that the colonies are prepared to act up to the resolution they have passed. The Australian representatives who were over here last year made no secret of their desire in this matter. Therefore, I say that an opportunity was offered to my right hon. friend of cementing that bond of union between all the branches of the British race by an act which would have cost him nothing. This is why I say that a grand opportunity has been missed. The views of my right hon. friend are the views of sixty years ago, and he will not be able to permanently stand in the way of this great advance towards British union. Only a day or two ago the Secretary of State for the Colonies stated in reply to a question that the Canadian Government, who naturally were tired of waiting for corresponding action upon the part of the mother country, had subsidised a foreign steamship service to the extent of no less than £10,000 a year. Our colonies have naturally to look to themselves first. If they find that they are giving 33½ per cent. of an advantage to the mother country, and are getting nothing in return, it is only human nature that they will look out for their own advantages, and make bargains where they can best make them. If we do miss this grand opportunity, I say that it will be the fault of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I will not allude in detail to the question of the West Indies, but we all know that this sugar duty afforded a special opportunity to consider the demands of these dependencies. There can be no doubt that unless something is promptly done in this direction there will inevitably arise a demand for a closer union between America and the West Indies. Surely nothing could more seriously injure the British Empire than spurning the advances of our colonies in a commercial direction. The Secretary for the Colonies has pronounced himself strongly in favour of reciprocal trading relations with the colonies. He stated

that Imperial unity could be best brought about in the first instance from its commercial side. Those sentiments will be very generally shared by hon. Members in all parts of the House.

As to the old Cobdenite doctrine, that is played out. I do not hesitate to say that if Sir W. Laurier; a Liberal and a Member of the Cobden Club itself; has shown the way, even the most timid mumblor of the dry bones of political economy surely may follow suit. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is at least fifty years behind the times in his commercial and financial views. Every country in the world has eschewed his views, and I will not now go over the globe to mention the countries that have eschewed them. Reference has been made just now to a great name which has passed from amongst us; Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone foresaw all this in 1894, when he pointed out that we had lost ground not only amongst the countries which had hitherto retained Protectionist views, but also in countries where free trade had been tentatively adopted, and he mentioned France and America. I only mention this fact to show that my right hon. friend, in resisting what is a truly national impulse in England towards the consolidation of the Empire upon sound broad lines of reciprocal commercial advantage, is simply kicking against the pricks. He is running against the strong current of the time, and he will soon find that he will have to give way to a strong public opinion. I will conclude by saying that I feel it to be my duty to urge these views very strongly upon the House. I will not trouble the House with taxes that I could suggest. I know that, so far from our expenditure diminishing, it is bound to increase largely in the future. I know that my right hon. friend warned us the other day that there would have to be interest paid upon the money borrowed, and he spoke of the Sinking Fund, by which I conclude he meant an augmented scheme for the reduction of our largely increased National Debt, but he omitted to mention that there were looming in the near future large fresh items of expenditure, such as old-age pensions, which he will have to give way to. I think it will be accepted throughout the House that, unless the classes who derive benefit from those pensions are not substantial contributors, it will be purely Socialism. Hence old age pensions, which are bound to come, will necessitate recourse to indirect taxation upon articles of general consumption which my right hon. friend will have to come to me for suggestions upon, little as he likes such a prospect. That, however, is beyond the question we have to consider to-night, my last word upon which is that even now I trust my right hon. friend will consider, before it is too late, whether he cannot give effect to the very large desire expressed through the Empire for preferential advantages to our colonies and dependencies.

MR. JOHN MORLEY (Montrose Burghs): I am afraid I must ask in no conventional sense for the indulgence of the House whilst I offer one or two observations upon the Bill now under discussion. I will not, at this moment at all events, follow the right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, but I will refer the Chancellor of the Exchequer to him as the awful example of what is going to happen to His Majesty's Government, and, perhaps, to Governments that may follow on this side of the House, if the present course of foreign and colonial policy is pursued. A discussion took place in the earlier proceedings on this Bill on

the point of

economy, and my right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton brought a motion before the House, of which the point was that economy in our normal expenditure was the thing to which we ought to direct our attention. I was not able myself to agree in that view, because I felt that this Budget, moved as it is at this stage of a great war, is a landmark and will prove to have been a landmark in our fiscal history. This Budget is not the last chapter, but the first; it is not the end, but the beginning of, I believe, a new system on which we have embarked. Economy, no doubt, is what we all desire, but which, I believe, none of us, so long as the present maxims of policy are accepted, will be able to attain. Every one of us would vote for platonic motions for economy of expenditure, but it is idle to support these motions or to delude ourselves with the idea that they have any real significance so long as we pursue and nurse ourselves with the idea, in Lord Salisbury's words, that it is our duty to take everything and to fight everybody. All depends upon that.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The Prime Minister did not say that, if I understood my right hon. friend to imply that he used those words?

MR. JOHN MORLEY: I did the Prime Minister great wrong if I said that; on the contrary, the Prime Minister was on the side of which the hon. Member for West Monmouthshire and I are humble members. It was the Prime Minister who said that you will get into great scrapes if you follow the present tendency to take everything and fight everybody.

One phrase fell from my right hon. friend the Member for East Wolverhampton the other night which I a little quarrel with. He said, talking of naval expenditure, that you ought to listen to the experts of the Navy. Perhaps the Chancellor of the Exchequer will agree with me that if you do that there will be no economy in the Navy. I regard that expression of my right hon. friend as being just as fatal to economy as the extraordinary suggestion thrown out by others on my own side of the House that the Commander-in-Chief of the Army shall be free to come to Parliament and

be able to fight his own parliamentary chief on matters of Army administration.

I am not so old-fashioned as the right hon. Member for Thanet, but I am old-fashioned enough to protest altogether in the name of economy and of the constitutional system against any idea of the kind; that either the experts of the Navy or the Commander-in-Chief shall overrule or appeal to Parliament against their parliamentary chiefs. The hon. Member for Exeter two days ago made a most interesting speech on economy, with most of which I entirely agree; but I will venture to tell my hon. friend this, what Mr. Gladstone said to me a thousand times, that there are only two ways of getting economy effected; one is the way pursued by a former Member for Montrose, Mr. Hume; a vigilant, tenacious, minute attention to details year after year, Committee after Committee; the other way is that a Chancellor of the Exchequer like Mr. Gladstone in Lord Palmerston's Government, like Lord Randolph Churchill with less success in another Government, like, perhaps, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, can, no doubt, effect economies, but all these ideas of Committees examining Estimates are unavailing. I have been in the House a good many years and I have

heard proposals for economy. They all come to nothing. You must either pursue economy in detail year after year, or else instal in power if you can a Chancellor of the Exchequer who will insist on having his own way in the matter of expenditure. I do not believe, for my part, that there is going to be any great economy. I do not see in the present temper of the people of this country where the steam, the generative force, of economy in this House, is to come from.

But I now come to the Finance Bill. I have given some votes in favour of the proposals of the Government, but I disclaim altogether the notion that in these votes I meant to, or hoped that the House would; to borrow my right hon. friend's phrase the other night; penalise the voters because they have adopted them. I will never deny that the country has adopted the policy of His Majesty's present Ministers. It would be childish to talk of penalising any body of men because they hold opinions which we do not happen to hold. Blood has been shed; thousands of our women have been made widows, thousands of children have been made fatherless; millions of wealth accumulated by the toil and skill of men have been flung down the abyss in pursuit of a policy which I must call a policy of stupendous folly. You have sown broadcast with both hands the seeds of enmity between two races, and if that is wrong, as I think it is, retribution will follow in a thousand shapes. I do not mean by retribution a twopenny income tax, and I do not think that a halfpenny a pound on sugar is the full Nemesis of these transactions. At the same time, though I should be most sorry to advocate any scheme of taxation which would look vindictive, I do rather rejoice at a scheme of taxation that is instructive. It is rather humiliating at this time of day, in our new century, but I declare what I think is true, that after all, in spite of a free press, in spite of the pulpit, the taxgatherer is, after all, the real schoolmaster. I cannot conceive any great empire existing under much more dangerous conditions than ours is likely to exist in if a great army of electors is to decide on questions of peace and war; decide on these great issues of policy; without its being brought home to them closely, directly, and, as Mr. Gladstone said in the passage quoted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, "intelligibly and palpably," what the effects of their acts and decision will be. But there is another element of danger. We are told by those organs of the press which worked before the raid and after the raid for this war that the opinion of the colonies must be taken upon the terms of any settlement which is ultimately arrived at. I almost think that my right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary has on one occasion used language which pointed in that direction. Well, if you are going to have war and peace; the launching of a war and the settlement of the terms of peace; dependent upon an electorate who are not to be made personally, palpably, and intelligibly responsible, and upon colonists who, moreover, contribute nothing to the cost of the war, I think that all will agree with me; all who are willing and capable of looking at these questions largely; that no empire has ever been in a more dangerous condition than ours.

I will not detain the House with figures, but I want to put in one figure, which I believe to be right, to show where we now stand and what is the point of this

Budget. It seems to me much more to the point, and it brings home the matter much more to the minds of the electors than any talk about economy. You borrowed a sum on which at 2½ per cent.; and that is giving you a little advantage, for on some you pay more; the annual charge will be £3,500,000. Then you put upon yourselves an additional charge of nearly three times that amount for the Army. You maintain that this new charge of £9,500,000 for the Army is a necessary and permanent charge; and this, together with the £3,500,000, makes a sum of £13,000,000. What is that? We have fastened round our necks by reason of this war an annual liability and obligation to pay £13,000,000, which is the equivalent of an extra loan upon our shoulders of 470 millions added to the National Debt. The First Lord of the Treasury dissents from that proposition. The figures are there. I quite admit that there is a difference between a charge which Parliament votes and can discontinue when it likes and a permanent charge on the National Debt. But the Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench cannot say so, because they say that the charge is necessary and permanent. We have, at all events, got rid in a quiet way of the idea that of this vast burden any part is coming to us from the Transvaal. I remember three or four years ago the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave a great deal of innocent pleasure to his political friends, and I rather think to some of my political friends also, by calling me "the false prophet of the Soudan." I think he has found out by this time that there are other parts of Africa besides the Soudan that breed false prophets. It is not so long since the right hon. Gentleman talked of ten millions for this war. Then he says, in order to soothe the House; I do not mean in order to delude the country, but to keep the country simmering in expectation of Transvaal relief; "We shall keep the claim alive. We shall not leave the question out of view. My right hon. friend the Colonial Secretary and I will get whatever is possible." I wonder whether the House observed an answer which the right hon. Gentleman was good enough to make to a question I put to him. He said; "We shall get whatever is possible from the new Government which is to be set up in the Transvaal." Then I asked, "Are they to consent to the contribution?" And the right hon. Gentleman answered, "No. We shall be very interested in hearing what they have to say; but of course the Imperial Government must ultimately decide." I was sorry to hear that answer. I was sorry because you will have fresh confusion and conflict in South Africa, because when that Government is set up; and it will not be set up very soon; you will immediately have, of course, a combination of Boer and Briton, and I think they will have a very good argument ready to their hand against contributing one sou to your charge, and their argument will be this, "We are a special class, but you have declared that this war in South Africa was waged not for a special class, not for territory, but for the interest of the Empire as a whole. Why should the people of the Transvaal, then, pay for what is for the interest of the Empire as a whole?" I am not going to argue that, but I am perfectly sure that after all these trials you will not get anything at all, or, if you do get anything, you will get it at a price which certainly will not be worth paying. But I heard with surprise what was said about the colonies, and I thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other night went as far as prudence allowed when

he spoke of colonial contributions under another head. We heard about Imperial funds and colonial contributions. Now, have hon. Gentlemen considered, when they look at this enormous figure, which I put at a sum equivalent to an addition of £;470,000,000 to the National Debt; have they considered, in view of this stupendous figure, what sum they can reasonably expect to get from the colonies? What will it be? How are they to go about it? I wonder, putting it at the uttermost, what you can reasonably expect to get from the colonies? All that we can in reason expect to get from them, at the highest estimate, would not relieve us of one penny in the income tax; there are 14,000,000 of people against our 40,000,000; if you got to the full this colonial contribution. I read a sentence the other day by a Gentleman we well knew in this House as Sir John Lubbock, now Lord Avebury, He said; "It seems to me unfortunate that we use the word Imperial in two senses. If it is a question of interest or expenditure it implies the whole Empire, but when it comes to the payment of the bill the word Imperial is confined to the British Islands."

There (pointing to the Irish Benches) is one of the British Islands, and the one that has suffered most from our misrule, and that forlorn island has to pay its share of this enormous charge, while the colonies, far better off than our own poor people, are able to feast, apparently; feast is, perhaps, not the right word; are able to enjoy old-age pensions, which we cannot. The hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Admiralty the other day said with the Imperial instinct boiling over in him, "Our own people first, our own people second, our own people third." I say the same, but I include the people who happen to live in these two islands.

Now I come to the observations that fell from the Chancellor of the Exchequer on Monday night about the war. They struck me very much. He said, "If the issue was whether Briton or Boer should be supreme in South Africa, then £;140,000,000 is a trifle in comparison." I would just say in passing that is rather a new reading of the orthodox formula. I thought it was to be "equal rights." Equal rights; It appears that it is not that; it is not to be equal rights; it is to be the mastery of one race over the other.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): But they are not masters yet.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: Yes, mastery of one race over the other, and in the name of mastery you have suppressed two little States which had as good a title; [Loud cries of "No" from the Ministerial Benches and Opposition cheers.]; as good a title; [Cries of "No."]; I hope hon. Members will listen to me; as good a title, if public law has any validity at all, to govern themselves as you have. I think it was a right hon. friend of mine

who said; some of my friends have said some very embarrassing things; that the Government of the South African Republic was an imposture. [Ministerial cheers.] Be it so, but at all events it was a Government which the people to whom the country belonged cherished and have given their lives for.

MR. CUST (Southwark, Bermondsey): May I remind the hon. Gentleman that in both cases the title to self-government was given by England to the Republics?

MR. JOHN MORLEY: I have got passages, I will not say by the dozen, but a good

many passages from despatches written in 1896, 1897, and 1898 which should entirely bear me out from official sources in my contention. I do not want to take up the time of the House in kindling again the fires of the old controversy. I am quite ready to do so, but there will be abundant opportunities to argue that out here and elsewhere. But I must traverse the way in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer put the issue in the sentence I have already quoted. It was not a question as the Chancellor of the Exchequer put it. The question of Boer and Briton was solving itself. The two races were intermarrying; their English education was slowly, but effectually, working out the legitimate influence of England; call it supremacy or what you like. Mr. Kruger, the representative and the rallying point of old and reactionary ideas, was himself an old man. A reform party was opposed to him that had all the future before it. Time and patience were bringing about all that any British statesman either on that side of the House or on this, and I do not except my right hon. friend the present Colonial Secretary, ever professed to desire. I do not deny for a moment the difficulties of the problem of adjusting the relations between two very different races, between two sets of men under very different and antagonistic social conditions. I do not deny, I never have denied, the enormous difficulties of solving that problem, but I contend that by taking the sword; [Ministerial cries of "Who took the sword?"]; to cut the knot of the entanglement which statesmanlike patience would have untied was a fatal blunder. I perceive that Gentlemen opposite think all this picture of mine is a dream. [Ministerial cheers.] I am right in imputing to them that view. But who tells you so? [Ministerial cries of "You."] Pardon me. Those who tell you so are the same men who told you, even at the eleventh hour, that there would be no war; the same men who, when the war broke out, said it would be over in three months; the same men who said the war would cost £10,000,000, and it has cost £150,000,000; the same men who said the Boers had lost their old heart and spirit for fighting, though they have been as brave as our own brave men. Then, when I am told that my view, that our view, of all this policy is a dream, I say were not your advisers, your inspirers, dreaming when they launched you on this enterprise? The Chancellor of the Exchequer's expenditure of £150,000,000 has brought not what British statesmen wanted, but precisely what they did not want. It has brought material havoc and ruin unspeakable; unquenched and, for long, unquenchable racial animosities; a task of political reconstruction of incomparable difficulty and all the other consequences which I need not dwell upon of this war, which I think a hateful war; a war insensate and infatuated, a war of uncompensated mischief and irreparable wrong.

I will now go on, if the House will allow me, to make a remark or two on the finance. I confess that I do not quite understand the Chancellor of the Exchequer's position. I am not going to indulge in any harassing gibes about an economical Chancellor of the Exchequer remaining in an extravagant Cabinet. Others besides him have found out that it is much easier to get into a Cabinet than to get out of it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that this growth of expenditure carries with it the gravest danger to the financial system to which

this country owes its prosperity.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I did not say that. What I did say was that the rate of growth that had gone on during the last few years could not continue without such a danger.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: The words were::

"This growth of expenditure carries with it the gravest danger to the financial system to which this country owes its prosperity."

If I have transcribed the words wrongly I will withdraw.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am quite sure of what I said.

MR. JOHN MOBLEY: Well, so be it. It comes to this;that the right hon. Gentleman is a party, an accessory, a confederate, an accomplice in what he admits to be putting you on the road to a position of grave national danger. My point is this;How is the Chancellor of the Exchequer going to meet that danger? I confess I am disappointed, because having listened to him for two or three years, and watched his own inclination, and especially having listened to him this year, I cannot see where it is that he wants us to go. He used a phrase he is never weary of using, "You must widen the basis of taxation." After considering the Chancellor of the Exchequer's position as well as I possibly could, I am afraid that is a mere phrase. Taking indirect taxation, how are you going to widen the basis there? He has himself said that in wine, beer, spirits, and tobacco he has got to the full length of his tether, and that the taxable capacity of those who contribute to these great reservoirs of taxation is now at an end.

Then I come to what I confess interests me very much;I think it has been overlooked in the discussion so far upon this Bill and the preliminary resolutions;I mean direct taxation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer does not think it wise to lower the exemption rate of the income tax. He does not think it wise even in a moment of financial crisis like this to suspend or alter the scale of abatement, and this immense impost is to go on being levied upon the same scale as at present without any differentiation as far as distribution goes. One or two hon. Gentlemen opposite really talked of taxation as some persons have talked of war, as a splendid thing in itself;that it braces a man. They have talked of it as of the other doctrines that have been produced by this great explosion of barbarism that has been going on. It is represented that taxation is something fine. I read in a print of great authority;we have not yet heard it in the House;at least I have not yet heard it;that from a national point of view the larger part of the naval and military expenditure is only a matter of form. We are told by our instructors that most of the money passes out of one pocket into another. It must be some view of that kind which explains the attitude of this House upon the income tax. The doctrine that naval and military expenditure adds to the wealth of the country is, at this time of day, one of the most astonishing doctrines that ever was advanced. And they say, "Oh! Much of this huge figure is spent in England." To say that that is any alleviation is just as absurd as this case would be, which I rather think I remember from one of the old economic books::A tax-gatherer goes into a man's shop and he takes out of the till, as tax-gatherer, £;100, and presently there comes in another Government agent who, with that £;100, buys £;100 worth of the

shopkeeper's goods. And then he says to the shopkeeper, "You are not ruined, you are none the worse." That ridiculous fallacy, that idiotic fallacy, is a fallacy that is now current among people who are really supposed to know the secrets of City and other finance. Now, let us look at the income tax for a moment. Ever since 1895 the income tax has stood at 8d.; and at 8d., mark you, in a time of peace. Within the last two years that 8d. has been raised 75 per cent., and, as I understand from the Chancellor of the Exchequer; I think his language goes as far as this; we are to look forward to at least a shilling income tax, possibly a 14d. income tax, possibly a 16d. income tax, but at least a shilling income tax for the rest of our natural lives.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH dissented.

MR. JOHN MORLEY: The Chancellor of the Exchequer says he never said anything of the kind. It is a very inconvenient inference, but I think that he did say something very much to that effect. Perhaps it would not be fair to ask him when he really thinks that 14d. is going to come down to a 1s. or to 8d. or to 6d. He knows very well that he anticipates no such fall in his time. Of course there is the noble Lord the Under Secretary for Foreign

Affairs, and, I think, his noble relative who sits below the gangway, who said, "Oh, England could bear ten times that amount." So, if the present Administration remains we are pledged to a 10s. income tax; We all of us know; I do not want to make any light points; but we all of us know that the most difficult of all fiscal problems is this: How are you to impose an income tax fairly upon incomes that are permanent on the one hand and incomes that are precarious and temporary on the other? How can a man who, in the famous phrase, neither toils nor spins be treated in the same way as the man who earns his income by the skill of his hand and the sweat of his brow? I venture to say this; that at the pace at which we are now going in reference to the income tax a claim; an irresistible claim; will be set up and maintained for a readjustment of the income tax and a reconstruction of it. Yes; but if anybody thinks that that will be easily done compatibly with maxims of public equity let them read Mr. Gladstone's speech in 1853, when he set the income tax finally upon its legs. I often wonder if Mr. Gladstone knew that by setting the income tax upon its legs he was not only providing the means but he was providing the direct incentive to that enormous expenditure which it was one of the great, one of the main, objects of his life to resist and to cut down. It is a great danger to this country that you should have, financially, an irresponsible war policy; but I do think that the other danger is just as great, that you have there a resource by which the Chancellor of the Exchequer of to-day, by touching, as it were, an electric button at his table, or drawing a lever, can at once fill his chest with whatever funds he desires. The income-tax payers are not organised; they are not like the coal gentlemen. Sir, I think that is in itself a great danger, and I am perfectly sure that, if this policy, which is at the root of all wild expenditure, continues, you will have trouble of the most serious kind with the income tax.

This is my last point for the Chancellor of the Exchequer with which I will trouble the House. [Ministerial cries of "Hear, hear," and Opposition cries of

"Order" and "Tories."] The House will allow me to make a passing observation to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. One conceivable device for solving what he himself has called the problem of indirect taxation would be to add an equivalent percentage all round of direct and indirect taxation alike. I know it was tried under favourable circumstances by Sir Francis Baring, who, I think, put a 5 per cent. increase on the Customs and 10 per cent. on assessed taxes. But it failed, and produced nothing like what was expected. But there was this difference between those days and these; that there were then 1,750 articles in the Customs tariff, and now there are six or eight; at any rate less than ten. I dare say the Chancellor of the Exchequer has been casting about for some method, but until you have some method, automatic or otherwise, for adjusting the relation between direct and indirect taxation, there will be, depend upon it, great trouble. The Chancellor of the Exchequer talks about the great problem of indirect taxation, but he will not say that that great problem is solved, or is in any way towards solution, by putting on an export duty on coal or imposing a sugar tax. He must be looking very much further than these. The Chancellor of the Exchequer thinks he has gone a long way towards the solution of the problem of indirect taxation by imposing an export duty on coal and imposing a sugar tax. But I wish he could have told us in his own language, and nobody commands stronger; I mean more effective language than he does; exactly how he solves this problem. I will try to do it for him. I do not think a single question has been put to the House of Commons which goes nearer to the root of the great matter than this; "Can you go on, with the necessity of an ever increasing revenue, taking a steadily decreasing share out of the Customs duties and Excise for intoxicants and tobacco, and taking a steadily increasing share out of the income tax?" Is the financial system sound, is a country like ours safe when the ultimate foundation is the contribution of an extremely limited class of population further limited by all sorts of exemptions and abatements? If I were the most flamboyant of Imperialists I should look on such a state of things with apprehension and alarm.

It is very late, but I wish the House would let me read a little table of the way in which indirect and direct taxation have moved within the last sixty years. The first year, 1841-42, indirect taxation was 73 per cent., direct 27 per cent. In 1861-62 indirect taxation was 62 per cent., direct taxation 37 per cent. Twenty years later indirect taxation was 59 per cent., direct taxation 40 per cent. This year direct taxation is 50 per cent., indirect taxation 49. There has been a steady systematic growth of direct taxation and a steady, systematic fall of indirect taxation. The broad result is that before Sir Robert Peel took the national finances in hand indirect taxation represented nearly three-fourths of the whole, while now it is rather more than half. It is quite a mistake, by the way, to divorce taxing questions from social and political questions. I would point out that there is a sort of law by which a rise in direct taxation coincides with a change in the distribution of political power. It is not an accident that direct taxation has gone up and indirect taxation has gone down. Is it not the fact that that has followed because

political power has widened? In 1874, when, as everybody knows, Mr. Gladstone went to the country and offered to abolish the income tax, it was not exactly the first time, but the second time the newly-enfranchised voters had given a deliberate opinion in regard to the questions immediately affecting themselves. Their answer was; it was an instinct, a curious instinct, great bodies of men do not work out these matters; they said, "No, we will keep on the income tax." For the rest of his days Mr. Gladstone felt that the income tax had been made a permanent element in the sources of national revenue. It is idle; I am sorry to say it is not a financial remark, but a political remark; it is idle for a militant Imperialist to say he is an ardent and unshakeable free trader. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet is not at all well advised in his doctrines in my opinion, but it is idle to deny that he is much nearer to having a considerable following in the House and the country than he ever had before. If you are going to be militant Imperialist, free trade goes. That is my firm belief. And the beginning of the job is the Budget which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has introduced, and which I am not resisting. I do not mean to resist it, because it has been launched on a scheme of policy which has to be provided for, and it is not my business to say how he could better have provided for it than he has done.

I will wind up with a mere commonplace, but I do wish to repeat here what I said to the electors who sent me here; the master-key of the prosperity and strength of the realm is peace. Peace means low taxes, reduced rent, advancement in the comfort and well-being of the people of these islands, and; what I do not, will not, disregard; it means the goodwill of the world. If our aim is the extension of territorial dominion, the transformation of our ancient realm, which has aided civilisation for generation after generation, into a boastful military Empire, to be supported, I suppose, by conscription and by a Customs union thrown in, which will lose us our best markets for the sake of the worst, then I say the financial ruin of which the Chancellor of the Exchequer told us undoubtedly awaits us. I quote a sentence from a great divine which I have used before;

"Things" are what they are, and their consequences will be what they will be.

Why, then, shall we seek to deceive ourselves?"

Wear out your coal, pile up your Debt, multiply and magnify your responsibilities in every part of the globe; starve social reforms among your people at home; and then, indeed, you will have a Little England, a dilapidated heritage to hand on to your children and your children's children.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down had no need to crave the indulgence of the House, for he may ever expect from it a sympathetic hearing. Those who have sat through the three days debate must have felt glad to meet in him a frank

opponent, holding it may be unpopular views, but views which he has the courage to defend and the frankness to expound. The right hon. Gentleman said the Budget was a landmark in our financial history; but the listless air that has pervaded the benches opposite on Monday, Tuesday, and this evening, and the half-hearted

discordant note struck by the Opposition in their speeches, do not give that impression. The fact of the matter is, that there has been no real discussion of the Bill, and the object seemed to be, not to bring the questions which divide us to an issue, but to hide the differences among hon. Members opposite. The attempt to conceal these differences among themselves has deprived the Opposition of the opportunity of challenging the policy of the Government. The right hon. Gentleman opposite has brought us back to a clear issue; he has spoken with no uncertain voice. We know now what is the question which is before us; it is not a question of a little more or a little less; it is not a question of £5, £10, or £100 which the Leader of the Opposition thought that a Financial Secretary by more careful study might pick up here or there from the salary of some official; it is not a cheese-paring examination of each Vote in turn; it is a question of the policy which the Government has pursued, and of the means which they are to employ to attain these ends. Well, that is an issue which is worthy of the House, and on which we shall not hesitate to meet the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman has repeated in no sparing terms his condemnation of the war in which we are engaged, and of the whole policy which led to it; he has declined for his part to have any lot or share in it; he has repudiated all responsibility for it; he has foretold disaster and misfortune to this country as a result of it, and has placed the burden of its consequences, whatever they may be, upon our shoulders who have been responsible for the policy pursued. Yes, upon our shoulders in the first place, but we no longer stand alone. What is the attitude of the party opposite, who throughout the autumn were protesting with an almost united voice? I except the right hon. Gentleman, frank then as always, but the great majority of them were as anxious to support the King's arms, as ready to vote the money, and as anxious to uphold our honour in South Africa, as the Government had been. I should be very glad to hear hon. Gentlemen opposite reconcile the attitude which they adopted then with the attitude which they are going to adopt now if they vote against the means which are taken to meet the charges of the war. It is true that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition declined to accept the policy of the war in the main, and spoke of reductions which might be made in our ordinary expenditure as justifying him in refusing his support to this Finance Bill. But he did not indicate very clearly the directions in which we are to look for such reductions. He intimated that we might save something on education, and a moment afterwards, to save himself from the rebuke which might await him from his own side, he added that we should spend a good deal more. He said that we spent too much upon the Army with its huge and numerous staff; that thirty millions was an enormous sum which ought to be reduced; but reduction of expenditure is not always the same thing as economy. It is cheaper to pay thirty millions, if we must, in order to obtain an efficient army equal to the needs of the Empire, rather than to go on paying eighteen millions for an army which events have shown was not prepared to meet the emergencies for which it was required and which would give us no guarantee for security in future. If it be necessary, as we think it is, to increase the Army and to maintain the Navy according to the

standard which successive Governments have upheld, is any right hon. Gentleman opposite prepared to make an attack on that policy and deliberately to refuse the Government the resources and the support which they consider necessary for the defence of the country? The right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken is prepared to take that responsibility; he thinks that the fears of the Government are exaggerated, and that to follow the advice of experts is the sure road to ruin. And for his part he would decline, no matter what facts and arguments might be adduced in favour of it,

to support an increase in the Army and Navy. I understood him to say that that places a very dangerous weapon in our hands, and encourages the country to embark in such enterprises as the war in South Africa which he himself so strongly condemns; and then he comes back to the old issue which is the foundation of this Budget Bill.

The right hon. Gentleman says that we have suppressed two little States which, by public law, had as much right to govern themselves as we ourselves had. But was it an unprovoked war on our part? Did we draw the sword? The history of the last twenty years is one of patience and long-suffering on the part of this country.;[Opposition cries of "Oh!";];under reiterated provocation, and every circumstance steadily growing from worse to worse, which has no parallel, I believe, in the relations between a great and powerful State with a small State such as the Transvaal. We bore with all this. We sought peace urgently. I would remind the right hon. Gentleman and the House that he himself in a public speech approved of the last despatch which was sent by this Government to the Transvaal. He described it moderate despatch, a despatch more moderate than he had ventured to expect, and he himself recommended its acceptance to the Government of the Transvaal. What was the reply to that moderate despatch? It was the issue of an ultimatum to the Government of this country that the Queen's troops were to be withdrawn, and that those on the high seas were to be brought back. It was not we who invaded their territory; it was they who invaded our territory. After all this the right hon. Gentleman tells the House that time and patience were all that were needed to avoid the war How much time, Sir? How much patience? I do not think it was time or patience that was wanting on the part of our Government, but goodwill on the part of President Kruger and his advisers. If he had been willing for a settlement on any terms, surely no terms could have been easier than those which were offered to him. He had it in his power to insure to his country its continued independence, and, if he wished it, to obtain every guarantee that this country could give.

He deliberately broke off negotiations, and refused all concession, even when we had reduced our demands to a minimum so small that it has been a constant taunt against this Government that it was not enough to justify us in quarrelling with the Transvaal. If our demands were not enough to justify us in quarrelling with the Transvaal, they were not enough to justify the Transvaal in taking up arms against us; still less did they justify the action of the Orange Free State.

This contest was forced upon us. Our view, as we held then, and as we hold now, was that we could not shrink from the challenge; that we could not have deserted the cause of our fellow-subjects which we had taken up, and that we could not

leave that constant source of friction, unrest, intrigue, disloyalty in South Africa to continue in the future. We were bound to meet the challenge which was thrown down, and having once entered into the struggle we are going to see it through.

The right hon. Gentleman says that peace is our greatest need. No one undervalues the blessings of peace, but there are things that are even more valuable to us than peace. We cannot sacrifice our good name and reputation, and the honour, respect, and loyalty of our colonies. To have turned back from the work before us, to have turned a deaf ear to the men who were vainly seeking redress for their wrongs in the Transvaal, to have submitted to the constant attacks by the Transvaal on the few small rights reserved to this country under the Convention, would have put a lasting blot on our name.

The right hon. Gentleman has totalled up the cost of this war, he adds to that the increase in the Army expenditure, and he says that our policy has involved us in an equivalent of £;470,000,000 added to the National Debt. I venture to say that the increase in the Army would have been just as necessary without this war. It would be just as much needed without the war, though the war has brought home to us defects in our military system which otherwise would not have been found out. But what we have got to look at is not merely the total expenditure.

We have to set against that the value of what we receive. We have to consider whether what we get is worth the money spent on it. You might apply the same calculation that the right hon. Gentleman has made to education. We are spending something like £;13,000,000 a year on education. That, too, is an equivalent of £;470,000,000 added to the National Debt. I think that shows that the right hon. Gentleman's illustration is a very absurd one, and that it really does not carry us a step farther. What we have to consider is not merely the amount we spend, but whether we could afford to do without the expenditure, no matter how high it is.

In one thing at any rate I am in agreement with the right hon. Gentleman. I think that when a policy such as this has received, as in this case it has received, the support of the vast majority of the people and every class and rank in life, it is only right that the sacrifices needed to maintain it should be borne by all in due proportion. I agree with the right hon. Gentleman in that. I agree with him that it would be a bad day for this country if it came to be supposed that one class of the population alone was to pay all the expenditure. I do not believe; we have shown that we do not believe; that anything will be allowed to interfere with the execution of our policy. We believe that the people who supported us in this policy will support us to the end, and will support us in the means by which we propose to raise the money required for the war. We have no hesitation in calling on the people to make sacrifices, and we believe that these sacrifices will be readily made. We feel that in a matter of this kind, where so much is at stake, where the future of this country, as the right hon. Gentleman rightly said in his speech, is at stake, that the people have a right to be plainly told what is involved, and have plainly put before them the sacrifices required of them. No one can say that my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer has attempted to hide the facts. He has put them

fully and clearly before the country, and we believe that we have every assurance of the confidence and support of the people. We have tried this issue under different forms in the House during the last six months, but I shall look with interest to see what attitude the party opposite will adopt towards this Budget, which is based upon the war, which has been necessitated by war, and which provides the means for waging the war which they assured their constituents and us that they would give every assistance to bring to a conclusion.

MR. ROBSON (South Shields) said he did not desire to detain the House, but he felt it his duty and his right to enter respectfully an emphatic protest against the assumption, which underlay the last two speeches, that we ought in a debate on the Finance Bill to consider, and consider only, the question of the policy which necessitated the expenditure. He ventured to submit that although the question of policy could not be called irrelevant, yet it was not the question which the House should consider. No matter what that policy might be, it was a totally different question from the principle on which expenditure should be raised. That was the question which the House had now to consider.

The Government were now introducing what was a fiscal revolution of the most extraordinary character. Where had a tax been laid on, certainly during the last fifty years, by any Chancellor of the Exchequer that had not apparently sought to reach as far as possible the whole of the community? That had always been the aim of every tax. It was the aim of the tax on tea, sugar, and other articles of general consumption. Now a tax was proposed which they were told was to be the first of a series of taxes under a fiscal policy which did not seek to touch the whole community, and which, on the contrary, it was contended, most idly and foolishly, did not touch the community at all. Instead of being a tax on the whole community it was a tax on a special trade, on a special branch of two businesses, and on the way in which two

great industries had chosen to conduct their affairs. He referred to the coal tax, and did not intend to touch on any other part of the Budget. He asked the House to consider more carefully than it had yet done the significance of that tax. It had not yet been fully debated, and it would seem as though a great revolution in the fiscal policy of England were to be carried without any adequate discussion. It was said that the policy on which the Budget was based ought not to be distinguished from the policy which led to the Budget, but the two ought to be distinguished; and whatever his hon. friends might have thought as regards the war, they could, as Liberals, have only one opinion on the financial policy of the Government. He was amazed to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in introducing his Budget, claim to be a free trader, and he seemed to be wholly unconscious of the fact that he was destroying in sentence after sentence the very first principles of free trade. He actually told the House that he did not agree with the Committee which sat on the question many years ago, that one of the special advantages of the export of coal was that it tended to cheapen imports. He seemed to think it an advantage that if goods were sent abroad the goods received in exchange should be as few as possible and as dear as possible. That certainly was not free trade. The Chancellor of the Exchequer

was pursuing the old Conservative policy of seeking to maintain taxation on industry for the purpose of relieving the burdens on property and a special class of property. Over £10,000,000 were given in relief of local rates, which was a most wasteful method of spending money. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in one of the Budgets he introduced in the late Parliament, pointed out that the country was getting near the limits of direct taxation, but shortly after he was found supporting the Agricultural Rating Act. The right hon. Gentleman's policy was to relieve

land at the expense of industry, and he ventured to hope that the Liberal party would be absolutely united in its opposition to the Budget.

AYES.

Ackland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward A.

Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Flannery, Sir Fortescue

Macdonald, John Cumming

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.

Fletcher, Sir Henry

MacIver, David (Liverpool)

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Flower, Ernest

Maconochie, A. W.

Arroll, Sir William

Forster, Henry William

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Galloway, William Johnson

M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B (Cambs)

Bagot, Capt. Joscelyne FitzRoy

Garfit, William

M'Iver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)

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

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

Malcolm, Ian

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Manners, Lord Cecil

Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.

Maple, Sir John Blundell

Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch)

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Martin, Richard Biddulph
Banbury, Frederick George
Graham, Henry Robert
Massey-Main waring Hn W. F.
Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Max well, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Bigwood, James
Gretton, John
Milward, Colonel Victor
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Bond, Edward
Groves, James Grimble
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Brassey, Albert
Hain, Edward
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Hambro, Charles Eric
Moore, William (Antrim, N.)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Hamilton Rt. Hn. LdG. (Midd'x
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)
Brymer, William Ernest
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Morrell, Georg, Herbert
Bull, William James
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Mount, William Arthur
Butcher, John George
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.

Carlile, William Walter
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Muntz, Philip A.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute
Cautley, Henry Strother
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Myers' William Henry
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Heaton, John Henniker
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Higginbottom, S. W.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Parker, Gilbert
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Hogg, Lindsay
Parkes, Ebenezer
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Hope, J F. (She'ffield, Brightside
Pemberton, John S. G.
Chapman, Edward
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh'm
Penn, John
Charrington, Spencer
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Plummer, Walter R.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Jackson, Rt. Hn. Wm. Lawies
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Pretymann, Ernest George
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Johnston, William (Belfast)
Purvis, Robert
Cox, Irwin Edward B.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Pym, C. Guy
Cranborne, Viscount
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Randles, John S.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Rankin, Sir James
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Keswick, William
Rasch, Maj. Frederic Carne
Cross, H. Shepherd (Bolton)
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Remnant, James Farquharson
Crossley, Sir Savile
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Law, Andrew Bonar
Renwick, George
Cust, Henry John C.
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Ridley, Hon. W M (Stalybridge
Dalkeith, Earl of
Lawson, John Grant
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Dairymple, Sir Charles
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas Thomson
Davies, Sir H. D. (Chatham)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Dickson-Poyuder, Sir John P.
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Robinson, Brooke
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Doxford, Sir William T.
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)

Ropner, Colonel Robert
Duke, Henry Edward
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Rutherford, John
Faber, George Denison
Lowe, Francis William
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Fardell, Sir T. George
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Finch, George H.

Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lucas, Col. F. (Lowestoft)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Fisher, William Hayes
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Simeon, Sir Barrington

Question put.

The House divided::Ayes, 236; Noes, 132. (Division List No. 203.)

Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Wills, Sir Frederick
Spear, John Ward
Valentia, Viscount
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.)
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (York.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Warde, Col. C. E.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Stock, James Henry
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Stone, Sir Benjamin

Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Stroyan, John
Webb, Col. William George
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Welby, Lt. Col. A C E (Taunton
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.
Younger, William
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John L.
Thornton, Percy M.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Tollemache, Henry James
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Sir William Walrond and
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Mr. Anstruther.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Flavin, Michael Joseph
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Fuller, J. M. F.
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Ambrose, Robert
Gilhooly, James
O'Malley, William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. John
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Atherley-Jones, L.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Partington, Oswald
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)

Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Bell, Richard
Griffith, Ellis J.
Power, Patrick Joseph
Boland, John
Hayden, John Patrick
Price, Robert John
Boyle, James
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Priestley, Arthur
Brigg, John
Hayter, Rt. Hn. Sir Arthur D.
Rea, Russell
Broadhurst, Henry
Healy, Timothy Michael
Reddy, M.
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Horniman, Frederick John
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Joicey, Sir James
Redmond, William (Clare)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Burns, John
Joyce, Michael
Rickett, J. Compton
Burt, Thomas
Labouchere, Henry
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Caldwell, James
Lambert, George
Robson, William Snowdon
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Langley, Batty
Roe, Sir Thomas
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Leamy, Edmund
Scott, C. Prestwich (Leigh)
Carvill, Patrick George H.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Causton, Richard Knight
Leng, Sir John
Shipman, Dr. John G.

Channing, Francis Allston
Levy, Maurice
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Clancy, John Joseph
Lloyd-George, David
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (North'nts
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Sullivan, Donal
Colville, John
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Condon, Thomas Joseph
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Craig, Robert Hunter
M'Crae, George
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Thompson, Dr E C (Monagh'n N.
Cremer, William Randal
M'Govern, T.
Thomas, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Cullinan, J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Tomkinson, James
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Mather, William
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Delany, William
Mooney, John J.
Walton, Joseph (Bamsley)
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Warner, Thomas C. T.
Dillon, John
Morto'n, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Donelan, Capt. A.
Moss, Samuel
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Doogan, P. C.
Murphy, J.
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)

Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Edwards, Frank
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Elibank, Master of
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Norman, Henry
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Nussey, Thomas Willans
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Wallace and Mr. Lough.
Fenwick, Charles
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Ffrench, Peter
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Bill read a second time, and committed for Thursday, 6th June.
STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.
Ordered, That it be an Instruction to the Select Committee appointed to inquire
into the system of Subsidies to
Steamship Companies under Foreign Governments, and the effect thereby produced
on British trade, that they do also report on similar bounties relating to
sailing ships.; (Mr. W. F. Lawrence.)
Adjourned at half past Twelve of the clock.