

<https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/apr/19>

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 19th April, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

KINGSCOURT, KEADY, AND ARMAGH RAILWAY BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

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

\*MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid), in moving that the Bill be read a second time that day six months, said he hoped hon. Members would bear with him while he endeavoured to convince them that this was not a measure which ought to receive the sanction of Parliament, and that it was one that was utterly opposed to public policy inasmuch as it increased a monopoly which had already grown to a too serious extent, in addition to which it might be described as a bold attempt to set aside a well considered discussion of the House of Commons. He trusted that hon. Members would come to the conclusion that it was nothing more or less than an insidious attempt to get round a deliberate decision of Parliament and to adopt a course which was in the highest degree injurious to the public interest. He would not enter into details as to the evil existing from the present railway monopoly. What he proposed to do was to attempt to show that this measure amounted to a breach of faith with Parliament and the public, and that moreover it was being promoted solely in the interests of the monopolists and was contrary to public policy. The new railway proposed to be constructed under the Bill was a junction connecting the Kingscourt and Armagh. Railway with the Great Northern Railway at Castleblaney. It was proposed to abandon a line, the construction of which had been authorised, between Kingscourt and Castleblaney, where it would join the Midland Great Western Railway. The line it was proposed to abandon was really a competitive and alternative route from Dublin to Armagh and other great towns in the North of Ireland. One of the striking advantages of the original scheme was that it would open up an entirely new district and would afford competition. That scheme received the sanction of a Committee of the House of Commons, whilst a scheme practically identical with that of the present Bill, which was also brought before the House by the Great Northern Railway of Ireland, was rejected by the Committee. Personally he was in no way financially interested in these railway undertakings, but he was interested as a matter of public convenience, because he looked at the advantages which would accrue from the adoption of a Bill which would enable a competitive route to be opened up. He was of opinion that that competitive line would be very useful to the district. Twenty-five witnesses who were called before the Committee to give evidence in support of the Kingscourt scheme, almost all of whom, having business connections with the district, were unanimous upon the matter. Those gentlemen were farmers, merchants, manufacturers, and others who knew the real requirements of the people and the locality, and they were unanimously in favour of an independent and competitive line. He opposed this Bill because it would create a monopoly which would cause the greatest possible inconvenience to the people of the

localities concerned. It would, in fact, be a breach of faith to the people, a flagrant breach of faith with Parliament, and might be described as a gross breach of faith on the part of some of the Kingscourt directors with their colleagues. In his opinion the passing of this Bill would mean defeating of the legitimate expectations of the people of Armagh, Cavan, Monaghan, Fermanagh, Meath, and the adjacent counties. The Bill asked the permission of Parliament for an arrangement that would, as he had before said, constitute a breach of faith with the House itself. The Committee last year recognised the advantages attached to an alternative and competitive route between Dublin and the North; advantages which were insisted upon by a large number of influential witnesses who described the crippling effects upon agriculture and manufactures, of the excessive rates at present charged by the Great Northern Railway Company, and Parliament having sanctioned the alternative route and rejected the Great Northern Company's blocking scheme he was surprised that the House should now be asked to deliberately reverse its decision by what he could only describe as a trick on the part of some of the directors of the company. So confident were the Midland and Great Western Railway Company in the success of an independent loop line that they expressed their intention of investing large sums of money in the concern, and the Committee sanctioned the Bill because they were induced to believe in the bona fides of the venture. But shortly after the passage of the Bill of last year arrangements were made by three of the Kingscourt directors, without the knowledge of the Chairman of the Board, practically to hand the line over to the Great Northern Company, and if the scheme were allowed to pass the monopoly of that company in the part of Ireland concerned would be established and confirmed. He moved that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

\*MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.), in seconding the motion, said that every public board and every man, whether Nationalist or Conservative, in the northwest portion of Ireland affected by this scheme was against the Bill. The proposal was really in direct contravention of an agreement between the promoters of the Kingscourt Bill and a Committee of the House. The Great Northern Railway had a splendid service between Dublin and Belfast, but it starved other districts. If the present Bill was allowed to pass it would prevent the inhabitants of the district affected having any competing line with the Great Northern Railway, which had a greater monopoly than any line in the country.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out the word 'now,' and at the end of the Question to add the words' upon this day six months.'";(Mr. Lonsdale.)

Question proposed, "That the word 'now' stand part of the Question."

MR. DE TATTON EGERTON (Cheshire, Knutsford) thought it his duty, as Chairman of the Committee

which passed the Kingscourt Bill last year, to point out that the line was originally intended to be an alternative route between Dublin and Belfast, passing through a district which would help to feed the line independently of any traffic from the two ends. The present Bill proposed to do away entirely with the work of that Committee, as it would throw back the whole country into

the hands of the Great Northern Company. In view of the necessity for an alternative through route opening up a completely new district, and one which would be beneficial to the public at large, the Committee accepted the evidence placed before them as to the bona fides of the promoters, and passed the Bill. As he understood, the promoters of the present measure had gone behind the back of the Chairman of the Board, and were endeavouring to undo the work of last year. With this statement he would leave the matter in the hands of the House to settle.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said there could be no question that the original scheme was a great deal better in the interests of Ireland than the proposal now before the House. He, however, had received resolutions from the County Council of Louth, the Dundalk Urban District Council, the Dundalk Rural District Council, the Dundalk Board of Guardians, and the Dundalk Harbour Commissioners; all in his constituency; asking him to support the Bill, and in deference to the wishes of his constituents he should reluctantly do so. The hon. Member for Mid Armagh had issued a statement that the Midland and Great Western Railway Company of Ireland were prepared, if the present Bill were defeated, to enter into an agreement by which the Kingscourt Railway, as authorised by the Act of 1900, would probably be constructed, and its competitive character restored and established. The House should remember, however, that during the last forty or fifty years not a single extension of line had been carried out in Ireland except by an existing railway company or by help from the British Government in the shape of a public guarantee. If this Bill was rejected no part of the line would be made.

He therefore suggested that the Bill should be sent to a Committee; the statement with regard to the Midland Company could then be inquired into, the people concerned cross-examined, and their guarantees to construct the line taken. A clause could also be inserted in the Bill suspending its operation for one or two years, in order to give the Midland Company a chance to carry out the original scheme.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.) admitted there was a great amount of difference of opinion on matters of detail as to what had been and might be done, but to discuss those matters on the Second Reading of the Bill was almost absurd. Members had been reminded that there were a large number of questions at issue between the Great Northern and Midland Companies, but was the House of Commons a fit tribunal to sit upon those questions? The proper course was to send the Bill to a Committee upstairs. The prevailing opinion in Belfast was that the Bill should be so dealt with, for this reason. They had the promise of the Midland Railway Company that the railway would be made by them in its entirety, and if the Bill went to a Committee the value of that promise could be tested. He, therefore, suggested that the ordinary course should be followed, so that the Bill could be discussed before a quasi-judicial tribunal.

MR. CARVILL (Newry) urged that the promoters of the scheme had never given the public a chance to find the necessary capital. The ink was hardly dry on the Act of Parliament before these gentlemen were negotiating with the Great Northern

Railway Company. It was unreasonable that matters should be allowed to remain as they were for another year by the Bill being sent to a Committee. Such a step would be giving approval to a course of conduct of which it was the business of the House to mark its disapproval. The real question was whether there had been a breach of faith with a Parliamentary Committee as well as with the public. The charge against the promoters was that by certain designs and representations they induced the people to believe that if they supported the Bill a measure would be granted by which an alternative route would be provided between Armagh and Dublin. His constituent were deceived as well. They requested him to give evidence, but, as he said before, throughout the whole length and breadth of Ireland not a single local body could be found to recommend the scheme to the House of Commons. He submitted, with all respect, that he had established that these gentlemen had humbugged a Committee of the House of Commons, and it was the bounden duty of the House to mark its disapproval of such conduct. He wished to press on the attention of the House what was stated by Mr. Balfour Browne, who opened the case last year before the Committee for the promoters. He said; "Now I propose, with your permission, to tell you something about the Kingscourt, Keady, and Armagh Railway. I appear with my learned friends, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Bushe, and Mr. Rowlands, for the promoters, and the Bill is for power to incorporate a company to construct a railway from Kingscourt, through Carrickmacross, through Castleblaney, and through Keady, to join the Great Northern Railway at Armagh, I believe the total length of the railway is about thirty-six miles. It has one very important feature that will be obvious to you on the map; it connects the system of the Great Northern of Ireland with the system of the Midland Great Western of Ireland, the Great Northern lines on that map being indicated by green, the Midland Great Western being indicated in blue. It will make a new route between the North of Ireland and Dublin, and that is one of the most important features of the scheme, and I believe that you will have tables of distances put before you that it will be a route taking Armagh as a common point, five miles shorter between Armagh and Dublin, than by the present existing Great Northern route via Newry and Dundalk. That of itself is a very important matter, and it is a matter which was entirely overlooked, I think, by the Committee which sat upon this Bill, and determined the preamble was not proved last year."

Later on in his statement Mr. Balfour Browne said;

"A railway company has no vested right in its traffic. It is there providing a road for the public to use, and if the public wants two roads the public ought to have them unless there are some countervailing disadvantages which would make you respect it. Here, Sir, there is not a word to be said against our line from beginning to end except by the Great Northern Railway. There is not a landowner opposing. Every one of the local authorities; every one of the county councils; every body in the district, has petitioned or passed resolutions or is in support of our line, and there is no one here to say that this line should not be made except a company that is dividing 60 per cent.; I do not complain of that; but a rich company that wants to maintain its monopoly in the north-east of Ireland. Sir, I do not think that is a ground for rejecting a

Bill. I hope it will not be made a ground in this case. Is it necessary that this line should be made?"

The hon. Member wished the House to understand that the necessity for this line was recognised so long ago as 1837, but matters progressed so slowly in Ireland, especially in industrial development, that here sixty-four years afterwards they were discussing whether the line was to be made at all. Mr. Balfour Browne referred to the fact that in 1837 a Royal Commission on Irish railways recommended that a railway running up from Navan to Armagh should be made, and the learned counsel continued;

"That is a long time ago, but ever since the people in this district have been urging the Great Northern or somebody to make a line; and in the year 1894 the Midland Great Western Railway of Ireland promoted a line running over practically one route from Kingscourt, where they are just now to join the Great Northern at Armagh. The Midland Great Western thought it was necessary. I have an opportunity, from the circular they sent to their shareholders, of giving you the opinion of the directors of that railway company as to the utility of this line. What Happened? When that line was promoted the Great Northern, in order to maintain its monopoly, went and canvassed the shareholders of the rival railway company; of the Midland Company; canvassed them to vote against this line; and so many did vote against the line that the Midland Railway Company did not get the requisite majority; they got a majority, but they did not get the requisite majority, so they had to withdraw that line which they themselves said was necessary in the interests of the public."

He would not trouble the House with any further quotations from the speech of the counsel for the promoters. He should like, however, to quote a few words from the evidence of the promoters themselves. Mr. Worthington, who was the principal promoter of this railway, was examined by Mr. Balfour Browne as follows;

"It was said last year that it was your intention to sell the railway it Parliament gave you the power to construct it? There was not the slightest ground for such a statement.

We had no intention whatever, and I believe it was said after we had called our evidence, when we had no opportunity of contradicting it, but you want to emphatically contradict it now?; Yes.

"Your object as one of the promoters is to have this railway made?; Yes.

"With your experience of Irish railways; I will not go over the evidence we have had; do you think, first of all, that the district requires a railway?; Clearly it does.

"Do you think also that a through rate from Armagh to Dublin will be an advantage to both those great centres?; Undoubtedly.

"Knowing Ireland well, do you think the district is so good as many others in which railways have been made?; It is a great deal better than many districts in which I have made railways.

"Besides that, will it develop traffic that does not exist at the present time?; It will no doubt."

[Cries of "Divide."] He had a great deal more evidence he should like to have

the opportunity of reading, but in deference to the wish of the House he would not pursue that course. His apology for troubling the House with these quotations; it was rather curious to have to offer an apology; was that this was a matter that concerned his constituency and the constituency of his hon. friend the Member for Mid Armagh, which almost adjoined each other. They knew the interest the public took in having a competitive and alternative route. Up to the 9th of April the rates on the Great Northern Railway were excessively and prohibitively high, but from a paper he had received from his constituency it appeared that within the last ten days the company had taken a step of the most extraordinary character, which he thought gave an insight into their style of management. There was in the town of Newry an important grass-seed industry. A large warehouse was established there, where seed was prepared for the market. It was not thriving, but it was not quite defunct. He believed that the last regulation of the Great Northern Railway Company was quite likely to destroy it. The rate for grass-seed from Belfast to Dublin was 8s. per ton, and from Newry, which was little more than half the way; he thought the distance was 70 miles against 112; the rate was 9s. 2d. per ton. The rate for potatoes was now raised from 5s. to 7s. 6d.

\*MR. SPEAKER said these matters were not relevant to the question before the House.

MR. CARVILL said he quite accepted the ruling. He concluded by reading a letter he had received from a Member of the Committee that sat upstairs on the Bill supporting the views he had put before the House.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.) said he understood that his hon. friend the Member for Newry opposed the Bill, though he thought his speech would more incline one to believe that the best way to get out of the tangle would be to send the Bill upstairs to a Committee. The right hon. and gallant Member had signed a whip in opposition to this Bill, because he was not impressed when he signed that whip that the Midland Railway were ready to plank down the money in order that this railway should be made. He was in favour of the railway being made at all hazards, because he thought it would be of advantage to a considerable part of Ireland. He should be very glad at the same time to see the competitive element brought into the railway scheme. But if the railway was not to be made, and the Midland Railway Company did not mean to plank down the money and defeat the object of the Great Northern, then he thought the best thing they could do was to send the Bill to a Committee upstairs. He ventured to say that next year, if the Committee found that either company had been acting unfairly and had no intention of carrying out a railway which would be beneficial to the country, the House would carry some scheme which would have the effect of giving to that part of Ireland the railway accommodation it required. Personally he hoped that the result of the deliberations of the Committee would be that the railway, when made, would be made on the competitive principle.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I do not rise in order to express my opinion on the merits of the Bill, for that, indeed, is not the question before the House. The question is whether

we shall or shall not this afternoon depart from the usual practice of sending such measures up to a Committee. That question has been very keenly argued. A somewhat strong case has been made out by the Member for Mid Armagh, who was reinforced by the Member for the Knutsford Division.

On the face of it, and on the argument they put forward, it looks as if there has been a breach of faith on the part of the promoters, and that they secured the assent of the Committee to their scheme on promises which have since been broken. If that argument stood alone, and if we were able to accept that argument altogether, then I think a case would have been made out for taking the unusual course of rejecting the Bill on the Second Reading; but after listening to two or three speeches I should hesitate to pronounce definitely upon an intricate case of that kind, and should like to hear witnesses examined before I would dare to say that the promoters are not acting in good faith. It would be a serious matter if this House were to reject the Bill on the Second Reading after listening to two or three speeches without offering the promoters an opportunity of showing that they are acting in good faith. The only other argument to which I shall refer is this. A suggestion has been made that the Midland Company gave some encouragement to the promoters of the Bill of last year, and that they are not making good that encouragement. If this through line cannot be made without the assistance of the Midland Company, and the Midland Company have given no sufficient evidence of the fact that they intend to give that assistance; what a difficult question that is to resolve in this House! Surely that is a question on which we should need to hear evidence and assure ourselves whether the Midland Company do or do not mean to assist in making the through route. But when we have to decide upon the relative probability of each, and upon the value of one by comparison with another, then I must say for my part I could not come to a decision without the assistance usually given by a Committee upstairs.

\*MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said he took great interest in the railway affairs of Ireland. He remembered reading long ago that one of the most eminent railway experts said: "If the State does not govern the railways, the railways will soon govern the State." It appeared to him that they had arrived at that stage. They had the Chief Secretary for Ireland, the Secretary to the Admiralty, the ex Chief Secretary, and present President of the Board of Trade making the suggestion that what was determined by the House of Commons last session should be thrown altogether overboard, and that they should give the Great Northern Company an opportunity to so manipulate affairs that they would be able to gain the end they had in view. Where were they now? They had the Government and several interested Members on one side, and they had public utility and the Members representing the district on the other. He had some experience of what railway monopoly in Ireland meant. Practically the carrying companies claimed to detain stock as long as they liked, and to deliver it in what condition they chose. He gave the Chief Secretary credit for doing the best he could, but he had as much knowledge of this subject as any Member on the Ministerial Bench, for he was for nearly six months on the Select Committee appointed to inquire into railway and canal rates and charges, and as the result of his experience he came to the conclusion that the object of railway managers

and railway witnesses was to befog the Committee. The end of it was to make confusion worse confounded. There were in Ireland at present four or five railway companies, and they were absolutely kings and lords of the districts in which the lines ran. They had and exercised the power of assessing the residents through rates and charges, and of unduly favouring certain centres at the expense of other districts. Except on the great main arteries between Dublin and Belfast, the autocrats of the Great Northern treated the public in whatever way they thought proper. He trusted the Government would not actively interfere in this matter. If they sent this Bill to a Committee of the House, and if it came back recommended by the Committee, hon. Members would argue that they could not go against the recommendation of the Committee. The scheme of last year was the proper one to adopt. The House was getting almost tired of railway Bills, and the railway managers ought to be a little more considerate in taking up the time of this House. A Grand Committee should take up this question, and lay down definite principles, in order to prevent the time of the House being wasted by private railway Bills of this character. The great element of an alternative way, which would make this

railway useful as a competing route from Dublin with the Great Northern Railway, had been absolutely left out of this Bill. He believed that the common sense and the commercial instincts of hon. Members of this House would defeat this Bill.

They should not allow it to be read a second time, because the element of public utility, which ought to be the basis of all legislation, was absent. He trusted therefore that the House would reject the Bill, as the entire management of the Irish railway system called for immediate and drastic changes.

SIR JAMES HASLETT (Belfast, N.) said the chief question before the House was whether there had been a breach of faith with the Committee of the House. They had to ask themselves whether a reasonable *prima facie* case had been made out in favour of this Bill going to a Committee. They were now in a position to investigate the statements which had been made pro and con, and the question was whether it was not the duty of this House, after having heard conflicting statements, to send this Bill to a Committee of the House, which, presumably, would take evidence without bias, and would report to this House the result. It was more than clear that among five members of the Kingscourt Railway board there was some conflict of opinion, and if there was a difference of opinion between those five members, surely that was not a question which this House could arrange, and it was a matter that should be brought forward fairly and squarely before a Committee of the House. It had been suggested that there would be a breach of faith if this Bill was adopted, but one of the clauses in the Bill passed last year actually opened the door for this Bill. There were certain running powers in connection with the Midland Railway. Sub-section 7 of Clause 51 says;

"Provided that the running powers over the railway of the Midland Company granted by this section shall cease in the event of the undertaking being sold or of the railways being worked by the Great Northern Railway."

That was the very thing that was being done or contemplated by the Act which the House were now asked to send to the Committee. Surely if there were any means of



interpreting plain language it was clear that, inferentially, such a scheme was contemplated. Evidence was taken upon that point, and the result was that this clause was added to the Bill. They had been told that this railway could not be made without a subsidy, and up to the present, so far as they knew, not one solitary farthing of capital had been planked down. They had had a great many hazy statements brought before them, and a great many had also been reported in the press. A Bill was now brought forward to make a railway through a paying part of the line where the manufacturing districts in Ireland required it. The representatives of every leading manufacture in the districts between Armagh and Keady were unanimous in favour of this Bill. [Cries of "No, no."] Yes they were, for he had gone into the matter with them. He thought this difference of opinion showed the necessity for having this Bill referred to a Committee. The argument in favour of referring this Bill to a Committee was irresistible. When the Midland Railway were approached by the other company they declined to carry out their verbal agreement, and now the line was being auctioned between two companies, and bandied about as in a game of battledore and shuttlecock. They would rather not have any Bill at all than not have the whole Bill. He thought it might be very fairly claimed that, under the circumstances, this Bill should be sent to a Committee where witnesses could be examined on oath. He earnestly asked the House to pass the Second Reading of this Bill, and let the measure go to a Committee in order to sift the evidence and find out what were the real wants and necessities of the district.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.) said that out of the thirty-six miles of railway dealt with by this Bill twenty miles passed through his constituency. He desired to point out to the House that there was not a public body in all Monaghan, from the county council downwards, which was not opposed to this Bill, and in favour of the Bill passed last year. The Bill before the House prevented Dublin having the benefit of any competition, and gave a monopoly to Belfast. He was very sorry that the Member for one of the divisions of Belfast, who was a member of the Government, had interfered in this matter. If this Bill was passed it would prevent for all time the establishment of a competitive line of railway with the Great Northern line, which was so much needed in Ireland. Was the House of Commons going to be a party to allowing two railway companies to divide Ireland between themselves, in order that those monopolies might extract all the money they could out of the unfortunate traders who were obliged to send their goods along those railways? In Ireland they were quite differently situated to England and Scotland, because in those countries the people were able to consume nearly all their own produce. In Ireland, however, most of the produce had to be sent to England and Scotland for consumption, and the Great Northern Railway Company were practically squeezing the life-blood out of the people of the constituency which he represented by charging such high rates. It cost them more at the present time to send one hundredweight of oats to Dublin than to Liverpool. By the line sanctioned last year the people living in the north-east portion of Ireland would be provided with a competitive line, by which they could send their goods to the capital of Ireland and to Belfast.

If the Bill before the House was passed, who was going to fight it upstairs? If it was sent upstairs the whole energy of the Northern Railway Company would be used in favour of the Bill, and he hoped that it would be rejected at the present stage.

\*COLONEL WELBY (Taunton) said that as a Member of the Committee which adopted the Bill of last year, he wished to place before the House his recollection of what took place before the Committee. They inquired very carefully into the needs of the district, and they found that for the general benefit of that district it was necessary that there should be a competing line. They came clearly to the conclusion that the rates charged by the Great Northern Railway were high, and that if it was allowed to have a monopoly it would be detrimental to that district. They were very careful to ascertain that it was the intention of the company not to sell it to the Great Northern Railway for a certain number of years. It was on the understanding that the line would not be sold to the Great

Northern Railway that the preamble of the Bill was passed. If Parliament were now to go back upon the decision arrived at last year he believed that they would be doing great harm to the district concerned.

MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) said he wished to corroborate most emphatically what had been said by the hon. and gallant Member for Taunton, and also what had been stated by other hon. Members, that if this Bill was passed there would never be any competitive route established at all. He entirely endorsed what had been said by his colleagues on the Committee in regard to this Bill.

SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.): I should like to say a word upon this question with reference to the attitude which the House is bound to assume towards its own Committee, and the carrying out of an honourable understanding and pledge given to that Committee. The Chief Secretary for Ireland has stated that there was a conflict of evidence as to the transactions which took place at the Committee, which ought to be examined by a fresh Committee. After hearing the evidence of hon. Members who have spoken, of the Chairman of the Committee, and also the letter from another member of the Committee, I venture to say that such a reason as that given by the Chief Secretary for Ireland falls to the ground. We have heard the evidence of four of the members of the Committee which passed the Bill of last year, to the effect that there was a distinct and honourable understanding given with reference to future action in respect of this railway, and if the House now allows a wealthy railway company to endeavour to upset the bargain made in the Committee upstairs it will strike a fatal blow at the carrying on of private Bill business in an honourable manner. I think the reasons given by hon. Members from Ireland with reference to the needs of the district and the necessity for a competitive line in that district have not been answered, and are unanswerable. But apart altogether from this, I say that this House ought to uphold the decisions and bargains entered into by its Committees, and I shall certainly vote against the Second Reading of this Bill.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central) said that there was no doubt whatever that the present Bill would

destroy the arrangement made by the Bill of last year, but the right hon. Gentleman must have forgotten that there was serious danger that if the Bill before the House were not allowed to go to a Committee, not necessarily to be passed, the result would be that neither the scheme of the Bill nor the scheme of last year had any chance of being carried out. There was considerable evidence to show that there was an understanding on the part of the promoters, rightly or wrongly, last year, that they would be assisted in the construction of the railway by the Midland Company, and if there was any such understanding; he did not wish to express a definite opinion regarding it; the Midland Company had now withdrawn from it, with the consequence that there was no prospect of raising capital for the construction of the line. That brought a new chapter into the matter, and it appeared to him that the House would be well advised to allow the Bill to go to a Committee in the usual way. The Committee could examine as to whether there was anything which deserved the title of a breach of faith, and if there were, the course that would be adopted was clear enough. But if there was not a breach of faith, and it was thought desirable that the question should be considered afresh, then it would be possible for the Midland Company to come forward and make a definite offer as to what they were prepared to do. [Sir H. FOWLER: Who is to pay the costs?] There was something besides costs to be considered, and that was the public interest. Having listened most carefully and in an impartial spirit to the discussion, he did not think that it would be to the public interest that the House should decide the question itself.

MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.) said he would have preferred to give a silent vote on the question but for some of the observations made in the course of the debate. His hon. friend had stated that there had been certain corrupt influences at work to promote the Bill, but as far as he was concerned he wished it to be distinctly understood that he had not been approached by anyone in favour of the Bill. On the other hand, he had been very strongly urged to oppose the Bill. It had been stated that local opinion was opposed to the Bill, but he held in his hand a resolution passed by the county council of Louth in favour of it. With regard to the statement of his hon. friend the Member for Newry that Dundalk had been subsidised by the Great Northern Company, he wished to say publicly that he knew two of the gentlemen concerned, one of whom was a friend of thirty years standing, and that there were not two more honourable or upright men in Europe. He had

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex, F.

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Garfit, William

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Aird, Sir John

Gibbs, Hn A G H. (City of London)

Parkes, Ebenezer

Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham  
Anstruther, H. T.  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Percy, Earl  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Purvis, Robert  
Arrol, Sir William  
Goschen, Hn. George Joachim  
Randles, John S.  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Baldwin, Alfred  
Gunter, Colonel  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Hain, Edward  
Ropner, Col. Robert  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Rutherford, John  
Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin  
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Bond, Edward  
Henderson, Alexander  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Brassey, Albert  
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampst'd)  
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.  
Brookfield, Col. Montagu  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, F.)  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Butcher, John George  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Gl'sg'w

Horner, Frederick William  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversham)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.  
Wharton, Rt. Hon. J. Lloyd  
Charrington, Spencer  
Lawson, John Grant  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u-Lyne)  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)  
Whitmore, Chas. Algernon  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Denny, Col.  
Long, Rt. Hon. Walter (Bristol, S.)  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Lowe, Francis William  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. J. W. (Cum Penr.)  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Dixon Hartland, Sir Fred. D.  
Macdonald, John Cumming  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs.)  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriesshire)

Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Younger, William  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Fison, Frederick William  
Newdigate, Francis Alex.  
Sir James Haslett and Mr. William Johnston.  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Nicholson, William Graham  
NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.  
Asher, Alexander  
Bell, Richard  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud  
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry  
Bill, Charles  
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitz Roy  
Blundell, Col. Henry  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Boland, John  
Ambrose, Robert  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn

nothing to say with reference to the merits of the Bill, but he thought there was a great deal of force in the argument of the hon. Member for North Louth, with whom he did not always agree, that the Bill should be sent to a Committee and that the Midland Company or others who desired to have the Kingscourt and Armagh Railway constructed in accordance with last year's Bill should be given an opportunity of submitting their proposals.

Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 114; Noes, 244. (Division List No. 129.)

Boyle, James

Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley  
Brigg, John  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Pilkington, Richard  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Burns, John  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Burt, Thomas  
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Holland, William Henry  
Price, Robert John  
Caine, William Sproston  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside  
Caldwell, James  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Rea, Russell  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Reddy, M.  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Renwick George  
Cawley, Frederick  
Joyce, Michael  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (St'ly bridge

Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Roberts, J. H. (Denbighshire)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Labouchere, Henry  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Lambert, George  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Robinson, Brooke  
Colville, John  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Leamy, Edmund  
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Leng, Sir John  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Levy, Maurice  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
Crombie, John William  
Lloyd-George, David  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Lough, Thomas  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Cullinan, J.  
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Lundon, W.  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Daly, James



MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tynesie  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan  
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Delany, William  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Spear, John Ward  
Dewar, T. R (T'rH'ml'ts, S. Geo.  
M'Cann, James  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (N'rth'nts  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
M'Crae, George  
Spencer, E. (W. Bromwich)  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk  
Dillon, John  
M'Govern, T.  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Donelan, Captain A.  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Doogan, P. C.  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Strachey, Edward  
Doughty, George  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Sullivan, Donal  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Duffy, William J.  
Malcolm, Ian  
Tennant, Harold John  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe  
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r  
Dunn, Sir William  
Markham, Arthur Basil

Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Minch, Matthew  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.  
Emmott, Alfred  
Mooney, John J.  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
More, Robt. Jas. (Shropshire)  
Tomkinson, James  
Faber, George Denison  
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen)  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Morley, Rt. Hn John (Montrose  
Tully, Jasper  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford)  
Ure, Alexander  
Field, William  
Mowbray, Sir Robt. Gray C.  
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Wallace, Robert  
Flower, Ernest  
Murnaghan, George  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Forster, Henry William  
Murphy, J.  
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.  
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans  
Nolan, Col John P. (Galway, N.  
Webb, Col. William George  
Gilhooly, James  
Norman, Henry  
Weir, James Galloway

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. H. John  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE. (Taunton  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)  
O'Dowd, John  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Grenfell, William Henry  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Groves, James Grimble  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
O'Mall'ey, William  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Hammond, John  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)  
O'Shee, James John  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Partington, Oswald  
Mr. Lonsdale and Mr. Morris.  
Harwood, George  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Main Question, as amended, put, and agreed to.  
Second Reading put off for six months.  
PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIE  
WITH).  
Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions  
for Private Bills, That, in the case of the Petition for additional Provision in

the following Bill, the Standing Orders have not been complied with viz.;;  
Great Central Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Report be referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.  
PRIVATE BILL PETITIONS (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED WITH).

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

London United Tramways.

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

NEATH HARBOUR BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

MIDLAND RAILWAY BILL.

As amended, considered; A Clause added; Amendments made: Bill to be read the third time.

TAFF VALE RAILWAY BILL.

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

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPETED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, Standing Order No. 62 has been complied with, viz.;;

London and India Docks (New Works) Bill.

Rickmansworth and Uxbridge Valley Water Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (STANDING ORDERS NOT PREVIOUSLY INQUIRED INTO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing Orders not previously inquired into, and which are applicable thereto, have been complied with, viz.;;

Arlesey Gas Bill [Lords].

Folkestone Corporation Bill [Lords].

Newcastle-upon-Tyne and Gateshead Gas Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

PRIVATE BILLS [LORDS] (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

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, originating in the Lords, and referred on the First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.;;

Berwickshire County Town Bill [Lords]

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

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, no standing Orders are applicable, viz.;;

Local Government Provisional Orders (Poor Law) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERET-COMPLIED WITH).

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

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 1) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time upon Monday next.

DORKING GAS BILL.

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

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (MONEY).

Petition, and Bill ordered to be brought In by Mr. Cohen and Mr. John Burns.

MILITARY LANDS PROVISIONAL ORDERS.

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.

MILITARY LANDS PROVISIONAL ORDERS RILL.

"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Secretary of State under the Military Lands Act, 1892," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 143.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3).

Bill to confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Billericay (Rural), Drighlington, Heston, and Isleworth Sunderland, and York, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

"To confirm certain Provisional Orders of the Local Government Board relating to Billericay (Rural), Drighlington, Heston and Isleworth, Sunderland, and York," presented, and read the first time; to be referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 144.]

ILKESTON AND HEANOR WATER BOARD RILL.

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

PETITIONS.

AGRICULTURAL RATES ACT, 1896.

Petition, from Rochdale, against re-enactment; to lie upon the Table.

BEER BILL.

Petitions, in favour, from Chichester; Nacton; Bentley; Levington; Southampton; Bucklesham; Fulkenham; Thorington; and Staffordshire; to lie upon the Table.

BURIAL PLACES (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

BURIAL GROUNDS (LOANS) (SCOTLAND) RILL.

Petitions, in favour, from Bothwell; and Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs of Scotland; to lie upon the Table.

## CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

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

## COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petitions, in favour, from Bickershaw; Bamfurlong; Digby; New London; Sutton; New Summit; Bentinek; Plumtree; Eastwood; Silver Hill (Nos. 1 and 2); Butcherwood; Annesley; New Hucknall; Dunston; St. John's; Staveley; Renishaw Park; Parkhall; Hartington; Norwood; Muirkirk; Talk o' th' Hill; Sandford; Hill; Hanley (No. 3); Bulwell; Pendleton; Cinder Hill; Broxtowe; Hartshead; Heage; Topcliffe; East Ardsley; Robin Hood; Thorn hill; Old Roundwood; Shaw Cross; Bruntcliffe; Mirfield; Whitwick (No. 6); Whitwick (Nos. 1 and 2); Coleorton; Snibstone (No. 2); South Leicestershire (No.

1) South Leicestershire (No. 2); Ibstock (No. 1); Ibstock (No. 2); Nailstonewood; Ellistown (No. 1); Little Hulton; Marlpool; Pentrich; Codnor; Ripley; Stanley; Ilkeston; Marchay; Turton Moor; Micklefield; Halton; Amington; Tame Valley; Hockley Hall: Birch Coppice; Alvecote; South Kirkby; Featherstone; Kippax; Glasshoughton; Ackton Hall; and Allerton Silkstone Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

## EDUCATION (YOUNG CHILDREN) (SCHOOL ATTENDANCE) (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

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

Petitions, for alteration of Law; from Stockton-on-Tees; and Brighouse: to lie upon the Table.

## LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

## LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petitions, in favour, from Sheerness; Chesterfield; Godstone; Workington; Wilmslow; and Birmingham; to lie upon the Table.

## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL.

Petition, from St. Mabe, against; to lie upon the Table.

## MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions, in favour, from Digby; New London; Sutton; New Summit; Burntcliffe; Bentinek; Plumtree; Silver Hill (Nos. 1 and 2); Butcherwood; New Hueknall; Annesley; Bamfurlong; Hindley Green; Muirkirk; Parkhall; Renishaw Park; St. John's; Staveley; Dunston; Norwood; Talk o' th' Hill; Sandford Hill; Hanley No. (3); Pendleton; Broxtowe; Cinder Hill; Bulwell; Hartshead; Topcliffe; East Ardsley; Robin Hood: Thornhill; Old Boundwood; Shaw Cross; Mirfield; Dillwyn; Gwendraeth; Crosshands; Cawdor; Gellicendrim; Ammanford (No. 1); Emlyn: Brynhenllyn: Rhos; Isllwyn; Eastwood; Ibstock (No. 1); Ibstock (No. 2); South Leicestershire (No. 1); South Leicestershire (No. 2); Snibston (No. 2); Coleorton; Nailstonewood: Ellistown

(No. 1); Ellistown

(No. 2); Whitwick (No. 6); Whitwick (Nos. 2 and 5): Pentrich; Ripley; Stanley; Ilkeston: Little Hulton; Turton Moor; Halton; Micklefield; Whateley; Kingsbury; Alvecote; Birch Coppice; Amington; South Kirby; Featherstone; Glasshoughton; Skelmersdale; Marchay; Marlpool; Ackton Hall; Kippax; and Allerton Silkstone Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

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

Petition, from Samuel Crossland and others, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

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

Petitions, in favour, from Sheffield (six); Helensburgh; Coupar Angus; Abram; Cardiff (seven); United Free Church of Scotland; Highgate; Catrine; Coatbridge; Meersbrook Park; Birmingham: Nottingham; Lochs; Stamford Hill; Midsomer Norton; Llantrissant (four); Morley (two); Middlesbrough; (three) Llandovery (four): Crompton; Blackburn; Leeds: Launceston; Great Grimsby (four); Great Coates; Glossop; Midsomer Norton; Brixton; Calderhead; New Monkland; Waltham; Thomer; Cleethorpes (two); Denaby Main (two); Taunton (three); Stainland; and Aberdeen: to lie upon the Table.

#### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions, in favour, from Straiton; Bonhill; Coupar Angus; Clunie; Bendochy; Kinnaird; Coldstream; Old Monkland; Dailly; Colmonell; Slamannan; Cadder; Muiravonside; Kirk-; michael; Prestonkirk; Unst; Prestonpans; Nairn (two); Blairgowrie (two); Sleat; Westray; Stronsay (two); Lerwick; Tingwall; Edina; Barry; Barvas; Ladybank; Newport; Fraserburgh; Queensferry; Dumbarton; Cumnock; Dunipace; Old Cumnock; Urquhart; Maryculter; Aberlour; Cambuslang; Marykirk; Johnstone; Bothwell; and, Port Glasgow; to lie upon the Table.

#### SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

Petitions, against, from Hampstead; and St. John's Wood; to lie upon the Table.

#### RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

#### REVENUE (COLLECTION OF TAXES).

Return [presented 18th April] to be printed. [No. 129.]

#### GREEK LOAN OF 1898.

Account presented, up to 31st March, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 130.]

#### EGYPTIAN GUARANTEED LOAN OF 1885.

Account presented, up to 31st March, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### CROWN'S NOMINEE ACCOUNT.

Abstract account presented, of Receipts and Payments of the Treasury Solicitor, in the year ended 31st December, 1900, in the Administration of Estates on behalf of the Crown, and Alphabetical List of Intestates' Estates in respect of which Letters of Administration were granted to the Treasury Solicitor as Crown's Nominee, and of other cases (partial Intestacies. &c.) in which accounts were opened in the Books of the Treasury Solicitor in the same year in respect of moneys received by him as Crown's Nominee [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

[No. 131.]

#### RAILWAYS ABANDONMENT.

Copy presented, of Report by the Board of Trade respecting the Bideford and Clovelly Railway (Abandonment) Bill and the objects thereof [pursuant to Standing Order 158A]; referred to the Committee on the Bill.

#### POLLING DISTRICTS (CITY OF WAKE-FIELD).

Copy presented, of Order made by the Council of the City of Wakefield, altering certain Polling Districts in the City [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

## EDUCATION (SCOTLAND).

Copy presented, of Minute of the Committee of Council on Education in Scotland, dated 19th April, 1901, amending the terms of Article 89 (b) of the Code of 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

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

Charitable Endowments (London).; Further Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August, 1894; Mr. Francis Stevenson]; to be printed. [No. 132.]

## QUESTIONS.

### SOUTH AFRICAN WAR; FINANCE OF THE WAR.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he will lay upon the Table a Return giving the total estimated cost of the South African War, and showing the way in which the cost has been, or is to be, met from additional taxation; from the application of realised surplus on ordinary expenditure and suspension of Sinking Fund; and by loan, Exchequer issues, or in other ways.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Yes, Sir. SURRENDERS AT LINDLEY, ETC.; ARMY ORDER, 11TH APRIL.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Special Army Order, issued on 11th April, announcing that any officer or soldier who, when in the presence of the enemy, displays a white flag or other token of surrender, will be tried by general court-martial, is retrospective and applies to the cases of the surrenders at Nicholson's Nek, Reddersburg, Koorn Spruit, and Lindley: and whether he will now give the names of the irresponsible persons who raised the white flag at Lindley, or state his reasons for withholding their names.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg at the same time to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state to what regiment or command did the person belong who raised the white flag at Lindley; and, if it is alleged that he was one of any Irish company, will a court-martial or inquiry be ordered.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The order will not be retrospective, though in certain cases of surrender inquiries or courts-martial have been ordered. In reply to the second paragraph and to a similar question put by the hon. Member for North Louth, the persons responsible for raising the white flag at Lindley were Lieutenant Robins and Corporal Jacques, of the 47th Company Imperial Yeomanry, Duke of Cambridge's Own. Lieutenant Robins was severely wounded and could not attend the court of inquiry. Lord Roberts is making a further inquiry respecting his case. Corporal Jacques had been invalided and discharged before the inquiry was held.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Neither of these gentlemen, I am happy to say, is Irish.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I do not think the right hon. Gentleman said whether the names of the persons responsible at Nicholson's Nek and Reddersburg would be given too.

MR. BRODRICK: No; Nicholson's Nek took place in November or October, 1899, and is too far back.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: You do not know them, I suppose?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;



#### LORD METHUEN'S ILLNESS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War what was the ailment from which Lord Methuen was suffering which rendered it necessary for him to go to hospital, from which, according to the list of British casualties published on 11th April, he was discharged on 7th April: how long was Lord Methuen in hospital; by whom were the duties of his command discharged in his absence; when did the news of Lord Methuen's illness reach the War Office: and what explanation, if any, is there that the fact of his illness was not communicated to the public.

MR. BRODRICK: The only notification as to Lord Methuen's illness which has reached the War Office was the notice that he was discharged to duty on 7th April, and this was duly published. It has not been thought necessary to inform the War Office when generals in South Africa go on the sick list, unless the illness is serious.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: How did the Government get the information that General De Wet was mad?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): May I ask whether the Government will consider the desirability of allowing Lord Methuen to come home for a rest?

MR. BRODRICK: Lord Methuen has recently carried out a variety of operations to the entire satisfaction of Lord Kitchener and the Government.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: What about Magersfontein?

#### PEACE NEGOTIATIONS WITH GENERAL BOTHA

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has any objection to state the exact terms of the verbal message received by General Louis Botha from Lord Kitchener, which is referred to in a published letter of General Botha dated 13th February 1901.

MR. BRODRICK: We do not know the terms if the verbal message alluded to; but we assume it was only a statement by Lord Kitchener that if General Botha desired to meet him he was ready to arrange a meeting.

#### GENERAL COLVILE'S CASE; PERSONAL EXPLANATION; MR. BRODRICK AND MR. DOUGLAS.

MR. BRODRICK: I have to ask the House to allow me to make a personal explanation in reference to a statement which has appeared in the public press in regard to a reply I gave to the hon. Member for North-West Lanark. The hon. Member, speaking in Scotland, alluded to an answer I had made in the House of Commons to a question from himself, and in commenting upon it said my statement was false, and that it was a very serious matter for a Member of the House of Commons to find that a truthful answer was not given to a plain question by a Minister. The question put to me was "whether I would publish a particular report sent by General Colvile to the Commander-in-Chief respecting the battle of Paardeberg. I replied to that that reports were furnished by officers commanding divisions only to the senior officer present, and did not accompany his despatch to the Commander-in-Chief. I said in consequence General Colvile's despatch or report was sent to General Kelly-Kenny, who was in immediate command, and was not sent to Lord Roberts. Search had been made in Lord Roberts's papers and the report could not at the moment be traced. Since the hon. Member used the expressions in Scotland to which I have referred I

asked Lord Roberts to make further search among his papers, and this morning the report was found in a box among a good many other papers of a similar kind, where they had been placed after an abstract of the recommendations in them had been made for the Commander-in-Chief's use. I need hardly say how much I regret to have been the channel of giving any inaccurate information to the House, but the House will realise that, amid so many hundreds and thousands of papers passing officially at a period of active service and removed on many occasions, it is not always possible to find a particular paper of that kind at the moment when it may be required. Although it is not the rule to lay papers of this description on the Table, I have not the slightest objection, as it is asked for, to lay this paper on the Table. But I ought to add, to avoid any misapprehension, that the report in question has reference to the battle of Paardeberg, and not in any way to incidents in the subsequent career of General Colville which formed the subject of debate a few nights ago.

MR. DOUGLAS (Lanarkshire, N. W.): After the statement the right hon. Gentleman has made, perhaps the House will bear with me for a few minutes while I make a personal explanation. I think it is evident from the tone of the right hon.

Gentleman in his remarks that he has somewhat misunderstood what I said. He seemed to have supposed that some observations of mine were a reflection on his private character. My observations

&#x2020; See preceding volume, page 60.

were only intended to apply to the answers themselves and their substance. I exceedingly regret that, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to say that no such intention or thought was in my mind, and such an intention I wish to disclaim as publicly as I made the statement in question. But perhaps the House will consider with me that the state of, matters appeared somewhat anomalous and serious. A question was asked whether a despatch had been addressed to Lord Roberts or not, and it was said in reply it had not been so addressed. In the course of the debate on General Colville's case I communicated to the right hon. Gentleman across the floor of the House that the despatch was in existence, that it had been addressed to Lord Roberts, and I offered the right hon. Gentleman a copy of it. Three days afterwards the hon. Member for the Stroud Division asked the right hon. Gentleman whether that was the case or not, and the statement was contradicted without any reference to what had passed during the debate. I thought this a matter of so much importance that, being questioned in my constituency, I could not allow it to rest where it was. I exceedingly regret that I should have been betrayed into any statement that could be supposed to be a reflection on the personal honour of the right hon. Gentleman, and hope he will regard the explanation I have made as satisfactory as the statement he has made is to me.

CHINESE LABOUR IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. HAVILAND-BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been called to the resolution passed by the Buluwayo Chamber of Mines affirming the principle of the introduction of Chinese labour, but under Government restrictions with regard to the return of the labourers to China; and whether His Majesty's Government will

exert its influence to prevent the introduction of Chinese cheap labour into any part of His Majesty's dominions.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I have seen a statement to this effect in the newspapers. I am not prepared to give any pledge, as Chinese

labour is already employed in several of His Majesty's colonies.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a very heavy poll tax has been placed upon Chinese labourers in many of our colonies, and will the right hon. Gentleman countenance such a tax in Rhodesia?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No. I am not aware of that.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is not a high sum demanded for every China man landed in New South Wales?

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

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I will give notice of the question.

REPORTED SHOOTING BY THE BOERS OF MR. WESSEL, PEACE ENVOY.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether Mr. Andries Weasel, who is described as a peace envoy, and who was reported to have been shot at Klip fontein in January last by order of General De Wet, was an accredited agent from Lord Kitchener, or any other British general, to General De Wet, or any other Boer general; whether he is aware that it is now reported from Craddock that Mr. Wessel is alive; and can he inform the House what are the true facts; and whether, if the former report be false, any steps will be taken to trace its source, and to prevent similar false-hoods being telegraphed to this country.

MR. BRODRICK: I have no information of this matter beyond that Mr. Wessel was reported to have

been shot. I will, however, make inquiries.

DISPOSAL OF CAPTURED CATTLE.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the military authorities in South Africa have decided to slaughter for food all captured cattle, and whether, if such action is or has been taken, consideration has been given to the importance of keeping a stock of acclimatised cattle in that country, and the cost and loss that would be entailed by restocking with cattle not acclimatised to the country.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The local authorities are alive to the importance of the question, and Government stock farms have been established.

MR. LAMBERT: But have the military authorities decided that the cattle should be slaughtered?

LORD STANLEY: I anticipate that if they are required for food they are slaughtered. I cannot say more.

MR. LAMBERT: Will the noble Lord get the information by Monday?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir.

OBSERVANCE OF PAROLE.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether British soldiers, who are not commanding officers, and who are captured by the enemy,

are permitted to give their parole or to take an oath not to take any further part in the war; and whether, if such parole is given or oath taken by a soldier, he is, on being liberated by the Boers, permitted by our military authorities to observe parole or oath.

MR. BRODRICK: According to custom of war, officers other than commanding officers are not permitted to give parole either for themselves or their men, and soldiers are not allowed to do so. A State has no power to force its subjects to act contrary to parole.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: May I ask whether, if parole is given or oath taken by a soldier, he is, on being liberated by the Boers, permitted by our military authorities to observe his parole or oath.

LORD STANLEY: If they are not allowed to give parole at all, no parole can be given.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: When it is given, and they are liberated, are they forced to fight or not?

LORD STANLEY: Certainly.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Does the same rule apply to the Boer army?

[No answer was returned.]

WAR GRATUITY; CIVILIAN HOSPITAL ORDERLIES.

MR. GUTHRIE (Tower Hamlets, Bow, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the civilian orderlies and other employees of the various field and stationary private hospitals who served in South Africa are to receive the war gratuity authorised by the Special Army Order, dated 8th December, 1900; and, if not, whether he will state the reason for making a distinction between these men and the orderlies of the Royal Army Medical Corps, who performed exactly similar work.

LORD STANLEY: As I have previously explained to the House, the war gratuity is not applicable to civilians employed on specific terms during the war.

RETURN OF TROOPS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War on whose advice and on whose responsibility, having regard to the statement of Sir Alfred Milner that the last half-year of the South African War has been a period of retrogression, were troops sent home in September and October last.

MR. BRODRICK: I understand this statement of Sir Alfred Milner's to have been made on a review of the whole situation, which could not be foreseen in September and October last. The troops were sent home by Lord Roberts with the full concurrence of the Government.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Was the war then over?

RETURN OF THE HOUSEHOLD BRIGADE.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, having regard to the repeated requests for mounted troops for South Africa, whether he can explain why were the Household Brigade, a cavalry corps, sent home, and infantry volunteers kept at the front.

MR. BRODRICK: At the time when the Household Cavalry were sent home the want of mounted troops in South Africa was not felt; cavalry drafts had been suspended. Great difficulty was also experienced in finding remounts for such heavy men.

Some infantry Volunteers were sent home at the time, but subsequent events postponed the return of the remainder or of any other troops.

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY;NEW ARMY ORDER.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can explain why the Imperial Yeomanry Order has been issued before the House of Commons has had the opportunity of considering the effect of the proposal upon the Volunteer Force and the possibility of getting recruits for the Yeomanry under the new conditions, and in what way commanding officers of Volunteer corps are to be compensated for having at the invitation of the War Office raised within the past few months, at great expense and trouble, companies of mounted infantry, and supplying them with uniform and accoutrements in consideration of a certain number of years service under them; and whether the Government have power compulsorily to transfer men who have joined particular regiments of the Volunteer force, and bound themselves to serve for four or five years, to another regiment and to another branch of the Army, serving under entirely different conditions.

The following questions also appeared on the Paper.;

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether the Army Order relating to the Yeomanry published on Thursday forms part of the scheme formulated in the resolution of which he has given notice for a future day; and, if so, why he has proceeded to put in execution a policy which has not yet received the approval of the House.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton): To ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware that an Amendment to the motion of the Secretary of State for War (Army Organisation) to retain the Yeomanry as at present, and to increase the Mounted Infantry to 25,000, instead of the 35,000 Yeomanry as proposed, was put on the Notice Paper before the recess, and whether he will suspend the Army Order issued yesterday until the House has had the opportunity of discussing this question.

MR. BRODRICK: I will reply at the same time to the questions of the hon. Member for Dundee and of my hon. and gallant friend the Member for Taunton. It has been necessary to issue an Army Order affecting the Yeomanry because the training of the force for the year begins in May, and the Commander-in-Chief has strongly recommended that the training and equipment of the force should be altered. The change in the status of the Yeomanry undoubtedly forms part of the general army reform now in progress, but the resolution of which I have given notice deals merely with the establishment of the Yeomanry. The present establishment will not be raised until the resolution is passed by Parliament, but it would be impossible to allow the training of the Yeomanry to proceed or the recruits to be raised under the old system which has been definitely abandoned. The question of establishment and the points raised by the Member for Taunton are open to debate and decision, as they were before the issue of the Order, which cannot be suspended. In reference to the question of the Member for Central Sheffield, there is nothing in the Yeomanry Warrant which forces a transfer of Volunteer Mounted Infantry to Yeomanry, but the military authorities are not prepared to continue the isolated companies of mounted troops hitherto raised, and if

commanding officers can prove a pecuniary loss to their corps, they will be safe guarded against this result. I may add that from all parts of the country, and from many Members of the House, I have received urgent appeals that, on the ground of expense as well as convenience, the new system of training and equipment of the Yeomanry should be at once made public.

#### COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF'S SALARY.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state what is the salary of the new Commander-in-Chief Lord Roberts, and whether it is larger than the salary paid to Lord Wolseley, the late Commander-in-Chief; if so, can he say the reason of such increase?

MR. BRODRICK: The salary of the new Commander-in-Chief is £5,000. It is £500 more than that of the late Commander-in-Chief, as it was considered desirable to make provision for house allowance.

MR. DALY: Had not the late Commander-in-Chief a house?

#### MILITIA TRAININGS.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state what Militia regiments, if any, will be embodied this year; and whether the regiments not so embodied will be called out for annual training.

MR. BRODRICK: I am not in a position to make any statement on this subject at present. We desire to avoid calling on the Militia as far as possible.

#### IMPERIAL YEOMANRY; IRISH REGIMENTS.

DR. THOMPSON (Monaghan, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if it is the intention of the Government to establish in Irish counties regiments of the Imperial Yeomanry.

MR. BRODRICK: No decision to this effect has been arrived at.

#### TITLE OF YEOMANRY FORCE.

COLONEL WELBY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the omission of the title Imperial from that part of his resolution that relates to the Yeomanry was intentional or a printer's error; and whether he is aware that that omission has led many to believe that it was intended to reserve the title Imperial for those troops, whether raised at home or in any other part of the Empire, that will be available for Imperial purposes.

MR. BRODRICK: The omission was intentional. I am not aware that it had the effect referred to in the second part of the question.

#### ARMY RECRUITING; INSPECTOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now state when the Annual Report of the Inspector General of Recruiting will be circulated.

LORD STANLEY: It is hoped that it will be in the hands of Members on Tuesday.

#### ARMY MEAT CONTRACTS.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the terms of the new contracts for the supply of meat to the Army will exclude foreign meat; and whether these conditions will apply to contracts for the supply of meat to the troops stationed in Ireland.

LORD STANLEY: Foreign meat is excluded, and the conditions will apply to

Ireland.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: What precaution will be taken to prevent the evasion of the terms of the contract?

LORD STANLEY: Every precaution possible.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: May I ask whether the contractors who import foreign meat for other purposes will be permitted to tender for these contracts?

LORD STANLEY: Certainly, so long as they fulfil the conditions of our tender.

VOLUNTEER CLOTHING CONTRACTS.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL PRYCE-JONES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether new regulation drab serge clothing and a head-dress for drill and manœuvres purposes for the Regular and Auxiliary forces have been sealed; and, if not, whether a decision may be arrived at at once, as there are several Volunteer corps which have to be reclothed before their annual camp this year, and which, unless the orders are placed in the hands of contractors at once, will be without uniform.

LORD STANLEY: The patterns of the articles forming the proposed service dress of the regular forces are at present under consideration. These changes in pattern will not affect Volunteer corps, unless so desired by the corps.

NAVY; RETURN OF FLEETS.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can now state on what day the Return of Fleets will be circulated to Members.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): I hope to-morrow.

THE BUDGET PROPOSALS; EFFECT UPON RUNNING CONTRACTS.

MR. PLUMMER (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will be prepared to consider the question of exempting from the export duty on coal contracts already entered into, in view of the fact that such duty, if persisted in, must necessarily fall on the exporter, and cannot be recovered in the price to be paid by the buyer abroad.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Yes, Sir. I am at present considering this matter with the members of the Board of Customs, and I hope to have the advantage of some communications on the subject this evening from the hon. Member and those who are associated with him.

MR. WARR (Liverpool, East Toxteth): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, having regard to the provisions of Section 20 of the Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, and of Section 8 of the Finance Act, 1900, the seller will, in cases in which sales of coal or sugar have been effected without express provision to the contrary, be at liberty to add to the contract price an amount equivalent to the duty to be imposed under the Budget resolutions.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The answer, generally speaking, appears to be in the affirmative, as regards any sugar not cleared prior to the incidence of the duty, though of Course it will depend in each case on the actual terms of the contract. The section would not apply to coal, but I propose to insert a clause in the Finance Bill which would have a similar effect.

\*MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydvil): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer

whether he is aware that business at Cardiff is practically at a standstill owing to the uncertainty as to the incidence of the new coal duty, and if in view of the suffering that will follow a paralysis of the trade of the district and the consequent cessation of work at the mines, he will take immediate steps to make known to the shippers of coal and merchants at Cardiff the precise liability of buyers and sellers of coal for export under existing contracts and future sales.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I think the hon. Member is confusing two matters; the liability for the duty in the first instance, and the ultimate incidence of that duty. The payment in the first instance is clear, and the question of exemptions so far as existing contracts are concerned is a matter which, as I have explained, I have under consideration, and I hope shortly to make an announcement to the House. Meanwhile, so far as I can see, there is no reason why the duty should not be paid in Cardiff as elsewhere.

\*MR. D. A. THOMAS: The confusion, if any, has not arisen in my mind, but in that of the merchants of Cardiff.

CHINA; CLAIMS OF BRITISH SUBJECTS.

MR. NORMAN (Wolverhampton, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Foreign Office caused to be published in the newspapers on 8th April an announcement that all claims of British subjects against the Chinese Government must be notified to His Majesty's Minister at Peking by 1st May; and, if so, whether he will inform the House by what route letters posted in England on 9th April could reach Peking by 1st May.

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): Yes, but it was stated in a previous notice issued in March that claims should be forwarded to the Foreign Office, when necessary. Such claims have been, and will be, transmitted to His Majesty's Minister by telegraph.

NIU-CHWANG MARITIME CUSTOMS BUILDINGS.

MR. NORMAN: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state what flag flies over the Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs House at Niu-chwang; by whom the customs receipts are collected, and what is their destination.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The Russian flag was hoisted over the Maritime Customs buildings on 4th August, when the Russian force occupied the town. The work is being carried on by the Chinese Customs staff, and the receipts are being collected by them under Russian supervision, and are held in trust by the Russian authorities subject to a future settlement.

PAPERS ON CHINA.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state when he will lay upon the Table further Papers on China, and whether he will include in the next Papers presented those concerned with the Manchurian Convention down to the date of the refusal of China to sign the Convention, and those concerned with the recent dispute between the Russians and English at Tientsin.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Papers containing the correspondence down to the end of December are nearly ready, and will be presented very shortly. Further Papers



will be presented in due course, but I am unable to give any pledge at present as to the subjects which will be included.

MR. DILLON: Why does the Government only include correspondence down to the end of December in the next batch of Chinese Papers?

\* VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I think the hon. Member will recognise that the preparation of these Blue-books requires a very great deal of care, and the Foreign Office has had such a tremendous amount of work lately that it really has not been able to get through it in sufficient time. But I quite feel that Papers ought to be presented soon, and I will do my best.

COAL EXPORT RETURN.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade when the Return relating to the export of coal from each port in the United Kingdom to various foreign countries, and ordered to be printed on 2nd April, will be issued to Members.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I am informed by His Majesty's Stationery Office that the Return will be issued next Tuesday.

SCHOOL BOARDS AND HIGHER ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether it is proposed to permit school boards to spend school board rates upon maintaining schools recognised under the higher elementary minute which forms part of the Education Code for 1901.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The Board of Education are advised that higher elementary schools may be established and maintained by school boards out of the school fund. But if this right were disputed, the question would have to be decided, not by the Board of Education, but in the first instance by the Local Government Board auditor, and ultimately by the courts of law.

CATTLE BREEDING IN COUNTY WESTMEATH.

MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction has been approached by the County Live Stock Committee of the County Westmeath for leave to grant premiums for this year for thoroughbred bulls three and four years old exhibited at the County Westmeath or other shows, on the grounds that it will be impossible to obtain the necessary number of younger bulls owing to restrictions on importation; consequent on the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in England, and seeing that otherwise small farmers will be obliged to breed from indifferently bred bulls, and that half of the grant for premiums is contributed by the ratepayers, can he state whether the Department is entitled to ignore the views of their committee, and will he take steps to give effect to them.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM.

Dover): Cattle-breeding schemes approved by the Department must be voluntarily accepted by a county council before any charge can fall on the rates, hence there is no danger of local views being ignored. As the main object of the scheme is to promote the introduction of young bulls, preferably yearlings, the

Department was not able to consent to the exception proposed by the Westmeath Committee. I am inquiring whether the difficulties due to restriction on importations from England were fully considered before the decision was arrived at.

#### IRISH REGISTRATION LAWS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in many Irish parliamentary divisions hundreds of qualified voters have been annually disfranchised through the neglect of agents, landlords, or others failing to fill in and return the requisition forms; whether he can explain why no prosecutions were instituted against such offenders in accordance with the provisions of The Representation of the People Act, 1884; and whether he will, in future, take measures to have the law on this point carried into effect in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: The duty of prosecuting is imposed by statute on the local authorities, and without communicating with these authorities the Local Government Board is not aware that it is the case, as alleged, that no prosecutions have been instituted against persons who have failed to comply with the provisions of the Act of 1884.

#### IRISH RAILWAYS; STATE PURCHASE; GERMAN STATE RAILWAYS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the German State Railways have realised a profit of £23,200,000 last year, and that this sum was utilised by the Government for revenue purposes; and whether he will appoint a commission to inquire into and report upon Irish railways with a view to their acquisition by the State and the reduction of taxation in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information on the first paragraph. The reply to the second paragraph is in the negative.

#### DAY INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS IN IRELAND.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has considered the advisability of providing day industrial schools in Ireland; and, if so, whether he can state what steps he proposes to take.

MR. WYNDHAM: Legislation would be necessary for the purpose; and I am unable to give any undertaking on the subject.

MR. FIELD: Will the right hon. Gentleman further consider this question?

MR. WYNDHAM: I will consider any matter brought before me, but I cannot promise to introduce legislation.

#### ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY; MUSKETRY INSTRUCTION.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the 17th inst. the Inspector of Constabulary for Limerick county came over from Ireland to Great Britain in company with several sergeants and constables of that force in connection with some manœuvres or drill practice; whether he will say where those manœuvres are being held, and whether they are of a military character; and who will be obliged to defray the expenses thus incurred.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; these officers proceeded to England to undergo instruction in musketry at Hythe. The same course has been adopted in previous

years. The expenses will be defrayed from the Constabulary Vote.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the Government send these men and their rifles to South Africa?

CAPTAIN DONELAN: With what object do the constables undergo this training?

MR. WYNDHAM: To perfect their marksmanship.

LAND TAX COMMISSIONERS' NAMES BILL.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, seeing that it has been the practice to introduce a Land Tax Commissioners Names Bill in the course of each Parliament, and that (except in the case of the last Parliament) it has been the practice to introduce the Bill during the first session

of Parliament, whether a Land Tax Commissioners' Names Bill will be introduced during the present session.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I understand the hon. Gentleman is mistaken in supposing that it has been the practice to pass this Bill in the first session of a new Parliament, and I am told that it is not necessary.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: To introduce it?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I see no object in introducing the Bill if it is not to pass.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): A great deal of interest is taken in this question, and I have received several communications on it within the last few days.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No evidence has come before me showing that there is great interest.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL'S QUESTIONS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL proceeded to ask a question in which he asked for the publication of the Report of the South African Commission, from which the Secretary to the Admiralty had quoted in a speech during the Easter recess.

\*MR. SPEAKER: The question is not in a form in which it would be received at the Table.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I gave the notice at ten o'clock, and remained in the House till twenty minutes past two, yet the Clerk at the Table did not tell me it was out of order.

\*MR. SPEAKER: I did not know the hon. Member handed the question in at the Table; I spoke from what I heard the hon. Member say.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Are the questions proposed to be put by Members of this House to be censored by the Clerks at the Table? Where do we stand?

\*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member will ask it in proper form;

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I did put it, in writing, in proper form, and the Clerk ruled it out of order.

\*MR. SPEAKER: It is sufficient for me to say that the question is out of order now.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I will put it in another form. Is the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House aware that the Secretary to the Admiralty referred to this Report in a speech he made at Belfast, and is there not a rule that when a Minister of the Crown refers to any public document it shall be published?

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member, I understand, is referring to matters which have passed outside this House, and is using them by way of argument.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I will tell you what I wish to do, Sir. The first part of my question was, no doubt, relevant. Then my contention was that, having regard to the fact that the Secretary to the Admiralty, a Minister of the Crown, and the Chairman of the Commission, referred to this Report, which has not yet been published, this House ought now to have it before it.

\*MR. SPEAKER: That is not a question on a matter of fact. It is a matter of argument.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: May I ask;

\*MR. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. Member will take the usual course of putting the question in writing, and then refer to me if any objection is taken to it at the Table.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: With great respect, Sir, this is a matter affecting the rights of every private Member of this House; it affects our rights of interrogation. I did hand in this question at ten p.m., and remained here till 2.30 a.m. Surely it was the absolute duty of the Clerk, if he objected to it, to refer the matter to you and to tell me? I cannot have my questions suppressed by the Clerk.

\*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member has any complaint to make, the proper and usual course is to come to me. I will make inquiries, and will communicate the result to the hon. Member.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury what course of business is proposed for next week.

\*COLONEL WELBY: Will the Amendments of the Army Annual Bill be taken after midnight to-night?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is necessary to go on with the Army Annual Bill, for the day is approaching when it must pass into law. The business for next week it is impossible to foresee until we know how long debate will be upon the remaining Budget resolutions. But probably the chief business next week will be getting the Speaker out of the Chair for the Civil Service Estimates and the remaining stages of the Budget resolutions. The Report of the resolutions I am anxious to take at a time that will allow of the opportunity for debate.

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES).

MR. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection; That they had discharged the following Member from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures; Mr. Kemp; and had appointed in substitution, Mr. Griffith-Boscawen.

MR. HALSEY further reported from the Committee; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Isolation Hospitals Bill; Mr.

Charles Allen, Mr. Bill, Mr. Colston, Mr. John Dewar, Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, Sir Walter Foster, Sir Robert Gunter, Mr. Charles Hobhouse, Mr. Grant Lawson, Mr. Walter Long, Mr. Herbert Roberts, Sir Thomas Roe, Mr. A. H. Smith, Mr. Strutt, and Mr. Tomlinson.

MR. HALSEY further reported from the Committee; That they had added to the Standing Committee on Law and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Cremation Bill [Lords]; Mr. Banbury, Mr. Broadhurst, Sir Michael Foster, Sir Walter Foster, Mr. Jeffreys, Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, Mr. Lowe, Dr. MacDonnell, Mr. M'Crae, Mr. Seton-Karr, Mr. Samuel Smith, Dr. E. C. Thompson, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. Luke White, and Sir Frederick Wills.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE (SUPPLY).

Ordered, That the other Government Business have precedence this day of the Business of Supply.; (Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

MORNING SITTINGS.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In moving that until Whitsuntide the House do meet on Tuesday at Two of the clock, and that the provisions of Standing Order No. 56 be extended to such morning sittings, I may at once say I hope that but few words will be considered necessary in explanation of the motion. Everybody will admit the importance of getting through our financial business, and there is much to be said in favour of morning sittings under these circumstances. No one will seriously maintain that the Government can afford to give the whole of Tuesdays to private Members. I trust the compromise I have adopted will meet with approval from all parts of the House, and that those friends of the Government who are most anxious for the rights of private Members will feel that the Government have done their best to preserve them.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That until Whitsuntide the House do meet on Tuesday, at Two of the clock, and that the provisions of Standing Order No. 56 be extended to such Morning Sittings:"; (Mr. A. J. Balfour.)

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I hesitated in rising, because I could not believe that a motion of this kind would be allowed to pass without some protest in behalf of the rights of private Members in this House. I rise, of course, to speak on this question from the purely Irish point of view. If the practice of the Government in taking Tuesdays year after year is to be persisted in, it would be far more honest, far more straightforward, and far more convenient to abolish altogether the supposed right of private Members to have the Tuesdays for the discussion of private Members' business, and to annex Tuesday once and for all as a Government day. Let me say a word on the general question. We are dealing at present with a session of Parliament in which there is practically no legislative programme, and from the very commencement of the session the Government has found it necessary to appropriate private Members' time. I ask the House of Commons to consider seriously what is the probable future before this House, if, in the case of a session where there is no legislative programme, the Government are forced to annex the time of private Members. It means that when a Government comes into office with a legislative programme it will be absolutely necessary for the House of Commons to sit the whole year through, if there is to be any legislation at all. These are serious considerations, which I think hon. Members ought to bear in mind. For my part I do not think the case is as bad as that. My conviction is that if the management

of the business of the House were conducted as it used to be in the old times, more in a spirit of conciliation and less by the violent use of the brutal methods of the closure and coercion, it would be possible for the House of Commons, notwithstanding the enormously increased business which has been thrown upon it of recent years, still adequately to fulfil its duties in discussing Supply and to have a margin for a legislative programme. But I leave that part of the question to be discussed by hon. Members who will take part in this debate solely from the point of view of the rights of private Members. I wish to put the case of Ireland.

In the King's Speech the Government promised to introduce legislation dealing with the question of land purchase in Ireland. I say it is discreditable to the Government, having given that promise in the King's Speech, on a matter of such vital importance to Ireland, that they should continue to maintain silence upon it. Before the House adjourned for the holidays I asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether he could say, as representing the Government, if he had any real, serious intention whatever of introducing a Bill on this question this session. He would not give a definite answer, but he gave an answer which led everybody to believe that he had no such serious intention at all, and he based his argument, if I may say so, on the ground that there was no time. Now, I would be prepared even to sacrifice my interest in private Members' rights to allow the right hon. Gentleman to get morning sittings on Tuesdays for the rest of the session, if he would undertake to devote the time to redeeming his pledge for legislation; but he will do nothing of the kind. I do not know whether the Government have made up their mind as to what they propose to do on this Irish land purchase question. I do not know whether they have got a Bill ready or not. It seems to me that if they have not made up their mind, and if they have not prepared a Bill, it was a most improper thing for them to have put that statement into the King's Speech. If they have made up their mind, I say it is a discreditable attitude to take up to refuse to disclose their proposals, and in the same breath to ask private Members of the House of Commons to sacrifice their rights on Tuesdays for the rest of the session. I ask the right hon.

Gentleman to put the Government Bill on Irish land purchase on the Table of the House, so that we can see what the ideas of the Government are. If the Government are not prepared to pledge themselves to devote sufficient time for the passage of such a Bill, let them produce a Bill so that we may know in what direction the mind of the Government is tending on the question.

The right hon. Gentleman has more than once admitted the urgent importance of the question. Scarcely a day passes on which there is not a question from some Irish Member dealing with some phase or other of this land purchase question; showing the urgency and importance of it in every part of Ireland. I say it is monstrous for the Government to come down now and ask for Tuesdays without giving any indication as to how they intend to use that time or any indication that they intend to fulfil the pledge they gave on Irish land purchase. I resent keenly the off-hand manner in which the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House gets up and proposes to annex the whole of the Tuesdays for the rest of the session, and says: "This is a motion, the effect of which

will be merely to deprive private Members of all their rights, and therefore it does not require many words to justify it."

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman is misrepresenting what I said.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I submit that I am giving a fair translation of the right hon. Gentleman's words.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman fails to give a fair translation.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: If my translation is not a fair one, then I at once withdraw it. But I do assert, and, of course, the whole matter is in the recollection of the House; it has occurred only within the last few minutes; that the right hon.

Gentleman proposes this serious motion to take away Tuesdays for the whole of the rest of the session. [An HON. MEMBER: Only till Whitsuntide.] That remark comes from some very inexperienced Member of the House; for anybody who has any experience of the House knows that whatever pressure there may be on the Government to take Tuesdays up to Whitsuntide, the pressure will be overwhelming after Whitsuntide. To take Tuesdays up to Whitsuntide means to take them for the whole session. Well, that serious proposal was made by the right hon. Gentleman in a two minutes speech, and in an off-hand manner, as if the subject did not deserve the earnest consideration of the House of Commons, and as if the proposal ought to be passed without practically any discussion at all and as a matter of course. I say that is a fair translation of the speech and of the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman. I keenly resent these large demands being made on the part of private Members in this off-hand manner by the Government. I can only speak in behalf of the Irish Members, and so far as we are concerned we resent this keenly, and let me say to the right hon. Gentleman, that it would be more honourable for him in making this proposal to say that if he gets this time he will redeem the pledge given in the King's Speech, and introduce the Irish Land Purchase Bill.

\*MR. WHITLEY (Halifax): I have been but a few weeks in the House, but I feel I must rise to join in the protest against the unbusinesslike methods of the Government. We are now at an advanced stage of the Parliamentary year, and there seems no hope of any reasonable progress being made with any of the many questions in which hon. Members are deeply interested. I have been a member of other assemblies than this, and those in charge of the business of these assemblies at least use the time which is given to them to businesslike purpose. For instance, on the great question of education, on which we have been trying for long enough to get a lead from the Government, we had an answer this very day from the Vice-President of the Council to the effect that he is not certain whether his own minutes are legal or not, and practically inviting some; I was going to say; I some junior Member of the Government, but perhaps I ought to say, some prospective Member of the Government, to upset his latest edict on the higher grade school question. Now, I do think it is time that the House made a stand and said it will not give this additional time to the Government unless they say clearly that it is going to be used for some intelligent purpose. For my part I am willing to give a good deal more, time to the Government if it is to be used in pressing forward even the legislative programme set forth in the King's Speech, such as that relating to education

and temperance. I submit it is mere foolishness on the part of the House to give them more time unless we are to know how it is going to be used. The Leader of the House only the other day gave an unnecessarily long holiday to the Members of the House; [Cries of "No, no."]; and I know that he has the theory that it is absolutely necessary that the House should rise before the 12th of August. But there are some of us who think that the discharge of public business is of more importance than shooting grouse, and we are getting very impatient indeed. I hope that a strong protest will be made against a suggestion of this kind, seeing that we have practically no Bills before us.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): The House is always in a great difficulty in discussing this inroad on private Members' time by Government taking the Tuesdays, because we are not in order in alluding to the better use that might be made of that time. Mr. Courtney, on this motion for taking Tuesdays, threw out the suggestion of giving various sections of the House more power over private Members' time by recognising syndicate motions. We are always in difficulty in debating such suggestions at all efficaciously, and we get little support from either of the front benches when definite proposals are before the House. The House will remember that on several occasions when hon. Members have tried to bring this matter before the House they have been met in the most hostile fashion. The Leader of the Irish party and the hon. Member who has just sat down have asked the Government to tell us a little more definitely than they have yet done what is the use they propose to make of the time they ask for. I think the Irish Members are within their right in pressing for a declaration in regard to the Irish legislation of the Government; and we are equally within our right in pressing, and we are bound to press, for some more definite declaration in regard to proposed legislation on factories and workshops, which affects the whole United Kingdom. The statement of the Leader of the House was extraordinarily vague, much more vague than usual when such a demand is made. He alluded only to financial business, and hardly mentioned at all any other business. The promised Irish Land Purchase Till, and the promised Education Bill have not yet been introduced; and the Government have only shown some desire to go forward with the Factories and Workshops Bill. Everyone who has taken an interest in this question concurs in the view that that Bill is a great improvement on the Bill of last year; but it is a Bill on which we shall have many observations to make in Grand Committee, if it goes there. The Bill, being a considerable improvement on that of last year, forms a most valuable basis for discussion before the Grand Committee. But will the Government tell us whether they seriously mean business with that Bill? Last year we had a Bill of about the same bulk as the present Bill. It contained clauses to which some of us objected, and omitted clauses which we wanted, but last year the Grand Committees were starved and ruined by the mode of conducting business in the House. Now, here is a chance of giving a Grand Committee solid, serious work to do, as it did when we passed the Factories Act of 1895. Do the Government mean business? Will they give a day, or more if necessary, to the Second Reading of the Factories and Workshops Bill, in order that the Grand Committee may be relieved from the process of sterilization



which has prevailed for the last year or two? Hon. Members are discouraged when they find that after their solid, heavy, and very hard work on these Grand Committees no good comes out of it, and that their labours are wasted. Here we are, through no fault of our own, but solely because the Government met Parliament too late at the beginning of the session, with no progress made with any measure promised in the King's Speech. I confine my question to the one important Bill which has the slightest chance of passing into law this session; I mean the Factories and Workshops Bill; and I ask whether the Government mean to persevere with that Bill?

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I desire to acknowledge the courtesy of the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House;

but as a private Member I desire to protest against these repeated encroachments against the rights and privileges of private Members. It has been almost impossible of recent years for private Members to do anything whatever; we have been reduced absolutely to voting machines. When I first entered the House private Members' days were never encroached, upon, or very rarely indeed. Up till Whitsuntide we had a chance of bringing on Bills and getting them advanced a stage, or of moving resolutions. I have no doubt that a private Member could get forty of his friends to make a House for him at nine o'clock, but it is an exceedingly difficult thing to do. I candidly confess that I have done it, by asking them to dine with me in the House; but that is a process which one cannot repeat indefinitely; and of course the cost is very great. There is another difficulty in forming a House for a private Member. A count will be moved immediately after nine o'clock, and unless there are forty Members present the House adjourns. Indeed, instances can be quoted where the Government have engineered a count. Now, if the Government ask us to adopt this resolution to-day, will they assure us that they are bound to form a House for private Members at nine o'clock, and not put on private Members the onus and difficulty of securing a quorum? I shall vote against this resolution unless the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House will assist private Members in forming a quorum at nine o'clock on Tuesday nights.

\*MR. NORVAL W. HELME (Lancashire, Lancaster): I would ask the Government whether they will bring in the Bill promised in the King's Speech in regard to the prevention of drunkenness; and, further to state whether, should the proposal now before the House be granted, they will give an opportunity for the consideration in Committee of the Bill to prevent the supply of drink to young children which passed its Second Reading with such a large majority, made up of Members on both sides of the House, representing the intense interest existing throughout the country. Speaking as a new Member for himself and many around him,

here for the first time charged to take some slight share in the business of the nation, I would appeal to the responsible leaders of the Opposition on the Front Bench to voice our wishes and bring such pressure to bear on the Government as will force their hands to bring in the Bill promised in the King's Speech, and also to assist the consideration of the Bill to prevent the sale of drink to young children.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I am sorry to find, on my return to this House, that the Members of the Government are still engaged in the same old task of taking the time of private Members; and that in so doing they are driving another nail into the coffin of this House. The noble Lord the Member for Greenwich the other day solemnly informed us that power was departing from this House, that this House was losing credit with the country, and that power was going from this House to a Cabinet composed mainly of a family whom we all honour; Well, it is so, and the reason is that this House has lacked spirit. On every appeal which a Minister makes for further time for the purposes of the Ministry there is no resistance, but a blind following of the Ministry into the lobby. We have had disorderly manifestations of spirit even this session. Nobody regrets them more than I do. I am shocked when events of that kind occur; but I cannot acquit His Majesty's Government of all blame. If they are determined to exaggerate the holidays, and to call the House together ten days or a fortnight later than it ought to have been called, and to crush into that small amount of time until that fatal

31st March all the amount of work we have got to do, then scenes are certain to occur. As I have said, I regret these scenes; but let me tell the right hon.

Gentleman that if he goes on attempting to shut down the safety-valves of the House there will be other explosions. Why does he not try to ride the House like a horseman? I ask, why does His Majesty's Government want these Tuesdays? No reason has been given. Possibly we shall hear of one before the debate is concluded; but let me point out this, that he has already taken our

Fridays for Supply. He has got the whole of the session before him, and now he asks for Tuesdays up to Whitsuntide. That, of course, means all the Tuesdays of the session. Why is there this pressure of business? is it because we began our sittings too late, or because we have had too long a holiday? Is it because of some determination on the part of the right hon. Gentleman that, whether the business of the nation is ended or not, we shall rise on the 10th August in order to enable hon. Gentlemen whose nervous tissue is too slack to go to the moors in Scotland by the twelfth? I repudiate all this. There are gentlemen who are moving Heaven and earth in order to get into this House. I should prefer that such persons should not be in the House at all. I should prefer to see the House composed of a smaller number of Members who mean Parliamentary business. Now, as to Tuesdays, it is a very strong demand on the part of the Government to be made so early in the session. The compromise which my right hon. friend suggests is absolutely no compromise at all, because when hon. Members come down to the House at two o'clock, and the Government exhaust the whole of the morning sitting at nine o'clock, not even the hon. Member for Central Sheffield could keep a House except he asked hon. Members to dinner. It is no compromise at all; but this is a motion not merely for the taking of Tuesdays up to Whitsuntide, but to take them with the condition that Standing Order 56 shall apply to Tuesdays. What is Standing Order 56? It is that when Supply is down for discussion the Speaker shall leave the chair "without question put." The old opportunity to raise a question upon the motion that the Speaker do leave the chair is gone from us, and now the right hon. Gentleman asks for Tuesdays. He

asks that the same conditions shall apply as apply to Mondays and Thursdays. Why? Is the right hon. Gentleman going to put down Supply for Tuesdays? He puts down Supply for Fridays. He has taken Fridays from us, and now he is going to take our Tuesdays, but unless he means to put down Supply on Tuesdays, Standing Order 56 would have no applicability to the motion.

I am sorry to find I have to stand almost alone in defence of the rights of those unplaced, unpaid Members who really compose the House of Commons. It is not that I am anxious to introduce Bills. I have never put my name to a Bill since I have been in the House; I consider it my mission rather to criticise, and sometimes endeavour to prevent legislation; but I am sorry to see the House deprived of every opportunity which it possesses for private legislation, and I hope that some rag of spirit will arise, if not among these dry bones, at any rate from some quarter of the House, and put a stop to the continual taking away of private Members' time by one Government after another.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman cannot be surprised at the ebullition of feeling which we have witnessed during the last half hour. It comes with especial strength from my hon friend who has just sat down, who is always conspicuous for standing up for the private Members of the House; but even if all the private Members' time is absorbed by the Government, I think my hon. friend would still find opportunities to address the House with advantage to, the debate and satisfaction to himself, I was more surprised by the importation of a fresh element into this ordinary discussion, with which we are so familiar. That fresh element comes from two hon. friends behind me who are new Members, and who expressed with ingenuousness and frankness the circumstances; they fully expected that, having come into the House, they and others like them would have ample opportunity given to them to prosecute those projects of legislation which they have been advocating for many years in the country, and which expectations the Government, for this session at all events, have effectually prevented being realised.

The right hon. Gentleman was able up to Easter to make some sort of case for the strong measures which he put upon us, because he was able to threaten us with the dreadful consequences which would ensue if the financial business was not completed by the 31st of March. We pointed out again and again that even

if that state of things with which he threatened us did arise, it was his own fault, because he had neglected to foresee the circumstances. Now he goes on, after a prolonged Easter holiday, in the same perfunctory manner to propose a new inroad into the time of the House, but in this case we expect to hear some new reason. Nothing, however, is said to us. We are told there is certain financial business to be got through, which we understand; but there is no fixed time for that, as before Easter, and something is said about legislative necessity; necessary legislative measures. We want to know what those necessary legislative measures are. The only indication we have received was in the Speech from the Throne. Where are the measures, and what progress has been made with those which have already been introduced, and which could be proceeded with? Those are the points upon which, I think, the right hon. Gentleman is

bound to give the House a great deal more information than he has vouchsafed to us.

I was rather astonished when I saw this motion on the Paper, because it is an unusually early time to commence these morning sittings. I am not sure that if we investigated the matter precedents, with which the right hon. Gentleman is so perfectly familiar, would not be found to show that some motion of this sort may have been taken at such an early period of the session as this; but if that be so, it was on the ground of absolute necessity; on the ground that there was such a mass of legislative business that it was absolutely necessary to take morning sittings. We have had no such assurance upon this occasion, and we ought to have that assurance from the right hon. Gentleman before he can expect us to agree with this proposal.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is my painful duty, but I am sorry to say a familiar one, to bring forward these resolutions curtailing the privileges of the unofficial Members of the House, and to be abused for an hour or two once or twice during the session for performing my painful part. The present debate has been, perhaps, as vigorous as any to which I have listened upon the subject. My hon. friend behind me, the Member for King's Lynn, has come back with renewed vigour from his foreign tour, but I am unable to say, so far as I can judge, however much the Bay of Biscay has improved his health and renewed his vigour, that it has in any way improved his temper. He spoke upon a familiar theme, upon which we have often heard him before, and upon which, I trust, we shall often hear him again, because I hope he will long remain a Member of this House, and so long as he remains a Member he will speak upon it, either from this or the other side of the House. But I do not think he has ever thrown himself into the part with greater

verve than upon the present occasion. I have noticed, and I hope the House has also noticed, the extraordinary inconsistency between the two sets of arguments we have heard on the present occasion. That inconsistency appeared in different speeches of different speakers, and sometimes it appeared in one speech. The Government is abused first of all for not bringing forward legislative measures, and secondly for taking private Members time, [A voice: "Wasting it."] An hon. Gentleman says we are wasting time. We are doing so; I do not assert that time is not being wasted; I do not indulge in so paradoxical a statement as to suggest to the House; to the Members of the House who have sat through our debates since we met in February; that there has not been a waste of Parliamentary time. All I deny is that we have wasted it.

It is the duty of the Government to lay before the House, firstly, the business absolutely necessary for carrying on the Government of the country, and secondly, those legislative schemes they are desirous of passing. Very well, that is admitted: so far we have not done very much towards carrying out the second part of our duty, but nobody will deny that we have done the first. The business we have introduced so far is the business which must be carried through, if the Government of the country is to be carried on at all. The business was financial. If that business has taken too long a time, it is not the fault of the Government. I am, indeed, told that if we had met on the 10th

of February instead of the 16th;[A voice: "We met on the 14th."] Well I do not propose to argue that case. I have told the House that the date upon which we met was an appropriate date, and Members will agree with me when I say that during the time between then and Easter, without any undue protraction of the debates, we could have done all the necessary work, and have done also something to carry out those projects of legislation which we are as anxious to pass as any hon. Gentleman opposite.

Is it not rather absurd to say on the one hand that we shall not have Tuesdays, and on the other that we shall bring forward these projects of legislation? The only chance we have of carrying out the schemes which we have indicated to the country in the Speech from the Throne is to get through the financial business of the year. How are we to get through the business unless we get the credits we ask for? Can anything be more absurd than to accuse us in the first place of not getting through these projects of legislation, and on the other hand to refuse to give us Tuesday mornings? Let us remember that the financial business of the session is this year exceptional. You have a most exceptional state of things to deal with; we have a Budget to deal with which everyone must admit is a Budget of great importance, and of exceptional character, raising questions of the utmost public interest, and we have the Civil List. Are we not to have this privilege to carry out these necessarily difficult matters? And until we know how long those discussions will last is it reasonable to ask us to give a definite pledge as to what we shall do between this and the end of the session? It is the habit of the Opposition to ask how the Government intends to allocate the time of the House. I wish the process could be reversed, and that the Opposition could be asked how long they intend to discuss this or that measure.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Let us see your measures; we have not seen them yet.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: You have seen the Budget. Will the hon. Member give me an indication of how long the necessary financial business will take? If he will, I will give some rough estimate as to the amount of time which will be given to legislative business, It is the practice now, as it has been ever since I came into the House, twenty years ago, to accuse the Leader of the House of not managing the business of the House as he should, but, after all, that matter rests with the Opposition and the critics of the Government.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E): There never was a Government which had so little regular opposition to deal with.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Then the matter rests with the irregular Opposition; If the irregular Opposition will tell me how long they intend to discuss the Civil List and the Budget, I might be able to satisfy their curiosity on the other questions which have been put. The House will observe that I am only asking this privilege up to Whitsuntide. This motion only relates to the time between this and Whitsuntide. Can hon Gentlemen, regular or irregular, hold out any hopes that after the Budget and the Civil List have been disposed of there will be any leisure for important legislation before Whitsuntide?

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon Gentleman produce his Irish Land Purchase

Bill?

MR. A. J BALFOUR: Does the hon. Member propose a bargain across the floor of the House; to let me have the Budget without difficulty or debate if he happens to like the Land Purchase Bill? There are many other persons interested in the Civil List and the Budget, and it is quite clear, and everybody who knows anything about the House knows at all events, that the bulk of the time between this and Whitsuntide must be occupied by financial business, owing to the action of the critics of the Government, regular and irregular, whether legitimate or illegitimate. If my expectations are happily deceived, and the business is got through with great rapidity, the Government will of course proceed with their programme of legislation at once. Those who press upon the Government the necessity for proceeding with that programme are the very persons who ought to give the necessary facilities for getting through the financial business. So I hope the House will not attempt to seriously hamper the Government, and will assent to this motion. The Leader of the Irish party and others referred to the fact that the present condition of business and the apportionment of the time of the House was unsatisfactory. I am not at all disposed to disagree with that statement. The result is not, however, due to the action of Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench or on the Front Opposition Bench. It is due to much larger causes. I have no intention of dilating on this theme at present; but if I have the privilege of occupying much longer the position which I now hold I shall certainly have to bring the matter before the House in a substantive form. The matter undoubtedly requires the attention of the House, and I am the last person to say that this enormous amount of time should be taken up by discussions in Supply on matters that must be passed, and that private Members' resolutions and opportunities for legislation should be as much curtailed and diminished as they have been. It is perfectly clear that the present position is not due to anything which the Government have done, or to their having pressed forward too many subjects at once. There must be, and ought to be, further debate on the great financial proposals of the Government; and until they have been substantially dealt with, it is impossible to make great progress with the legislative programme. In order to reach that programme without delay, I ask the House, and especially the critics of the Government, to give the Government the privileges for which we ask.

\*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I confess I am a little surprised at the tone of irritation which the right hon. Gentleman has displayed at the criticisms and protests against the proposal he has made. The right hon. Gentleman has called his proposal a painful one, and so it is. But when a person is inflicting pain, he should not be surprised if there were some complaint on the part of the sufferers. In former days, happily long gone by, I have stood in the same painful position as the right hon. Gentleman, and have asked for the indulgence of the House. But then I thought it becoming on such occasions to appear in the attitude of a suppliant. I came before the House with a halter round my neck, so that if the House did not support me it might execute me; but the right hon. Gentleman has only scolded those who have ventured for a moment to object to or

protest against the taking of all their time. The right hon. Gentleman has no right to expect that the House should go like a lamb to the slaughter;

"Pleased to the last, he crops the flowery food,  
And licks the hand just raised to shed his blood."

The right hon. Gentleman seems to expect that the whole of the House of Commons except himself should gladly yield to the Government that time to which the House is entitled. What my hon. friend next me asked for is that the Government should give some special reasons for the course proposed, and for the privilege they sought. I never remember a demand of this kind being made to the House without the Leader of the House making his prayer to the House and setting forth the special reasons on which it was to be granted. The right hon. Gentleman has advanced no reason but exceptional financial business. Surely this exceptional financial business was of so popular a character that there would not be the smallest difficulty in passing it. It seems as though the right hon. Gentleman had not the confidence he should have in the Budget of his colleague. The right hon. Gentleman might have told the House without pledging himself to particular measures what were the measures to which the Government attached particular importance. It has always been the habit to give this information. The Government might even have introduced the Bills, so that the House, and the country might have had time to consider them. Therefore, according to my experience and recollection, we have not had such a declaration of the intentions of the Government as we might have expected from them. The hon. Gentleman behind me has spoken of a particular measure passed by a great majority in this House. There is a strong desire that an opportunity should be given for that Bill to pass into law. If all this time is given to the Government

we have a right to expect that they should provide such an opportunity. Then there is the measure referred to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Forest of Dean, a measure which, I am sure, a great majority of the House desire to see pass, dealing with youthful labour in mines. I cannot help suspecting that the late period at which the House met after Easter had some connection with the extinction of the hopes of that Bill. The ordinary course would have been for us to meet on the Monday after Easter, and then we should not have lost that Wednesday upon which a Bill of such special importance was down for consideration. I must say, having listened to the speech of the right hon.

Gentleman, that I think the protest which has been made, though ineffectual, is perfectly justified, and I am sorry the right hon. Gentleman should not have been able to give some satisfactory answer to my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition as to the legislative intentions of the Government.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): I think that these inroads upon the time of private Members are becoming more and more serious, and that we have certainly a right to make some protest. It is quite true that when we do have a certain amount of time it happens in some way or another that the Irish Members get the greater part of it, and as a London Member I think they really get an unfair share of private Members' time. How this is to be avoided I do not know, but certainly there are many points which we London and English Members desire to bring before

the House, but have not the opportunity. The question as to why the Government do not let us know some of the measures they intend bringing forward is a very serious one. If the Leader of the House would bring forward some of those measures; whether on education, Irish land, or the temperance question; even though they were introduced under the ten minutes' rule, we should see what they were, and have something to consider and digest. But some of us almost fancy that the Government have not made up their minds upon these questions. I think it is only reasonable that we should know what these measures are, and that if we give this time; reluctantly, because we are compelled to; the Government should give a pledge that the main points upon which they intend to legislate this session should be placed before the House. There are not many questions mentioned in the King's Speech; it is a very meagre fare, but I think it is reasonable we should know what the Government propose to do. We must make a certain protest against our time being taken, and, although it may be of no use we are bound to support our rights to the best of our ability.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): The first feature in the present debate is, to my mind, the tone in which the Leader of the House made this motion to-night. As the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth said, it is the custom on such occasions for Ministers to appear in an attitude of apology at least, and to put forward some special grounds on which they make this large claim on the rights of private Members. On the present occasion the only apology the First Lord offers is for not taking the whole of the Tuesdays up to Whitsuntide. When I heard the right hon. Gentleman I was reminded of an occasion in 1895, when the then Chancellor of the Exchequer and Leader of the House, the present Member for West Monmouth, ten days after the Address proposed to take Tuesdays up to the 31st March for the necessary financial business of the year. He made that motion in a speech occupying five or six pages of Hansard, giving a long and detailed explanation of the grounds on which he based his claim. What was the result? Although then the private Members still retained their rights to Fridays (which have now been taken from them), no sooner had the right hon. Gentleman sat down, than up sprang the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, quivering with indignation, and delivered a speech extending to ten pages of Hansard, denouncing the proposal. Here is a passage from that speech. He said; "But if anyone would examine the series of precedents in this matter he would find that those precedents were growing, he would find that the Government of the day; be it a

Liberal Government or a Conservative Government; never went back upon a precedent when once it was made, so that year after year more of the time of the House and more control over the House were obtained by the Government. Now what was the precedent they were asked to establish on this occasion? Within ten days of the termination of the debate on the Address, private Members were to be deprived of any opportunity of bringing forward motions, except after nine o'clock on Friday evenings, and of any chance of having discussions on Hills which they had introduced, unless they had been fortunate enough to secure the first or second



place on the thirteen or fourteen Wednesdays before Whitsuntide. That might be a necessary change in their procedure; circumstances might have arisen which rendered it right and proper to make it. But he was absolutely certain that this resolution, or something more stringent, would again be proposed after Easter, and would practically apply to the whole of the session."

That was the grievance complained of with indignation by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1895, in a session when there were large and important Bills to be introduced, and a considerable programme of legislation indicated in the Queen's Speech. The right hon. Gentleman went on to say;

"What had happened already? When hon. Members were deprived of the opportunities allotted to them by the ordinary rules of the House for bringing forward matters in which they took an interest, they persistently bubbled up on every other occasion. Adjournments were moved, and debates were started on questions of principle in Committee of Supply, instead of Supply being confined, as used to be the case, solely to questions of finance."

The right hon. Gentleman evidently approved of the cause of the then Tory Opposition, and yet the present Leader of the House thinks he is entitled to complain, now that he has drawn the bonds of discipline against the rights of private Members infinitely tighter than they were then proposed to be drawn, if hon. Members "bubble over," and other opportunities are sought for pressing questions in which they are interested upon the attention of the House. To use the language of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Bristol, I ask the House to consider what precedent they are setting this year. Every Tuesday up to the present has been taken by the Government. It is a mockery to talk about giving us nine o'clock sittings; the Government might as well take the whole of the day, as such sittings are

almost invariably counted out. Where do the private Members come in? In view of the action of the Government this year, I say it would be more decent and honest to abolish altogether the Standing Order giving private Members any rights on Tuesdays or Fridays.

I have never known a session in which less business was placed before the House by the Government, and yet this is the session in which such a precedent is being set. If the House agrees in such a session to part with all its Tuesdays, what argument will there be for any private Member against the Government taking the whole of the Tuesdays in a session in which there is legislative business to be brought forward? But that is not all. This is being done in a session when the closure has been used with greater stringency and frequency than I ever remember being the case before. I venture to say that while there will hardly be a statute of importance added to the Statute-book, it will be shown at the end of the session that the closure has been used with more frequency and stringency than at any time in the history of the House of Commons. When a Minister talks of the waste of public time, I want to know what he means by that. The Leader of the House is armed with greater powers than any Minister ever had before for putting an end to discussion, and whenever he thinks that discussion has gone far enough he does not scruple to use those powers, and yet the business of the country is in a state of paralysis. The business of a Minister like the right

hon. Gentleman is to conduct the business of the House in a reasonable and a fair way, and it was to my mind a most preposterous position for the right hon. Gentleman to take up, when he said that if there was a difficulty and congestion of business it was entirely the fault of the Opposition. It is an old saying that a bad workman quarrels with his tools, and the real difficulty in this matter is that those upon whom the responsibility for the conduct and management of the business of the House must rest have so managed it that there is congestion, and that public time has been wasted, and when the results are made manifest the Leader of the House, instead of examining his own conscience, turns upon

the Opposition and seeks to thrust the blame upon them. When the Leader of the House talks of some measure which he is revolving in his mind, by which the business of the House is to be re-distributed, I warn him that that problem has been tried over and over again. It is the problem of trying to put a gallon into a pint pot. You cannot by any redistribution of the time of the House or by appointing Committees get this House to deal with more business than the time at its disposal is able to allow it to cope with. The only way in which you will solve this problem is by getting rid of some of the business of this House, and letting it be done by those who better understand it. Why is this House in such a state of paralysis that the business of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales must be thrown into the background? Why, it is simply due to the policy of Imperialism

and expansion. You are not content with doing the business of Great Britain and Ireland, you must undertake to extend this Empire into every part of the habitable globe, and having undertaken to manage the business of all those multitudinous races you have not time to attend to the business at home. The House of Commons cannot manage the affairs of the whole world, and it is this Imperialism and expansion, this abominable policy, that is really responsible for the deadlock in the House of Commons, and until you understand that, and base your remedy upon that understanding, you will never get the machine so adjusted as to do the business of this country satisfactorily.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton) said it was allowed on all hands that their business was being done under pressure, which was not good for the business or the credit of the House. He believed the explanation was that the business of the House was increasing. The hon. Member for East Mayo had condemned our Imperialism. He did not condemn it at all, but the House of Commons as a gathering of sensible men should consider what it involved. Whether they were in favour of it or not they should, as business men, recognise the consequences it carried with it. It must be obvious to anyone that if we were to

enlarge our business we must give more time to the business or do it worse. The Leader of the House had referred to the Civil List and the Budget, but surely the right hon. Gentleman knew quite well before the House met that there would be a new Civil List and a special Budget. Why did not the Loader of the House anticipate this and give more time to do the business? The House had a right to complain of the Leader of the House, who would not look the facts in the face. The right hon. Gentleman had lengthened the holidays instead of shortening them.

Reference had been made by the Member for Greenwich to the circumstance that the House of Commons was falling in public credit. He agreed with that, and he would say that it would fall further in public repute unless it did its business better than now. He submitted as a plain business man that the Government had not recognised the fact that the House had more business to do, and had not given proper time to do it.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House stated that the arrangement was required on account of the Budget and the Civil List. But on looking at the Paper to-night I find that the next business after the Budget is the Demise of the Crown Bill. I would like to ask the Government whether we are to take the statement of the right hon. Gentleman as an assurance that none of these Tuesdays will be devoted to the Demise of the Crown Bill. If that assurance was given it might mitigate the hostility we feel to the present motion. Unless the right hon. Gentleman confines his motion to the Budget and Civil List, he must let us see what is in his bag. He says, "If you tell me what the Opposition will do, I can easily tell you what Bills we can and will produce." But surely when the Government brought forward the King's Speech they knew what kind of opposition they would have to face. And yet they put forward in the King's Speech a certain programme of legislation. We wish to know whether it is not a fact that, as a rule by Easter, and certainly by the week after Easter, it has been the constant tradition of the Government to let the House know what their Bills are.

But here in this case when we ask the Government what its programme of legislation is, the right hon. Gentleman says, "Tell me how the Opposition will behave." I heard the right hon. Gentleman make a most ferocious attack on the Front Opposition Bench, which has never done any harm. I have begun to realise what is the great antipathy the right hon. Gentleman feels to the Front Opposition Bench, and I will tell hon. Gentlemen what it is. The Government, I fancy, after the speech of yesterday, are extremely anxious to get out of office, and extremely anxious that others should wash up the dish, and every time the Government are anxious to get into a minority the Front Opposition Bench votes for them. The Opposition and the Leader of the Opposition do not want to be forced into office at the present juncture. That is really the present position of affairs. The right hon. Gentleman has asked for these Tuesday sittings, and he has used all this kind of abuse, but I do not suppose that there is anyone more tired of the right hon. Gentleman's Government than himself. We see this unfortunate Government, though they have only normally been one session in office, more weak, limp, and jaded than any other Government I have ever known. Why does not the right hon. Gentleman tell us what his Irish programme is at the present stage? It is not the Nationalists that he is afraid of at all, for he knows perfectly well that we are ready and anxious to further any legislation of a useful character for Ireland. He is afraid of the hon. Gentlemen on his own side, who are never willing to take up useful legislation for Ireland in the month of April. If any such legislation were introduced in April the Orange and landlord party would tear it to pieces, and it is only when this House is thoroughly jaded and tired that you can have Irish legislation

brought in, when hon. Members think that the holidays are more important than legislation. Why does the Leader of the House not communicate with the Leader of the Irish Party as to what his plans are? We know that there is only one Bill to be passed for Ireland this session so far as the Government is concerned. Is it not easy to say, "We will bring forward this excellent Bill; here it is. We dare not show it to the Orange party, for we cannot trust them, but we can trust the Nationalists." The right hon. Gentleman has practically admitted that the business of the House is really done behind the Chair and not upon the floor of the House. The real difficulty is that the Government do not take into their confidence that section of the House which was not represented on the Civil List Committee.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.) said he wished to make his humble protest against what had been proposed by the First Lord of the Treasury, and his reason for so doing was that he belonged to a section of humble Members of this House who did not say much and who did not get much chance of saying anything. Members of the House might be divided into one-column men, half-column men, quarter-column men, and one-line men. On behalf of the one-line men, he protested against the First Lord of the Treasury taking away the only chance they had of making themselves heard. The way in which Bills were brought into the House of Commons reminded him of the American incubator, where they put the eggs in at one end and the chickens came out at the other. When Bills were brought forward the one-column men had their innings, and the one-line men never got any innings at all. In earlier days the First Lord of the Treasury had been only a one-line man, and he ought to look back with some affection to those days and remember that one-line men wanted a chance occasionally. If the right hon. Gentleman required more time, let him bring forward a Home Rule Bill, and let the Irish Members go home to manage their own affairs. So long as they sat in this House they would do their best for their constituencies, and they would do it whether they were closed or not. The First Lord of the Treasury was now proposing to take away about the only chance they had got of laying their grievances before this House in a proper form, and he trusted the motion would be withdrawn.

\*MR. CORRIE GRANT (Warwickshire, Rugby) said he did not desire to detain the House more than one or two moments, but he wished, as a new Member, to add his protest against the action of the First Lord of the Treasury upon this question. During this session the new Members had more than once tried to help the Government to carry through the business of the country. The First Lord of the Treasury now asked for all the Tuesdays up to Whitsuntide, and gave no reason at all which appealed to new Members for doing so. A debate followed, and Members on this and on the other side of the House had put specific questions to the right hon. Gentleman. He had been asked whether he would help private Members to keep a House on Tuesdays, and they had very good reason for asking that, because on the last Friday when the private Members got a chance they would remember that the Government walked behind the Chair in order that a count might be taken, and the right hon. Gentleman himself was one of those who walked behind the Chair. Having disposed of the motions, there was a very small Bill brought before the House which endeavoured to give some;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is now going into the case of a particular Bill in a manner that is not relevant.

\*MR. CORRIE GRANT said he had no intention of discussing that Bill, and he was only endeavouring to show why some of them were anxious to keep a House that night. They had very good reason for asking the right hon. Gentleman whether he was going to follow this course again, and whether, after they had come down to the House from two o'clock to seven o'clock to help through the Government legislation they were going to have any help from the Government to keep a House. Were they going to give facilities for the Children's Bill, or for Higher Education, which some of them cared about if the right hon. Gentleman did not? The Member for Forest of Dean had inquired what was going to be done with regard to the Factory Acts. The right hon. Gentleman, in his reply, did not devote a single word to dealing with the questions which had been asked him. He had delivered an adroit and brilliant speech which was everything but what a speech ought to be on such a question from the Leader of the House. He (the hon. Member) knew very little; [Ministerial cries of "Hear, hear."] Would hon. Members opposite kindly allow him to finish his sentence? He knew very little about the Leadership of the House, but there were two duties acknowledged to be foremost among the duties of a Leader: the first was so to arrange the business that the legislation could be carried forward easily and quickly, and he ventured to say that when the Leader of the House endeavoured to do this he always got the assistance of the House. What was the course pursued by a former Leader of the House; the late Mr. W. H. Smith; who had not half the debating ability of the present First Lord of the Treasury? He took the House into his confidence, told them what he wanted to do, and how he proposed to do it. He did not keep up his sleeve the measures he intended bringing before the House, and he got the assistance of the House. The second duty of the Leader of the House was to protect the rights of all the Members on all sides of the House, and he very seriously complained of the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman for the manner in which he walked out of the House the other night. He claimed that private Members ought to have the assistance of the Leader of the House in order to keep a House. The example set by the right hon. Gentleman did more to destroy the rights of private Members than all the polite and courteous speeches which he was always making about his desire to help private Members. He hoped that before they went to a division they would have a statement of the attitude the right hon. Gentleman was going to take up with regard to Tuesday nights. If they found that he was not going to protect the rights of private Members, he hoped hon. Members would take the matter into their own hands and set their faces sternly against the attempt to take the whole time of the House for Government business.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he had often heard a similar motion made in this House from the Government Benches, but never one made in a more cavalier manner than the motion made by the First Lord of the Treasury that evening; and he was not surprised at the manifestations of impatience which had been exhibited by hon. Gentlemen on the Conservative side of the House, because the example had been set them by their own chief. He would like to discover how many hon. Gentlemen opposite had humbugged their constituents by pretending they were going to

produce legislation, and who had introduced large numbers of Bills to which they had referred at public meetings in their constituencies, and which they were presently going to prevent from being proceeded with by voting for the motion before the House. Of course the usual excuse would be forthcoming, that but for the Irish Members the measures would have been passed. He would next day take out from the division lists the names of all those Members who had so humbugged their constituents. The First Lord of the Treasury had stated that but for the Irish Members, the irregular opposition, the Government would have had time to pass the necessary financial business of the session. Why was not Parliament called together before? Why were the holidays so long? and why all this waste of time? In all our great colonies there was no trouble, and there was no necessity to take private Members' time. In the colonies one seldom heard of all-night sittings. Why? Because they conducted the Legislature on business lines, and met at a reasonable hour in the morning, and the hours at which the Parliaments met were not arranged merely for the convenience of Members who liked to be up late at night and sleep till late on in the day. He hoped when the right hon. Gentleman took this matter in hand, as he had threatened to do (and he hoped he would do it on a nearly day), that he would say that this House should meet at a reasonable hour; 9 or 10 o'clock in the morning; like men engaged in any other work, and that the House should cease its labours at a reasonable hour, so as to give an honest and plain interval to Members of the House to feed.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The question before the House is not what interval shall be allowed for dinner.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he would not suggest any further alterations; he would merely say that the impatience manifested in the House, with the most surprising regularity, between 7 and 9, was not due to any burning interest which the Members took in the matter under discussion in the House on which they desired to vote. It was not because on the present occasion they were most anxious to destroy the only chance they had of passing Bills which they themselves had introduced; it was for quite a different reason, the same reason that had caused him to intervene. It was due to the fact that the hours of the House were so wrong, and the Rules so incongruous and absurd, that Members could not go home to their dinners without feeling that something dreadful would happen in their absence. He quite conceived that this was a motion which the First Lord of the Treasury should be called upon by the country to explain. If the motion was carried, it would in all probability kill the Bill for the purpose of prohibiting the sale of drink to young children, and the Eight Hours Bill for miners, and if the time of the private Members was to be taken, then it should be made clear to the people of the country that it was done by those who voted for it for the express purpose of killing legislation. Let hon. Members be honest, and say they did not believe in legislation, and were prepared to let the Government have as much time as they pleased. If they took that straightforward and honest course, he ventured to hope that when the next General Election came round a great number of them would be relieved from attendance at the House of Commons for evermore.

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."

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Gibbs, Hon. A G H (City of Lond.

Nicholson, William Graham

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden

Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)

Allsopp, Hon. George

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

Parkes, Ebenezer

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'ml'ts

Pemberton, John S. G.

Arnol, Sir William

Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon

Percy, Earl

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim

Pilkington, Richard

Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitz Roy

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Graham, Henry Robert

Plummer, Walter R.

Baird, John George Alexander

Grenfell, William Henry

Purvis, Robert

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

Groves, James Grimble

Randles, John S.

Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W. (Leeds

Gunter, Colonel

Reid, James (Greenock)

Banbury, Frederick George

Guthrie, Walter Murray

Remnant, James Farquharson

Barry, Sir F. T. (Windsor)  
Hain, Edward  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Renwick, George  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Richards, Henry Charles  
Beckett, Ernest William  
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Bigwood, James  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney  
Bill, Charles  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Robinson, Brooke  
Blundell, Col. Henry  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Bond, Edward  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Round, James  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Heath, J. (Staffords, N. W.)  
Rutherford, John  
Brassey, Albert  
Henderson, Alexander  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Brookfield, Col. Montagu  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Bull, William James  
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)  
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.  
Bullard, Sir Harry



Hope, J. F. (Sheffi'ld Brightside  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
Butcher, John George  
Howard, John (Kent, Fav'rsh.  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J. A. (Gl'sg'w  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Carson, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Smith, H C (North'um. Tynes'de  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks)  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Kenyon, Jas. (Lancs., Bury)  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Keswick, William  
Spear, John Ward  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.  
Lawson, John Grant  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Chamberlain. J. A. (Worc'r)  
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Charrington, Spencer  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.  
Stroyan, John  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G (Oxf'd Univ  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Thornton, Percy M.  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison  
Valentia, Viscount  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Madona, John Cumming  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Denny, Colonel  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Wason, John C. (Orkney)  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo.  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cams.  
Webb, Colonel William George  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Welby, Lt. Col. A. C. E. (Tauntn  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Malcolm, Ian  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Williams, Rt Hn J. Powell (Bir.  
Doughty, George  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow  
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Mount, William Arthur  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Finch, George H.  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Fison, Frederick William  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Sir William Walrond and  
Forster, Henry William  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Mr. Anstruther.

The House divided::Ayes, 198 Noes, 147. (Division List No. 130.)  
NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)  
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herb. John  
O'Dowd, John  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
O'Malley, William  
Asher, Alexander  
Hammond, John  
O'Mara, James  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydv'l  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Shee, James John  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Hayden, John Patrick

Philipps, John Wynford  
Bell, Richard  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Boland, John  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Priestley, Arthur  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Rea, Russell  
Boyle, James  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.  
Reddy, M.  
Brigg, John  
Holland, William Henry  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries)  
Burt, Thomas  
Joicey, Sir James  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Jones, William (Carnarvons.)  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Caine, William Sproston  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Caldwell, James  
Joyce, Michael  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Roche, John  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Lambert, George  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Cawley, Frederick  
Lay land-Barratt, Francis  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Leamy, Edmund  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)

Clancy, John Joseph  
Leng, Sir John  
Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Lough, Thomas  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Lundon, W.  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Colville, John  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Spencer, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift  
Sullivan, Donal  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Cremer, William Tandal  
M'Crae, George  
Tennant, Harold John  
Crombie, John William  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Cullinan, J.  
M'Govern, T.  
Thomas, David Alf. (Merthyr)  
Daly, James  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan Gower  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Thompson, E. C. (Mouaghan, N  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Mather, William  
Tomkinson, James  
Delany, William  
Minch, Matthew  
Tully, Jasper  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Mooney, John J.  
Ure, Alexander  
Dillon, John  
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose  
Wallace, Robert  
Doogan, P. C.

Murnaghan, George  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)  
Murphy, J.  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Duffy, William J.  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Weir, James Galloway  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Dunn, Sir William  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidst.  
Norman, Henry  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Field, William  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Sir Thomas Esmonde and  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)  
Captain Donelan.  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Question put accordingly, "That until Whitsuntide the House do meet on Tuesday  
at Two of the clock, and that the provisions of Standing Order No. 56  
AYES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Bond, Edward  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden

Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Boulnois, Edmund  
Allsopp, Hon. George  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Brassey, Albert  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Brookfield, Col. Montagu  
Arrol, Sir William  
Beckett, Ernest William  
Bull, William James  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.  
Bullard, Sir Hairy  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy  
Bigwood, James  
Butcher, John George  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Bill, Charles  
Campbell, Rt Hn. J. A (Glasgow  
be extended to such Morning Sittings."  
The House divided::Ayes, 192; Noes, 145. (Division List No. 131.)  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Randles, John S.  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Han'l'y  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.  
Renwick, George  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Henderson, Alexander  
Richards, Henry Charles  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson

Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffi'ld, Brightside  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
Charrington, Spencer  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.  
Robinson, Brooke  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton  
Round, James  
Colomb, Sir, John Charles Ready  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Rutherford, John  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Keswick, William  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Cripps, Charles Alfred  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.  
Denny, Colonel  
Lawson, John Grant  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'ml'ts, S. Geo.  
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Smith, Abel H (Hertford, East)  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.  
Smith, H. C (North'mb. Tynes'e  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Doughty, George



Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.  
Spear, John Ward  
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore  
Macdona, John dimming  
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverp'l)  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Camb.  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Finch, George H.  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire  
Stroyan, John  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Malcolm, Ian  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Max well, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Talbot, Rt. Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.  
Fison, Frederick William  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Thornton, Percy M.  
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Flower, Ernest  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Forster, Henry William  
Morgan, David J. (Walthamst.  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Webb, Col. William George  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford

Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C E (Taunton  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Mount, William Arthur  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'rH'ml'ts  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm  
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon  
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath  
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)  
Groves, James Grimble  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Gunter, Colonel  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Hain, Edward  
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Percy, Earl  
Hamilton, Marq of (Lond'nd'ry  
Pilkington, Richard  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.

Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Sir William Walrond and  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Mr. Anstruther.  
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.  
Purvis, Robert  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.  
Brigg, John  
Colville, John  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Allen, Charles P (Glouc. Stroud  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Ambrose, Robert  
Burt, Thomas  
Cremer, William Randal  
Asher, Alexander  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Crombie, John William  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Caine, William Sproston  
Cullinan, J.  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Caldwell, James  
Daly, James  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Dalziel, James Henry  
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)  
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Bell, Richard  
Cawley, Frederick  
Delaney, William  
Boand John  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Dillon, John  
Bolton, Thomas Dolling  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Doogan, P. C.  
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn  
Cogan, Denis J.

Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark),  
Boyle, James  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Duffy, William J.  
Duncan, James H.  
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Dunn, Sir William  
M'Arthur, Wm. (Cornwall)  
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)  
M'Crae, Georye  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Farquharson, Dr. Robert  
M'Govern, T.  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Farrell, James Patrick  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Roche, John  
Field, William  
Mather, William  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Minch, Matthew  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Furness, Sir Christopher  
Mooney, John J.  
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh'e  
Gilhooly, James  
Murnaghan, George  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Murphy, J.  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Grant, Corrie  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R (Northants.  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Hammond, John  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil  
Norman, Henry  
Tennant, Harold John  
Harmsworth, R. (Leicester  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Hayden, John Patrick  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Charles Seale-  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md  
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.  
Helme, Norval Watson  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Tomkinson, James  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.  
Tully, Jasper  
Holland, William Henry  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Ure, Alexander  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
O'Dowd, John  
Wallace, Robert  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Joicey, Sir James  
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
O'Malley, William  
Weir, James Galloway  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Mara, James  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
O'Shee, James John  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Lambert, George

Philipps, John Wynford  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Leamy, Edmund  
Rea, Russell  
Leng, Sir John  
Reddy, M.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

Lough, Thomas  
Redmond, John K. (Waterford)  
Sir Thomas Esmonde and  
Lundon, W.  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Captain Donelan.  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.

Reid, Sir K. Threshie (Dumfries)

Resolved, That until Whitsuntide the House do meet on Tuesday, at Two of the clock, and that the provisions of Standing Order No. 56 be extended to such Morning Sittings.

NEW BILL.

VAGRANTS' CHILDREN PROTECTION.

Bill for the further protection of the Children of Vagrants, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Warr, Mr. Yerburch, Mr. John Burns, and Mr. Hay.

VAGRANTS' CHILDREN PROTECTION BILL.

"For the further protection of the Children of Vagrants," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday 30th April, and to be printed. [Bill 145.]

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee;;

(In the Committee.)

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

LOAN.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That, towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March nineteen hundred and two, sums not exceeding sixty million pounds may be raised by all or any of the following methods;;

- (a) by means of the creation of two and three-quarter per cent. Consolidated Stock within the meaning of the National Debt Conversion Act, 1888; or
  - (b) by means of the issue of further War Stock or War Bonds under the War Loan Act, 1900; or
  - (c) by means of the issue of Treasury Bills; or
  - (d) by means of the issue of Exchequer Bonds;
- and that the principal of, and interest on, any sum so raised be charged on the Consolidated Fund.

That all expenses incurred in connection with raising the said sums, including any additional remuneration to the Banks of England and Ireland, be charged on the Consolidated Fund." (Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) reminded the House that when the Vote of £10,000,000 was asked for last session he opposed it, on the grounds that the amount was totally insufficient, and that it was impossible accurately to forecast the amount of money which would be required. The views he then expressed had been borne out by what had occurred, and Ireland had the same objection to sharing the fresh burdens now proposed as on the former occasion. In addition to the war expenditure the Estimates were characterised by enormous extravagance in almost every Department of State. If a Member criticised any portion of the Government's proposals he was looked upon as an enemy of the country, with the result that the expenditure progressed with fearful rapidity. This absolute want of economy had brought about a position that the National Debt amounted to £687,797,000, an amount larger than the National Debt of any other civilised State. It was a mistaken financial system to draw cheques on posterity in order to gratify the desires of certain individuals who desired to make war on unoffending nations. The annual expenditure was now £187,000,000, and a larger expenditure was incurred in regard to the Army and Navy than in France and Germany. The imperial taxation had almost reached the limits which the people could bear. The only security for the enormous National Debt was Great Britain's commercial supremacy. It would therefore be necessary to take those facts into consideration. He held the opinion that England was living upon its capital. The imports

were enormously increasing, and the supremacy of Great Britain as a commercial nation was gradually vanishing, and owing to the peculiar system of taxation the foreigner selling goods in this country paid nothing towards this enormous amount of £187,000,000, the burden of which fell mainly upon the native producer. He did not propose to discuss at any great length free trade, fair trade, or protection, but would ask the attention of the House to the points most germane to the question. The Government did not appear to know their own mind, and were pursuing a zig-zag policy to obtain the end they had in view. Whilst on the one hand there was an import duty levied on sugar, on the other there was an export duty to be levied on coal. So far as he individually was concerned, he was opposed to export duties altogether. He was a free trader, but the policy of England was free imports not free trade, and therefore he maintained there ought to be a reasonable duty put upon all manufactured articles coming into this country.

England had been prosperous in spite of free trade. In principle he was a free trader, but in theory and practice there was sometimes a very wide divergence, and what was called free trade in this country was not in reality free trade. He reiterated it was a policy of free imports, and the result, he maintained, was to lessen employment at home and destroy native agriculture. If Cobden and Bright and those who advocated free trade for this country could return to the scene of their labours, they would not recognise the policy which was called by their name. The Government taxed many imported articles, and the articles most

heavily taxed were those consumed by the poor. A resolution had been passed to tax sugar. Why not put a moderate import duty on butter, and enable home producers to give work to labourers? The result of allowing the free importation of flour, so far as Ireland was concerned, was that there was not a river in the country capable at the present time of running a mill profitably, and no doubt the same statement was equally true with regard to England. Why not give the millers and farmers and labourers a chance against the foreigner who neither contributes

to rent, rates, revenue, nor employment. The cost of production had been so lowered that foreign manufactured goods were being sold at less money than they could be produced in Ireland, which must necessarily do away with a considerable amount of the labour of the country. Goods made in German prisons were brought over and sold in open competition with articles made by free labour, and some effort should be made to keep convict-made goods in their own nation.

As the imports were increasing and the exports decreasing, the land was being allowed to go to waste. The National Debt and the expenditure of the country was enormously increasing, whilst at the same time the employment in the country was decreasing, and the commercial supremacy of England gradually vanishing. Where was the security for the National Debt? Where was this enormous annual charge of £187,000,000 to come from in future? The position of this country was that if foreign supplies of food were stopped it would be starved in between, three and six weeks. Was that a satisfactory state of affairs? Commercial supremacy had kept up this country, but that state of things was changing. There was a time when America, imported into this country raw material; they now sent in the manufactured article, and beat you in your own markets. Liverpool got its electric plant from Germany, whilst Glasgow, the greatest iron manufacturing district in Great Britain, had lately been importing steel rails from America.

The American manufacturers were absorbing nearly all your foreign markets. Where was it going to end? The Manchester school of thought, which looked upon anything like an attack upon free trade as a sort of commercial suicide, may cry out, but the fact remained that the colonies were protected against the Mother Country. They had been obliged to protect themselves; it was the only way they had to raise revenue. Yet so-called free-traders could not see that every country in the world was banded against it. According to the views of English economists, it should not have been possible for America and Germany to progress and prosper under protection; but the Americans had changed the character of their exports from raw material to manufactured goods, and at the same time immensely increased the exports, whilst diminishing their imports. He did not advocate protection in the rigid sense of the word, but he would advocate that upon all manufactured articles a moderate duty should be paid. It appeared to him that nobody had the courage to face the problem. Foreigners were not only allowed to import into this country articles free of duty, but they were actually protected by preferential railway rates. Some time ago the rate per ton for the carriage of native meat on the London, and North Western Railway was 50s., whilst the rate for foreign meat was 25s., so that practically foreign meat was bounty-fed, so far as the London and North Western Railway was



concerned, to the extent of 25s. a ton. The same state of things existed with regard to foreign imports at the present time on all the railways in the three kingdoms. These great private monopolies, aided by the State, actually gave a bounty to foreigners to bring their goods to the markets which should belong to the producers of this country. In Germany the State railways had realised a profit of £23,200,000, which was applied to the reduction of taxation in Germany. In New Zealand, where the colony also owned the railways, they made a profit on the railways of no less than £2,500,000. This was not the only advantage derived by the colonies and countries like Germany, where the State owned the railways; there was not only the advantage of low rates and the profit and the reduction of taxation, but also the fact that there was a realisable asset as security for the National Debt, which England did not possess. The policy of this Parliament seemed to be to place power in the hands of these great carrying companies, who controlled the House of Commons, and through them the country, and he hoped the views he expressed would receive consideration. In conclusion, he would say it was a wrong system to pay our debts by drawing cheques upon posterity. The Chancellor of the Exchequer did not like the idea of war loans, and, if he could have managed it financially, would have infinitely preferred to have met the expenditure as it came along out of income; but if the extraordinary extravagance of expenditure was to be allowed to continue, and private Members were to be closed and prevented from discussing the Estimates, then they had arrived at a condition of things when all financial business was to be engineered by the Front Bench, and when wholesome agitation and criticism from the House would enable the right hon. Gentleman to exercise a certain amount of control over the Treasury with regard to what was called national expenditure. It was for such reasons that he had criticised the proposal to obtain this money by means of a war loan. He did not propose to enter into the protest of the shipping interest regarding the coal tax, which he thought would create grave cause of complaint in Ireland against the Mercantile Marine, because the Mercantile Marine was protected by the British Navy, to which Ireland had to contribute far more than its share, and the business of the Mercantile Marine was to collect and carry produce from all parts of the world and bring it over at cheap rates to British markets in competition with Irish produce. He had no desire to see the price of food raised, but Ireland could not live out of the profits of English manufacture. Englishmen could not live out of the profits of manufacture, but must have a certain amount of agriculture. The burden of taxation ought to be put upon the shoulders of those who were best able to bear it, and foreign manufactured articles ought to take their share. He could not vote for the war loan. He felt, as an Irishman, that they were obliged to pay a far larger amount of money than their share of the taxation which would be levied in various directions, and he suggested that some arrangements ought to be made to lessen the burdens so far as Ireland was concerned. He drew attention to the fact that the income tax was originally only to be levied in certain parts of Ireland for a certain period, and that it was a very exceptional tax, and it would be an act of simple justice on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer if he would arrange that an

amount equal to that levied through income tax in Ireland should be returned to that country in the shape of grants for reproductive purposes.

\*MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I am not quite sure that the House would be entirely prudent in leaving to the Chancellor of the Exchequer such a large choice with regard to the manner in which the loan is to be raised. The first method proposed is by means of the creation of Two-and-Three-Quarter per Cent. Consolidated Stock within the meaning of the National Debt Conversion Act, 1888. I do not know what price the Chancellor of the Exchequer will obtain for sixty millions of 2½ per cent. Consols; it may possibly only be 91 or 92.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.):

89.

\*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: An hon. Member says 89; that surely would not be a very profitable bargain. The other methods are by means of the issue of further war stock or war bonds under the War Loan Act, 1900; or (c) by means of the issue of Treasury Bills; or (d) by means of the issue of Exchequer Bonds; and that the principal of and interest on any sum so raised be charged on the Consolidated Fund. I am not convinced that the right hon. Gentleman would be perfect in his choice of method which all these opportunities open to him. Great complaint was made of his manner of dealing with the last loan without adequate notice, and his selection of American financiers, and at the time of the Greek loan, secured by France, Russia, and this country, the right hon. Gentleman so contrived that English contributors to the loan paid 1 per cent. more for their contributions than either the French or Russian contributors. Now I come to the Budget. This is the most appalling Budget I have ever seen. I do not say so by way of blame; it was inevitable. It is appalling not only on account of the enormous amount but also on account of the entire absence of any promise or probability of any reduction next year or any succeeding year. The Chancellor of the Exchequer confesses to an expenditure of £187,000,000, but that is not the whole of the expenditure. It is one of my complaints that our public accounts are deliberately falsified and that people are deceived, and I am obliged to correct the right hon. Gentleman.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer puts the Exchequer expenditure at £187,600,000, but to that sum we must add the nine or ten millions which the right hon.

Gentleman intercepts for local purposes, and also the eight or nine millions of appropriations in aid. That eighteen millions is part of the national expenditure, though it is concealed by the form in which the accounts are kept, and brings the Exchequer expenditure up to

£205,000,000. But apart from that there is the local expenditure, which is at least £100,000,000, so that in the coming year the total expenditure will be £300,000,000. The National Debt is stated to have been increased by £59,000,000, and now stands at

£688,000,000; but that is not all, there is a further sum of £14,700,000 which the right hon. Gentleman describes as re-productive moneys, so that the National Debt has actually been increased to £702,000,000. That, added to the local debt, which is certainly not less than £300,000,000, makes the total debt of this country £1,000,000,000. These figures are appalling and point to a most

alarming prospect, to a state of things which will be extremely difficult for any Chancellor of the Exchequer to handle. At the present time it has been a very difficult matter. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is far from diminishing the gravity of the facts he laid before the House last night; in fact he had a tendency to exaggerate rather than to diminish the gravity of the situation. I was struck by the tone of the Chancellor of the Exchequer rather than by his remarks. He seemed to have come to the House for the purpose of washing his hands of his colleagues. The right hon. Gentleman says that his colleagues are to blame for all this, but I am not quite so sure of that. The Chancellor of the Exchequer is not entirely without blame, for he must share the responsibility. From the year 1895 to 1899 there was a swelling revenue, and we had surpluses every year. But from 1899 up to the present time it has been a very different story indeed. It is Pharaoh's dream over again. In the years of prosperity the right hon. Gentleman squandered the surpluses that he had, and he would not allow scarcely a farthing to go towards the reduction of the debt. There was nobody to whom he would not give a million, and he was a most extravagant Chancellor of the Exchequer. He not only squandered all the surpluses, but he also laid hands upon the Sinking Fund, a thing which shocked every sound financier. Therefore it could not be said that he was entirely without blame in the matter. It is like the case of the seven well favoured fat fleshed kine and the seven ill favoured lean fleshed kine in Pharaoh's dream. But Pharaoh has awoken, and the prospect is that which the right hon. Gentleman has placed before the House with such great courage, candour, self-denial and readiness. I have never been an absolutely unqualified admirer of the finance of the right hon. Gentleman. I think that when he has in any way departed from the lessons of the great masters of finance he has followed the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire, and whenever he has done things out of his own head he has often been on the verge of failure. I think he was on the verge of failure when he removed the tobacco duty, a step which he said would bring in a golden harvest, but which he afterwards admitted brought in no harvest at all. He was mistaken also with regard to the Greek Loan. I know that the right hon. Gentleman has the courage of his opinions, and he is not afraid to profess and openly avow to the full extent every proposal that he makes. I for one was sorry to note a sort of tone about him last night as though he was looking forward to defeat upon his Budget, and to a removal of himself from his present sphere of usefulness. Of course the first reason that occurs to one to account for this appalling Budget is the war; but that is not the only reason. Even what the right hon. Gentleman calls the normal expenditure has so increased that he was obliged to say last night that, even apart from the war, he would not be able to give us any remission of taxation. Putting that aside, I come to the war. I think that in the history of English Government there never has been such a series of miscalculations and falsified promises as those which have arisen in connection with this war. We look to the English Government, who are supposed to be in possession of full and secret information of all sorts from

all over the field, for the formation and announcement to us of an adequate opinion as to the probable extent and cost of any undertaking in which they are about to engage. We also look to the Government for proper and adequate financial provision for such undertakings. The Government had full information with regard to this war. It is not disputed that their Intelligence Department had provided them with absolutely correct information as to the whole of the Boer armaments, and as to their preparations for war, but the Government failed to comprehend that information. This reminds me of the wise man who said; "Wisdom is the principal thing; therefore get wisdom, but with all thy getting get understanding."

The Government had the wisdom but not the understanding. They knew the facts, but they were incapable of appreciating them. The result is that in consequence we have to face this enormous Budget. From the very beginning there was, and even up to yesterday there has been, a most extraordinary and a most noticeable optimism on the part of Her Majesty's Government as to the duration and the conduct of the war. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was, up to yesterday, always telling us that the war was going to end before the next time he had to face the House of Commons. He was always explaining to us that his financial demands, which might appear heavy, were purely temporary, and he was always telling us that he would get a large share of the expense out of the Transvaal. In September last the right hon. Gentleman believed that the war was entirely over, that we were in possession of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, and that we had obtained possession of them at the cheapest rate ever heard of in history. He made a speech to his constituents in Bristol to that effect. He said on the 29th of September last year;

"If they considered that from small increases in taxation the country had been able to bring to a conclusion one of the greatest wars; perhaps the greatest war; in which it had been engaged since the early part of the century, he thought they would be satisfied that the Government had not extravagantly wasted the resources of the country. We had added a territory of vast value to the Empire without imposing on it a greater burden than it could bear. He believed that with a fair field and no favour English manufactures could beat the world, and it was in that belief and looking to the union it had brought about between them and their great colonial possessions he felt that even the war in South Africa would prove in the end to be a blessing to their country."

I am only quoting this to show that the right hon. Gentleman on the 29th of September last believed that the war was ended, and shared the extraordinary optimism which His Majesty's Government has shown in regard to it. I have not shared that optimism from the beginning. On the 27th of October, 1899, I warned the House that this would be one of the most unexampled conflicts for its importance and seriousness within living memory. I warned the House that we should have disasters and reverses. I told the House that we were dealing with courageous and capable adversaries, and that the House must be prepared for a long war. I know that I was rebuked at the time by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Ecclesall Division of Sheffield and the Member for the Kirkdale Division of Liverpool, and I was told that I was uttering ridiculous non-sense. When I

found the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the 29th of September declaring that the war was ended, and that we had annexed these two States at a very cheap rate, I began to think that I had been a false prophet. I told my constituents what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said, that the war was ended, and I got elected. [Opposition cheers.] Alas! it was not myself who was the false prophet, but the false prophet was a person in a higher position than myself. Even now, many months after the 29th of September last, we find Sir Alfred Milner, in February last, saying that he can foresee no definite point of time at which we can consider peace in sight, and he even declares that during the last six months things have retrogressed. So that even at this moment, long after the 29th of September, when the General Election has long been passed and a new Cabinet has been formed, mainly consisting of the ablest family in the country, we are still as far off as ever from any ability to name the precise moment when we shall be able to say to ourselves in truth what the Chancellor of the Exchequer said to his constituents in September last, that the war in South Africa is over. But if the military authorities miscalculated the military aspect of the war, surely the Chancellor of the Exchequer must take to himself no small amount of blame for having so seriously miscalculated the financial aspects of the problem. He has never ceased to tell us that he expected to get a large amount towards the war from the Transvaal. He began to tell us that in October, 1899, at the time I was warning the House that the war would be a long and costly one. He told us that he meant to get a large proportion, or at least a considerable portion of the cost, from the Transvaal, and if possible the whole of it. On the 6th of March he said;

"I look for the cost of the war first to the Transvaal, and then I look to the other sources of revenue which I have named."

I did not even then share his view of the financial possibility of getting money out of the Transvaal, and I ventured then to tell him that he would never get anything at all unless he got it as voluntary contributions from the mines.

Therefore it will be seen that in 1900 the right hon. Gentleman believed we should get a substantial contribution from the Transvaal to the cost of the war; but in 1901, after having sent out an expert to obtain evidence as to the precise amount of this financial contribution, he presents to us now a picture of a ruined country and a bankrupt people. He says to-day that it is a hopeless case, and all he has to say about this substantial contribution, upon which he based his system of finance, is,

"We will keep alive our claim"; a claim against a ruined country and a bankrupt people. Is it not childish? I think in this part of his speech the right hon.

Gentleman showed a little want of that candour and courage which he displayed when he was dealing with the shortcomings of the rest of his colleagues.

Now I come to the specific proposals of this Budget. First of all I will take the income tax. My belief is that there is no tax in the world so good as the income tax, if it is levied equally and fairly all

round. Let no man tell me that the working man would not cheerfully pay his share of the income tax. I am convinced that the working man is as ready to pay

income tax as any man in this country, and more ready to pay any tax that he is persuaded is required by his country, whether a tax of money or of blood. But you must not surround the tax with such conditions as obtain at the present time. The same sum which is produced by an income tax of 1s. would be produced by an income tax of 4d., if instead of only taxing equally all incomes over £;700, as you do now, and granting abatements and total exemption to the rest, you were, to tax the whole of them equally, and devise a simple and convenient method of collection of the smaller sums. My belief is that this is not beyond the possibility of achievement by a Chancellor of the Exchequer. At present you charge incomes over £;700 1s. 2d. in the £;, because you think that other people would not be willing to pay an income tax of 3d. or 4d. in the £;. I do not believe this. I believe that if you will make the payment easy to the working man he would be ready to contribute towards any reasonable object, and I believe he would be perfectly ready to contribute towards the war in South Africa, and to pay his 3d. or 4d. in the £; as willingly as anybody else. I think this is the true doctrine of fiscality, that your object should be, not to get large sums from a small number of people over a small area, but you should base your finances upon a system of getting a large, number of small contributions from a large number of people spread over a large area, by simple methods. This is the true method, and it is the method which you already pursue in the Post Office, There it is your penny stamp that produces the enormous revenue of £;13,000,000 or £;14,000,000 without any danger or trouble to anybody. I commend that process to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for I believe it to be the true one, and in future I hope he will try, not to levy large contributions upon a small number of people, but seek more to levy small contributions upon a larger number. So long as this tax is so unequally levied, and abatements and exemptions are allowed, so long as you impose this tax in this way, I think it imprudent, and it is bad finance, to add to the tax itself, while leaving its incidence so partial and unequal. The average income-tax payer is indeed not a person who will openly complain, and the burden of the income tax will be more or less silently borne; but it will not be borne without resentment, which may, upon some future occasion, transform itself into open hostility to the Government. I come now to the sugar duty. There I see a more dangerous experiment. I do not understand what polarisation means. We have had no explanation of it. I do not understand what is to be ascertained by the instrument. Is it the essential part of sugar, which I believe is called sucrose? [An HON. MEMBER: "Glucose."] No, I believe the essential part is called sucrose. Saccharin is a different thing, which makes you think you are taking sugar. I do not understand what polarisation is intended to ascertain. Is it intended to ascertain the amount of the essential part of sugar which I have called sucrose, just as we ascertain the amount of alcohol in wine and spirits? It appears to be an incomplete method, but I pass that for the moment, and what I come to is this;the price of the lowest quality of sugar in this country at present is, I believe, 1s. 6d. Now that same sugar is imported from Hamburg, and at Hamburg it costs about 3d. The difference between the 3d. and the

1s. is paid for us in the shape of a bounty by the foreign country, and thus we get cheap sugar at the cost of the foreign taxpayer. We pay 1s. and he pays the other 1s., and it is in consequence of the great influx of cheap sugar that a considerable number of important new industries have grown up, and are still growing up in this country. We must all have observed the great increase in confectionery and sweetmeats, but what we may not have observed is that the British manufacturer of preserved fruits is positively driving the native out of the market in places like Germany, Spain, and France, and the reason is the extra-ordinary cheapness of sugar here. Now mark the result. You are going to put, broadly speaking, 3s. per pound on sugar. Don't you think that foreign countries, who have been intending for some time to alter the bounty system, will take this opportunity of getting rid of their bounties;

in other words, of depriving our sugar of the contribution of 1s. per pound which they now make? They have now, I think, the opportunity of doing a bad turn to England, and it is extremely likely that the imposition of this 3s. per pound may lead to the

1s. bounty being abandoned by the foreign country. If so, the result will be that our sugar, instead of being 1s. per pound, will be 3s. per pound. That would be sufficient to kill the whole of these young industries. They are vigorous and enterprising industries, which have sprung up owing to the cheapness of sugar. They are young, and they will fight, and let the Chancellor of the Exchequer believe what I say; they will not have their trade destroyed, as it may be, or injured, as it surely will be by the tax, without a struggle. I am warning the Chancellor of the Exchequer to expect opposition. I have myself received strenuous representations begging me to oppose the duty on sugar, and although I am accustomed to do what I think right without much regard to representations from outside, I am free to say it does add to the difficulty I have in voting for the sugar resolution of the Government.

I have only one thing more to say, and that is in regard to the proposed export duty of 1s. per ton on coal. That, I think, is the most important, and I venture to say the most unfortunate proposal of the whole Budget. Will the House bear with me while I read a statement on export duties in general by one of the best of the economic writers; I mean Dr. Bastable. There is no doubt that an export duty is a relic of barbarism. There is no kind of duty that so dislocates trade, introduces such confusion into the operations of commerce, or is so extremely doubtful in its effects in the incidence of the duty and the damage caused. Dr. Bastable says;

"As employed in mediaeval times";

It is astonishing how the mediaeval argument resembles the argument used by the right hon. Gentleman last night;

"As employed in mediaeval times it was intended partly to tax those foreigners who used the staple product of the country, and partly as an impost on the producers or owners of natural agents. It is evident that the incidence of the tax will vary according to the

position of the article taxed. That the home traders will try to raise the price is certain, but their success in this endeavour will depend on (1) the extent to which outside competition is possible, and (2) the need that foreigners have for the article. Where several sources of supply exist the effect of taxing one will be to turn demand to the others, and where increased price checks demand it tends to bring about a fall. Thus it may be said, that in most cases the export duty is chiefly paid by the country that imposes it. Unless the country has a complete monopoly of the product, and the foreign demand remains unaffected by a rise of price, the whole burden cannot be transferred to the consumers. This case is, it need not be said, rarely found, but an approximation to it will partly pass the tax to the foreign consumers. Still, as a practical result, the bulk of the duty falls immediately on the producers of the taxed product, though it might be shifted by them to the owners of land, skilled labour, or fixed capital concerned in the business. A large number of export duties might even by diminishing foreign trade lower the rates of wages and interest generally." It is always the producer concerned in the business who has to suffer, according to Dr. Bastable, and I entirely agree with him. I believe there is no duty more mischievous in its indirect effects than an export duty. You have to double the task of the preventive staff. They have to look after not only what comes into the country, but what goes out. It changes the character of your preventive service in respect that it doubles the aspect. Now as to this coal tax. The right hon. Gentleman proposes to except bunker coal. What is bunker coal? According to the view of the trade, bunker coal usually is intended to mean coal carried in bunkers for the use of the ship; but that is not the view the right hon. Gentleman takes. But how is the amount of bunker coal a ship is to carry to be fixed? How is bunker coal to be defined? I have never seen nor heard any definition that would include bunker coal and exclude all other coal. There is another question I want to ask. Is the duty to be levied on coal shipped in one English port to be delivered in another English port? [Sir M. HICKS BEACH shook his head.] I presumed it would not. I am right there. Is it to be levied on coal shipped at an English port for an English possession. [Sir M. HICKS BEACH: Yes.] It is well to observe the result. A foreign ship takes bunker coal at Cardiff and pays nothing on that coal, but an English ship goes for coals at Malta and pays 1s. per ton on that coal. You give an advantage to foreign ships bunkering in England. You give them an advantage over the native. If the duty is to be levied on the coal you send from an English port to a British possession, it is certainly a very new departure indeed. The Secretary for the Colonies, whose absence during this interesting discussion I much deplore, proposed to give the colonies special advantages by customs and fiscal regulations, and he even suggested entering into an Imperial Zoll-verein, with a view to a closer connection with them. This tax places the colonies at a greater disadvantage, and tends rather to disunion than to union. In the case of the Sugar Tax, what we are to look to is the essential thing, namely, the sucrose. I will use that term while waiting for another from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. In the case of coal it is coal you are going to tax, but it takes three tons of coal to make a ton of iron, and consequently



when you are exporting a ton of iron you are exporting three tons of coal. I know that is refining the argument, but what is good for one product in the way of taxing the essential thing is, I submit, good for another. But that is not my real and main objection. I will take one example. This tax, I think, will act most prejudicially in the case of certain places abroad. Gibraltar is one of the most important of our mercantile coaling stations. It supplies from 500,000 to 600,000 tons of coal to merchant ships in the year. The competition is very keen indeed between the coaling stations at Algiers and Gibraltar. Sometimes Algiers gets the upper hand, as in 1893, when the amount supplied at Gibraltar fell to 300,000 because of the competition. So great importance does the Government attach to the coaling at Gibraltar that in the year 1895&#x2013;6 they agreed to spend £;700,000 on the creation of a coaling mole, of which the Gibraltar merchants are to pay out of the profits of the coal trade £;400,000. If you are going to put 1s. per ton on the coal that goes to Gibraltar, and if Gibraltar continues to use 500,000 tons per annum, you are putting a very large tax on Gibraltar. If you are going

to put a tax on Gibraltar coal and expose it to the keener competition of Algiers, you may increase the price of coal at Gibraltar, and ruin the coal trade there altogether, rendering it impossible for the coal merchants to pay the £;400,000, and you may find that you have expended £;700,000 without any prospect of getting the £;400,000 you expect in diminution of the amount. If it is thus at Gibraltar I think it probably may be the same in other cases. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said;

"This coal is exported, as I have shown, mainly to ports in Europe and the Mediterranean. They are short voyages, If the merchant chooses he can devote more bunker-space in his ship to coal and less to his cargo, and escape the duty altogether."

But the shipowner only carries coal for the sake of carrying cargo, and to say that he may escape the tax by carrying more coal and less cargo is like saying that if a bird had more wings and less stomach it would be very much lighter. But merchants and shipowners cannot be dealt with as if they were Cherubim and Seraphim. If they want wings to fly with, they also want something to sit down upon. I cannot imagine where the Chancellor of the Exchequer got the notion. But he has suggested one still more amusing fallacy as regards coal. He said;

"I think the law should be framed so as to enable a person who had made a contract here to break his contract, unless the person with whom he made the contract abroad were willing to pay the 1s. duty. That is the effect of the action of the Act of last year, but practically the duty has to be added to the price agreed upon, so the person who might take the delivery of the coal would not pay out of his own pocket."

I really think that a doctrine of that kind, coming from a Chancellor of the Exchequer, was never heard of in this House before. If you have made a contract for coal with a foreigner you are to break the contract unless the foreigner will agree to pay the extra shilling per ton which it has pleased the Chancellor of the Exchequer to impose on coal; an amazing and impossible doctrine. I think he can scarcely have considered what he said at that moment, and I am quite sure

that on reconsidering it he will see that is a kind of doctrine that cannot be acted upon. It would be entirely idle to put such a clause in an Act of Parliament. Now, the whole effect of what I have been saying comes to this. I do earnestly beg and implore His Majesty's Government to drop this duty on coal. I believe if they adhere to it, it will get them into serious trouble at home, and the reason I urge so strenuously that they should abandon it is really largely this; in my opinion, it is of the greatest importance that this Government should stay in office until the war is over. It has no right to imperil its own existence. It appealed to the country to give it a majority to finish the war, and whatever its difficulty may be, and whatever differences may be found within its own ranks, it cannot abdicate its position. The reason it cannot abdicate its position is because there is nothing over there

(pointing to the Front Opposition Bench). I should not feel all the anxiety I do, nor express with so much earnestness my desire to maintain the precious life of His Majesty's Government, were it not that I see no alternative Government in esse or in posse, and scarcely the chief of a possible Government. Therefore, I look with the greatest possible apprehension on the situation, knowing that His Majesty's Government may be diminishing their popularity and diminishing their support in large portions of the coal mining districts, and possibly imperilling their existence, because I do feel that after this Government we shall be in the presence of something like political chaos. It is for this reason that I have risen to make these remarks, which were longer than I intended. I thank the House for listening to me. I do earnestly beg His Majesty's Government not to invite danger, not to invite disaffection and loss of seats, small majorities, and all those accidents which are the preludes to the dissolution of a Government, by persisting in the coal tax, which is newfangled and mischievous, and which cannot fail injuriously to affect the industry of the country.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion) said that as one who had strenuously and consistently opposed the war, not only after it commenced, but in anticipation of it, he was able to look with a considerable amount of equanimity at the consternation exhibited by hon. Members on the other side who strenuously supported the Government and egged them on to the war. Now, when they are asked to pay for the war they begin to whine of the danger to their seats. They ought to have considered that before they egged the Government on to the disastrous course they entered upon. Instead of weakening the hands of the Government in imposing taxation to pay for the war, those who supported the war ought to strengthen the hands of the Government. Those who opposed it were entitled to oppose all payment for it; they were not responsible for the war; but those who were responsible were under an honourable obligation to support the Government, at the cost of popularity and their seats, in getting them out of the mess they had entered upon. The taxation of industries was always an unpopular measure, and it was always an undesirable measure, but if large expenditure was incurred it was always an unavoidable measure. But if they taxed industries they ought to find a method by which the burden would be universally and not locally felt. That was the strong objection to the coal duty in its present shape. If the duty

was confined solely to the coal exported the burden would fall unequally. There were some coalfields whose output was almost entirely exported, while there were others that exported practically none. Those districts producing coal

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)

Colville, John

Furness, Sir Christopher

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Gilhooly, James

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud

Craig, Robert Hunter

Goddard, Daniel Ford

Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.

Cremer, William Randal

Grant, Corrie

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Cullinan, J.

Griffith, Ellis J.

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Daly, James

Hammond, John

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)

Bell, Richard

Delany, William

Harmsworth, R. Leicester

Boland, John

Dillon, John

Harwood, George

Burke, E. Haviland-

Donelan, Captain A.

Hayden, John Patrick

Burt, Thomas

Doogan, P. C.

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

Buxton, Sidney Charles

Duffy, William J.

Healy, Timothy Michael

Caldwell, James

Duncan, J. Hastings

Helme, Norval Watson

Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Dunn, Sir William

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.

Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.  
Emmott, Alfred  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
Holland, William Henry  
Cawley, Frederick  
Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)  
Jameson, Maj. J. Eustace  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Joicey, Sir James  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Field, William  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Joyce, Michael

for export would be heavily taxed, and other districts not less responsible for the war would escape altogether. He would prefer that the tax should be made not an export duty but an Excise duty of 1s. per ton on all the coal produced in the country. It would then fall on the coal consumers, and that would be the entire country. Every householder; with the exception possibly of the very poorest class, who ought to be exempted, he meant the Crofters of the Highlands and Wales and the peat burners of Ireland; would feel the imposition of an Excise duty on coal. He entirely agreed with the view expressed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the working classes ought to be made to feel the burden of this war as well as any other class. They might be the victims of misrepresentation, like other parties, but they willingly fell into it, and they were as intollerant as any in not permitting a contrary expression of opinion to what they felt. He would like to draw the Chancellor of the Exchequer's attention to a further point.

This observation excited some laughter, as the Treasury Bench was at the time entirely deserted. The, hon. Member then moved to report progress.

Motion made, and Question put. "That the Chairman do report progress; and ask leave to sit again." (Mr. Bryn Roberts.)

The Committee divided:; Ayes, 127; Noes, 171. [Division List No. 132.]

Kennedy, Patrick James  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Labouchere, Henry  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Lambert, George  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (Northants)

Layland-Barratt, Francis  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Strachey, Edward  
Leamy, Edmund  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Sullivan, Donal  
Lewis, John Herbert  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Lough, Thomas  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Thomas, Dav. Alfred (Merthyr  
Lundon, W.  
O'Dowd, John  
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower)  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Thompson, E. C (Monaghan, N.  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.  
Tompkinson, James  
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift  
O'Malley, William  
Tully, Jasper  
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall  
O'Mara, James  
Ure, Alexander  
M'Crae, George  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
O'Shee, James John  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
M'Govern, T.  
Partington, Oswald  
White, George (Norfolk)  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Rea, Russell  
White, Patrick (Meath, North  
Minch, Matthew  
Reddy, M.  
Whiteley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Mooney, John J.

Redmond, John E. (Waterford  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth  
Moulton, John Fletcher  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Murnaghan, George  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Murphy, J.  
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)  
Mr. Bryn Roberts-and Mr. William Jones.  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire  
NOES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Lawson, John Grant  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants. Fareham  
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Dyke, Rt Hon. Sir William Hart  
Leighton, Stanley  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N S.  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)  
Finch, George H.  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Macartney, Rt Hn. W G Ellison.  
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)

FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-  
Macdona, John Gumming  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Fitzroy, Hon Edward Algernon  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin  
Flower, Ernest  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs.  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Gibbs, Hn AG H.(City of London  
Malcolm, Ian  
Beckett, Ernest William  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Bigwood, James  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Bond, Edward  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire  
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow.  
Brassey, Albert  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Brookfield, Col. Montagu  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Depford  
Bull, William James  
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'y  
Mount, William Arthur  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Butcher, John George  
Groves, James Grimble

Muntz, Philip A.  
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Middx  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Hamilton, Manp of (L'nd'nderry  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert Wm.  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.  
Heath Arthur Howard (Hanley)  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Charrington, Spencer  
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.  
Parker, Gilbert  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Coghill, Douglas Harry  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Percy, Earl  
Colomb, Sir John Chas, Ready  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Pilkington, Richard  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Hope, J F. (Sheffield, Brightside  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Horner, Frederick William  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.  
Purvis, Robert  
Denny, Colonel  
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)  
Randles, John S.



Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Remnant, James Farquharson.  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Renwick, George  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Keswick, William  
Ridley, Hon. M. W. (St'Iybr'dge  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.  
Doughty, George  
Lawrence, William F.  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
Ropner, Col. Robert  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)  
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Rutherford, John  
Stone, Sir Benjamin  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Stroyan, John  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Valentia, Viscount  
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George  
Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.  
Skewes-Cox, Thomas  
Wason, John C. (Orkney)  
Younger, William  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)  
Webb, Col. William George  
Smith, H. C. (N'rthb., Tyneside  
Whiteley, H (Asht'n-und-Lyne  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
Sir William Walrond and  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Williams, Rt Hn J. Powell- (Bir.

Mr. Anstruther.

Spear, John Ward

Willox, Sir John Archibald

Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)

Wills, Sir Frederick

Original Question again proposed.

\*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I am anxious to say that I think the hon. Gentleman opposite was under some misapprehension. I had not the slightest intention of showing any discourtesy to him. I was called out to speak to another hon. Member for one moment, and should have been here in another second.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS said that he had not moved to report progress owing to the conduct of the right hon. Gentleman, as he had been listening to the debate most patiently all the time, and he was quite aware that the right hon. Gentleman had gone out of the Chamber for a minute on business. But at this hour of the night, half-past ten o'clock, there ought to be some Member of the Government to represent the Government, and it was because there was no Member of the Government in the House that he moved to report progress. He had been dealing with the question of the coal duty. His contention was that there should be an Excise duty of 1s. per ton rather than an export duty, because then the burden would be felt generally, instead of by only a few coal dealers. An Excise duty of 1s. per ton would bring in no less a sum than eleven millions to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The total output of coal last year was 220,000,000 tons, and an Excise duty of 1s. per ton on that amount would, as he had said, yield £;11,000,000, which would be felt by the whole country. That was the only principle on which direct taxation should be levied. The only consistent course would be to select for taxation some article of universal consumption, and not confine it to one or

two industries of a local character. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that he would take into consideration the question of existing forward contracts. The hon. Member for King's Lynn suggested that contracts with foreign dealers should be cancelled, but he would point out that these contracts would not be enforced in this country by our courts of law, but would be taken to foreign courts, who would pay no attention whatever to our legislation. It was true that the contracts could not be enforced against property in this country, but they could against the property of the contractors abroad, such as stores and depots. The proposal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be absolutely futile. It operated successfully in the case of the tea duties, but it was because the tea was consumed in this country, and, therefore, the persons who took advantage of the breach of contract were subject to the jurisdiction of our courts.

On the general question, the courage of the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been deservedly recognised, but he could not compliment the right hon. Gentleman without qualification, for while the Chancellor had expounded courageously to the House the true facts of the case, when he came to grapple with the situation which resulted from those facts he did not display equal courage. What was the

position? This lamentable war had cost us in round numbers £;150,000,000; but did any man in or out of the House believe for a moment that, even if the whole mess was wiped up and the war stopped to-morrow, that sum would cover the whole cost? Why, the cost would be found to be at least £;200,000,000. Now, how was that to be met? The Chancellor of the Exchequer very properly said that he would be no party to carrying on a war of this kind and throwing the whole debt on to posterity. He ought to have gone further, and said that he would not throw the principal part of the cost on to posterity. He thought that the whole of the debt ought to be placed on the present generation. On what conceivable ground could it be said that this generation ought not to show as great a patriotic feeling as our fathers did in the days of the Crimean war? The timidity which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had shown in this respect was not his own timidity, but had been forced upon him by his colleagues, and indicated what was the real opinion of His Majesty's Government as to the popularity of the war. If they really believed in the patriotism of the country in making this war on the small and brave nation of Boers, and that the country thoroughly supported the war, why should they shrink from imposing the chief burden on the people? They shrank because they knew in their hearts that the patriotism was false and spurious, that it was not the better sense of the country, that if the country had time to realise its thoughts it would repudiate with indignation responsibility for the war. Hence the rushing of the elections, and if it had been possible they would have rushed the Budget. Unfortunately for them, the Bill would have to be met after the war was at an end. Only when the people have recovered their senses, and when the worthier portion of the community were able to make their voices heard, would there be seen the appalling disparity between the causes of the war and the consequences of the war. The cause of this war was simply a question of two years for the franchise for the Uitlanders. On what ground could the throwing of the greatest part of the cost of the war on to posterity be justified? It was said it was to maintain the Empire. No, it was not to maintain the Empire; it was to throw the expenditure caused by the blunders of the Government on to the shoulders of posterity. What right had they to throw the punishment of their mistakes on to unborn generations? Did anybody believe for a moment that if Mr. Gladstone had been alive, and if the Liberal party had been in office, and had been actuated and governed by the principles of Liberalism, this war would ever have been undertaken? It would have been impossible. This war and the whole expenditure was due to the blunders of the Government, and the first blunder was the Jameson raid.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that the hon. Member is entitled to go into that question in discussing the resolution before the Committee.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS said that his point was that the war was due to causes that were avoidable, but supposing that even by the exercise of perfect wisdom it was unavoidable, it was not reasonable to put the cost of it on posterity. The whole initiative came from this country. By the admission of the Government, and of the Colonial Secretary himself, we interfered with the internal affairs of the Transvaal, a thing we had no right to do. And it was that interference on our

part, at the instigation of big capitalists in South Africa who had the Colonial Secretary under their heel, it was owing to that criminal blunder that we were led into this war. Further than that, they would not have made that blunder had they not thought that the result would not be war. So that the whole expenditure of £150,000,000 was the disastrous result of a foolish attempt to bluff the Transvaal Government by the Government of the day. Why should posterity pay because we had a foolish Government which thought that they could serve the capitalists in South Africa by a little bluffing? Was not that unreasonable? He would go further, and say that if we threw this loan on posterity, posterity would be perfectly justified in repudiating it. He did not agree with Henry George in everything, but he did in this, that if a loan for the purpose of carrying on a wanton and wicked war was thrown on posterity, posterity would have a perfect right to repudiate it.

He proposed to move an Amendment to the resolution. They had been reminded more than once that it was only right the Transvaal should pay a great part of the cost of the war. Apparently the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not yet abandoned the hope that it would be made to do so. At any rate, he fancied

that the right hon. Gentleman wished to keep the hope alive, and, consequently, he desired to assist him in that very laudable undertaking. When he spoke of the Transvaal they would readily understand that what he really meant was the gold mines of the Transvaal, for there was no other taxable property in that country.

What he had to propose was to leave out of the resolutions the words, "Consolidated stock within the meaning of the National Debt Conversion Act, 1888" in order to insert the words, "Transvaal Land Stock to be secured primarily by a charge on the assets of the Transvaal Colony and guaranteed by the United Kingdom." This would mean the creation of a 2½ per cent. Transvaal Loan, and the floating of such a loan would be equally as easy as one based on the Consolidated Fund, because it would have behind it the guarantee of the British Government. At the same time it would constitute a notice to everybody concerned, and to the mine-owners in particular, that it was intended that in due time those gentlemen should pay a great part of the cost of the war. No doubt strong objection would be made by the South African capitalists to the proposal. They had already had a book written and published for the express purpose of deprecating any attempt to

throw this burden upon their shoulders. But it had been pointed out that, by their own admission, one result of this war would be a saving of five millions in the working of the mines. That was the minimum benefit which they themselves anticipated deriving from the war, and that in itself represented a capital sum nearly sufficient to pay two-thirds of the cost of the war. But was it reasonable that they should sacrifice nothing but the increased profits which they expected to accrue to them from the war? His answer to that was an emphatic negative. He held that, if possible, every shilling of the expense should fall upon their shoulders, seeing that they instigated the war, and that it was entered into entirely in consequence of the agitation which they organised, financed and buoyed up in every possible way. They exercised influence in high

quarters in this country in order to support their schemes. True, the result might be that their anticipations might be falsified. Indeed, a good many anticipations had been falsified in the course of this war. At first it was thought that ten millions sterling would cover all the necessary outlay, and that three months would be the outside of time required for bringing the war to a conclusion. There was not a single miscalculation made by the Government that was not put practically into their mouths by the capitalists of South Africa. It was said that the Boer Army was small and ill-equipped for the conflict. That bubble had certainly been pricked. Who was it that said that? Was it the Army Intelligence Department? No, it was Mr. Cecil Rhodes. They were told, too, that the Boer Army would not fight. True, they did not fight until they had exhausted every effort to avert and avoid war. They made concession after concession, they reduced the franchise qualification from fourteen years to nine years and even to seven years;

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order; I fail to see what these remarks of the hon. Member have to do with the Amendment.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS said he was asking that the capitalists who led the country into the war by their misrepresentations should be made, as far as possible, to pay the cost of it. He was showing that they were responsible for the war, and that they were the men who ought to pay. He was asking the House to make the loan a primary charge upon their properties. He was proving to the Committee that they were the people responsible for making the representations which led the Government into the war, and he was suggesting that they and not the innocent British taxpayer should bear the burden. He was arguing that every miscalculation which had resulted in great loss of life and treasure to this country was due to the misrepresentations of the Transvaal capitalists. Why then should they not pay? He quite recognised what the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said with regard to the probability that they would get no immediate help from the Transvaal in the payment, of the cost of the war. But, at the same time, he held that they should show their determination to throw the entire burden on the mines, even although they might not be able to recover a single shilling for two or three years.

There was no reason why the stock should not now be created as Transvaal stock, and the liability at once placed upon the colony. It was true that the interest for this year, next year, and the year after might not be paid by the colony, and that this country might have to pay a large proportion of it for a great number of years. But that was no reason whatever why the burden should not be placed primarily upon the colony. Among the inducements held out in order to induce the Boers to surrender was the promise to give them representative government at the earliest practicable moment. Nobody supposed that the grant of such a government could be made coincident with the conclusion of the war. But the liability for the payment of the debt should at once be placed on the right shoulders. Unless the burden was now definitely placed upon the Transvaal, was it likely that, when representative government had been given and Home Rule practically established, this country would be able to induce the Colonial Government to take over the debt? They certainly would not do it willingly, and

in the event of their refusal, how would it be possible to make them accept the liability? Could we do it by force? We had had some experience of that in the past, and he did not think that that experience was such as to induce a revival of the experiment. It was necessary that Parliament should make clear its determination to compel the mineowners to pay the expense. They might grumble and groan as much as they pleased, but the taxpayers of this country were fully justified in compelling them to bear the consequences of their own misdeeds. It might be argued that many of the shareholders in the mines were not British subjects. He did not know how many of them might be the subjects of Germany or France. The more the better, so far as he was concerned, for his contention was that if they chose to entrust their money to the people who engineered this atrocious war their property should be made to pay the cost of it. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed;

"In line 5, paragraph (a), to leave out the words from the words 'per cent.,' to the end of the paragraph, in order to insert the words 'Transvaal Loan Stock to be secured primarily by a charge on the assets of the Transvaal Colony and guaranteed by the United Kingdom.'";(Mr. Bryn Roberts.)

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

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Member desires by this Amendment to place the loan, which it is necessary now to raise, upon the mine-owners or capitalists or other persons in the Transvaal whom he considers the authors of the war.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Primarily.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Primarily, but I do not want to discuss that matter at all. I am as anxious as the hon. Member can be that those who own the wealth of the Transvaal should make a contribution, as I have always said, towards the expenses of the war. But let me point out to the Committee that the object of the hon. Member will not be gained by passing this Amendment, through which he would get nothing from these mine-owners or capitalists, or from the wealth which they own. I was obliged to admit last night that the Transvaal at present is not in a condition to pay anything towards this loan, or even to pay the interest on it.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: For a year or two.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Quite so, but it cannot at present, and therefore there is no question of charging the Transvaal or anybody in the Transvaal at present in this matter. The effect of substituting a 2½% Transvaal stock for an Imperial Government security would be to saddle the taxpayers of this country with a much larger charge than I have ventured to propose to the House. It is very well known to any one who studies these things that English Government stocks command a much higher price in the market than the stocks which merely have the guarantee of the English Government, and the effect of the hon. Member's proposal, therefore, would be that we should have to issue this stock at a lower rate than we issue the security of the kind I propose. But more than this. I venture to say it would be deluding the public. What is the use of issuing a security which

is nominally a charge on the Transvaal for the cost of the war at a moment when we know that the Transvaal cannot pay the interest? I do trust that the Committee will not sanction any such suggestion as the hon. Member has made. It is in the interest of the taxpayers that we should raise the loan on the best terms we can; that is, on our own credit. I can assure the hon. Member that I have so arranged the borrowing which has hitherto taken place that it is necessary from time to time during the next ten years for those borrowings to come under review by Parliament, and then, of course, will be the time for any contribution obtainable from the Transvaal to be obtained. May I make an appeal to the Committee? I trust we may be permitted at any rate to come to a decision on the Amendment without delay and to pass this resolution this evening. Last night I appealed to the Committee to pass the resolution then, but in deference to an appeal from the hon. Member for Waterford I did not press it, thinking it quite reasonable that further time should be given for the discussion. But the position is this. Of course I was obliged in my Budget speech to announce the fact that I proposed to go to the market for a considerable loan, and directly that announcement is made by a Chancellor of the Exchequer all kinds of rumours get about and all kinds of dealings and speculations take place, and there are persons who make it their interest to lower certain stocks to the utmost possible point in order that they may be able to obtain any new loan more cheaply. I cannot put it too strongly to the Committee in the interests of the public and of the taxpayers of the country that they should come to a decision upon this resolution to-night. I cannot as Chancellor of the Exchequer take the responsibility of holding the matter back any longer. It is necessary for us to act upon this. If the Committee consider that the Amendment is preferable to my proposal, let them accept it, or, if they decline to sanction the issue of the loan, let the resolution be rejected; but I entreat the Committee to come to a decision to-night.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said that every Member of the House of course recognised that the passing of this resolution was only the first step, and it did not imply they would have no further opportunities for discussing the subject. It had already been announced that on the following Tuesday the matter would be brought up on Report, and in addition to that, other opportunities would arise for discussing the various stages of the Bill which would have to be introduced. While he entertained the strongest possible opinion against the whole policy of the resolution, he could not, in fairness, deny that the appeal of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was a reasonable one. Hon. Members in every quarter of the House were under a great obligation to the right hon. Gentleman for the perfect candour and courage with which he had put the full facts of the financial situation before the House, and, in view of the right hon. Gentleman's appeal, he certainly should advise his hon. friends around him not to prolong the discussion. But, having met the right hon. Gentleman in that fair spirit, he thought he was entitled to make an appeal to the Leader of the House on another matter. It had been intimated that there was an intention to take the next stage of the Army Annual Bill that night. The Bill was one which involved considerable discussion, and he hoped that the Government would allow it to stand over

instead of making it necessary to sit after midnight. With regard to the Amendment which had been moved by the hon. Member for the Eifion Division, while he was in entire sympathy with every opinion he expressed, and while he had the highest possible respect for him, he was bound to say that he did not think the Amendment would have the effect of competing the mine-owners to pay the cost of the war.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Member for Waterford has most fairly met the appeal of my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer. With regard to the appeal which he has made to me, although it is important that we should get on with the Army Annual Bill, I am very unwilling to put any unreasonable pressure upon hon. Members, and if the House will allow the Bill to pass up to the point on which it is non-controversial, we might then move to report pro-progress.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: When will it be resumed? Will it be on Monday, and, if so, will it be taken before Twelve o'clock?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It must pass before the end of the month. I will do my best to bring it on at as early an hour as possible.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: May I be allowed to say that if there is really no controversial matter before Clause 4, the right hon. Gentleman will gain nothing by getting these clauses. I do not know whether there is any matter requiring discussion in the clauses before Clause 4, but I really think the right hon. Gentleman would not be endangering the rapid and convenient passage of the Bill by letting the whole matter stand over.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If the hon. Gentleman tells me he has no desire to; if I may use the term; obstruct, I am quite prepared to meet him, and will accept his statement.

MR. BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I rise to make an appeal to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. If he had taken the same excellent advice in the case of coal as he did in the case of sugar;

\*THE CHAIRMAN: An Amendment having been moved, the discussion must be confined to that until it is disposed of.

MR. LOUGH: As my hon. friend has got a sympathetic answer from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, perhaps

he would be good enough to withdraw his Amendment. The right hon. Gentleman has treated the subject very satisfactorily, and he has pledged himself over and over again to get all the money he can out of the Transvaal. I do not believe he will be able to get anything out of it, but I think it would be unfair to load the taxpayers now with the large interest which would be the result of adopting the Amendment of my hon. friend. I would therefore appeal to him to withdraw it, in order that something may be said about the resolution itself in the short time now left to us.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydvil): May I ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer a question with reference to the matter raised by the Amendment? He has told us that it is his intention to make the Transvaal goldfields pay a substantial contribution towards the cost of the war. Assuming the Transvaal becomes a Crown Colony, will the right hon. Gentleman say how he purposes to collect any contribution which he may levy on the goldfields in the Transvaal? Has he



thought of any means by which the proposed contribution would be levied apart from that suggested in the Amendment of my hon. friend? If he has, of course that would simplify matters very considerably, but unless he has some scheme it seems to me that some such safeguard as that embodied in the Amendment is absolutely indispensable. As has been pointed out, we have no power to enforce taxation on a colony of the Crown, and no power to collect it even if we sought to enforce it, and in the event of these patriotic mine-owners refusing to pay the contribution asked from them, what steps will be taken to forestall them, in the possible contingency of their refusal, by obtaining some lien over the still untouched wealth of the goldfields of the Transvaal? The question seems to me to be one of considerable moment, and I trust the right hon. Baronet may enable my hon. friend to withdraw his Amendment by giving the House some assurance that his desire to obtain a contribution towards the cost of the war from the Transvaal goldfields is something more than a desire.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Member is asking me to cook the hare before I have caught it. He must remember that in the first instance the Transvaal will, of course, be a Crown Colony under the Imperial Government, and it will be for the Imperial Government to deal with the matter as soon as the finances of the Transvaal are able to bear it. Of course, when a more responsible Government is given to the Transvaal, arrangements will have to be made in the matter, as has frequently been done. There will be no difficulty in the matter.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Borough): As this will not be the last war loan, I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he can give us an assurance that, in the event of further money being raised, the particular way in which this sixty millions is to be raised will not be treated as a precedent, and that the hands of the Government will be free to deal with the matter as circumstances arise.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I have often been found fault with for the variety of ways in which I have borrowed, on the unfortunately numerous occasions on which I have been obliged to go into the money market for loans. I can assure the hon. Gentleman that the fact that I am borrowing in a particular way now will not be treated as a precedent for the future.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I am afraid unless we look a little more carefully into the matter these toads will be able to get outside the harrow; but my hon. friend should remember that we will, on a future occasion, be able to take a vote on his Amendment. At the present moment, undoubtedly, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made an excellent case why the resolution should be passed before twelve o'clock, and it seems to me that my hon. friend would consult his own views and the views of the many who agree with him if he would not take a division to-night, but bring forward the question on a future occasion.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: I desire to withdraw the Amendment, and, in doing so, I wish to state that I do not withdraw in any sense or form from my determination to get if possible this money from the Transvaal. I may say that, although the Chancellor of the Exchequer is a member of a Tory Government. I have some amount of confidence in his declaration that he will make every effort to get this money from the Transvaal. I recollect the very sturdy speech, he delivered when Mr. Cecil Rhodes endeavoured to get the cost of his railway from

this country, and I hope he will be equally determined in this matter.

Amendment by leave, withdrawn.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. BAYLEY: I am now in order in speaking on the question of the export duty on coal. The Chancellor of the Exchequer did not get the same advice in regard to coal as he did with regard to sugar. The question of coal was not as well thought out. Does the Chancellor of the Exchequer really realise how far-reaching this duty on coal will be? Whose interests is it going to affect? It will affect the interests of the miners, the mine-owners, the railways, and the owners of ports, and harbours in this country, and will also affect very much the interests of Manchester and the Ship Canal. The coal export trade is a struggling one in many of our new ports, and I sympathise very much with the hon. Gentleman the Member for King's Lynn, who knows perfectly well that if this duty is carried on the lines proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer there is not the slightest chance of any supporter of the Government being again returned for King's Lynn.

I would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to look at the effect of his proposals. Take a place like Port Said Coal sent there from this country will have to pay this duty, and will have to compete with Australian coal, so that actually if this duty is carried we will be putting Australia in a far better position than ourselves. The same applies to our other colonies. It would have been far better if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken a bolder course, for there is always safety in boldness, and made the income tax 1s. 4d. That would have been more satisfactory to the country. Take my own constituency. It is a large mining constituency and exports a great deal of coal which goes through the Manchester Ship Canal to all parts of the world. If this duty is passed the quantity of coal exported will decrease from 20 per cent. to 30 per cent. I think the ratepayers of the city of Manchester, who have a very large interest in the Canal, will have something to say as to why this money could not have been found in a way which would not inflict such an injury on Manchester and the Ship Canal. My constituency; Chesterfield and the neighbourhood; is more or less dependent on the mines, and if this duty is passed the value of the mines will go down from 20 per cent. to 30 per cent. If that goes on for three or four years the value of property in Chesterfield will decrease from 30 per cent. to 40 per cent. It is a very serious matter to cripple in this manner one of the fundamental industries of the country. I hope the Chancellor of the Exchequer will reconsider this question, and that he will think out some other means of finding the money required. The present proposal is certain to be exceedingly unpopular in the country.

MR LOUGH: I think it is a great pity that the suggestion which I understood you, Sir, to make yesterday, and which I think commended itself to the First Lord of the Treasury and to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was not more strictly carried out this evening. I thought when we discussed sugar and coal last night that these subjects would be then postponed, so that we might have an opportunity of discussing this very important resolution. The hon. Member for King's Lynn, however, devoted himself almost exclusively to the subjects which

were discussed last night, but I should now like to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer for a few words of explanation with regard to the steps he intends to take on this important matter. I myself was not able to join in the very enthusiastic congratulations made on the Chancellor of the Exchequer's statement last night. He said, however, that he would not be the man to come to the House and ask for power to borrow an undue proportion of any charge for war, and he suggested that as long as he was Chancellor of the Exchequer he would insist on raising a fair proportion of the sum required for war from taxation. Now, I challenge the right hon. Gentleman as to whether he has done so on the present occasion. I will take an immediate test. Last year we were also at war, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a deficit of thirty-seven millions. He insisted on raising twelve and a half millions, or a third, by taxation. This year he has a deficit of fifty-five millions, and he proposes to raise eleven millions, or one-fifth, by taxation, so that he is borrowing four-fifths this year, whereas he only borrowed two-thirds last year. The main point I wish to put to the Chancellor of the Exchequer is this. He has created a great deal of discontent in financial circles in London by the way in which he has raised money up to the present time. He has had Exchequer bonds, Treasury bills, and war loans, but I think the present proposal is the worst of all. The right hon. Gentleman claims the right to take one large loan in Consols instead of short loans. Anyone familiar with the City knows that there is a great deal of discontent at the manner in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has raised his money. The story is that, having taken advice through the usual channels, and having got a unanimous opinion, he did exactly the opposite. The result has been that within the last year or two we have seen the most alarming fall in securities, especially consols, that we have had in this country for a generation or two. Consols have fallen 20 per cent. during the last few years, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer must acknowledge that he is responsible to a large extent for this unfortunate circumstance. The question of the price of Consols is of great importance, because it affects other securities, and the alarming fall in Consols has brought down home railways and every other good security. I think the Chancellor of the Exchequer might do something to avoid increasing the evil. The advice he got was to raise the money by a plain addition to the National Debt. The mistake he made in the earlier stages of the war was to take too hopeful a view of the situation; now, I believe, he takes rather too pessimistic a view. The right hon. Gentleman has had plenty of temporary loans, and I think the Committee might have an assurance from him that he would raise the money now required by a simple addition to the National Debt. At any rate the market would like a definite announcement as to the intentions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. At present no one knows what he intends to do, and surely he

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Dunn, Sir William

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden  
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart  
Leighton, Stanley  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Finch, George H.  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitz Roy  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Eitz Gerald, Sir Robert Penrose-  
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. Ellison  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W. (Leeds  
Forster, Henry William  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.  
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L B (Cambs.  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin  
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick  
Malcolm, Ian  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Maxwell, W. J. H (Dumfriessh.  
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Bill, Charles  
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rifi'mlt's

Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Bond, Edward  
Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire)  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow  
Bowles, T. Gibson (Kings Lynn  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Brassey, Albert  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'y)  
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Bull, William James  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Mount, William Arthur  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.)  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Carson, Rt. Hn. Sir Edw. H.  
Groves, James Grimble  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Guthrie, Walter Murray  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld. G. (Midx  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nde'y)  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Chamberlain, Rt Hon. J. (Birm.)  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wore.  
Harris, E. Leverton (Tynemth.  
Parkes, Ebenezer

Charrington, Spencer  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Percy, Earl  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Henderson, Alexander  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Hickman, Sir Alfred  
Price, Robert John  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.  
Purvis, Robert  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside  
Randles, John S. G.  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
Renwick, George  
Denny, Colonel  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge  
Dickson, Charles Scott  
Joicey, Sir James  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Kennaway, Rt. Hon Sir John H.  
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph

Keswick, William  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Dorrington, Sir John Edward  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter  
Doughty, George  
Lawrence, William F.  
Round, James  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Lawson, John Grant  
Rutherford, John  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
ought to take the Committee into his confidence.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: If I could take the Committee into my confidence without also taking everyone else into my confidence, I should be glad to do so; but at present I think I had better keep my own counsel.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 186; Noes. 117. (Division List No. 133.)

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Wilson-Todd, W. H. (Yorks.)  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B; Stuart  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Warr, Augustus Frederick  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Smith, H. C (N'th'mb., Tyneside  
Wason, John C. (Orkney)  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)  
Webb, Col. Wm. George  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u-Lyne  
Younger, William  
Spear, John Ward  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk  
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Sir William Walrond and

Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Mr. Anstruther.  
Stroyan, John  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm.(Cork, N. E.)  
Hammond, John  
O'Kelly, James (Rossc'mm'n N.  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)  
O'Malley, William  
Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Mara, James  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Asquith, Rt. Hn. Herb. Henry  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas. Seale  
O'Shee, James John  
Harry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
Partington, Oswald  
Boland, John  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Brigg, John  
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.  
Priestley, Arthur  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E  
Rea, Russell  
Burt, Thomas  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
Reddy, M.  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Caldwell, James  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Joyce, Michael



Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)  
Cawley, Frederick  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Lambert, George  
Robson, William Snowdon  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Colville, John  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Lundon, W.  
Spencer, Rt Hn. C. R. (North'nts  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Cremer, William Randal  
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Cullinan, J.  
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift  
Thomas, David Alfred Merthyr  
Daly, James  
M'Arthur, Wm. (Cornwall)  
Thomas, J. A. (Gl'm'rg'n, Gower  
Delany, William  
M'Crae, George  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.  
Dillon, John  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Tomkinson, James  
Donelan, Captain A.  
M'Govern, T.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Doogan, P. C.  
Minch, Matthew  
Tully, Jasper  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)  
Mooney, John J.  
Ure, Alexander

Duffy, Wm. J.  
Murnaghan, George  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Murphy, J.  
White, Luke (York, E. R.)  
Emmott, Alfred  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Norman, Henry  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Field, William  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Gilhooly, James  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid  
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Mr. Lough and Mr. Schwann.  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
O'Dowd, John  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

It being after midnight, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday

next; Committee to sit again upon Monday next.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve of the clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 22nd April, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bill, referred on the

First Reading thereof, Standing Order No, 62 has been complied with, viz.;;  
London and North Western Railway Bill.

Ordered, That the Bill be read a second time.

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 Bills, referred on the First Reading thereof, the Standing  
Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.;;

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 3) Bill.

Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 4) Bill.

Electric Lighting Provisional Order (No. 5) Bill.

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time to-morrow.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS (NO STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions  
for Private Bills, That, in the case of the following Bills, referred on the  
First Reading thereof, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.;;

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Order (No. 1) Bill.

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Ham) Provisional Order Bill.

Metropolitan Common Scheme (Orpington) Provisional Order Bill.

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS (PETITION FOR ADDITIONAL PROVISION) (STANDING ORDERS NOT COMPLIED  
WITH).

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

London County Council (General Powers) Bill.

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

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL (NO. STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions  
for Private Bills, pursuant

to the Order of the House of the 2nd day of April, That, in the case of the  
following Bill, no Standing Orders are applicable, viz.;;

Dublin Corporation Bill.

NATIONAL GALLERY (PURCHASE OF ADJACENT LAND) BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE  
THERETO COMPLIED WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions  
for Private Bills, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 1st day of April,

That, in the case of the following Bill, the Standing Orders which are  
applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.;;

National Gallery (Purchase of Adjacent Land) Bill.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING (LONDON) BILL (STANDING ORDERS APPLICABLE THERETO COMPLIED  
WITH).

Mr. SPEAKER laid upon the Table Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions  
for Private Bills, pursuant to the Order of the House of the 2nd day of April,

That, in the case of the following Bill, the Standing Orders which are applicable thereto have been complied with, viz.:

Electric Lighting (London) Bill.

BURY CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL.

HONLEY URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL (GAS) BILL.

LONDON BRIDGE WIDENING BILL.

LONDON, TILBURY, AND SOUTH END RAILWAY BILL.

Read the third time and passed.

LEATHERHEAD GAS BILL.

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

PETERSFIELD AND SELSEY GAS BILL.

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

LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL (MONEY) BILL.

"To regulate the expenditure of Money by the London County Council on Capital Account during the current financial period, and the raising of Money to meet such expenditure," read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

LONDON UNITED TRAMWAYS.

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (POOR LAW) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP F).

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS informed the House that the Committee on Group F of Private Bills not being-appointed to meet until to-morrow, the parties promoting the Devonport Corporation (Gas) Bill, which was set down for consideration on the first day of the meeting of the Committee, had appeared before him and proved that the evidence of Samuel William Wright, a servant of the Admiralty, 62, Alexandra Road, Devonport, was essential to their case, and that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, Ordered, That Samuel William Wright do attend the Committee on Group F of Private Bills to-morrow, at half-past Eleven of the clock.:(The Chairman of Ways and Means.)

PETITIONS.

COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Tunstall (No. 1): Watermills; Bedford; Abram; Dewsbury; Wharton Hall; Radcliffe and Kearsley; Bower Hollinwood; Broad Oak; and Dunkirk Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Greenwich; Gosport; and London (two); to lie upon the Table.

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from New Cwm-; gorse; Tunstall (No. 1); Watermills Dewsbury; Aspull; New Flint; Bedford; Abram; Twyn Gwyn; Wharton Hall; Stevenston; Radcliffe and Kearsley; Broad Oak; Dunkirk; Bower Hollinwood; and

Oldham Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

#### PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE.

Petition from London and other places, for extension to women; to lie upon the Table.

#### POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Dumfries; and Perth; to lie upon the Table.

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

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

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

Petitions against, from Oldham; Manchester; Matlock Bridge (two); Matlock Bath (three); Matlock Bank (two); Tansley; Matlock Green (two); Bensall; Holloway; Winster; Elton; Stockton-on-Tees; Darley Dale; Cromford (two); Darley Bridge; Lea; Two Dales; Darley; Evesham; Horfield; Sheffield (two); Berkeley; and Stockport (fourteen); to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Glasgow; Inveraray; Fife and Angus; Bere Alston (two); Chudleigh; Donside; Bishops Teignton; Bi shop Auckland; Spennymoor; Virginstowe; Marston; Lancaster; Caton; Thornton; Kearsley; Ardrossan; Sheffield (two); Beith; Little Dunkeld; Westminster; Cheriton Fitzpaine; Crediton; Dumbarton (two); and Sandford; to lie upon the Table.

#### SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Tyrie; Holm; Mains; Tillicoultry; Birsay; Alva (three); Annan; Dumfries; Royal Parliamentary and Police Burghs of Scotland; Fordyce; Fenwick; Kilbirnie; Stewarton; Anstruther Easter; Crail; Boyndie (two); Mull; Rathven (three);

Dumbarton; Glassary; and Logierait; to lie upon the Table.

#### RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

#### POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF ESSEX).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of Essex altering certain Polling Districts in the County [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### TRADE REPORTS.

Copy presented, of Index to Reports of His Majesty's Diplomatic and Consular Representatives Abroad on Trade and Subjects of General Interest (with Appendix), 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### ARKLOW HARBOUR.

Copy presented, of Report of the Arklow Harbour Commissioners and Statement of Accounts for 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### IRISH LAND COMMISSION (JUDICIAL RENTS).

Copy presented, of Return for the mouths of July and August. 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### PAWNBROKERS' RETURNS (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Returns from the City Marshal of Dublin for the year ended 31st December, 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

#### TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2576 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

#### TRADE REPORTS (MISCELLANEOUS SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Miscellaneous Series, No. 551 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

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

Charitable Endowments (London).;Further Return relative thereto [ordered 2nd August, 1894; Mr. Francis Stevenson]; to be printed. [No. 133.]

ALLOTMENTS (SCOTLAND).

Order [28th February] for a Return relative thereto read, and discharged; and instead thereof;

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7.
- 8.
- 9.
- 10.
- 11.
- 12.

County

Parish

Number of applicants granted Allotments since 15th day of May, 1895.

Number of applicants granted Allotments since 15th day of May, 1895.

Total number of applicants to Parish Council for Allotments since 15th day of May, 1895.

Number of Allotment holders and total acreage of Allotments at 1st day of April, 1901.

Total annual rent payable to Parish Council for Allotment

Number of applicants granted Common Pasture since 15th day of May, 1895.

Number of applicants refused Common Pasture since 15th day of May, 1895.

Total number of applicants to Parish Council for Common Pasture since 15th day of May, 1895.

Number of holders of Common Pasture and total acreage of Common Pasture at 1st day of April, 1901.

Total annual rent payable to County Council for Common Pasture.

Number of Allotment holders

Acreage.

Number

Acreage

A.r.p.

£; s. d.

A. r. p.

£; s. d.

II.;The proceedings of County Councils in regard to representations by Parish Councils of Orders under the Local

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.
- 7
- 8.

County

Parish

Date of each representation from Parish Council to County Council as to land for Allotments.

Orders made by County council for taking land on lease compulsorily for Allotments.

Date of appeal (if any) to Local Government Board from decision of County Council.

Date of Local Government Board Order (if any) overruling decision of County Council.

Date of memorial (if any) presented to Local Government Board praying for further inquiry.

Date of final decision (if any) of Local Government Board.

Granted by County Council.

Refused by County Council.

Date of Order.

Acreage of land authorised to be taken for Allotments.

Annual rent payable by Parish Council for such land.

(1) Confirming Order.

(2) Rejecting Order.

A. r. p.

£; s. d.

;(Mr. Eugene Wason.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND) INQUIRY (WEXFORD).

Return ordered, "giving the Report of the Proceedings of the Local Government Board Inquiry into the question of the Salaries of the County and Assistant Surveyors held at Wexford on the 16th and 17th days of April.";(Sir Thomas Esmonde.)

Return ordered, "showing;

;The proceedings of Parish Councils in regard to Allotments and Common Pasture under Section 20 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act, 1894.

Government (Scotland) Act, 1894, Section 26, authorising land to be taken on lease compulsorily for Allotments.

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS (LICENSED HOUSES).

Address for "Return showing the number of fully-licensed Public Houses and the number of Beer Houses upon the states of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in the Metropolitan District which have been already suppressed by the Commissioners since the date of a Report

of a Select Committee of the Board made in the year 1883 (see House of Lords Return, No. 175, of Session 1883), and the numbers of those which the Commissioners have decided to suppress upon the determination of the current leases.";(Lord Hugh Cecil.)

#### SALE OF INTOXICANTS (REFUSAL OF LICENCES).

Address for "Return of the number of Licences for the sale of Intoxicants in the United Kingdom the renewal of which has been refused by the licensing authority during the year ending in October, 1900, and the grounds of such refusals.";(Mr. Tomkinson.)

#### STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON reported from the Chairmen's Panel, That they had appointed Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Law, and Courts of Justice, and Legal Procedure.

Sir JAMES FERGUSSON further reported from the Chairmen's Panel; That they had agreed to the following Resolution; That any Member of the Chairmen's Panel be and he is hereby empowered to ask any other Member of the Chairmen's Panel to take his place in case of necessity.

Report to lie upon the Table.

#### QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA; JAMESON RAID; POSITION OF THE CHARTERED COMPANY.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES (Carmarthen Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, if the Government are unwilling to take legal action against the Chartered Company in respect of the Jameson Raid, he will sell any rights pertaining thereto that the British Government may have as successors to the Transvaal Government, and at what price.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I have never stated

that His Majesty's Government were unwilling to take legal action in this matter, but that they were advised that they had no legal rights. I have no reason to believe that a purchaser can be found for rights which we are told on the highest authority do not exist.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Will the right hon. Gentleman tell the House who his legal advisers are? And is he aware that the coffers of the Imperial Exchequer are empty;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is arguing the question.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Will the light hon. Gentleman kindly state who his legal advisers are?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The ordinary advisers of the Crown.

MR. ALFRED DAVIES: Will the right hon. Gentleman answer one other question? Will he sell the rights if a purchaser can be found to take them, seeing that the coffers of the Exchequer are empty, and that an honest penny may thus be earned?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Any tender which the hon. Member may wish to make had better be addressed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): Will the Law advisers send their fees as conscience, money to the Chancellor of the Exchequer?



MR. MERRIMAN'S LETTER OF 11TH MARCH, 1898.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether his attention has been directed to the motion introduced in the House of Assembly in Cape Colony on 9th October by the hon. J. X. Merriman, declaring the publication, without his permission, by the Colonial Secretary of Mr. Merriman's letter to President Steyn, dated 11th March, 1898, to be deprecated, and to Mr. Merriman's statement that Sir Alfred Milner had forwarded that letter without the knowledge of Mr. Merriman to the Colonial Secretary, and had, with the Colonial Secretary, been guilty of a breach of the ordinary decencies and courtesies of official life; and whether he has any explanation to offer to these statements.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have seen the report of a debate in the Cape House of Assembly in which Mr. Merriman attacked the High Commissioner and myself in moving a resolution deprecating the publication of his letter. The resolution was rejected by the Cape House, and I have nothing to add to what I have already said on the subject.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Was the resolution rejected by a majority of three, at a time when there were six Members away?

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): Will the right hon. Gentleman explain why he calls the speech an attack upon himself?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is arguing.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman will publish his own letter that he sent back with the Rhodes correspondence?

\*MR. SPEAKER: That question is out of order.

PROPOSED DEPORTATION OF BOER PRISONERS TO TASMANIA.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the Australian Commonwealth Government have refused to allow Boer prisoners to be imprisoned in Tasmania, and whether, in view of this refusal, the Imperial Government still intends to send any prisoners to Australasia.

The following question also appeared on the Paper::

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the Federal Cabinet of the Australian Commonwealth, at its first sitting in Melbourne on 11th April, decided to reject the recommendation of the Colonial Secretary that Boer prisoners should be sent to Tasmania; and what course does he propose to adopt in view of the action of the Federal Cabinet.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I telegraphed to the Governor-General of Australia on 14th March requesting him to ascertain from his Ministers whether they were willing that I should address an inquiry to the Governor of Tasmania asking if any Boer prisoners could be accommodated in Tasmania, and if so, how many. I added that his Ministers would, of course, understand that if there were any local objections His Majesty's Government would not desire to press the suggestion. I was informed by Lord Hopetoun that although the Tasmanian Government would be willing to receive Boer prisoners, the Federal Government were averse to the proposal. The idea was accordingly at once abandoned. This reply also answers

the question on the same subject addressed to me by the hon. Member for South Donegal.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Were not the last convicts sent to Tasmania Irish Nationalists?

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: The right hon. Gentleman has not answered the last paragraph of my question.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes; I said the proposal had been immediately abandoned.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Then, where are these prisoners to be sent?

[No answer was returned.]

SOUTH AFRICAN HIGH COMMISSIONER'S CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the High Commissioner's Consultative Committee has as its secretary Mr. R. J. Pakeman, who wrote an article in the Johannesburg Star, entitled "The Dead Duke" (at the time when the late Duke of Clarence was awaiting burial); whether the British population of Johannesburg compelled Mr. Pakeman to leave for Durban in consequence of this article; and whether this committee has held meetings at Government House, the official residence of the High Commissioner.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Mr. Pakeman is hon. secretary to the committee, but I have no information as to the newspaper article referred to, and I have received no complaints in regard to his appointment to this unpaid position.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman consult the Uitlanders on the subject?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Mr. Pakeman is in a sense representative of the Uitlanders on a committee appointed by the Government to assist me in dealing with the question of the refugees, and they would naturally be the first persons to complain if they thought they had any right to complain. I believe there is great doubt; this much I may say; whether Mr. Pakeman was the author of the article.

MR. T. M. HEALY: The statement I quoted appeared in the public newspapers of South Africa.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes, Sir; but everything which appears in the public newspapers is not necessarily true.

FLOGGING SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVES

MR. OSMOND-WILLIAMS (Merionethshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the new justices whom Sir Alfred Milner will appoint will have power to administer as many as twenty-five lashes to any native culprit who may come before them; and, if so, whether, in view of that part of the King's Speech which said our object was to establish in South Africa equal rights to all white people and protection and justice to the native population, he will reconsider the appointment of magistrates with these powers.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have received no official information, but I shall take the opportunity of Sir Alfred Milner's visit to this country to discuss the matter with him.

SOUTH AFRICAN LAND COMMISSION.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies when

the Report of the Commission on Land in South Africa, presided over by the Secretary to the Admiralty, will be published.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: As I stated in reply to a previous question, I have forwarded the Report to Sir Alfred Milner for his observations, and when I receive them I will consider whether it is desirable to publish the Report.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Secretary to the Admiralty has quoted from the Report in a speech to the Orangemen of Belfast?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: On the contrary, I know that he has not done so.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: And I know that he has.

SOUTH AFRICAN DESPATCHES.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can explain why the despatch received from Sir A. Milner in February last was only published this week; and whether, in future, important messages from South Africa will be laid before Parliament as soon as they are received.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: There was in my opinion no necessity in the public interest for the immediate publication of the despatch in question, which was kept back with other matter in the expectation that further despatches of interest might be received which would be included in the publication of Papers. Owing to the continuance of the war, the progress in regard to civil administration has been slower than I anticipated and the publication of Papers was only finally decided upon when Sir A. Milner's request for leave was received, which I considered should be immediately laid before Parliament.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Was not the despatch which the right hon.

Gentleman says it was not in the public interest to publish the one in which Sir Alfred Milner stated that affairs were now worse in the Transvaal than they were six months ago?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I did not say it was not in the interest of the public to publish it. I said its immediate publication was not necessary in the public interest, and it has never been the custom for any Department of the Government to publish every despatch immediately it is received.

CAMPS OF CONCENTRATION.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can inform the House of the number of camps of concentration formed by the military authorities in South Africa; where they are situated; what is the approximate number of men, women, and children confined in each; what is the nature of the shelter erected; whether the system of diminished rations for the women and children whose husbands and fathers have not yet surrendered is still in practice with the sanction of His Majesty's Government; whether records of the births and deaths in these camps have been and are accurately preserved; what provision exists at each camp for the medical attendance and nursing of the sick; and what arrangements have been made for the education of the children confined in the camps.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): It is not possible within the limits of a reply to a question to give all the detailed information required, and, further, such information as has reached me at present is confined to the Transvaal. These camps and numbers of refugees, so

far as we are aware, are as follows:;Barberton, 703; Heidelberg, 1,307; Irene, 1,497; Johannesburg, 5,487; Klerksdorp, 456; Middelburg, 977; Potchefstroom, 5,373; Standerton, 1,342; Vereeniging, 661; Volksrust, 2,068; Mafeking, 800&#x2013;20,671. There are also 434 self-supporting refugees. The nature of the shelter varies according to the locality, solid buildings being used where possible. All refugees were placed on the same scale of rations on 27th February. Every provision has been made for medical attendance, and the education of the children is being conducted in sheds or marquees according to the accommodation. Sir Alfred Milner is giving his personal attention to improving the conditions of life in these camps.

Records of births and deaths are preserved, and I have telegraphed for figures.

MR. HUMPHREYS-OWEN (Montgomeryshire): Are not the children Dutch-speaking children, and is the education given in English?

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

AN HON. MEMBER: How many of the camps has Sir Alfred Milner personally visited? [No answer was returned.]

MR. JOHN ELLIS: Will the right hon. Gentleman communicate with the authorities at Port Elizabeth?

MR. BRODRICK: I asked Lord Kitchener for a general Report on the whole of the camps, and he has sent me what he could get before the last mail. I hope to get more.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE (King's County, Tullamore): Is the wholesale deportation of non-combatants in a State admittedly, prior to the war, a free, sovereign and independent State;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;

MR. HAVILAND BURKE remained standing.

\*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member persists in standing up after I have risen to call him to order, I shall have to call serious attention to his conduct.

MR. HAVILAND BURKE: I beg to say that as a, new Member I might be reasonably excused.

\*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member tells me that he was not aware that there was any such rule I shall accept his statement.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state the number of Boer women and children detained in camps by the British authorities, and what the death rate has been amongst them since they were brought into camps from their homes.

MR. BRODRICK: I have telegraphed to Lord Kitchener for the figures desired by the hon. Member.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: When shall I put the question down again?

MR. BRODRICK: In a week or so. It requires careful investigation.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: This day week.

AMERICAN CHARITABLE RELIEF FOR BOER NON-COMBATANTS.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to an appeal by the wife of the British Military Governor of Pretoria to the American public for funds to provide clothing for the Boer women and children confined by the military authorities in the camps of

concentration in South Africa; and whether His Majesty's Government will give instructions that all reasonable facilities by way of access to the camps shall be given to those desirous of alleviating the situation and mitigating the sufferings of the women and children therein confined.

MR. BRODRICK: I am aware that the Governor of Pretoria has opened a subscription list for funds to supplement the issues made to the Boer prisoners. I have received some information as regards the camps in the Transvaal, but I have not yet received a Report on those in the Orange Colony and Cape Colony. As regards the former, I am informed that every facility of access to the camps is granted. Admittance is permitted on application to the head officer or local superintendent. The authorities are and have been for some time in communication with various charitable institutions regarding aid to the refugees, and have received expressions of thanks. The refugees themselves are allowed to freely visit the towns adjacent to their camps, and stores have been as far as practicable established in the camps themselves.

COST OF THE WAR.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the average weekly cost of the war in South Africa for the last ten weeks.

MR. BRODRICK: The average cost of the war for the last ten weeks may be taken approximately at about one and a half millions a week.

VOLUNTEERS AND YEOMANRY WAR GRATUITY.

MR. GUTHRIE (Tower Hamlets, Bow and Bromley): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the men serving in Volunteer and Yeomanry corps receiving higher pay than the Regular troops will receive the special war gratuity.

MR. BRODRICK: Yes, Sir; the gratuity is granted to all commissioned officers and attested men, irrespective of the rate of pay.

RETURN OF TROOPS; LOYAL SUFFOLK HUSSARS.

MR. PRICE (Norfolk, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether there is any probability of the early recall of the Loyal Suffolk Hussars.

MR. BRODRICK: I am not yet in a position to say when these men will be recalled.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Why not replace them by the Household Brigade?

IMPERIAL YEOMANRY; TERMS OF SERVICE.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that the period of service of the members of the Imperial Yeomanry who volunteered for war was understood to be for one year, that members of this force volunteered for the war on the faith of that understanding, and that some of them who so volunteered left situations in this country which cannot be kept open for them much longer, whether he can explain why the Imperial Yeomanry, in breach of the understanding on which they volunteered, have been detained in South Africa while other Volunteers who went under similar conditions, and Regulars, notably the Household Cavalry, whose service has been shorter, have been allowed to return home, and whether the War Office will give an intimation to these men that they will be immediately recalled.

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member is mistaken. The men were enlisted for a year or

until the conclusion of the war. Every consideration will be shown to them which is compatible with the public service.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Why were the Household Brigade allowed to come home before the irregulars?

MR. BRODRICK: I answered that question last Friday.\*

PAY OF YEOMANRY AT THE FRONT.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the pay of the Yeomanry serving at the front has been reduced to cover the cost of their rations or for any other cause.

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member's question is not understood. Nothing is known of any such reduction.

SOLDIERS IN HOSPITAL IN SOUTH AFRICA.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state approximately the number of troops at present in hospital in South Africa.

MR. BRODRICK: The House has been informed on previous occasions that as the numbers vary from day to day, and as we receive no telegraphic information about them, it is not practicable to give the required information. The last Report, dated

8th March, 1901, showed 13,993.

MILITARY PRESS CENSORS AND FALSE NEWS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether

\* See page 780.

his attention has been directed to the letter of Captain H. G. Classon, South Wales Borderers, the officer in command of the post captured at Modderfontein, contradicting the statement in a Reuter's cablegram dated Krugersdorp, 2nd February, that Dr. Walker, who was amongst the killed at Modderfontein, had received three bullet wounds and was finally despatched by a Boer, who battered in his skull with a stone, and stating that Dr. Walker was hit only once by a stray bullet and died in the afternoon from the effects of the wound, and that the Boer General expressed his deep regret at the occurrence, and that every possible kindness was shown to the wounded British soldiers by the Boers; and what explanation has the War Office to give for the permission of the Military Press Censor to pass this Reuter's telegram.

MR. BRODRICK: I believe that statements to this effect have appeared in the press. Military press censors are not in any way responsible for the accuracy of the facts alleged in telegrams passed by them. Their duty is limited to the prevention of the publication of statements or intelligence which may assist the enemy.

CIVILIAN HOSPITAL ORDERLIES.

MR. GUTHRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the number of civilians, exclusive of doctors and natives, employed in the private, field, and stationary hospitals during the course of the war; and seeing that many of these men threw up lucrative positions in order to volunteer for service, that the pay they received was by no means equal to what they were previously earning at home, and that some of them have not been reinstated in the positions they occupied before the war, he will reconsider his determination

not to allow these men the same war gratuity that is to be awarded to the men of the Royal Army Medical Corps, who performed exactly similar work.

MR. BRODRICK: About 860 civilians exclusive of doctors and nurses, were employed in the private hospitals, including the hospital ships "Princess of Wales" and "Maine"; these were not

paid from Government funds. About 1,600 men of the St John Ambulance Brigade were employed by Government under a civil contract; and as part of their remuneration they receive a gratuity equal to, or in case of those re-engaged, exceeding the war gratuity received by the men of the Royal Army Medical Corps. Only civilians who have enlisted into one of the local medical corps in South Africa are entitled to the war gratuity. The House will understand that it is not feasible to grant the war gratuity to men serving on civil engagements. Such a course would expose the Government to endless claims on the part of civilians employed on other semi-military service during the campaign.

VOLUNTEER OFFICERS SERVING AS TROOPERS.

LIEUT.-COL. PRYCE-JONES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a senior subaltern of the 4th Volunteer Battalion "The Queen's" (Royal West Surrey Regiment), on having volunteered and been accepted as a trooper in the Imperial Yeomanry, was compelled to resign his commission; and whether it is obligatory on an officer of Volunteers desiring to serve either as a non-commissioned officer or private in the Imperial Yeomanry or in a Volunteer Active Service Company in South Africa to resign his commission in his Volunteer corps.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): Yes, Sir; I am aware of the case. It is obviously impossible to permit any person to occupy the position of officer and soldier at the same time. Any Imperial Yeoman, or other soldier so situated, will, when discharged from his present engagement, be considered for reinstatement without loss of seniority.

INSUBORDINATION; UNDER-AGE RECRUITS; CASE OF MICHAEL McMAHON.

MR. JOYCE (Limerick): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if his attention has been called to the case of Michael McMahon, now a prisoner in Gosport gaol, whose offence was that he struck a sergeant, who he alleges struck him first, for going for a drink of water at the Modder River; is he aware that this boy joined the County Limerick Militia without the consent of his widowed mother, when he was not fifteen years old, that he volunteered into the 3rd Royal Munster Fusiliers, and was sent to South Africa, and in ten weeks marched 800 miles; and whether, taking this boy's age into account, and the fact that he has already spent five months in prison, he will take his case into consideration with a view of remitting the remainder of his sentence.

LORD STANLEY: It is presumed that No. 6449, Private Michael McMahon, 1st Battalion Royal Munster Fusiliers, is the man referred to. He was tried by general court-martial on November 11th for striking his superior officer, and again on November 13th for disobeying the lawful command of a superior officer, and was sentenced to one year for the first offence, and to one year and discharge with ignominy for the second. Nothing is known about the statements

made in the second paragraph of the question. He stated his age at seventeen, and had the physical equivalents. As to the final paragraph, the Commander-in-Chief decided about a fortnight ago to make a partial remission of his imprisonment, contingent on his good behaviour in prison.

MR. JOYCE: Is it not the fact that this boy when sentenced was under sixteen years of age, and that he was a mere schoolboy fighting the battles in South Africa?

LORD STANLEY: He gave his age as seventeen and looked like it.

MR. JOYCE: If I can prove he was under sixteen at the time sentence was passed, will the noble Lord see that the remainder of his punishment is remitted?

[No answer was given.]

MR. T. M. HEALY: When does the noble Lord expect to give me the particulars of sentences on soldiers in South Africa about which I have several times questioned him?

LORD STANLEY: I am afraid I cannot answer that. It hardly arises out of the question.

MR. T. M. HEALY: How many Irish soldiers have you in gaol?

[No answer was given.]

SOLDIERS' DEPENDENTS; CASE OF GEORGE POWELL.

MR. JOYCE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will take the case of the wife and children of George Powell, R.A., No, 82,930, into his consideration, seeing that this man has over ten years good service, never had a crime, that he married without leave in 1893, and that his wife lived with him in Woolwich until he was sent to South Africa, leaving his wife with three children at home with a very small sum allotted to them from his pay, quite insufficient to keep them; and, whether, if on inquiry this woman's statement is found to be correct, he will order such increase in the pay as will keep herself and her children.

LORD STANLEY: If this soldier would have been entitled to transfer to the Reserve had no war taken place, his wife can be given separation allowance; but no separation allowance can be given to the wives of men married without leave who are not on the strength of the regiment.

MR. JOYCE: Will the noble Lord inquire if this man's commanding officer did not promise that his wife should be placed on the strength of the regiment? Will he increase the grant to her?

LORD STANLEY: If there is any question of hard treatment in the matter I shall be most happy to take it into consideration.

RETURNED SOLDIERS' CIVILIAN SUITS.

MR. ALLEN (Gloucestershire, Stroud): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the contract price for the civilian suit which the Government presents to each soldier on his return to civilian life has recently been reduced from 12s. 9d. to 11s. 9d.; and, if so, what precautions are taken that the contractor can make a reasonable profit and pay a reasonable wage.

LORD STANLEY: The old rate of 11s. 9d., which was temporarily raised owing to the increase in price of the raw material, has now been reverted to. The War



Office has nothing to do with the profits of a contractor, but only insists that the wages paid in the execution of the contract shall be those generally accepted as current in each trade for competent workmen in the district.

MR. ALLEN: In view of the price, which cannot be termed extravagant, will the noble Lord see that the wage regulations are strictly enforced?

LORD STANLEY: Certainly not.

ROYAL ENGINEER CORPS ADJUTANTS.

MR. HARRY SAMUEL (Tower Hamlets, Limehouse): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for War whether all the Royal Engineer Corps in the Home district have been without the services of adjutants from the Regular forces for at least a year; and, if so, can he state when it is proposed to remedy this state of things.

LORD STANLEY: It is not possible to provide adjutants from the Regular forces until the Royal Engineer officers return from South Africa. Their work has been meanwhile performed by acting adjutants selected from the Volunteer corps concerned.

MR. HARRY SAMUEL: Seeing that the Volunteer adjutants have done the work so well, cannot they be given the temporary rank of captain in the Army?

LORD STANLEY: I am afraid that that does not arise out of the question on the Paper.

ARMY MAN&#x0152;UVRES.

COLONEL WYNDHAM MURRAY (Bath): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state what Army man&#x0153;uvres are proposed to be carried out this year.

MR. BRODRICK: There will be no Army man&#x0153;uvres in 1901, but only some district camps for tactical exercises.

MR. FLYNN: Are the man&#x0153;uvres in South Africa enough for the British troops just now?

VOLUNTEERS;CLASH FIRING.

COLONEL ROYDS (Rochdale): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if, having regard to the scarcity of range accommodation in parts of the country and the distance rifle butts are frequently from the quarters of Volunteers, he will consider the relaxation of the condition requiring the completion of class firing before going into camp, bearing especially in mind that some camps have for local reasons to be held early in the musketry season.

MR. BRODRICK: The special circumstances of any particular corps in any particular year will be given careful consideration. But the military authorities strongly deprecate any amendment of the regulations in the direction suggested.

ARMY COMMISSIONS;PHYSICAL QUALIFICATIONS.

MAJOR RASCH: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether it is proposed to modify the requirements of the War Office as to height and weight of gentlemen competing for commissions in the Regular forces.

MR BRODRICK: The physical standards for candidates for commissions in the Regular forces are under consideration.

EXPLOSIVES COMMITTEE;PATENTS TAKEN OUT IN MEMBERS' NAMES.

MR WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that two of the members of Lord Rayleigh's Committee on Explosives are taking out patents in their own names for improvements in detonators and nitro-explosives for artillery; and whether this action is consistent with their position as members of the Committee on which they are serving.

MR. BRODRICK: Sir William Roberts-Austen and Sir William Crookes, members of the Explosives Committee, have taken out patents in connection with explosives. These patents were taken out with my authority. The specifications were prepared by the patent expert of the War Office, and have been assigned to the Secretary of State for War, the arrangements having been made by the Treasury Solicitor, and the specifications are kept secret. These gentlemen having, in the course of their experiments as members of the Committee made certain discoveries which the Committee considered might prove of value to the State, placed their discoveries unreservedly at the disposal of His Majesty's Government. They have not received, nor do they desire to receive, any payment for the discoveries so made. They have not got, nor do they intend to get, any personal profit out of them. The only reason why the patents have been taken out is that the Committee may not be debarred by some subsequent inventor from making use of their own results. It is obvious that, unless the Government directs either the publication or the patenting of such discoveries as they are made, this danger cannot be avoided. The Committee are studiously careful to avoid everything approaching to appropriation of discoveries communicated to them by inventors.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Have these gentlemen dealt with the foreign rights in the patents?

MR. BRODRICK: So far as the Government think it necessary to obtain the foreign rights, the question of those rights will be considered.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Was there not a similar transaction with reference to the invention of cordite?

[No answer was returned.]

#### REPORT ON CONTINENTAL RIFLE RANGES.

COLONEL WYNDHAM MURRAY: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the officers who went abroad last year to inspect Continental rifle ranges have reported; and, if so, whether the Report will be laid before Parliament.

LORD STANLEY: The answer to both questions is; Yes, Sir.

#### DURR WATER-TUBE BOILERS.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can state how many Durr water-tube boilers have been ordered from Germany; what is the total cost of same; whether the cost includes fitting on board; what vessel are they to be fitted in; and if any guarantee is given to the Admiralty by the patentees for results in continuous steaming; also, what is the nature of the defects developed in the Belleville boilers during the last trials of His Majesty's ship "Formidable."

\*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): Eight water-tube boilers of the Durr type have been ordered from Germany. The total cost of the boilers is £19,450. This is exclusive of spare parts and fitting on board.

The boilers are to be placed on board H.M.S.

"Medusa." They have been guaranteed by the maker to give 155,000 lbs. dry steam per hour from feed water at 80 deg. F., with an air pressure of 1½ inches; 104,000 lbs. per hour with 1 inch air pressure (that used for continuous steaming); and 80,000 lbs. per hour with natural draught.

The only defects observed in the boilers of H.M.S. "Formidable" on recent trials were one nickel sleeve in number ten boiler at the junction of the feed collector with the element split, and a few others leaking slightly. The trial and the preliminary trial showed that greater provision for the moving of the steam pipes under expansion was required, and steps are now being taken to remedy the defect arising from this cause.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: Why is not the "Formidable" at sea if the defects are so slight?

\*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Owing to the expansion of the steam pipes it has been found necessary to make a readjustment, which, as the hon. Member knows, is a serious piece of work.

CHINA; FIRE AT PEKING PALACE.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the Government have received an official confirmation of the recent fire at the Peking Palace; whether any evidence as to the cause of the conflagration has been discovered; and whether any estimate of the damage done to the palace and its contents can be given.

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): His Majesty's Government have learned from His Majesty's Minister at Peking with very great regret that a part of the palace which was occupied by Field Marshal Count von Waldersee and his staff was burnt down on the night of the 17th instant, and that General Schwarzkoff, the Chief of the Staff, most unfortunately lost his life on that occasion. The origin of the fire was unknown. His Majesty's Government have not received any estimate of the damage done.

INDEMNITY CLAIMS OF THE VARIOUS POWERS.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the indemnity demanded by Great Britain from China amounts to £5,000,000; and, if not, whether he can yet state the amount to be demanded; and, whether such indemnity includes the amounts due as compensation to private persons.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The amount of the British claim is not yet finally settled. It will include amounts due as compensation to private persons.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the indemnity asked from China by Russia is over £17,000,000, whereas the indemnity asked by Germany and England amount to only £7,000,000 and £5,000,000 respectively; and whether the Russian Government have offered to reduce their indemnity if the Russo-Chinese agreement regarding Manchuria be adopted by China.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: It is not possible to give positive information as to the amounts of the indemnities claimed by

other Governments, as with the exception of the United States' claim for twenty million dollars the amounts have not been finally specified by the Powers concerned. His Majesty's Government are not yet in a position to state the exact amount of the British claim. We have no information of an offer by the Russian Government to reduce their claim if the Chinese Government accept the proposed Manchurian agreement.

CHINA, RUSSIA, AND JAPAN.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can give the House any information as to reported negotiations between Russia and Japan for the independent settlement of Chinese questions.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Government have no information of any such negotiations.

PLANS OF PEKING.

MR. MACDONA (Southwark, Rotherhithe): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the further correspondence respecting events at Peking, China, No.

3, 1901, was issued without the three plans being printed along with it, which were sent with it by our Minister in Peking; and whether, seeing the value such plans are, he will order them to be printed forthwith and distributed amongst the Members along with the other Papers on China.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The plans will be ready for distribution in about ten days, if

the House desires to have them.

CRETE; PAPERS ON ADMINISTRATION.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government will communicate to the House the Report of the High Commissioner of Crete upon the administration of that island for the past two years, together with the remarks of the British Consul at Candia upon that Report, and any other information which in the public interest may now be made known.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Papers respecting the administration and financial condition of Crete up to the end of last year are nearly ready for presentation, and will be distributed very shortly. No Report such as is mentioned in the question is, however, included amongst them.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE KING'S ACCESSION; SPECIAL MISSIONS TO FOREIGN COURTS.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer what is the total number and the estimated cost of the Special Missions which have been sent to foreign Courts to announce the King's Accession; what are the precedents for this procedure; and whether, considering the present national burdens and the improved modern means of communication, some more economical method of conveying the information might not have been arranged.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: Four Special Embassies proceeded abroad to announce the King's Accession. The accounts have not yet been received, and no estimate of the cost can at present be given. There are no precedents for the despatch of such Missions from this country, but the arrangements for conveying the

announcement were made in conformity with the practice now generally observed on the accession of a Sovereign.

#### NEWFOUNDLAND FISHERIES.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether any negotiations are about to be entered into with France in reference to her claims in Newfoundland.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: His Majesty's Government is in communication with the French Government on the subject of the Newfoundland Fisheries question.

#### OLD AGE PENSIONS IN THE COLONIES.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the Paper he promised some time ago in reference to the old age pension question in the colonies has yet been published; and whether copies will be supplied to Members of the House.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The New Zealand Acts and Reports and the New South Wales Act, referred to in the answer which I gave to the hon. Member last February, have already been placed in the Library of the House; copies of the Acts passed in Victoria will now be similarly placed, but no further Reports on the working of these colonial schemes have since been received.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will they also be distributed among Members?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir; I do not think that that is necessary.

#### NEW COAL DUTY; RUNNING CONTRACTS.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in the event of the Finance Act of the year being so framed as to make a provision making a person who made a contract in this country for the sale of coal abroad to break his contract unless the person with whom he made the contract abroad were willing to pay the 1s. Customs Export Duty, such last-mentioned person would be bound by such a provision, or whether he might still take proceedings abroad to enforce the performance, or to recover damages for the non-performance of the original contract.

\*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The hon. Member asks me what would happen if a hypothetical clause, which is not yet before the House, became law in the case of a contract, with the provisions of which I am not acquainted. I am afraid that if I were a lawyer I should be very careful not to answer such a question; not being a lawyer I cannot.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: What has the right hon. Gentleman to say to the suggestion made last Friday that the colliery proprietors of this country should be enabled to break their contracts in cases;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member is debating the question.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state approximately the quantity of coal sold for exportation abroad during the financial year ending 31st March, 1902, under contracts entered into before the 19th April last.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am not in possession of the information referred to.

#### COAL OUTPUT OF BRITISH COLONIES.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies

whether he can state what was the approximate output of coal of the British colonies in the year 1900, and what was the approximate total amount of coal exported from these colonies in the year referred to.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The latest statistics available are those for 1899, in which year the output of coal from the British colonies amounted to 2,003,705 tons, and the exports, which include re-exports, to 4,509,822 tons.

UNCLAIMED BALANCES RETURN.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will grant the Return as to unclaimed balances in Government Departments appearing on this day's Paper.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am afraid the Return cannot be given. I will write to the hon. Member and explain the objections to giving it.

UNCLAIMED CHANCERY FUNDS.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can state what is the total amount received by the Treasury in respect of unclaimed moneys since the date of the Act of 1872 (35 and 36 Vic.) Court of Chancery Funds (c. 44).

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The only funds in the possession of the Chancery and other Courts which can be described

as unclaimed funds are the so-called Dormant Funds; that is, funds which have not been dealt with for fifteen years and upwards. A list of these funds is published triennially in the London Gazette. The last list was issued in 1899.

These funds are held by the Paymaster General subject to the orders of the Supreme Court. None of them are held by the Treasury.

LICENSING LEGISLATION; THE GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS.

SIR WILLIAM HOULDSWORTH (Manchester, N.W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can now inform the House when he will introduce the Bill for the amendment of the Licensing Laws which was promised in the King's Speech at the beginning of the session.

\*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I am not in a position to make any statement on the subject.

SMITHFIELD MARKET.

MR. OSMOND-WILLIAMS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the fact that English salesmen are being driven out of Smithfield Market by Dutch and American traders; that within the past few weeks several transfers have been allowed by the Markets Sub-Committee; and that in one case the sum of £16,000 was paid by American traders to acquire a stall in Central Avenue at Smithfield, and that another American firm paid £12,500 for an inferior position; whether there are any regulations in Smithfield which prohibit trafficking in market sites; and whether something can be done to put a stop to foreign firms ousting the English, Irish, and Scotch traders from their own market.

\*MR. RITCHIE: It appears to be the fact that transfers of the tenancies of premises in Smithfield Market frequently take place, and during the last fifteen months there have been two cases which correspond more or less to the description at the end of the first paragraph of the question. Regulations

require that a full disclosure of the terms and of the nature and extent of the trade and all other facts and circumstances connected with any proposed transfer shall be made to the Central Markets Committee, and I am informed that this is done in every case. I am not aware that it is correct to say that English salesmen are being driven out by Dutch and American tradesmen. Subject to the approval of the Corporation these transfers appear to be conducted according to the principles ordinarily governing the disposal of the goodwill of a business. In any case I have no powers of interference.

IRISH LIGHTS;FASTNET ROCK.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the reasons why the Irish Lights Commissioners refuse permission to British shipowners to establish and maintain at their own cost a reporting station on the Fast-net Rock, which is desired by Lloyds, the Chamber of Shipping, several large steamship owners' associations, and the Cork Harbour Commissioners, on the ground that the Fastnet being the point for which all ships make in following the southern route across the Atlantic, is the most suitable reporting station; and whether the difficulties which formerly arose owing to the breaking of the telegraph cable being now removed by wireless telegraphy, he will use his influence with the Irish Lights Commissioners to establish a reporting station on the Fastnet as early as practicable.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The Board of Trade have been in communication with the Irish Lights Commissioners on this matter. The latter are at present considering the best arrangements to be made for housing the additional light-keepers on the Tuskar and Fastnet Lighthouses, which will be necessary for the establishment of a system of private signalling. The difficulties are very considerable, both on this point and as regards the method of signalling, but the consideration of the subject will be pressed forward.

HOG ISLAND CHANNEL;DANGER TO NAVIGATION.

MAJOR JAMESON (Clare, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is he aware that six years ago a Greek brig put into Kilrush for repairs and was waterlogged outside the Shannon and became a total wreck off Cappa pier; that the wreck was sold by auction and the purchaser has never been able to float her, and owing to a storm several sections of the wreck drifted up the channel between Hog Island and the mainland, and are a danger to navigation and prevent the bay being fished for salmon; and will he take steps to have these portions of the wreck removed.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Neither the Board of Trade nor the Commissioners of Irish Lights have any information as to the wreck in question. I will cause inquiry to be made of the Limerick Harbour Commissioners, within whose jurisdiction the wreck is probably situated.

ELECTRICAL ENERGY BILLS.

\*MR. REA (Gloucester): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in view of the multiplication of the private Bills of companies established for the distribution of electrical energy, he intends to promote legislation to give effect to the recommendations of the Joint Committee of 1898 to confer

additional powers upon the Board of Trade, to enable the promoters of such Bills to acquire the necessary powers by means of Provisional Orders instead or by private Acts.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The recommendations of the Joint Committee have not been lost sight of, but I am unable to make any definite statement at present.

DEATH CERTIFICATES; CASE OF LILY GRAVES.

LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the certificate of death given in the case of a certain Lily Graves, whether he is aware that it is alleged that the certificate was so far false that it omitted a material circumstance, and that the Registrar General has been asked, and has declined to take any action in respect of such allegation; and whether the Home Secretary will take steps, either in regard to this particular certificate or generally, to safeguard the accuracy of certificates of death.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): My right hon. friend has asked me to answer this question. The reply to the first two paragraphs is in the affirmative. As regards the third paragraph, I have no authority to interfere in the matter, but I may state that the Registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1874, provides that any person who wilfully makes a false certificate for the purpose of the Act shall be liable to a penalty. There can be no doubt that the omission from the certificate of death of the fact that the deceased person died while under the influence of an anæsthetic is to be regretted but I understand that the Registrar General was not satisfied that the omission constituted a definite offence against the Act, and that under all the circumstances of the case he did not consider that any action could usefully be taken by him, more especially as the matter was not brought under his notice until eight months after the death occurred.

OVERCROWDING IN EAST LONDON; PAUPER ALIENS.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether in the Census Returns it will be possible, with a view to supplying reliable information on the question of overcrowding in East London, to provide tabulated information as to the number of one to six-roomed tenements, and the number of their respective occupants; and whether it is possible

to include an accurate Return of the number of pauper aliens within the Metropolitan area.

MR. WALTER LONG: Information as to the number of tenements consisting of one, two, three, and four rooms, with the number of occupants of each will be given, but it will not be possible to supply similar information with respect to tenements of five and six rooms. The answer to the second paragraph of the question must be in the negative.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state the number of poor law officers in receipt of superannuation allowances and the total amount of these allowances in the year 1895, and what has been the increase, if any, in the number of officers receiving pensions, and



the increase of the amount of the pensions since the passing of the Poor Law Superannuation Act of 1896.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am not in possession of the particulars desired as regards the year 1895, but in the year ended at Lady Day, 1897, the pensions paid to poor law officers otherwise than under the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act,

1896, amounted to £40,800. The number of poor law officers to whom pensions under the Act of 1896 were granted during the year ended 29th September, 1897, was 335, and the number to whom pensions were paid in the year ended 29th September, 1900, was about 1,340. The amount paid under the Act of 1896 during the year ended Michaelmas, 1897, was £19,800, and during the year ended Michaelmas,

1900, was about £74,500.

POLICE AND SANITARY REGULATIONS COMMITTEE.

\*MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state the reasons which have prompted him to abstain from moving for the appointment of a Select Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations Bills, contrary to the practice of many years.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley): It has been decided not to reappoint the Committee.

\*MR. M'KENNA: What is the reason for that?

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: There are several, but a sufficient one is that the number of Bills during the last year or two has so largely increased that it has been found most difficult to get a Committee to undertake the onerous work involved in the consideration of the Bills.

\*MR. M'KENNA: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that at least ten hon. Members have volunteered to serve on the Committee?

MR. JESSE COLLINGS: That may be, but the hon. Member must be aware that at many of the sittings at which he acted as Chairman last year only two Members attended, and not always the same two. The matter has been very carefully considered by the Local Government Board and by others concerned, who have come to the conclusion that it would be better in the public interest to remit the duty to the ordinary Committees.

\*MR. M'KENNA: The Committee over which I had the honour of presiding consisted of five members. The quorum was three. The usual attendance was of four members, and on many occasions all five were present.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; This discussion cannot be carried on by question and answer.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Who is now to do the work hitherto done by the Committee?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Notice must be given of that question.

EDUCATION; REX v. COCKERTON.

MAJOR EVANS-GORDON (Tower Hamlets, Stepney): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether, in view of the Cockerton judgment, he can reassure the minds of those concerned regarding the immediate

or eventual closing of the evening continuation classes; and whether the Government propose to take any steps to prevent the closing of these classes. THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I fear that no statement of mine will reassure the minds of those who have been persuaded to expect the immediate or eventual closing of evening continuation schools; but no communications have reached the Board of Education which lead it to anticipate so disastrous an event. The Government await the decision of the London School Board as to an appeal to the House of Lords before considering what action on their part is necessary.

#### WIMBLEDON SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION.

MR. NUSSEY (Pontefract): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he is aware that the temporary accommodation provided by voluntary effort at Wimbledon has been condemned as in-sanitary, and that the plans proposed for new schools have been rejected by the local sanitary authority; and whether he will, without further delay, secure the provision of suitable and sufficient school accommodation by forming a school board in accordance with the wishes of the ratepayers as expressed at the statutory meeting held in July last.

SIR J. GORST: NO, Sir; the Board of Education has no such information. The necessity for forming a school board has not yet arisen.

#### SWANSEA POSTAL STAFF.

SIR GEORGE NEWNES (Swansea Town): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the case of a sorting clerk at Swansea of ten years standing, promoted recently over the heads of telegraph clerks with services ranging from twelve to twenty-four years service; whether the sorting clerk has been passed over in his own department; and whether the Postmaster General can state the reasons which led to this promotion.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The case to which the hon. Member refers is presumably that of Mr. A. E. Samuel, who was recently promoted from the rank of sorting clerk and telegraphist on the postal side of the Swansea office to a clerkship, the duties of which are

partly postal and partly telegraph. Mr. Samuel was certified to be the best qualified officer on the whole class of sorting clerks and telegraphists, and he is fully competent to perform the duties, both postal and telegraph, of the post to which he has been promoted. It is true that he had been on one occasion passed over for promotion on the postal side, there being at the time among the juniors one officer who was better qualified.

#### LEDBURY; EX-POSTMAN'S GRIEVANCE.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if the case of W. Chambers, of Ledbury, who for thirty-two years was employed as an unestablished rural postman, and who had received six good conduct stripes, comes within the terms of the service rule regulating the grant of compassionate allowances or bonuses, instead of pension;

and, if so, will this man be granted a bonus.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Although Chambers had altogether more than thirty-one years service, his wages were paid out of an allowance to the postmaster up to the 9th November, 1889, and until that date, therefore, he was a servant, not of the Department, but of the postmaster. Chambers's service subsequent to November, 1889, did not amount to fifteen years; the minimum period necessary to render him eligible for the award of a compassionate gratuity under the Superannuation Act, 1887; and it was not possible, therefore, to obtain for him on his retirement any award under the Superannuation Acts.

HEBDEN BRIDGE; POSTMEN'S GRIEVANCES.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether, in view of the number of relatives holding appointments on the same staff, he will inquire into complaints made by the postmen at the Hebden Bridge Post Office of the undue interference of the postmaster's wife, she acting as paid assistant to her husband.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The case to which the hon. Member refers appears to be one in which two of the postmen attached to the Hebden Bridge office refused to accept instructions given to them by the postmaster's wife, who is employed as his assistant. In this refusal the postmen were not justified. Full Reports have been made on the case, and the Postmaster General sees no reason to take any further action at present.

COUNTY COUNCILLORS ON ACTIVE SERVICE.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General if it is necessary for a district councillor elected in March, 1901, who is absent on active service in South Africa, to make his declaration of office or attend the council within six months or any other period from the date of his election: or whether the Act 63 and 64 Vic., c. 46, applies to his case.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): The Act 63 and 64 Vic, c. 46, applies to the case of an officer or soldier of the Auxiliary forces or Reserve forces who is on service in South Africa, so that no vacation of office or pecuniary penalty results from omission to make the declaration of office within the prescribed time or his non-attendance at the meetings of the council caused by absence in South Africa on service.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE: Do I understand the hon. and learned Gentleman to say it applies to councillors elected since it was passed?

SIR ROBERT FINLAY: I think so, Sir.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY; CASE OF SERGEANT JAMES SULLIVAN.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether Sergeant James Sullivan, late of Mulranny, county Mayo, has recently been suspended from duty; and, if so, what was the charge on which he was suspended.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Sergeant

Sullivan was suspended from duty pending the investigation of a charge preferred against him of having assaulted a married woman. The result of investigation showed that there was no evidence to sustain the charge, and tended to prove

that it was fabricated. The suspension has been removed and the sergeant entirely exonerated from the imputation brought against him.

MR. DILLON: Will the right hon. Gentleman give us access to the evidence?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir. The evidence was submitted to the Law Officers of the Crown, who had no hesitation in saying there was no case for prosecution. I have been through the evidence, and come to the same conclusion. I have no doubt whatever that the charge was fabricated.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR: Are we not told that all charges against policemen are fabrications?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;

IRISH CREAMERIES.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state if the money placed at the disposal of the Board of Agriculture is about being used for the support of creameries in Ireland; and, if so, whether, instead of such expenditure, he will consider the advisability of encouraging farmers by supplying them with loans to procure separators to be used by their families, and thereby encourage home industry.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer to the first query is in the negative. The Department is considering the question of making loans to farmers to enable them to purchase separators.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) ACT;APPLICATIONS IN GRANARD UNION.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any complaints were made to him of the loss sustained by rural district councils by the rejection of numbers of representations

under the Labourers Acts, each of which had cost a considerable sum to bring before the inspector at the local inquiry; and whether, in the case of the Granard Union, county Longford, he can state the number of cottages applied for, the number rejected, and the principal grounds on which a number were rejected.

MR. WYNDHAM: Complaints are sometimes made of the rejection by the Board, after a local inquiry, of applications for cottages, but not on the ground suggested.

The applications from the Granard Union numbered 387, and the rejections 217.

These were on the usual grounds;namely, informality of representations, defective service of notices, the applicants were not agricultural labourers, etc.

IRISH UNION NURSES.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is yet in a position to make any statement as to the intention of the Irish Government to give facilities for the training of a certain number of girls in each union who could afterwards be employed as qualified nurses on the basis of getting back half the salary; and, if so, whether this change could be included in a Provisional Order to be confirmed by Parliament.

MR. WYNDHAM: I can make no promise beyond that already given. The matter will not be lost sight of, but nothing can be done on this year's Estimates.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, in view of the

urgency of this matter, he will take any steps to press this matter on this session, say before Whitsuntide?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not pledge myself to the opinion that the money should be voted, but at any rate I cannot approach the Chancellor of the Exchequer this year.

#### KILLARNEY QUARTER SESSIONS.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, seeing that it is the usual practice when there is no criminal business for disposal at quarter sessions to have the presiding judge presented with white gloves, he can explain the non-performance of this ceremony by the sheriff at the last Killarney Quarter Sessions; and whether, having regard to the fact that the Killarney quarter sessions district comprises that part of the county of Kerry where the United Irish League has most branches, and to the crimelessness of the district, he will give, instructions to the constabulary to desist from interfering with or watching those who attend the meetings of the United Irish League in future.

MR. WYNDHAM: The sub-sheriff was unable to attend at the opening of the quarter sessions, but presented the chairman with white gloves later in the day. The police do not interfere with persons attending the meetings of the League. They carry out detective duties incumbent upon all police forces with a discretion which calls for no further admonition on the part of the Government.

#### CORK CITY CRIMINAL SESSIONS.

MR. J. F. X. O'BRIEN (Cork): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Recorder of Cork was presented with a pair of white gloves at the recent City Criminal Sessions; and whether there is any record of a similar presentation previous to the establishment of the United Irish League in the city of Cork.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. The incident was unprecedented, and eminently satisfactory. I have, however, failed to trace any causal connection between it and the operations of the League.

#### UNCLAIMED BALANCES IN IRISH BANKS.

MR. O'SHEE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has any means of information as to the amount of unclaimed balances in joint stock banks in Ireland; if not, whether there is any obligation in law on such banks to give public notice as to unclaimed balances which have remained on their hands.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to each of these questions is in the negative.

#### IRISH LABOURERS; PRIZES FOR INDUSTRY.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Local Government Board will sanction the giving of small prizes (the value of which shall not exceed for each electoral division a limited sum) out of the rates to labourers holding cottages and plots of land from the rural district councils, with the view of encouraging the occupiers to keep their cottages and plots in good order.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Board has no legal power to authorise rural district councils to expend any portion of their funds in the manner proposed. I am inquiring

whether the Department of Agriculture is in a position to make payments for the purpose.

#### IRISH ROAD SYSTEM.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can say when the Provisional Order legalising the system of direct labour on the roads in Ireland will become law, so that the county councils in the country may be in a position to work the roads under the said system.

MR. WYNDHAM: The final draft of the Provisional Order is now under consideration, and the Order will be laid before Parliament within the next fortnight. The delay is due to the fact that county and district councils have been given an opportunity of expressing their opinions upon the draft Order.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Will the right hon. Gentleman allow the House to discuss this Order before it is confirmed?

MR. WYNDHAM: A question of that kind should be addressed to the Leader of the House. I am following the usual course in laying the Order on the Table, and no doubt there will be adequate opportunity of discussing it.

#### AGRICULTURAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION IN TUBBERCURRY.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware of the fact that the rural district of Tubbercurry, county Sligo, although contributing its quota towards the promotion of agricultural and technical education in that county, is excluded by the Department of Agriculture from participating in the benefits of the scheme adopted by the county committee, on the ground that portion of the union is scheduled as a congested area; and whether, seeing that the other rural districts of the county are similarly circumstanced, being partly scheduled, he can explain why Tubbercurry, a purely agricultural district, has been thus treated; and what steps will be taken to have the matter remedied.

MR. WYNDHAM: I must refer the hon. Member to my reply of 1st April.\* It has been found necessary to exclude from the live-stock schemes districts-which are mainly congested, upon the ground that many of them object to pay for a service which they can obtain without payment from the Congested Districts Board. That being so, the Tubbercurry district will not be asked to rate itself for the live-stock scheme.

#### DAVID FINLAY'S ESTATE, COUNTY CAVAN.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg-to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, can he state on what date the tenants on the estate of the late David Finlay and others, situate in the county of Cavan, signed agreements to purchase their holdings through the Irish Land Commission; on what date were these agreements lodged with the Irish Land Commission; and what were the reasons that these agreements had not been lodged at an earlier date.

MR. WYNDHAM: No proceedings: for the sale of the estate referred to in the question are pending in the Land Commission.

\* See page 361.

#### CARRICK-ON-SHANNON WATER CHARGES.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland

whether the Local Government Board have received from the Carrick-on-Shannon No. 1 District Council representations to have the charge for the Carrick-on-Shannon Waterworks made a township charge, as was the case until the issue of a Sealed Order of the Local Government Board, and whether he can state the grounds on which the Local Government Board will not sanction this charge being a township rate under the provisions of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1900.

MR. WYNDHAM: Representations to the effect stated have been received. The grounds upon which the Local Government Board based their action were the same as those which operated generally in regard to the making of the Order of 25th May, 1899, as to the chargeability of rural sanitary expenses. Carrick-on-Shannon is not a town or township under municipal government, and, therefore, not entitled to exceptional treatment.

#### KERRY EVICTED FARMS.

MR. MURPHY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of evicted farms in Kerry for which special police protection is necessary, the amount of the rent heretofore paid for these farms, and the cost of the police protection now afforded in connection with them.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer to the first query is 47. I have no official information as to the second query. There are no extra police in Kerry, and any expenses involved by the employment of men on protection duty are not, therefore, defrayed out of local rates. It is not practicable to state, with accuracy, the cost of the protection afforded, as the number of men employed is constantly changing.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Is it a rule of the Irish Constabulary force for policemen to take evicted farms?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

#### DEFENDANTS' COSTS IN ABANDONED PROSECUTIONS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland if the Government will bear the costs of Messrs. M'Inerney, Halpen, and Lynch in the prosecution against them which the Government did not persevere with to the end.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): There is no power to pay the costs of the accused, nor is this a case where that should be done, even if the power existed.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is it not the fact that the Government initiated the prosecution and then dropped it? Why should it not bear the costs incurred by these gentlemen?

MR. ATKINSON: It is true that the Government took the proceedings and then, at the solicitation of the hon. Member, dropped them.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Were they not dropped in consequence of a judgment delivered by the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland? Why should these men have to pay the cost of defending themselves against accusations which were untrue?

[No answer was returned.]

#### IRISH POOR RATE COLLECTOR.

MR. KENDAL O'BRIEN (Tipperary, Mid): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether a person who was appointed a poor rate collector prior to the

passing of the Local Government Act, 1898, and was an existing officer under that Act, and was continued in office under the county council, is entitled to carry on retail business; and whether a person appointed since the passing of the Local Government Act is precluded from doing so.

MR. ATKINSON: This is a purely abstract question, involving the construction of several orders and statutes. I must, therefore, respectfully object to answer it. If, however, the Member will confine his question to a specific case, I will endeavour to reply to it.

NENAGH URBAN COUNCIL;MR. PATCHELL'S DISQUALIFICATION REPORT.

MR. KENNEDY (Westmeath, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland if his attention has been called to the Report of Mr. Patchell, disqualifying the entire urban council of Nenagh because of the payment of rates for voters under £;4 valuation by the Trade Labour Association, on the ground that this was a corrupt practice; and will he lay this Report and the shorthand writer's notes taken at the trial upon the Table for the information of the House.

MR. ATKINSON: It is true that Mr. Patchell held that the payment of rates under the circumstances mentioned was a corrupt practice, and declared void the election of the councillors in whose interest the payment was made. No application was made to have the question of the soundness of the decision in point of law by case stated, or otherwise, reserved for the opinion of the Superior

Court. There is no precedent for laying the Reports and the shorthand writer's notes on the Table of the House in such a case as this, and no good purpose could be served by it. In addition, it is now under consideration whether the parties reported guilty of these corrupt practices should not be prosecuted, so that in any event it would be undesirable to have any discussion on the matter at present.

CONTEMPT OF COURT;CASE OF THOMAS EATON.

MR. M'DERMOTT (Kilkenny, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Thomas Eaton, of Gores-bridge, county Kilkenny, who was committed to prison for contempt of court has now been ten months imprisoned, and that Dr. Waters appeared at the petty sessions to prosecute Eaton as representing the trustees of the estate; and whether he will give instruction that the Crown shall be represented by some solicitor other than Dr. Waters at the forthcoming prosecution of Eliza Eaton.

MR. ATKINSON: At the request of my right hon. friend, I will reply to this question. Thomas Eaton was committed for contempt of court on a writ of attachment issued by the Court of Chancery, the contempt of court consisting of retaking forcible possession of the holding from which he had been evicted. He was imprisoned from the 15th April, 1899, to 19th May, 1899, and again from the 7th June, 1900, to the 30th ultimo. I see no inconsistency in the prosecution of Eliza Eaton for forcible entry being conducted by the Crown Solicitor, Dr. Waters. It is in the interest of public order.

DUBLIN G.P.O.;PROMOTIONS.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will state the



number of vacancies existing in the class of superintendents, assistant superintendents, and clerks attached to the sorting office, General Post Office, Dublin; whether he is aware that two positions on the class of superintendents, namely, that of chief clerk to Controller, and that of sub-accounting officer, vacated by the reduction of two officials for irregularities in connection with the Corcoran defalcations, have recently been filled by the promotion of two officials from the surveyor's branch over the heads of officers of the sorting department; whether these promotions are due to statements made by the present Controller when on his defence in the Corcoran case, to the effect that he had no officials in his establishment competent to fill the higher positions; and whether, having regard to the fact that the present Controller and one of the officers concerned in the case are importations, it is the intention to again apply the principle of promoting officials from provincial and English offices.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There are in the sorting office, Dublin, at the present time one vacancy for an assistant superintendent and several on the clerks' list. The two vacancies to which the hon. Member refers, and which were filled by the appointment of officers from outside the Dublin sorting office, were two which existed on the class of superintendents. One of the officers only was from the surveying establishment, the other being from the circulation department in London. These were so filled because the officers selected were considered to be better fitted to carry on the duties to be performed than any of the officers who would in ordinary course be considered as eligible for the appointments. The principles followed in making the promotions referred to are those which would be followed in similar circumstances at any other office of the Department.

#### FERMOY POST OFFICE.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork Co., N.E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can explain the cause of delay in the appointment of a medical officer to the post office at Fermoy, for which candidates were invited to make formal applications in June, 1900; and when will the appointment of such medical officer be made.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The delay is owing to the fact that no suitable candidate has applied for the appointment. It is hoped that a suitable candidate may soon be obtained.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: Is it not the fact that several local medical gentlemen have applied for this position on the terms of the requisition sent to them? How then can it be said that there are no suitable candidates?

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I have no information beyond that supplied to me by the Postmaster General.

#### BELTURBET POST OFFICE.

MR. M'GOVERN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that the present post office in Belturbet is unfit both as to its position and capacity for the business that has to be transacted in it; and can he state whether the Department have taken any steps to procure a proper site for a new post office; and when they intend to have a new post office erected in a suitable position in the town.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: As the hon. Member was informed on the 4th ultimo, the post office business at Belturbet is being carried on in temporary premises, and a scheme for buying a site and erecting a new building is under consideration. The Postmaster General is still awaiting a report from the Board of Public Works on the subject.

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

MR. TRITTON (Lambeth, Norwood): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in response to the memorial recently presented to him, signed by 285 Members of the House of Commons, he will afford special facilities to the Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to Children Bill, the Second Reading of which was carried by a majority of 318.

SIR W. HART DYKE (Kent, Dartford): May I ask whether my right hon. friend, if he is able to accede to the hon. Member's request, will use his best endeavours to secure that this measure shall be considered in Committee of the Whole House, so that the working classes of the country may understand and appreciate the manner in which it is dealt with.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In answer to my hon. friend and my right hon. friend, I have to say that it is not easy, and would, I think, not be convenient at this period of the session, for the Government to make any declaration as to the course they propose to follow with regard to a private Bill. But I can assure my hon. friend that the Government are fully alive to the very great interest which this measure is exciting in the public mind.

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I wish to ask the Leader of the House what will be the business to-morrow, and what Supply will be taken on Friday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If, as I earnestly hope, we finish to-night the motion "that the Speaker do now leave the Chair" on the Civil Service Estimates, we shall proceed with the consideration of the Budget resolutions in Committee at the morning sitting to-morrow. If we are not able to finish the motion to-night, I think some public inconvenience will ensue, and that discussion will be continued at the morning sitting to-morrow. Thursday will be devoted to the further consideration, either in Committee or on Report, of the Budget resolutions, and, if we finish that work on Thursday night, the Supply I propose to take on Friday will be Class 3 of the Civil Service Estimates; Law Charges, Police, Prisons, and other Votes.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: When will the resolution of the Secretary of State for War be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not this week, certainly.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Is it proposed to take the Army Annual Bill to-night?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes, after twelve o'clock.

#### SUPPLY (CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES)

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY FOR IRELAND.

MR. ROCHE (Galway, E.): I rise to move the resolution which stands in my name. This question has been frequently debated in Senates, Parliament, board rooms, and county council meetings, and on public platforms, with the obvious and necessary conclusion that in this matter Ireland has a real and substantial grievance which ought to be redressed. Very recently, after an animated discussion at the Oxford Union, in which men of the highest culture and intelligence took part, seventeen voted for and only twenty-six against the following resolution;

"That this House would view with satisfaction the establishment in Ireland of a State-aided Roman Catholic University."

The question has also been debated by distinguished Members of the House of Commons, including the Leader of the House, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, the hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick-on-Tweed, and at least one of the Members for Dublin University, also by the King's Representative in Ireland, and other leading public men; all admitting that the Catholics of Ireland are entitled to the same rights and privileges with regard to higher education as are enjoyed by other citizens of the United Kingdom. I trust that the Government, with its huge majority, will grasp this opportunity of settling this question in a statesmanlike manner. I ask Englishmen to be just and liberal towards Ireland in this matter of education. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I rise to second this resolution, and in doing so I wish to state that I feel that since this great question was last under the attention of the House a revolutionary and vital change has been effected in the political situation as far as higher education in Ireland is concerned. Since the last debate on this question the Government have taken a certain step and made an announcement which so alters the situation as to make it difficult, if not impossible, to debate the question on its merits to-day. Speaking on the 9th of March, in reply to a deputation, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland declared that the Government had decided to issue a Royal Commission to inquire into the whole question of university education. Therefore, any attempt now to argue this question upon its merits would be met by the well-known formula that the subject had been referred to a Royal Commission, and that until that Commission had brought its labours to a close the Government are not in a position to consider the matter. I recognise the situation created by that decision. But whether for good or for evil this great question has now been referred to the Royal Commission, and until that Commission brings its labours to a conclusion and produces a Report, or a litter of Reports, it will not be possible for us to have any real debate upon the merits of the question in this House, whatever may be done by way of agitation outside. Within my memory many great questions have been referred to the tender mercies of Royal Commissions, with the result that they have not been heard of again within the domain of practical politics for many years. I trust and sincerely hope that the result may not be similar in the present instance, but I feel it my duty at the very beginning of this debate to declare, as I now do

declare, that the National party who sit upon these benches have no responsibility whatever for the appointment of this Commission. We did not ask for it, and we were not consulted about it. So far as any information has reached me I understand that the Irish hierarchy did not ask for this Commission, and I feel confident that they would not make themselves responsible for its issue without consulting the Irish party. Therefore, the Irish party are free from all responsibility in regard to this policy of referring the question to a Royal Commission, and the National party will retain their freedom of action in the matter whatever course the Commission may adopt. I feel it all the more necessary to emphasise that fact in view of one of the most remarkable and sinister passages which occurs in the speech of the Lord Lieutenant made on the 9th of March. He says;

"One of my reasons for approving of an inquiry at the present time is this; let us, at all events, come to some decision on this matter. If there is no remedy for the system, if no one can suggest or, rather, if all parties cannot agree upon any proposals which are likely to command the confidence of the public and meet with success; then do not let us continue the controversy, which does not certainly tend to the promotion or improvement of education in Ireland, which, every day it is prolonged, on the contrary, reacts unfavourably in Ireland, and let us acknowledge there is no system under which we can possibly improve higher education in Ireland."

That is a position which the Nationalists are not prepared to take up, and if this Commission succeeds in arriving at a unanimous Report of such a character as would remove, if carried into effect, the grievances of the Irish Catholics, or whether they disagree or produce a litter of Reports, this question will not die, but the Irish party and the people in Ireland who are so deeply interested in it will retain their right to continue the agitation and to demand justice.

As I stated before, this Commission was not asked for either by the National party or by the hierarchy of Ireland. But what body did ask for it? It was asked for by the Senate of the Royal University on the 22nd of February last, when they passed a resolution unanimously asking for this Commission. I will read that resolution to the House, because, as hon. Members will immediately perceive, it is of the very utmost importance. On the 22nd of February last the following resolution was unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Senate of the Royal University;

"That in the opinion of the Senate the relation of the university with its own colleges and students, and with other colleges and students, are unsatisfactory, and that it is most desirable that a Royal Commission should be issued to inquire into the working of this university as an examining and teaching body in relation to the educational needs of the country at large, and to report as to the means by which university education in Ireland might receive a greater extension and be more efficiently conducted than it is at present."

Hon. Members will notice that the resolution consists of two distinct parts. The first portion sets forth the grounds on which the present situation is considered to be unsatisfactory. I must confess that I rejoice at the first portion of the resolution, because everyone who has followed the history of this

question in Ireland will agree with me that the language of the opening portion of this resolution is accepted as a condemnation of the whole method and system of the Royal University in Ireland. It appears to me to be a great step in advance in the struggle for true university teaching for the masses of the Irish people, that those who have been responsible for the working of the Royal University system, after twenty years experience, have now had to declare that the system is unsatisfactory, and that they have condemned it. From the earliest days of the foundation of the Royal University, which is over twenty years ago, I have been regarded as a bigot in my hostility upon this question, but I never could bring myself to accept the foundation of the Royal University as a step in the right direction, or as any point gained for the cause of higher education in Ireland. On the contrary, I have always regarded the foundation of the Royal University as a

retrograde step, inasmuch as it was the introduction and endowment of a system of higher education in Ireland, which, however much it might commend itself to a number of individuals who were enjoying or hoped to enjoy its money prizes, was bound in the long run to degrade education in Ireland and to discourage and extinguish that high ideal love of learning and higher knowledge, for which Ireland has been distinguished in the past as much as any other nation in Europe. I rejoice, therefore, after twenty years experience, to find that the Senate of the Royal University has condemned the whole system and declared; "That the relations of the University to its own colleges and students and to other colleges and students are unsatisfactory."

The truth is, that in drafting and passing the Bill for the establishment of the Royal University in Ireland no one for a moment cared for the interests of education in that country. The whole object was to give something to the Irish Catholics which would bear at all events the semblance of concession without arousing the furious opposition of those sections, both in this country and in Ireland, who are the victims on this question of ignorant bigotry; and so on the occasion of the foundation of the Royal University the interests of the Irish people on the question of higher education were ruthlessly sacrificed, as they have always been sacrificed, to political considerations, and rather low political considerations, throughout the whole century that has gone by. Why in the world sacrifice those interests in order to disarm the hostility of sections of the population who on this question are the victims and the slaves of formulae based on no real knowledge? I do not think I would be in the least degree exaggerating if I were to affirm that throughout the whole of last century no Irish educational problem was ever considered on its merits, or with a sincere desire for the advancement of true learning in Ireland, until the recent appointments of the two Commissions that sat and inquired into primary and secondary education in Ireland.

If time permitted I should desire to say a few words as to the reasons why those two Commissions were able to deal with the questions of primary and intermediate education. They were enabled to address themselves at once to educational problems, and they were enabled to get their recommendations carried into effect without undue or unreasonable delay. As is well known, the right hon. Gentleman

the First Lord of the Treasury takes a sympathetic interest in this question of Irish education, and the truth is that in the case of the two Commissions to which I have alluded, happily for the cause of primary and secondary education in Ireland, the Commissioners approached their task with no political complications to face. In the case of primary and secondary education no great dividing principles existed which had aroused the passions, prejudices, and bigotries of large sections of the population, and the result was that they were enabled to approach the question from the point of view of educational experts, and with the happy results I have already described. If there was any hope that this graver question of university and higher education could be dealt with and settled on the same lines and methods which have been so successfully applied to the case of primary and secondary education, no one would be more rejoiced than I would, because then the Irish party would be relieved of the burden of one of the most difficult and one of the gravest cases they have to handle in this House. We would then be within measurable distance of the time when there would be lifted from the shoulders of the people an intolerable and crushing burden in connection with the provision of that higher education which is becoming daily more and more essential to the existence of the people. Nobody knows better than the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury that unhappily there is no prospect of being able to settle the question of university education so peaceably and quietly. The Lord Lieutenant himself has recognised that in the speech in which he declared that he could not undertake the responsibility of dealing with this by a vice-regal Commission, and thought it should be a Royal Commission of a most influential and weighty character. The reason is very simple. In the case of the University, the question has become mixed up with politics, and at the very outset of their investigations the Commissioners who are to be appointed will be met by great dividing questions of principle, which will make their task one of the greatest possible difficulty. On that point a suggestion has been made which is rather amusing. It is contained in a resolution passed by the Liberal Unionist Association of Belfast, a very intelligent and superior body. What do they suggest? They say; "We have observed with satisfaction that on the advice of the Lord Lieutenant the Commission is to be a Royal rather than a vice-regal Commission. We infer from this decision that it is the desire of his Excellency and of His Majesty's Government that the Commission should be composed of men of universally acknowledged eminence in educational and public affairs, and who are known to be superior to sectarian and political partisanship. We earnestly urge the Government, whatever pressure to the contrary may be exerted upon them, to adhere resolutely to this constitution of the Royal Commission, as otherwise its conclusions will fail to command respect in any quarter, and will simply result in intensifying the existing confusion in Irish university conditions."

Where are the Government going for these Commissioners? I shall look with curiosity to see. There are Gentlemen in this House whom I trust sincerely may be on that Commission, such as the Members for the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford. The members of the Commission must be men of great eminence in science and art, without any prejudice on the question at all. That is the view of the

Lord Lieutenant, and he is determined to carry it out. If that is the only practical suggestion, I am afraid we have not got much further on the road. I wish to say a word on a rather delicate subject; whether this question is really at its present stage ripe for a Commission at all, whether this question in the present political situation can best be dealt with by reference to a Commission. If I were consulted on that matter, as I have not been consulted, I should say that I do not think it is. It appears to me that a better course would be, if it were possible, to agree on the principle on which the Commissioners were to operate, and then, after the precedent of the London University, to appoint a Commission for the working out of details. It appears to me that it would be a far more practical method. I do not myself think that the system of referring the question to a Commission at this stage is the best method of procedure. But I trust that things may turn out better than I am disposed to think they will.

Taking it that a Commission will be appointed in view of the decision of the Cabinet announced by the Lord Lieutenant on the 9th March, two questions force themselves on our attention. First of all, what ought to be the terms of the reference and the scope of the inquiry; and, secondly, what ought to be the composition of the Commission; these are two questions of vital importance, and it seems to me that the debate to-night must turn largely upon them. With regard to the scope of the inquiry, it is manifest from the resolution I have just read that the original demand of the Senate of the Royal University was for the widest possible inquiry, that the Commission should be absolutely unfettered, and that they should have full discretion to make inquiry wherever they thought necessary. That was perfectly plain. The Lord Lieutenant, when waited upon by a deputation from the Senate of the Royal University, declared that a Commission would be granted, and that the terms of the reference would be those indicated in the resolution of the Senate of the Royal University. I would earnestly recommend to hon. Members the reading of the full report of the interview between the Lord Lieutenant and the Senate. No more interesting and important document has been published in the recent history of the Irish University movement. Referring to the fact that the deputation had agreed to the omission of Trinity College, the Lord Lieutenant said;

"I allude to the great and glorious institution which you have in your midst in Dublin, which is endeared to all Irishmen both by its great traditions and memories, and also by the work which it has done, and I hope will continue to do, for the benefit of education."

And then his Lordship went on to say;

"I do not believe myself that any such importation as an inquiry into the condition and circumstances and official work of Trinity College, Dublin, could possibly strengthen your hands. I believe, on the contrary, it would alienate from you a great deal of sympathy; it would alienate the feeling and interest, of which you have heard so much, as to the necessity for such an inquiry."

Now I may say that, differing as I do in general politics from Lord Cadogan, I recognise in him a man who, like the First Lord of the Treasury, has become

convinced of the necessity of dealing with this question, and I desire to give him full credit for a sincere and earnest desire to give such a settlement as will be acceptable to the Irish Catholics, always provided that the Orangemen of Ulster will allow him. At first sight, to exclude Trinity College from the scope of an inquiry into the facilities for university education in Ireland seems so absurd as to be incredible. It is precisely on all fours with a proposal to issue a Royal Commission, composed of the best and most influential men in the United Kingdom, to inquire into the general condition of university education in England, with this proviso, that it shall not take into consideration the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. After giving the matter my most careful consideration, absurd as this restriction at first sight seems, I am not at all sure that we Irish Catholics have any strong reason to object to it, and I will explain why. I do not know whether the authorities of Trinity College have thoroughly appreciated what is involved in the exclusion of that institution and of Dublin University from this proposed inquiry; but in the exclusion there is involved the assumption, which lies at the base of the inquiry, that Trinity College is an institution to which Irish Catholics cannot be expected to resort. Otherwise, if that is not the assumption, what could be more grotesque and absurd than to direct a Royal Commission to inquire, with all pomp and ceremony, into the facilities afforded to the people of Ireland for acquiring a university education, and debar it from inquiring into the greatest university in the country? The inference is absolutely irresistible. But I do not need to rely on my own opinions, because the Lord Lieutenant, in his speech in reply to the deputation from the Senate, used these extraordinary and most interesting words;

"But after all, Gentlemen, it would be idle, of course, to ignore the fact that the question of the Catholic grievances, and the alleged; I suppose I must say alleged until they are proved; the alleged injustices under which Catholics suffer with regard to education in this country is the dominant factor in the desire which is at present felt that we should enter into a consideration of perhaps an entire renewal or renovation of the system of university education."

The dominant reason for this attempt to reconstruct the system of education in Ireland is the grievances of the Irish Catholics; But if the Irish Catholics can reasonably be expected to resort to Trinity College, where is the grievance? Therefore, I say beyond all question, that the exclusion of Trinity College from this inquiry is an admission that Irish Catholics cannot reasonably be expected to resort to it.

There is, however, another word to be said. I qualify what I have just said as regards the position of Irish Catholics towards this exclusion by referring to the qualification made by Dr. Healy at the deputation. He agreed that there should be no inquiry into the emoluments, the methods of teaching, or the administration of the funds of Trinity College, but he pointed out that it would be impossible to leave out of mind in this inquiry the existence and wealth of that institution, on which the whole inquiry is, to a large extent, based. With that qualification, I do not care whether this exclusion is persisted in or not.



But we are in a very difficult position. As regards this exclusion of Trinity College we are entirely in the dark as to the attitude of the Protestants themselves; that is, the attitude of the Church of Ireland. We have had no indication from the Trinity College authorities as to whether they desire to be excluded, though there is some very remarkable evidence that there is a fluttering in the, dove-cotes, and also evidence of the feeling of the Presbyterians of Ireland. When this announcement was made the Higher Education Committee of the Presbyterian Synod passed a resolution protesting in the most violent terms against the exclusion of Trinity College. Here is an extract from a speech delivered at Magee College on 4th April by the Rev. John A. Hamilton, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland; "What changes might be proposed by the Commission on university education, recently promised by the Lord Lieutenant, it was impossible to foresee, and whether any of these would be carried out by the Government it was equally impossible to foretell. But one thing in the statement of his Excellency, he (the Moderator) for his part most deeply regretted; namely, that Trinity College and the University of Dublin were excluded from the inquiry of the Commission. It was surely not statesmanship that an institution which was the creature of the State, and which owed its prestige to its State connection, but which had done so little for the progress of the community in the path of education, should be carefully fenced round and regarded as the inalienable property of one-eighth of the population of the kingdom."

That is rather a serious declaration, I can assure those who take an interest in Trinity College. Now what do we see? Trinity College is beginning to get a little alarmed, and not without some ground. We Irish Catholics have been always liberal and reasonable in our attitude towards Trinity College, but when they hear from the Presbyterians of Ulster they get alarmed. In to-day's Times there is a most extraordinary report of a debate at a meeting of the Board of Trinity College, when this wonderful state of things was revealed. The junior fellows presented the following resolution, signed by twenty-two out of their whole number of twenty-five;

"That the junior fellows wish to urge on the Board the desirability of intimating publicly and officially to the heads of the Roman Catholic Church their readiness to provide facilities for the catechetical and religious instruction of Roman Catholic students by lectures, examinations, and the supervision of their religious observance by clergymen of their own Church, and of inviting their co-operation in drawing up a scheme for securing this."

And then they go on to say;

"That the junior fellows further urge on the Board the desirability of commencing negotiations with the heads of the Presbyterian Church, with a view to establishing a Presbyterian divinity school, and arranging for Presbyterian religious services in Trinity College."

The next thing we shall have will be an invitation to the Jesuits to set up their camp inside Trinity College. It is a very certain sign that these gentlemen are beginning to see, to use the words of the Moderator of the

Presbyterian General Assembly, that it is intolerable that this great institution, which for 300 years has absorbed the higher education of Ireland, "should be fenced round and regarded as the inalienable property of one-eighth of the nation"; that one-eighth, moreover, which can very well afford to pay for its university education.

What has been the position of Irish Catholics in this regard for long years? When we agitate this question we speak for three-fourths of the population who have been left out in the cold in the matter of the higher education, while the whole endowments of the past have been plundered from us by confiscation. We have said to Trinity College over and over again; "Unjust and unreasonable as it may be, we Irish Catholics are content to leave you this great property, fenced round and maintained as the exclusive property of an eighth of the population, on one condition; namely, that we are allowed to secure for the three-fourths of the population equal rights, and an institution to which our people can resort, as well endowed and as well equipped as Trinity College, Dublin." But the time has come to address a warning to the governing body and representatives of Trinity College that this offer on the part of the Irish Catholics cannot stand open much longer. It will be an evil day for Trinity College if, as on the land question, the Catholics come to an agreement with the Presbyterians. In view of the very persistent opposition to our moderate claims I think that I may ask, on behalf of the Irish party and the Irish Catholics, from the governing body of Trinity College something more than a cold neutrality on this question. Gratitude for past favours and for favours to come ought to secure their warmest support. Assuming that Trinity College and Dublin University are excluded, two or three questions arise which I would like in all seriousness to ask the First Lord of the Treasury. Is Trinity College to be represented on the Committee? and are the professors of Trinity College to be invited to give evidence before the Committee, while their own institution is excluded from all inquiry? I say that Trinity College (and this is to me a vital question) ought not to be allowed once more to make the monstrous plea, which has been frequently put forward before, that even if we Irish Catholics consent to

allow it to go on its own path with its gigantic endowments, its vast revenues, and all its long traditions, no unfair competition shall be set up against it; in other words, that no system of education more available because cheaper to the Irish people, shall be set up in Ireland from fear that it would interfere with its preserves.

Before I pass from Trinity College, Dublin, I must refer to the high eulogium passed upon that great institution by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. He said it was deep-seated in the confidence and love of the people of Ireland. I traverse that statement. I say that in Trinity College there is not a spark of Irish spirit. I do not believe it is up to the level, in its general education, of any university of modern Europe, and that is why it is so much afraid of competition. I go further, and say, so far as the true spirit of our people, the true spirit of the old race in Ireland is concerned. Trinity College might as

well be located in Birmingham or Manchester as in Dublin. It is not an Irish institution. It is a foreign institution planted in our midst three hundred years ago for the purpose of degrading and putting down our people and catering for the wants of the English garrison in Ireland. For three hundred years it has been faithful to the teaching and spirit of its founders, and treats the Irish people outside its gates as pariahs. Was there ever paraded in any country of the world a more scandalous exhibition of bigotry and anti-national feeling than that paraded by Trinity College in its present bigotry and malignant hatred against the native language? That college, with its ancient fame, has buried in its library most valuable MSS. dating from the time when Ireland shone as the greatest home of learning in Europe. Yet down to yesterday they have turned the cold shoulder to the ancient literature and language of the country in a manner which has been a monstrous scandal, when Trinity College ought to be the centre of all that is great in the intellectual life of the country. That is all I have to say as to Trinity College; it is not an Irish institution. But we are willing to leave Trinity College in undisputed possession of all its great emoluments and equipments, because we feel it is necessary to secure some opening for the unfortunate people for a chance of Irish education, and I would not allow for a moment any bitterness of feeling, such as I now display, or any memory of our wrongs to remain in the way of its receiving those emoluments. What I say is that, bigoted and stereotyped as it is, so far as education is concerned, I would gladly welcome Trinity College if it will only consent to come under the investigations of the Commission, but I maintain that if it is to be excluded from the investigations of this Committee it should be excluded in more ways than one. It should be excluded from seeking to affect the decision of the Commission if it will not submit itself to the Commission. I have said that, in my judgment, and I repeat it, it will be very easy indeed to set up a better system of education in Ireland. It has been the custom, and a very absurd custom, to indulge in extravagant eulogiums with regard to the college. I am ready to admit that it is a great institution, and that it has produced some great men, but I submit it is not up to the level of modern requirements in the matter of university education. We want in Ireland a system of university education up to the level of modern ideas and requirements, and suitable to the needs of the country, and that is a matter not to be left out of consideration in dealing with this question. We want an educational system like that of Germany or Scotland, or that which has lately been started in Wales; a system which will bring home the benefits of university education and training to the doors of the poorest labourer of Ireland. We want no aristocratic university, which caters for a small section of the population, and that the section which is best able to cater for itself. If the university education question was simply concerned with the needs of the wealthier Catholic classes I would never raise my voice in favour of it, nor would any man on these benches; but because we speak for the poor we ask, not for a university for aristocrats and the sons of wealthy men, but for a university where the children of the artisans and labourers of Ireland will sit side by side with the sons of the most wealthy, without any distinction, save that which God

made when he created one with more brains than another.

It is charged against us, and is put as a reason why we have not had a university given to us, that we have asked for one governed by Roman Catholic bishops and priests. That is a false charge; we have never asked for such a university. We have asked for a university which shall be in its inception as Catholic as Trinity College is Protestant, and nothing more, and if we get such a university, it will remain Catholic as long as the people remain Celtic and Catholic. That is what will be the result if you make its constitution free. If such a university is set up I promise we will waive our animosity to Trinity College. Such a university would be Irish in sentiment and spirit, and would, I trust and believe and know, open its arms wide and endow its chairs for our ancient literature and language, which is not one of the characteristics of Trinity College; so that men who come to the university would come to the highest centre of learning in Ireland, and not to a foreign institution. Let me just refer to the remarkable words uttered by Father Delaney; one of the most enlightened men who has dealt with this question. What did he say? He said; "He had one other observation to make, and it was this: their object was not merely to obtain equality; that was the political aspect of the education question in Ireland; equality between the different classes and religions in Ireland. Their object was to obtain the highest and best modern education, and anyone who had studied the developments of science and its application in recent times could say that the development of a country depended almost entirely, or certainly to a very large extent, on the degree to which people were educated in the best and most modern systems. He hoped, therefore, that they would have a Royal Commission, on which science would be adequately represented, and that, if possible, they should have on it some men representative, not merely of the science of fifty years ago, but of the science of to-day, who would come to Ireland and realise how hopelessly and deplorably backward we were in what was essential if we were to hold our place with the other countries of the world."

That utterance is not uninteresting, coming as it does from a Jesuit priest; a sect which is held up by ignorant people as being against the enlightenment of Ireland. Yet here was this gentleman inviting the most enlightened people in the world to come and say how higher education for Ireland is to be obtained. I agree most heartily with the desire expressed by Dr. Delaney; by all means let us have some of our greatest scientific men to inquire into this matter. Many things will be proved when they come to look into this question, and I can anticipate nothing but good resulting from the highest intellect you have coming to Ireland and making this investigation; but I think there ought also to be on the Commission some adequate representation of those acquainted with Catholic claims, so that their views should be adequately expressed and put before the Commissioners, so that the Commission could say whether their grievances, or alleged grievances, demand a remedy. The secretary ought to be a man intimately connected with the condition of affairs in Ireland, and one who could be trusted to assist the Commissioners, by his knowledge, to arrive at a just decision. I have only one more word to say, which I address to those on both sides of the House who are irreconcilably opposed to any such university. I believe those

gentlemen are honest in their convictions, and I will only say that those convictions are based upon an ignorance of the situation. When this question was debated before, I found a number of hon. Gentlemen protesting on principle that no endowment should be given to sectarian institutions; yet some of those hon. Gentlemen voted for sectarian schools in this country. Is it not extraordinary? What have they done? I have read the statement of Father Delaney, who says what they have done. Are you aware that under the Royal University system, at the very first meeting of the Senate they devised a scheme openly for the purpose of endowing a Jesuit college on St. Stephen's Green, and that of their revenue £4,000 is paid over to the governing body of the college? When you endow a Jesuit college with public money, the teaching of which you cannot control in any way whatever, which from their point of view is absolutely indefensible, the only defence of hon. Gentlemen is, "We will allow this money to be allocated to this Jesuit college so long as the matter is done through a back door"; but if we are asked to endow a sectarian institution, the charter of which could be laid on the Table of this House, they say, "No." What humbug! What monstrous hypocrisy! Was there ever a country like this? You endow a Mohammedan college at Khartoum; you endow sectarian colleges in this country; we have the very wastrels of the street put into the industrial schools of this country; you endow colleges and universities in the North, where the Presbyterian is the religion; you endow every form of education in Ireland on strictly sectarian principles; you endow a Jesuit college on St. Stephen's Green, through a back-door process, but you will not endow in Ireland a great national university which will be free to all. It is only in England that such an attitude could be taken up. I hope the day is not far distant when we may see the scales fall off the eyes of this House, and that for the unhappy people who have been kept out in the dark for centuries the golden gates of learning may be unrolled, and Ireland may take her stand, where once she stood, among the most forward of the learned nations of the earth.

Amendment proposed;

"To leave out from the word 'That' to the end of the question, in order to add the words 'in the opinion of this House, the provision for universities is totally inadequate, and none can be regarded as equitable which does not secure for the Roman Catholics of Ireland, equally with other members of the community, facilities for university education without violence to their religious feeling'; instead thereof." (Mr. Roche.)

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

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): The hon. Member for East Mayo addressed a considerable portion of his speech to the discussion of the Commission which is to inquire into what takes place in Ireland in this matter, and objecting very strongly to Trinity College being withdrawn from the purview of that inquiry. I myself should be very glad to see Trinity College come under examination, for I believe if it did it would come out triumphant. The hon. Member also supported his argument by quoting the endowment of the Jesuit college in Dublin. That was effected entirely with-

out the knowledge of Parliament, and I earnestly hope, when the investigation takes place into the whole system of university education in Ireland, that endowment will be withdrawn. I do not intend to devote my time to criticising the future action of the Commission. I will address my remarks to the proposal of the hon. Member opposite embodied in this motion. This motion proposes, "That in the opinion of this House, the provision for universities is totally inadequate, and none can be regarded as equitable which does not secure for the Roman Catholics of Ireland equally with other members of the community facilities for university education without violence to their religious feeling." I thought, when the hon. Member commenced his speech, he would point out how it comes about that the Roman Catholics find themselves handicapped for university Education in Ireland.

MR. DILLON: I told you twice over.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: The hon. Member certainly said they could not learn Irish at Trinity College. I do not believe the hon. Member can speak Irish, and he is not a member of the university.

MR. DILLON: My father was.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: And no doubt was an ornament to the college from which he came. The hon. Member for Waterford was also in Trinity College, and everybody will agree that he is a very excellent specimen. I do not believe anybody will say that the Protestant atmosphere of the college, to which Roman Catholics so much object, had any deleterious effect on either his faith or morals. We object to a Roman Catholic college in Ireland, because it would be dominated by the Roman Catholic Church. That is the view I take and which I shall try to prove, and in order to do so, it is necessary to take the evidence of Roman Catholics themselves upon the matter. What did the Bishop of Down say?

MR. DILLON: What date?

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: 1868. The views on faith and morality held by the Catholics in 1808 are the same as they

hold in 1901, and this is what the Bishop said;

"The managers should use no books in the school but such as would be approved by the heads of their religious denomination. Q. How far will extend the right of judging as to the secular portion of the instruction?;A. The Church has a general right to examine any book, and to see whether or not there is anything in the book contrary to sound faith and morals;any book whatever. Incidentally there may come into any book a proposition which may be very objectionable. There is no book which I conceive the proper authority of the Church would be excluded from examining."

I ask the House to mark how he went on, as this shows the amount of liberty which the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland allows to its members;

"But a parent may, if he likes, independently of the Church, say, 'I will not be tied down by the Church. I will not be priest-ridden.' He may do that, but if he does it is by the violation of his principles, or by following an erroneous conscience as a Catholic."

So that a Roman Catholic in Ireland has no choice whatever. Either he must follow the education given to him and superintended by the priests of his

Church, or, if he tries to obtain education where that authority is not exerted, he does so at the peril of his position as a Catholic. Therefore, if the House wishes to know why Roman Catholics in Ireland have not of late years gone in large numbers to Trinity College, the reason is to be found in that statement of the Bishop of Down. You cannot expect a Roman Catholic who firmly believes in his religion, in the face of that utterance, to send his son to Trinity College, or any other college where the priests are not supreme. Of course, I shall come into that category described by the hon. Member for East Mayo as "intolerant bigots." [Nationalist cheers.] I knew that would evoke a cheer; but my idea of bigotry and that of hon. Gentlemen opposite are entirely different. I do not say that a man who holds very strong views on the religion he professes is a bigot, but I do say that that man is a bigot who tries to force his opinions down the throats of those who object to them. Nobody will be able to show, in the course of this debate, that a Roman Catholic who goes to Trinity College has to confront any attempt to undermine his faith. I appeal to the hon. Member for Waterford, who has been to Trinity College, to tell me whether, during the time he was a member of the college, any effort was made to injure or undermine his faith, or whether, during his residence, anything was done that he saw or heard of which would be offensive to the most tender conscience of a Roman Catholic.

Why do Roman Catholics not go to Trinity College? For one reason and one only; that they are not allowed. In the debate two years ago the Leader of the House said, "What a terrible thing-it would be if the Catholics did come in great numbers," and he asked how we should like that.

Why, if they came in shoals, we should receive them with open arms. We should be only too glad to see our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen coming to receive their education at the same college as that at which we received ours. We believe that by that means a bridge would be built over the gulf which religious intolerance and bigotry have placed between different portions of the population. For my own part, I repudiate bigotry or intolerance, but I will oppose to the bitter end any attempt to create in Ireland a university which inevitably must be directly guided and governed by the Roman Catholic priesthood. I would equally oppose the creation of a university absolutely governed by the Protestant Church. There are priests in every denomination; and I equally dislike them all. In what way is a Roman Catholic who enters Trinity College at the same time as a Protestant handicapped or interfered with in his progress towards the prizes which the open competition of the university holds up for its scholars? Is it not perfectly true that they are treated absolutely fairly, irrespective of the faith they profess, and that all the prizes and fellowships of the college are open to the competition of both? It cannot be denied that that is so. The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland has in the past made great claims on the Legislature of this country. It began, and rightly, by pleading for toleration. It got it. It then pleaded for equality, and, although the Irish Church had to

be disestablished, it got that equality. It now asks for absolute supremacy over the education of the majority of the Irish people. A few years ago, when this

question was under discussion, I had a letter from a Roman Catholic gentleman in Ireland hoping I would stick to my guns in the matter, and he said that on the governing body of a Roman Catholic university, with a predominance of laymen, if there were one bishop, that bishop would have more weight than all the rest put together. The position of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland is absolute. The House of Commons is asked to create and endow a Roman Catholic university. What do hon. Gentlemen opposite offer in return? Do they promise loyalty? Do they propose to bury the hatchet which they and their friends and the priests have been sharpening all these years? Do they intend to try, as far as they can, to cause the Irish people to forget those dark days, which, thank God; have long passed away? No; they promise nothing, and expect to get everything. The House of Commons, which is essentially a businesslike assembly; except sometimes; will naturally ask itself, if we do grant a Roman Catholic university, guided, influenced, and practically dominated by the priestly authority, What kind of citizens will it turn out? The House has not far to go to see what kind of citizens Roman Catholic education in Ireland turns out. There are about eighty specimens below the gangway opposite. I do not use the word "specimens" in any offensive sense. I do not say "bad specimens," as that would be very uncivil to hon. Gentlemen opposite. I do not say "good specimens," because that might be insulting to the Irish people. I take it that hon. Gentlemen opposite are merely ordinary specimens of the output of Roman Catholic education in Ireland. Can you hold up the Nationalist party in this House as an example of what good citizens of this Empire should be? They themselves openly avow that they hate the British Empire, and that whoever strikes great Britain is their friend. [Nationalist cheers.] They are perfectly frank. But is it likely, if the output of Roman Catholic education increases, it will be for either the well-being treat Britain or the good of Ireland? I do not think it will.

One cannot deny that the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland have gone outside the natural boundary of the religious domain, and have entered the field of politics. They have pointed out that they cannot sever their views of religion from politics, because politics affect morals. There is one opinion which I will ask the permission of the House to quote. A very great authority. Mr. Gladstone, in speaking of the influence of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, pointed out that there the priests were absolute over the people, the bishops were absolute over both, and the Pope was absolute over all three. This Roman Catholic university, their own priests said, must be planted by themselves or Roman Catholics will not be allowed to go to it; they must have their learning passed through ecclesiastical filters before it reaches their mind; and is that, in the twentieth century, a university which ought to, or can, command the respect of the world at large, or even of Ireland?

Two years ago the First Lord of the Treasury sympathised with the idea of establishing a Roman Catholic university in Ireland. I venture to point out to my right hon. friend and the House that the position since then has materially changed. My right hon. friend may have had in his mind the hope, which is not well founded, that by concession to the Roman Catholic clergy and hierarchy he



might secure their loyal support to the Government of the country. What has happened during the last two years? This country has been engaged in a great and bitter war, and what course did the Roman Catholic hierarchy pursue, in sympathy with hon. Gentlemen opposite? Why, all over Ireland the Roman Catholic clergy have held up our enemies to admiration and condemned Great Britain. These are the men whom you propose to place at the head of Irish university education. Last, but not least, they really showed their true colours when this country suffered under the bereavement of the death of our beloved Queen. Who, among all her subjects, alone showed no sorrow, sent no testimony of their sympathy? The Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland. That, in itself, was sufficient, I should say, to open the eyes of my right hon. friend to the men into whose hands he proposes to commit supreme authority for the education of Ireland. Do you think that these men will turn out loyal citizens; these men who side with our enemies, who refused to express sorrow at the death of our Queen? Are they the men into whose hands you think it would be a good thing to confide the educational destinies of Ireland? I say, "No," and when I say, "No" I think I am speaking for the majority of the House of Commons and for the great majority of the Protestants of the Empire. I have spoken somewhat warmly, for I feel very warmly upon this subject, but I think that it would be a supreme and almost a criminal mistake for this or any other Government to ever try to persuade the House of Commons to hand over the education of Ireland to these men, to this Church, to this hierarchy, and thus forge a chain which would be bound for ever round the intellect of Ireland, by giving it over to these clerical fomenters of discord and teachers of treason.

\*MR. MORRIS (Galway): I should like, with the indulgence of the House, which I hope will be extended to me on this, the first occasion of my addressing it, not to let this opportunity pass by without giving expression to the views which I hold upon the interesting question which has come before us tonight, and which I hope the House will consider in a fair-minded, tolerant, and sympathetic manner. I am quite certain that time will show that this is a question fraught with the greatest importance, not only for the intellectual development but for the whole social and public and political life of the country to which I belong, and whose interests I have so much at heart, and a portion of which, and that the capital of the most Catholic province in Ireland, I have the honour of representing in this House. And I hope that I am not presumptuous in thinking that there are one or two reasons why my views may not be without value to this House because, owing, to the chances of my life, I have, I think, had special or certainly varied opportunities

of forming the views which I hold. Perhaps the House will in this matter excuse my being a little personal in my remarks, but I desire to say that I was educated in England in my school days at a Catholic school, which was presided over and influenced by one of the greatest Englishmen of his day, and one who added to his other great claims of distinction that of having made the most valuable contribution and given the most brilliant advocacy to the very question which we are now discussing, and who was also the founder and first rector of the Catholic University started in Dublin in the middle of the last century. I

refer to Cardinal Newman. I lived, therefore, at that school in a Catholic atmosphere. My fellow students were Catholics, and the masters were Catholics, but there was no undue clericalism. They were all laymen, and I had thus the opportunity of being educated under the best and healthiest Catholic auspices. When my school days were over and I returned to my own country, the only option I had, if I wished to go to a university, in the strict sense of the word, was to go to Trinity College. I went there and spent four years of my life at that college, and, as I hope to be able to show from my own experience, I spent four years in one of the most Protestant institutions which I believe it is possible to conceive. I also happen to live in the neighbourhood of one of the Queen's Colleges, and am familiar with its history and working. I only mention these facts in order to show that I have come into contact with the question from various points of view, and am acquainted with the many conflicting interests involved in this question, which is undoubtedly a vexed and difficult one. But there is another reason why I think my opinions should receive the attention of Members, on the Ministerial side more especially. I am the sole Unionist in the House of Commons out of three provinces of Ireland, and I am the only Catholic Unionist in the House from Ireland. Practically speaking, Irish Catholic Unionists are unrepresented in the House of Commons, because, though a large, they are a scattered body, and at no place do they exist in sufficient numbers to return a representative to Parliament; nevertheless they are a large body, and particularly in connection with this question, as they happen to belong to a class who are one and all interested directly in its solution. And I think they have some claim upon the Government, and upon Members on this side of the House, because as in the past they remained loyal, in spite of terrible laws and the loss of their position and property, to the faith of their country, so in recent years they have, in the face of an immense amount of undeserved unpopularity and loss of local influence, remained loyal to the Throne and the Constitution. On their behalf, then, I appeal more especially to this side of the House for a sympathetic consideration of this question. But beyond mentioning the fact that there is such a class in Ireland, and that they are so unrepresented in this House, and yet that they are so deeply interested in the settlement of this question. I do not wish to lay stress on political distinctions, because know and cordially recognise that the Catholics of Ireland, whether Unionists or Home Rulers, are solidly united in one body in demanding justice in this matter.

If the House will allow me, I will briefly review the university opportunities that at present exist in Ireland, and are available for the possible Catholic student. There is, first of all, of course, Trinity College, Dublin. It is pre-eminently first. And before I say a word about Trinity College, I wish for myself to offer a tribute of warm affection and regard for my old university. I hope I am not an entirely unworthy son of an university where I spent much pleasant time, and the memories of which I recall with sincere gratitude; and I would go further and say that there is no Irishman, no matter what his political opinions or religious views may be, no matter whether he happens to have been to Trinity College or not, who ought ever to mention the name of Dublin University,

the mother of so many distinguished and patriotic Irishmen, without the greatest respect and pride. It was the university of Berkeley, Swift, Congreve, Goldsmith, Burke, Flood, Grattan, Plunket, Curran, Moore, and Lever; and I may remind the hon. Member for

East Mayo that it was also the college of Wolfe Tone, Emmet, Davis, and Butt. Such are my personal feelings with regard to what is a most distinguished institution, which has in the past done good work in Ireland from its own point of view, and which is now doing good work from its own point of view, and which I hope will continue to do good work from its own point of view, and which is my own Alma Mater. But I would ask whether I am guilty of a want of filial respect if I say that my collegiate mother is a Protestant, for that is all I desire to say with reference to Trinity College, and what also I do not wish to see changed, but I do say that Trinity College is a Protestant institution from top to toe, from the provost at the head of it to the porters at the gate. It is Protestant in its birth, history, traditions, and customs; in its system of education; and it is Protestant this very minute in its composition and administration. It is idle to deny that it is Protestant in its atmosphere and spirit, when it is Protestant in substance and reality, and it is absurd and unfair to ask any Catholic in Ireland to be satisfied with it as a means for higher education. How could it be otherwise with Trinity College? We know what it has been for three centuries. Trinity College has been openly and avowedly a disseminating fountain of Protestant thought, culture, and feeling in Ireland. It has been the actual centre and rallying point of the Protestant ascendancy, which ruled Ireland up to a few years ago. It was in past years openly and avowedly connected with proselytism. It was founded and endowed for such purposes, and it should be remembered that Trinity College is a State founded and State endowed institution, and that the State endowment includes a divinity school. For two centuries Roman Catholics were not even admitted to the college, and only in recent times have the positions of emolument been opened to them. It may be said that all that is past, that the tests and disabilities which prevented Catholics from going to Trinity College no longer exist. But, nevertheless, I maintain that the college cannot be considered acceptable or congenial to the Catholics of Ireland. I would ask hon. Members to picture to themselves the

converse of such a university as I am describing, and if they do so, I think they will have to admit that although Catholics are no longer excluded by law from Trinity College, it is a Protestant institution, and dangerous, if not positively injurious, to the faith of Catholics. I ask you to look at Trinity College as it exists to-day. This is the college which we are told meets the requirements of the Catholic people of Ireland, who are the great mass of the nation. More than 90 per cent. of the students attending Trinity College are non-Catholics; the provost, all the fellows, and all the professors are Protestants. The provost and many of the professors are in addition Protestant clergymen. I ask hon. Members whether such an institution, if equally Catholic, would be acceptable to Protestants to send their sons to. There is in connection with Trinity College an official chapel. When the bell rings the Protestant

students congregate dressed in cap and gown, but what becomes of the Catholic student on that occasion? If he attends at all, under such circumstances, to the duties and observances of his own religion, he has to sneak out of the college into the streets of Dublin to follow his devotions. The chapel in Trinity College is a most conspicuous feature of the social life of the college. Its ceremonial goes on daily before one's eyes and in one's hearing. I speak from experience and observation, and I again ask hon. Members to picture the converse. Then the divinity school of Trinity College is one of the largest, most important, and most influential schools in the university. It is the actual training school of the Church of Ireland, and in connection with it there is, of course, the retinue of professors and lecturers in theology; men, too, who lecture on controversial points as between Catholics and Protestants, and who afterwards lecture Catholic students in subjects of philosophy and morals and modern history. It is one of the richest schools in connection with the college. There are a number of prizes, exhibitions, and bursarships open only to Protestants, because they can only be competed for by students coming from the Protestant preparatory schools in Ireland, and in connection with the chapel and the divinity school there are several social and debating societies, such as the college theological society, the church musical society, choir societies, and university missions. But, leaving aside the actual College chapel and the divinity school, I say that the influences which permeate the whole college and constitute its spirit and atmosphere, with respect to even the smallest detail, are as Protestant as it is possible for them to be. The provost is a distinguished Protestant theologian, actually famous for his writings against Catholics. Books are included in the college courses which are essentially Protestant in their nature; the Catholic student is lectured and examined in philosophy and history by a professor, who that morning may have been conducting services in the chapel, preaching controversial sermons, or, very properly, from his point of view, lecturing in the divinity school on subjects of theological differences between Catholics and Protestants. It is a thoroughly sectarian college. Even students who are not divinity students, but who are members of the Church of Ireland, have to attend services in the chapel, and attend catechetical lectures and examinations. The Dublin university press is, too, the principal Protestant publishing firm in Ireland. I could go more into detail, but I think I have said enough to show the House, in dealing with the only university in the strict sense of the word that exists in Ireland, that it is carried on actively in connection with, and is steeped in the spirit of a particular form of belief, that it is a most sectarian college, and that it is idle and ridiculous to deny that its atmosphere is Protestant; an atmosphere which always seemed to me like a sort of cold, smokeless incense; when the actual composition and administration of the college are so intensely Protestant. Trinity College, therefore, can never be a college for the Catholics of Ireland. If it does not actually injure or destroy the faith of a Catholic, it certainly subjects it to the greatest danger, and it certainly humiliates all the religious sentiments and susceptibilities of an Irish Catholic. I think it is monstrous to ask an Irish Catholic, who is a member of the religion to which

the great mass of the nation belong, when he wants to finish his education to, as it were, leave his country behind him, leave his religion behind him, and all the associations connected with his faith and home and earlier education, and go into such an institution, where he practically finds himself living alone like a pariah; and I ask again, would Protestants send their sons to a college as Catholic, or half as Catholic, as Trinity College is Protestant? But the Catholics of Ireland have no desire to touch Trinity College. We recognise that it meets the requirements of a large section of the Irish people. We know that it was founded for the purpose of teaching the Irish people through the medium of Protestantism, and we are perfectly willing that it should continue to do the good work it has done in the past, but I say it is unfair to ask Catholics to be content with it. Trinity College, however great, however much I admire it in many respects, is part and parcel of the old Protestant ascendancy, and when the Catholics of Ireland take into account its history and traditions it is absolutely uncongenial to them and thoroughly out of touch with all their views and feelings. It is an exotic and unnational institution. One of the Fellows of the college himself said that it was not a national institution, and had never pretended to be such. It has, I believe, been called by the other universities "the silent sister." and could there be a stronger piece of evidence of how uncharacteristic it is of the country it is located in? Now, I have endeavoured to survey Trinity College as it exists as a university available for at least open to the Catholic students of Ireland, and I wish now to ask what other opportunities they have in the matter of higher education. To my mind there is no other university. It is said that there is the Royal University; but the Royal University is not a university at all, it is not even a college. It neither educates nor teaches the Irish people. It has simply one of the most perfunctory attributes of a university; that of examining. It is a university without residence, without pupils, without teachers, without classrooms, without reading-together, without debates. I have seen it mentioned as a criticism of all university teaching in these days, even in the oldest colleges in this country, that it is too much a process of cramming. If that can be said of Oxford and Cambridge, with all their intellectual and social life and spirit of culture, how much more is this the fact in the case of a dry examining board, a question and answer machine, a university of results? In my opinion the Royal University cannot in any high and formative sense educate or advance the mind of the people of Ireland. There is nothing which arises out of old traditions, no genius loci, none of the advantages of personal stimulus and oral instruction; no interchange of ideas and comradeship between young men coming from different parts of the country, creating enlargement of mind and tolerance; no social or even festive life or athletics. In a word, none of the unstudied education or unwritten lessons which are the most valuable part of university training. I have seen it said that the Houses of Parliament and the atmosphere around them are a sort of university of politics. If an hon. Member of this House never came here but occasionally to vote, if he missed all the valuable oral instruction that can be gained here, say in the debates; the social life of the place; what the hon. Member for Kerry calls "the ins and outs of the

smoking room"; all that can be learnt from the manners and customs of the place; could it be said that such a Member was deriving all the advantages which can be gained as a student in this university of politics? The same may be said of the Royal University of Ireland, which is thoroughly unsuited to the social and intellectual needs of the Irish people, is a miserable makeshift, a sham university, and has been condemned by its own governing body.

There is only one other form of higher education in Ireland to which I would refer, and that is the Queen's colleges. The Queen's colleges were founded by Sir Robert Peel, when he tried to force a purely secular education on the people of Ireland; but they are absolute failures in regard to meeting the requirements of the Catholic people of Ireland. The only one which has taken root is now practically a Presbyterian college. Any attempt to force a purely secular education

on Ireland will never be acceptable to the Irish people. Secularism is absolutely repulsive in the eyes of the Irish people, including the Protestants, for they are just as keenly opposed to un-denominational education as the Catholics. The Irish people will never accept any education from which religion is banished. But it has been said that to found a Catholic university would be retrogressive, that it would be to go back on the principle of not endowing any institution in which religion is taught. The Irish people have never accepted that principle, although it may have been accepted sometimes in this country. The religious conscience of Ireland is absolutely opposed to such a principle. The other day I read a description of that principle by a great educationalist, a distinguished Englishman. I will quote it for the benefit of hon. Members on the opposite side of the House who are such advocates for the principle. He called it "that spavined, vicious-eyed Liberal hobby expressly bred to do duty against the Irish Catholics." Moreover, all existing education in Ireland; whether primary, intermediate, or university; is sectarian. Trinity College, for instance, is. And I would point out that to attempt to secularise Trinity College will be of no earthly use to meet the demands of Irish Catholics. I say that if any such thing is attempted it would ruin Trinity College as an institution for Protestants, and, far from making it a half-way house, would remove it thousands of miles further away from Irish Catholics, for they would much prefer a Protestant atmosphere to an agnostic or atheistic atmosphere in a university.

I have dealt with the only opportunities that exist for university education in Ireland. I have spoken of Trinity College and its Protestant character, of the Royal University, and of the Queen's colleges, and have shown how unsatisfactory for different reasons these all are, and how there is no possibility of their meeting the daily growing needs of the Catholic people of Ireland, who desire a university education. I now wish to answer some of the objections which have been made to establishing a Catholic university in Ireland. One objection I have heard raised is, "It is all very fine to make this demand, but why do not you found a university yourselves? Why do you always come, like beggars, to us?" The reply is that we are too poor, and that it is your fault that we are so poor. The history of Catholic Ireland is the history of the poor.

And we have no wealthy men who could dream of founding a fully equipped university. I would ask the House to consider how much the poor Catholics of Ireland have done, and are doing, for the cause of education and religion. They support their own clergy; they have had to build in recent years churches to replace those confiscated from them in penal times; and they have subscribed liberally to innumerable educational institutions. It is simply marvellous to consider how much has been done by the generous and faithful poor of Ireland for religion and education. But not only do they support their own Church and educational institutions; the poor Catholics of Ireland in the past, and indirectly at this moment, support the Protestant Church there, because we all know that their money went to endow the Church of the wealthy Protestant minority, and that, although the Tithe Commutation Act was passed, the burden falls still upon them indirectly through the rent. Not alone are they poor, but it is your fault that they are poor. The other day there was a debate in the House when some hon. Member referred to Irish history. The First Lord of the Treasury in reply afterwards; and there is no gentleman whom, from an Irish point of view, I more admire, or who has shown as a British statesman a more sincere desire to deal with the great problems he became familiar with in Ireland; deprecated in discussing Irish questions references to Irish history. In discussing English questions in this House there is no necessity to refer to history. The questions which come before the House in reference to England are questions that have arisen owing to modern developments and the conditions of modern society; but, unfortunately, the questions we have to bring before the House from Ireland are not modern questions. They are old questions. I wish that they were modern questions dealing with new social and industrial complexities. The questions which we have to ask the House to consider refer to the redress of ancient wrongs in Ireland and the necessity for doing justice to Ireland; unfortunately most of the demands from Ireland are for arrears of justice, and it is absolutely necessary, when bringing them before the House, to look into Irish history. No Irishman looks into Irish history except with a shudder, but he has to do so in order to trace the springs of the wrongs and anomalies which exist in his country in so many cases. And there you will find that the poverty of the Irish people is due to the infamous penal laws which were directed against not only the religion but the property and position and trade of the Irish people. A century ago it was a felony for a Catholic to learn. They were offered either Protestantism or Catholicism and ignorance. They chose the latter, but of course suffered. So the Catholic population lived on in Ireland without colleges, or schools, or religion, not allowed to hold property of any kind, and yet you are now astonished that the Irish people are poor. But now these laws are at an end you have coming before this House the demands and necessities of the immense daily growing Catholic population of Ireland who have just emerged from the suppression of the past, after centuries of persecution, and who ask you to deal justly and fairly with this matter. I consider, for my part, that the penal laws of Ireland may be said still to exist to a certain extent so long as you prevent the Irish Catholics from having university education, and so penalise them from entering the higher walks of professional

life. Complaints are made of so many Protestants being appointed in Ireland to various offices, and I often think that this is due to the fact that they are the most highly qualified, because the Catholics have not had the educational advantages which they have had. I agree with the hon. Member for East Mayo that the proposed university should be instituted upon the lines of those of Scotland, where the poorest can go. The fact is that the revolution has taken place in Ireland. Democracy rules in Ireland as elsewhere, and a new generation has arisen to whom you have given political and local power, but to whom you still deny the power of knowledge. I hope the House will now deal with this question once and for all. It is high time that it was settled. For generations the House has seen the Catholics of Ireland come here and by every means in their power endeavour to persuade the House to deal fairly in this matter, and I trust that the present Government, which I look upon as friendly to Ireland, will not allow this occasion to go by without settling a question which is so important to the whole intellectual and social development of the country from which I come.

\*MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) said this was essentially an educational, and only accidentally a religious, question. He had seen a circular from the Liberation Society in which it was said that there was no reason why Irish Catholics should not frequent Dublin University, inasmuch as English Catholics went to Oxford and Cambridge. As an English Catholic who had been to Oxford he could say that there was no arguing from one to the other. English Catholics had not the numbers for a university of their own, and there was not that historical wall of division between them and their fellow-countrymen which unfortunately existed in Ireland. Unionists had always insisted on the duality of Ireland; and the worst way to create a real unity was to endeavour to force a factitious uniformity between alien elements. He found among his own friends the greatest misconception as to what was really asked for. The Irish hierarchy had laid down distinctly that the university they wanted should be subject to four conditions; (1) the majority of the governing body were to be laymen; (2) no chair of theology was to be endowed out of public funds; (3) the independence of the professors was to be guaranteed by the appointment of outside visitors; and (4) the university was to be open to all comers. When they had a declaration of that kind, how could it be said that an endowment of Roman Catholicism was desired? He believed that, if these conditions were clearly laid down and endorsed by Irish Members opposite, and if they went before the Commission and made it perfectly clear in black and white that that was what they asked for, they would have an irresistible case, not only with this House, but with the whole of the people of England. But he was afraid that hon. Members on the opposite side of the House could not be surprised if they found on the Ministerial side a certain very natural prepossession against anything that emanated from them. He feared that they had not been so mindful of the dignity of Parliament, so careful of the susceptibilities of Englishmen, so zealous for the honour and credit and integrity of the Empire, that now, when they asked for a large concession, they could expect to be welcomed with open arms by those who



were concerned for the honour and credit of the Empire.

MR. DILLON: It is a pity we ever emancipated you.

\*MR. JAMES HOPE said he hoped, however, that the House would take a higher and broader view of the position. It was not a case of pleasing hon. Members opposite or of satisfying the Irish hierarchy, but it was a case of doing the right and proper thing by the young generation of Ireland.

\*MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member for East Clare and other hon. Members near him to refrain from interrupting.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): On the point of order, Sir, I desire to ask you whether the hon. Gentleman is in order, instead of addressing himself to the Chair, in addressing us and giving us a lecture.

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is perfectly in order. He did address himself to the Chair.

\*MR. JAMES HOPE said he was perfectly aware that what he had said would not be acceptable to hon. Members opposite, but every word he had said was true.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Why did your uncle stand by when the King insulted us? Why did not the Duke of Norfolk object?

\*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member persists in interrupting and obstructing the business of the House I shall have to call attention to his conduct.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: The hon. Gentleman should not insult us.

\*MR. JAMES HOPE said that hon. Gentlemen opposite had prided themselves on the sentiments to which he had referred, and how, then, could they be insulting to them? French Canada was a source of strength to the Empire, because there the people had the education that suited them. Ireland was a source of weakness because Irish people had not been able to get the education which they had a right to. For educational and national reasons, and not because he was a Catholic, he trusted that this question would be settled on the lines suggested in the Amendment.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin Co., N.): Of the two speeches which have just been delivered I infinitely prefer that of the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh.

The hon. Member who has just sat down has presumed to lecture the Irish Nationalist Members on the dignity of Parliament and various topics. We want no lecture from the hon. Member, and, what is more, we will take no lecture from him. If we were to gain our demand by his single vote, I would rather lose it; non tali auxilio. The hon. Member's speech was most impertinent, and was characteristic of the class to which he belongs, and which always makes me think that the Catholics of Ireland were very ill-advised when they struggled for emancipation, and emancipated not only themselves, but such specimens of Catholicism as the hon. Gentleman opposite, who probably would have remained a slave to the present day but for the efforts of persons whom he now has the impudence;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member must withdraw that expression.

MR. CLANCY: The word has been used frequently.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; The hon. Member must withdraw the expression.

MR. CLANCY: I did not hear what you said, Mr. Speaker, but I, of course,

withdraw any expression that you regard as unparliamentary. But the substance, of what I say is perfectly plain. The speech of the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh voiced the sentiments of Portadown; sentiments which I will illustrate with a short story. A Protestant was conversing with an artisan, also a Protestant, on Portadown station, when the former said to the artisan, "You ought not to speak so badly of the Pope, because he is a very good-living man"; and the artisan replied, "Well, all I can say is this; the Pope may be a very good man, but he has a very bad name at Portadown. The right hon. and gallant Member spoke on behalf of a very small and fanatical minority, rather than on behalf of the great bulk of the Protestants even of Ireland. The right hon. and gallant Member pointed to the "manifestations of disloyalty" which had come from the Irish benches, and made that the ground for refusing the demand for further educational facilities for the Catholics of Ireland. That, surely, is an argument against himself, for if the result of the present system of education in Ireland has been to produce those disloyal persons [pointing to the Irish Nationalist Members], it is only reasonable to expect that an extension of university education would lead to an improvement. Apparently the right hon. and gallant Gentleman thinks that, bad as we are now, we would be ten times worse if we were better educated. That may be, but the future will speak for itself. I observed that when the right hon. and gallant Member was speaking of manifestations of disloyalty, many hon. Members around him enjoyed it, and regarded the whole thing as a joke; but the Members who have to deal with the problem of governing the people of Ireland were as glum as death. They did not laugh. They know very well; probably the right hon. and gallant Gentleman himself knows; that the result of the present system has been to produce what are called a "band of rebels." I do not apologise for those "rebels," because everything they have done is justified by British rule. One of the causes of their disloyalty is the fact that they have been refused those educational rights which are never denied to any free people except by a tyrant who uses his power as a tyrant.

The right hon. Gentleman asked, "What have we to give in return for this boon?" Does the right hon. Gentleman mean that justice is to be sold? If our demand is just, why should anything be given in return for the granting of it? If it is unjust, refuse it; but if it is just, why ask any price for it? It should be given freely and voluntarily. The result would be to make discontented people contented. We have two sets of opponents on this question. The right hon. and gallant Member represents a small and fanatical minority of Irish Protestants. All Irish Protestants, I am glad to say, are not opposed to this demand. Trinity College itself has declared, through the mouths of several of its leading spokesmen, in favour of it; and it is supported by the two Members for Trinity College. The principle was also assented to, during the debate on the Home Rule Bill in 1893, by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the present Solicitor General for England. The majority of the Presbyterians are, I think, opposed to it, but the opposition is not unanimous, for one of the principal lawyers in Ireland, and one of the leaders of the Presbyterian body, delivered a lecture in support of the claim in Queen's College, Belfast, with the president of the

college in the chair. In a recent speech the Marquess of Londonderry said that to assent to the proposal made on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland would be to do an injustice to the Protestants of Ireland. I deny emphatically that any real injustice would be done. This cry comes badly from the opponents of this demand. The Protestants were planted in Ireland as a garrison, and got the fat of the land; indeed. Trinity College itself was built and endowed on the ruins and out of the revenues of a Catholic college. It is living to-day on the proceeds of the pious founders of 300 years ago, who were all Catholics. Catholics have been allowed to grow up almost brutalised without education; they have been deprived of nearly all means of getting on in the world, and now, after 300 years, when this really miserable demand is made, a representative of the Protestants of Ireland gets up and says it is an injustice to Irish Protestants. I should have thought a gentleman like the right hon. and gallant Member opposite would have defied Portadown, and said, "After 300 years we do owe something to the Catholics, and I for one am willing to pay the debt." But if the conduct of the Protestants is reprehensible, that of the Presbyterians is absolutely mean. The Presbyterians were persecuted as the Roman Catholics were, and when the Roman Catholics were emancipated the Presbyterians were also at the same time. It was our agitation that obtained for them religious equality and the rights they now possess. They never obtained anything for themselves. Even to-day they are in the habit of allowing the Catholics to work for them, and then, when a beneficial Act is obtained, they come in and reap the fruits. I solemnly declare that for my part I would rather have the enmity of an outspoken institution like Trinity College, objectionable though it is from every point of view to the Catholics of Ireland, than the miserable system of sectarian education which the Presbyterian mind so devotedly admires. I come now to our British opponents. I understand that a large majority of the Liberal party are opposed to this demand, but we have never yet had an authoritative declaration to that effect from the Front Bench. Unionist Members at the last election pledged themselves in their addresses that the British Parliament was willing to do for Ireland everything that an Irish Parliament would do itself. We challenge those Members to say that an Irish Parliament would not decide this question in the way we desire, and we call upon them to fulfil that pledge. As to Members on this side of the House I recollect the hon. Member for Carnarvon speaking to this effect;

"I was willing during the debates on TNT Home Rule Bill to give you the power of establishing a Catholic university for Ireland if you wished, but I am not willing to vote here for it myself."

The distinction he drew was that in the one case he would not be responsible for a thing he disliked, while in the other case he would. I say that is futile and trifling; it is pure humbug. He would be equally responsible in either case, and he ought to be ashamed to use such an argument.

But let me face frankly the great objection urged against a Catholic university. The right hon. and gallant Member put it brutally, perhaps, when he said that such a university would be dominated by the Catholic clergy. I do not admit that that is so. The argument has been put in this way; that the Catholics of Ireland

cannot expect this Protestant nation to contribute to that in which they do not believe, and which they detest. That is a curious illustration of the absolute incapacity of some people to take account of the position of others. Supposing we were arguing for a Catholic university; one with religious tests, and one which must remain Catholic to the end of time because tests were imposed; have we not as much right to ask for that as the Presbyterians of Ulster have to ask for a non-sectarian university? Suppose Catholics regarded with horror the system of education called non-sectarian, and looked upon it as certain in its results to lead to indifference in religious matters, to infidelity, immorality, and bad citizenship, and felt it a grievance to be obliged to contribute towards its propagation and maintenance. Have they not, as taxpayers, as much right as Protestants have to demand what they think to be right? What superiority or infallibility have the Protestants to say they are right and we are wrong? The Nonconformists say that this is a Protestant nation, and that you cannot do a thing which offends the convictions and susceptibilities of the people. That means that all your boasts of religious equality are a sham, and that you still maintain a Protestant ascendancy in this realm. You say that all sects are equal before the law, and that all denominations are upon a level, and yet when we make this demand in accordance with our religious tenets we are told, "Oh, the equality does not extend to that. We are still a Protestant nation, and to anything which offends the Protestant

convictions and susceptibilities of the nation we will object," If that is the argument, it is an argument against all that has been done during the last fifty years to establish religious equality. If it be true, the Irish Church ought never to have been disestablished, or a single penny voted for the education of Catholics in Ireland. All should have been brought up as strict Protestants. The opponents of this demand should have the courage of their convictions, and say as Cromwell once said; "I do not object to the Catholics of Ireland practising their religion; they may do as they like, but they must not go to mass." That is exactly the same position as when it is said that there is religious equality in this land, but not such equality as will permit Irish Catholic parents to educate their children as their consciences dictate.

Then, I desire to draw attention to the remarks of Lord Londonderry the other day on the question of this Commission. Lord Londonderry as well as Lord Cadogan is a member of the Cabinet, and I should like the Chief Secretary or the First Lord of the Treasury to explain his Lordship's statement at Belfast; it would throw a great light upon the meaning of the appointment of this Commission. Lord Cadogan is in favour of our demand, and has repeatedly said so. We also know that Lord Londonderry is not in favour of our demand, and yet he, too, is in favour of the appointment of this Commission. I would like to know whether it is the Londonderry or the Cadogan element that is going to be uppermost in this Commission. It is all the more necessary to ask this question, because Lord Londonderry himself has laid stress upon the composition of the Commission. He said in a speech delivered in Belfast that what we have to do is to see that the Commission is properly constituted, but what is properly constituted from Lord Londonderry's point of view cannot be so from the point of view of Lord Cadogan.

With most of the speech of the hon. Member for W. Galway I entirely agree, and this is one of the few questions upon which I do agree with him. I wish to point out, however, that the hon. Member could not have been elected for W. Galway if he had not declared himself

in favour of a Roman Catholic university for Ireland. With one of the pleas put forward by the hon. Member I do not agree. He spoke of the poverty of Ireland as a ground why this demand should be granted, but I object to put the case upon that ground. We do not come to the House as beggars upon this question.

\*MR. MORRIS: I did not put it upon that ground, though I did say that the Catholics of Ireland were incapable of founding a university for themselves on account of their poverty.

MR. CLANCY: I contend that that is a plea of begging, and I will not make any such plea on behalf of Ireland. We are only asking for what we are entitled to. I will take every opportunity of saying that we do not ask for one single penny of English money, for whatever sum of money is given to us, whether it is one, two, three, or five millions, you will not be giving us one penny which you have not robbed Ireland of in the past. I will never admit that whatever money Ireland gets from the British Treasury is due to the generosity of England, or that it is anything else but a restitution of our stolen or plundered property. I put our demand upon the ground of justice. The Protestants of Ireland are amply endowed; but the Catholics, who are in a great majority in Ireland, are without endowments. As taxpayers we have a right to equal treatment for our educational needs. I should be ashamed to go back to my constituents if for a moment I put this simple demand for justice upon any other ground than that we are entitled as of right to what we are asking for.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir EDWARD CARSON, Dublin University): I desire to intervene in this debate for a very short time, not at all as a member of the Government, but as representing Trinity College, Dublin, in this House. I do so with certain regrets, because I would much rather that the task could have been undertaken by my colleague, whose absence from illness I am sure the House deplores. As has been pointed out, I was myself probably the first member from Ireland representing a Unionist constituency, certainly the first representing Dublin University, who gave my support to propositions for doing something for the higher education of Catholics in Ireland; something that would satisfy the demands of the great majority of the population. I have taken up that attitude now for many years, and I have upon every occasion, I think, that this question has come before the House expressed my views fearlessly, and I hope clearly. Upon the last occasion I had the honour of being returned as the Member of Parliament for Trinity College, notwithstanding a very strong speech to the contrary by the eminent gentleman who did me the honour of opposing me, I felt it my duty to again reiterate those sentiments. I did that because, in the first place, I was convinced of the necessity of conceding these demands in some form or another; and, in the second place, I believed that, in taking up this attitude as a representative of Trinity College, I was acting in accordance with the Liberal traditions of the University of Dublin. I suppose the majority of hon. Members will agree that the

highest ideal of a university would be one in which students of all religions, and even those of no religion, might meet upon a common platform. I myself look back with the greatest pride and pleasure to the friendships of gentlemen of a different religion to my own which I made and cemented within the walls of Trinity College, Dublin; and those friendships which are made in a university career are perhaps the best that one makes through the whole period of our professional life. If I were asked and had the power to set up an ideal university for the education of the youth of Ireland, I should prefer to set up one such as we have had to a large extent established, not only in Trinity College, but all over the kingdom, in which all religions and all creeds meet together upon a common platform. I know that a strong argument put forward against the demands of Irish Catholics is that it is a fatal thing to put young men at the very outset of their career in opposite camps, and to bring them up apart and separate the one from the other. That may be true to a large extent; the present system in Ireland has, however, been tried, and Roman Catholics have not taken advantage of it.

For my part I value so highly a university training that I would make almost any sacrifice which would enable Roman Catholic young men to receive the benefits of such a training.

It is essential, at any rate for Englishmen, who probably do not know exactly how the question of university education stands in Ireland, to see what efforts have been made in the past to bring about what I have called the ideal state of university training. In the first place, there is Trinity College. Listening to the speech of the hon. Member for East Mayo, and to the very able speech which we all listened to with so much pleasure made by my hon. friend the Member for Galway, one would be led to think that in Trinity College we have some great bigoted Protestant institution. Such is not the case. Trinity College was originally founded for the purpose of propagating the Protestant religion in Ireland. Even since the year 1873, which is now somewhat ancient history, every office, every fellowship, every prize in Trinity College is accessible without any test to any person of any religion whatsoever. The governing body of the University of Dublin is open to persons of all religions and creeds, inasmuch as the board of Trinity College is composed of fellows according to seniority. If the Roman Catholics had gone freely into the college and captured the fellowships, the Catholic fellows would necessarily in time have become members of the governing body. True it is that there is attached to the University of Dublin a divinity school, but I would remind the House that as large a grant as £400,000 has been given to the Catholics by Parliament for the purpose of founding a Catholic divinity school at Maynooth. Trinity College has always been perfectly willing that Roman Catholics should have within the walls of the college exactly the same treatment as Protestants have, by the instruction and services of Roman Catholic priests. Notwithstanding all this, it is perfectly true that we are not educating in a university career the large majority of the Roman Catholics of Ireland. But let it not be supposed that Trinity College is the bigoted Protestant institution that has been described by some hon. Members. If the governing

body of Trinity College were asked to-morrow to have exactly the same institutions inside the walls for Catholics as they have for Protestants, they would themselves welcome the overture and do all in their power to meet any such suggestion. Another attempt was made when the Queen's colleges were established, in which no religion was taught. That, however, was not what either Protestants or Catholics in Ireland desired. No sooner were they established than they were denounced as godless colleges, because there was no religious education there at all. The Queen's colleges, with the exception of the one in Belfast, which has practically become a Presbyterian college, have been an utter failure in bringing about what was desired. Another effort was made when the Royal University was established, which was not really a university in any proper sense. There they attempted to bring about a satisfactory state of things for Catholics and Protestants alike by, I think, establishing a board on which there should be almost an equal number of Protestants and Catholics. But the Royal University has been rather less successful than the Queen's colleges, because it does not give the advantages of university education, and certainly in connection with that university the way in which the professors are appointed seems to me to be little less than a scandal. I am not now saying that because I object in the least to the endowment. Of course my speech is directly the contrary of that. You have had all these efforts, and you have had all this money spent with the view of bringing about an ideal university. That has failed. We have had. I am glad to say, within the walls of Trinity College about 10 per cent. of Catholic students who, I venture to say, have no ground of complaint against the institution for trying to interfere with their faith or morals. I think the best testimony to that is the fact that the hon. Member for Galway himself has passed unscathed in that respect through its portals, as his father had done, and, I believe, a distinguished brother of the hon. Member is at present within the walls of Trinity College. But while that is so, we cannot but say that the Catholics of Ireland are still without university education.

The question

before the House is, Are you going to leave them in that condition for ever simply because you say you will not devote public funds to sectarian purposes? If you do not do that, what are the various alternatives before us to settle the question? With reference to the observations of the hon. Member for East Mayo, I would say that Trinity College, Dublin, is not on its trial in this matter, and is not to be considered at all. If every privilege that is given to Protestants inside Trinity College were given to Catholics, the Roman Catholic Bishops would not be satisfied. On the other hand, they would not be satisfied if an Act were passed saying that no religion of any kind should be taught there. You must face the real facts of the case.

I should like to ask hon. Members who object to this scheme of what are they afraid. For my own part, while I should be sorry to say anything that could be thought disrespectful, I should prefer Roman Catholicism highly educated to Roman Catholicism in ignorance, and the only way in which that result can be brought about is by the establishment of some system of higher education. I have attempted to show that Trinity College has done all that could be done by it in

furtherance of this system, and that other efforts have also been made. Now, at all events, we are about to do something. For my own part, I hope and believe that the Commission which we are granting will be composed of men of the very highest character in educational matters, and it certainly could be a very grave misfortune if Catholics themselves were not to a very large extent represented on that Commission, as I am perfectly sure they will be. The hon. Member for East Mayo made a rather curious speech in regard to the inclusion or exclusion of the affairs of Trinity College, and I really could not make up my mind whether the hon. Member wished Trinity College to be included or excluded. All I can say is that when the deputation waited on the Lord Lieutenant to urge the appointment of such a Commission Bishop Healy, on behalf of the deputation, specially disavowed any desire to have the affairs of Trinity College included in the reference to the Commission, and the Lord Lieutenant most specifically stated that Trinity College would not be included. If you concede that what you want is not a mixed education inside Trinity College or the exclusion altogether of religious education from Trinity College, you must recognise that the only other alternative, if the affairs of Trinity College are to be included, would be to turn it into a Catholic seminary of some kind, which, I think, no person of sense would suggest. Nothing therefore that could be inquired into in relation to the college could in the slightest degree advance the object which hon. Members opposite and the Bishops of Ireland have in view. I have attempted to put the situation clearly and fairly before the House, and I can only say that, so far as I am concerned, I shall keep the attitude I adopted when I entered the House, and will give any assistance in my power to put within the reach of the great mass of the people of Ireland the benefit of university education.

MR. JOHN GORDON (Londonderry, S.) said he simply desired to express his views in regard to the question of Catholic university education in Ireland as it had been represented to the House and in the form in which it had been put down in the Paper. At first sight there was not much to object to, but when regard was had to the way in which the question had developed, it would be seen that the idea was to have an entirely separate Roman Catholic university in Ireland. As a Member of the Presbyterian religion of Ireland, he wished to give his view in regard to that. The first question which would arise was why the Roman Catholics had not equal facility for university education with the other inhabitants of the country. In Ireland at the present time there was an old university, established for centuries, and whatever might be its past history, everyone knew that it was open to all, no matter what religious belief was professed. If any body desired to have religious education, Trinity College would be delighted to meet them and afford them every facility for obtaining religious instruction. When, under those circumstances, Government were asked to set up a separate Roman Catholic university, it would be wise to consider what underlay the proposals which had been pressed so often, with so much vigour, both within and without this House, for separate denominational education. There was something more than a desire to have a good education. The Queen's Colleges, which had been established on non-sectarian



lines, had been described as godless colleges. The people who sent their children to those colleges had a right to look after the religious training of the members of their own church, and they had appointed persons to look after their religious education; but why should that be paid for by the Government? The Presbyterians of Ireland were satisfied to send their children to the Queen's Colleges to be trained by the clergyman appointed in residence to look after them. Why did not the Roman Catholics do the Same? Directly those colleges were founded they denounced them as godless colleges, and would have nothing to do with them. The college established in Belfast was availed of by the population of Ulster to a very large extent, but the Roman Catholics, instead of making the college in Cork the success which the Belfast college was, which they could easily have done, kept away from it, and now complained that the Protestants had used the colleges and made them useful for their own people, and argued that as the Presbyterians were adequately provided for, they having taken advantage of the colleges placed in their midst, that was an argument for establishing Roman Catholic colleges for the rest of the population. In 1873 an attempt was made to do something for university education in Ireland, and the Royal University was established, upon the lines of the London University, granting degrees as high as any in the world, but having no religious teaching, That had the element of being free and untrammelled, and open to every person who chose to come and take advantage of its degrees. The student was not subjected to any religious test. He was perfectly free to come; and be educated there. Why should there be in Ireland a State-founded and State-endowed university simply for the purpose of satisfying the wishes of one particular religious denomination? In Ireland the people should be, as far as possible, on an equality. The, people should be judged or classed, not according to their religion, and provided for upon that basis, but simply as subjects of the country. Trinity College was perfectly free and open, and religious instruction would be provided for Roman Catholics in exactly the same way as for Protestants. An institution was not denominational simply because, while it was open to all, only one particular section took advantage of it and filled its halls. Other people had a perfect right, and were at liberty to go there and take up the same position. He was not concerned to defend Trinity College to any greater extent than to say that it was open and free. The Queen's Colleges were also open and free, but it was idle to say that those colleges were in any sense to be regarded as godless colleges. Every religion had a right to appoint its dean, and did so, with the exception of the Roman Catholics. It was said that Trinity College belonged to the Episcopalians, and was an Episcopalian university, and that therefore the Catholics required a Catholic university. That Roman Catholic university would have to be endowed, provided for, and equipped by the State. Then there would have to be a Presbyterian university. Where was it to end? Was a university to be provided for all the smaller religious denominations which existed? Every denominational institution had been widening its lines and opening its halls to all students, no matter to what denomination they belonged, and to establish such a university as was now asked for would be a distinctly retrograde step. No parallel could be

found. It was argued that the Scotch universities were Presbyterian. Yes, but they were not Presbyterian in foundation; they were not State-aided Presbyterian institutions. They were established for the benefit of everybody, and it was perfectly true that in Scotland, where the vast majority of the people were Presbyterians, the Presbyterians flocked to the universities. But that was a very different thing from establishing and endowing a university solely for one class of the community. The way in which the question had been argued was very curious. The

hon. Member for Galway had said a great deal about the benefits to be gained by people coming from different parts of the country, interchanging their views, and making friends for themselves for life. The right hon. Gentleman representing Trinity College had referred to the same matter. This was a point which ought not to be lost sight of in dealing with educational questions in Ireland; there were in Ireland quite enough causes of difference, and quite enough matters which created dissension; but why should another be permanently added to the number? Members of one profession worked together, met each other every day, and, although belonging to different religious bodies, had the greatest respect for each other. Why should the sons of these men be sent one, because he belonged to one religious faith, to one university, and another, because he belonged to another religious faith, to another university, to be brought up with feelings of distrust and estrangement existing between them, where all ought to be amity and friendship?

With reference to the proposed Commission, whatever views might be held about Trinity being brought within the scope of the inquiry, if the Commission was to deal with the matter on the broad lines which ought to be laid down, he was unable to see how Trinity College could be excluded. The hon. Member for East Mayo suggested that on the Commission there should be two or three members advocating the one view, two or three supporting the other, and that some poor unfortunate persons who did not care about either should be thrown in to be torn to pieces by the conflicting opinions. He also appeared to imply that it would be impossible to get men of high educational standing, with a knowledge of public affairs, who would be above party and sectarian feelings. He (the speaker) did not believe that that would be the case, and he urged those who would be responsible for selecting the Members of the Commission to endeavour to appoint, not partisans from the one side or the other, but men of acknowledged standing, who would be able when dealing with a question of this kind to put aside mere personal feelings and to treat the subject on broad lines.

As one who knew something of the Protestants of Ireland, he unhesitatingly declared that with the exception of a very few the Protestants were against this proposal. They considered that it would be a step in the wrong direction, that it would accentuate differences which ought to be healed rather than perpetuated, and that, above all, university education in Ireland would suffer by it. In a country with 4,250,000 inhabitants, the vast majority of whom were very poor, it would be a great mistake to have three separate and distinct universities. The degrees of such institutions would cease to carry any weight whatever. Parliament should be careful not to do anything which would encourage

the idea of an endowed separate denominational university in Ireland. [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Except for Protestants.] The Protestants had not asked for an endowment, and where had the Presbyterians got a separate Presbyterian university? They asked nothing for themselves which they did not freely concede to every other man in the country. Hon. Members opposite could not cite a fact or document or an incident in the history of the country which would bear them out in the suggestion they had made. He hoped the House would reject this proposal.

\*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): As an Ulster Member I wish to place before the House of Commons the claims of my Catholic fellow-countrymen upon this question. I could not be satisfied with giving a silent vote upon this occasion. I had not the advantage of hearing the entire speech of the hon. and learned Member who has just sat down, but such portion as I did hear reminded me of the old fable of the dog in the manger. The hon. Member purported to speak on behalf of the Presbyterians of Ireland, and he argued that they did not want a university. But was that any reason why a university should be withheld from the Catholics of Ireland, who do require it? They did not want a university as Presbyterians, because they have already got all the advantages of education through the medium of the Belfast college, but I am not at all sure that a great section of the Presbyterians have not put forward a claim by which they also will get a university as well as

the Catholics. The Presbyterians of Ireland know how to take care of themselves, and my hon. and learned friend evidently had not this historical fact before his mind, that by the Scotch Act of Union the benefit of university education was secured to the Presbyterians of Scotland. They made it a condition when entering into the Treaty of Union, but unfortunately when the Irish Act of Union was passed there was no one to speak on behalf of the Catholics, in order to secure to them the same measure of justice. I cannot believe that the Presbyterians of Ireland are in any way, as a body, averse to the concession of this boon to the Catholics. On the contrary, I believe that those whose opinions are of the greatest weight are altogether in favour of it. I am coming forward to support what I believe to be the least measure of justice that my Irish fellow-countrymen are entitled to, and I am willing to meet this case and argue it quite apart from the case of the Presbyterians. The hon. Member for Galway, in a most admirable maiden speech, which contained a good deal of the hereditary ability of his father, stated that he came forward as the only Catholic Liberal Unionist in the House. [Cries of "No, no."] I believe he called himself a Catholic Liberal Unionist.

MR. RENTOUL (Down, E.): No, the only Catholic Unionist.

\*MR. HEMPHILL: Perhaps he did not call himself a Liberal Unionist, but I thought that all Unionists who were not Tories were proud of being Liberal Unionists, and I understand that the essence of a Liberal Unionist is that he is Liberal in everything except Home Rule. The hon. Member for Galway says that he is the only representative of Catholic Unionism in Ireland. I may say that I am the only representative of what may be called Protestant Liberalism in Ireland. All my friends on both sides are possibly far less Liberal than me, but I happen to be

unique in this, that I am the only Protestant Liberal sent from Ireland to plead the cause of Liberal Protestants in this great assembly. I protest against the hon. and learned Member who has just sat down purporting to speak on behalf of the Liberal Protestants of Ireland.

It is quite fair that he should represent Presbyterians, but he has no authority to say what the feelings of Liberal Protestants in Ireland are with regard to this question. I am a medalist of Trinity College, and I have spent some of the happiest days of my life there, and I join with my youthful friend the Member for Galway in expressing admiration for Trinity College as a great Protestant institution, but only as a Protestant institution. Trinity College was founded to propagate Protestantism in Ireland. It was founded by Queen Elizabeth three centuries ago in order to stamp out and extinguish the Roman Catholic religion, and for nearly three centuries it fulfilled that mission, and it was not until the year 1873 that a single emolument or a single fellowship or scholarship was thrown open to the Catholics. It has been suggested that Catholics, by passing fellowship and scholarship examinations, might partake of the benefits of the institution, but to do this they must un-Catholicise themselves. When I was there there were some eight per cent. of the entire pupils members of the Catholic religion, and I know well that there was a feeling more or less of inequality and humiliation amongst them. Men of the ablest intellects and with the greatest industry saw their Protestant brethren come in for prizes from which they were excluded. It is admitted that though nominally Trinity College is open to Catholics, it is really a Protestant institution. I am not going to trouble the House with many quotations, because I know there are many hon. Members who wish to speak upon this subject. In the year 1891 I was present at the opening meeting of the Historical Society in the hall of Trinity College, where a very distinguished audience assembled, and upon that occasion a very eminent man of great literary qualification, who had been himself a fellow of the college, and who is now a county court judge; I allude to Judge Webb; used these words;

"Their University (said the judge) was founded by Protestants, for Protestants, and in the Protestant interest. A Protestant spirit had from the first animated every member of the body corporate At the present moment, with all its toleration, all its liberality, all its comprehensiveness, and all its scrupulous honour, the genius loci, the guardian spirit of the place, was Protestant. And as a Protestant

he for one said, and he said it boldly, Protestant might it ever more remain."

That was his opinion of the Protestantism at Trinity College. Upon the same occasion Lord Justice Fitzgibbon, who was then, and happily still is now, one of the greatest ornaments of the Irish Bench, said;

"They in that University claimed to be proud of their college and content with their University. Their work challenged competition; it therefore should be free from disturbance. But if it was to be made safe from disturbance, it should rest on the foundation of justice, and that could only be laid by the States providing for others what Queen Elizabeth and King James and their own conscientious discharge of their duty for three hundred years had provided for

that place."

That is from a Protestant Unionist; a man of the greatest eminence among living Irishmen. Now that is all they ask. We, the Presbyterians, are satisfied with the status quo as regards Trinity College, but three-quarters of the Irish people are Roman Catholic, and they demand to have what they are fairly entitled to; a university in which their youth may matriculate and graduate without any scruple or fear of having their faith shaken or disturbed. One of the great fallacies is that Dublin College is, as at present constituted, sufficient to satisfy the wants of the Irish people. Reference has again been made to Scotland. Scotland has a population even now of much less than Ireland, low as the population of the latter is at this moment, and yet Scotland has the Universities of Edinburgh, St. Andrews, Glasgow, and Aberdeen. All these universities are largely endowed. I do not know whether they are at the present moment endowed by original grants from the Crown, like the case of Trinity College, but undoubtedly the fact is that each has considerable endowments. I quote now from the title "University" in the Encyclopædia Britannica, which we know is a work of singular authority; "The sums voted annually or charged on the Consolidated Fund for the ten years ending 30th March, 1883, were for Aberdeen, £65,821; for Edinburgh, £85,906; for Glasgow, £66,182; and St. Andrews, £38,111. In addition to these sums Edinburgh had received £80,000 and Glasgow £20,000 in the form of grants in aid."

Why should Ireland be in a worse position than Scotland for the sons of farmers and small shopkeepers? If there was nothing else to render the demand of the Irish people unanswerable it is that the people were too poor at present to compete with those who are in the habit of sending their sons to Trinity College. I think that is what the hon. Member for Galway meant, in that I would be inclined to agree with him. I want that a young Irishman who may be in a very humble position, who may not be endowed with the gifts of fortune, should have the portals of a university thrown open to him, where he could enter without fear and without scruple. I know that Trinity College can now admit other colleges to be affiliated with it, but I, as an Irishman, having had considerable experience of various shades of life and society in that country, am satisfied that the true and best solution of this question is to start a university, de novo, constituted on the lines to which attention has been called by the hon. Member for the Brightside Division, who marred an interesting and liberal speech by an unnecessary attack on my friends below the gangway (the Nationalist Members). Perhaps if he had been Irish, and if he had been brought up with the antecedents of some of my friends below the gangway, if he had been brought up in the traditions of a persecuted race, he would have had a more sympathetic feeling for the position in which they are placed.

MR. JAMES HOPE: What I said was that hon. Members opposite were spoiling a good case.

\*MR. HEMPHILL: I am sure that no one now regrets the observations into which he was betrayed more than the hon. Member himself. If I wanted an argument in favour of my position I would refer to the fact that amongst the Gentlemen

occupying the benches below the gangway are some of the keenest intellects in this House, and some of the most eloquent speakers in this House. Everyone who has been watching the proceedings of the House since the opening of the present Parliament must admit that I am right in what I am saying and yet very few of them have had the opportunity of graduating in a university. Why should such men be

placed under circumstances that deprive them of the advantage of university education? We all go on the postulate that there is great value and importance to be attached to university degrees. Why exclude any class of clever, intelligent Irishmen from attaining that position? Why prevent the priesthood of Ireland from being armed with a university degree? I would like to appeal to the sense of justice, to the love of fair play; which, however, in some instances it may be overlaid with political prejudice or religious bigotry, is, I believe, the bedrock of the English nature; not to withhold this advantage from three or four millions of the Irish people. It will cost very little. The conditions read out by the hon. Member show that it is not a Roman Catholic university that is sought but a university into which Roman Catholics may enter, a university not presided over by a man who has brought his great talent and genius to bear in the polemical controversy between the Church of Rome and the Church of Ireland, to the disparagement of the former.

\*MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, E.): In the course of the debates which have taken place on this question in previous sessions we have not had much enlightenment as to the real character of the organisation of the university proposed to be set up, for both on this side of the House and on the other side the supporters of this project have carefully abstained from departing from the platform of vague generalities, and from defining in clear and precise language what are the limitations by which this new university is to be established and maintained as an undenominational institution, and at the same time to be impregnated with the Roman Catholic atmosphere. But though we have only got so far as to understand that Roman Catholic atmosphere is an essential, if not the most essential, feature of this university, and though we have not yet been informed by what machinery this Catholic atmosphere is to be generated, the debates which have taken place have not been altogether without some real value, for the House is now in possession of the general facts bearing on the question at large, which cannot be overlooked in dealing with the nebulous proposal placed before Parliament. We in the first place know that in England Roman Catholics go to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge with the fullest sanction of the spiritual authority of their Church; and we know that neither the organisation, nor the Government, nor the curriculum of these universities differs in any distinctive feature from the University of Dublin. We know, moreover, that in foreign countries Roman Catholic students go to universities which are as little under the control of the clergy of the Church of Rome as the Queen's colleges in Ireland; and that in no foreign country does the State provide specially for the university education of Roman Catholics. We further know that in Roman Catholic countries, such as Spain and Bavaria, institutions founded and endowed by the Roman Catholic Church have now been secularised. It

is plain from all this that this proposal is one that cannot be substantiated by any appeal to the condition of affairs in foreign countries, and that the Roman Catholic Church and bishops in Ireland are now endeavouring to obtain from this Parliament what they have not been able to obtain from any legislative authority or assembly in Europe. There is another fact which we cannot overlook, and that is that members of the Roman Catholic Church have been in the habit of taking advantage of the facilities for university education that are afforded in Ireland; and it has never even been suggested in this House, in any debate, that any one of these students have been seduced from the faith of their Church. COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I knew one.

\*MR. MACARTNEY: I will give the hon. and gallant Member an opportunity afterwards of substantiating his case; but I say that there has been no suggestion that any Roman Catholic student has been seduced from the faith of his Church;[An HON. MEMBER on the Irish Benches: There have been several.];or has suffered the slightest inconvenience from the atmosphere of Trinity College The hon. Member for

Galway spoke of Trinity College being the symbol of Protestant ascendancy, but what has it done for his distinguished father? It has promoted him to the highest offices, and that distinguished peer felt so much the benefit of the education he himself had received at Trinity College that he sent there not only the hon. Member, but the hon. Member's younger brother.

\*MR. MORRIS: I said that there was no alternative, if a Catholic student wanted to follow a university career in Ireland.

\*MR. MACARTNEY: My argument is that there was no danger to the faith of either his father, himself, or his brother. That is a material fact which this House cannot overlook, and I submit that the House must come to the conclusion that if it were not for some special and peculiar pressure exercised by the bishops in Ireland, the laity would take larger advantage of the facilities that are offered by Trinity College, just as the laity do in Italy, Germany, Spain, Bavaria, and other Roman Catholic countries. These being the facts, let us see how far we have got in formulating any definite proposals for this scheme. The Leader of the House, the First Lord of the Treasury, said in the month of February, 1898, that

"the Roman Catholic bishops would be content that any new educational institution in Ireland should be placed under the same limitations;no less and no more;that now exist in the universities of England and Scotland."

Well, if it were desirable to multiply universities in Ireland;a policy which is extremely doubtful, having regard to the population of the country;there would, in my opinion, be no great objection to a university which was founded and organised upon that general preposition. But my right hon. friend went on to point out very clearly in the rest of his speech that that was a mere phrase, that it had no real meaning, and that it did not touch the essence of the policy of which he himself was a supporter. And he went on to say that;

"of course it is the essence of the case that the college or university should be founded upon such lines as would make it Roman Catholic in the same sense that Trinity College is Protestant: and that you must do that or you will fail

in your policy."

Now here there is a cleavage of the most profound character; a cleavage between the system of the English universities and Trinity College and this new university-proposed to be set up; a cleavage which separates them entirely and distinctly. The atmosphere of the English universities is not the product of legislation; but you have at once a forewarning from my right hon. friend that by legislation you are going to impress upon this new university an atmosphere, an organisation which is something absolutely and entirely different from anything which exists in any English university, or in the university of Dublin. Well, it is plain that this must be carried out with some limitations. What these limitations are the House is absolutely ignorant. My right hon. friend has never told us what he proposed to do in regard to them. These limitations are still shrouded in a mass of vague generalities, and it is not to my right hon. friend, but to the Front Bench opposite, that the House is indebted for coming more closely in touch with the question. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose Burghs in the same debate laid down five different conditions which were essential to any scheme to which he would give support in the future. These were: First, that there was to be no test for any chair except that of theology; second, no test for any student; third, no student was to be shut out from any competition on account of his religion; fourth, there was to be no State endowment of the theological faculty; and fifth, the most important of all, that the governing body was to be nominated by this House, and afterwards replenished by the Crown.

MR. DILLON: No, no.

\*MR. MACARTNEY: These are the conditions laid down by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose Burghs. What we have now to consider is how they approach the ideal of Catholic education in Ireland. That matter has been pronounced upon by one of the bishops of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in a clear and unmistakeable note. The Bishop of Limerick said, in regard to the conditions formulated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose Burghs; "It must be evident to the least informed person that an institution constituted under

these five conditions cannot be regarded as a Catholic university in the true sense of the word. &#x2026; In a Catholic university the authority of the Pope would be supreme, and reach directly and indirectly every part of its organisation and pervade and inform its operation. He would grant its charter and sanction its degrees. All its intellectual life would be carried on under ecclesiastical supervision and control."

Now, that is a perfectly clear and frank definition of what the atmosphere of a Roman Catholic university should be.

MR. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman is making a mistake. The reverend bishop went on to say that he would accept such a university as was proposed by the right hon. the Member for Montrose Burghs.

\*MR. MACARTNEY: If any hon. Gentleman goes to the Library and looks up the Nineteenth Century for January, 1899, he can satisfy himself whether I am not actually quoting the words of the Bishop of Limerick. This is a perfectly frank



exposition of what ought to be the atmosphere of a Roman Catholic university, and which cannot be created under the conditions postulated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose Burghs. Here we have, on the one side, the ideal of the Catholic bishops, and on the other side the makeshift presented by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose Burghs. I ask the House, Does anyone suppose that the Catholic bishops of Ireland are going to withdraw from their ideal, or that they would rest for a moment until the new university would be so pervaded and so leavened in its constitution that the whole of the intellectual life of the university would in the future be under ecclesiastical control and authority? Anyone who has watched the Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland will know that that is the inevitable result of the policy of my right hon. friend, however he may have intended otherwise. I ask how does this policy stand now? Is it a policy of developing in Ireland a university as we know it in this country, or as carried on on the Continent? Nothing of the sort; on the contrary, it is diametrically the opposite. It is a policy which proposes to create an atmosphere, and when it has created that atmosphere to endow such an educational system as this atmosphere will not smother. As it has been very appropriately named, it is a policy of social expediency, because it undoubtedly prefers the bye-ways of political convenience to the ethics of education. This policy aims at destroying and limiting all the real elements of university life, until they are lowered to the level demanded by the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland. The right hon. Member for Montrose has gone as far as he could to try and meet the demand of his supporters below the gangway. The right hon. Gentleman said his policy was justified, because it was accepted by three late Chief Secretaries for Ireland, a most dangerous triumvirate. There are no persons whom the House ought to be more chary of following in a question of this sort. I will accept, for the purposes of argument, that the First Lord of the Treasury may be a most bigoted Protestant; but, if so, he is the last person to be entrusted with this problem, because fanatics of this description have a dangerous tendency to go from one extreme to the other. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose said he was opposed to clericalism, but in Irish matters he invariably capitulates to its forces, and, therefore, I hope the House will not accept the arguments of these three gentlemen, though they be ex-Chief Secretaries. It has been argued that there is a difference between a Roman Catholic university and a university for Roman Catholics. There is a difference, but it is only a difference of phraseology; in either case it is evident, from the statement of the Bishop of Limerick, that there must be what the Bishop calls ample security that the teaching will not be contrary to the principles of the institution. We have been told that the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland have accepted four out of five conditions laid down by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose, and that we may quite accept this as a justification for this policy, but I do not admit that at all. Two of those conditions are absolutely immaterial. The faculty of theology we know is to be in this university. The Bishop of Limerick has told us that it is to be the principal factor in creating a Roman Catholic atmosphere. Nothing appears to me to be more

ridiculous than the affectation of unsectarianism which this proviso covers. This university must of necessity be under the control of the dominant theological faculty, and, just in order to enable the supporters of this policy to say the Government have not endowed the Roman Catholic Church, they have omitted to endow the faculty which is to control the study and teaching of the university. We are told also that the Roman Catholic bishops have consented to a majority of laymen, who must of necessity be Roman Catholics, being on the governing body. Under these circumstances, it is a matter which is absolutely immaterial whether the governing body is to be lay or clerical. A whisper from the Bishop of Limerick would govern all the Roman Catholic laity in Ireland; [Cries of

"Withdraw" from the Irish Benches.]

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; If the hon. Gentleman had said anything which required to be withdrawn, I should have called upon him to withdraw it.

\*MR. MACARTNEY: The Bishop of Limerick would govern all the Roman Catholic laity of Ireland when anything occurred to affect the faith and morals of the Church.

I say that these provisions which are put forward as security for undenominationalism in this university are absolutely unsubstantial. The Roman Catholic bishops know that they are unreal and empty, and therefore have no hesitation in accepting the makeshift that is put forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Montrose.

What is to be the result of this policy? At the age when university education begins for every Irishman you are going to divide my countrymen into two or three separate universities. The Roman Catholics are to go to this new university; the Presbyterians are to be taken by the neck and flung into the university at Belfast, and the Episcopalians are to go to Dublin. Just at the age when one is most likely to form those friendships and those acquaintances which do so much to soften the bitterness of political or religious feelings in after life you are going to take away every chance of this being done, and are going to perpetuate in Ireland in connection with higher education that unfortunate division which has been countenanced already in primary education. Yet my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury and the supporters of this policy affect to believe that this is going to benefit Ireland. The very class in Ireland upon whom the future of the country depends most is to be separated forcibly if this proposal passes, and is to be driven into three camps at a time when the students are most open to form those friendships which, as I have said, do so much to soften the bitterness of political and religious differences of after life. I can only say I look upon this policy of separation with absolute horror, and I say to treat the education of Ireland as a question of social expediency is unworthy of this House. The hon. Member for Stow-market will probably say this is a question of ancient prejudice. He presented himself to the House last year as the product of Scotch porridge and the national covenant, and he implored us all to divest ourselves of ancient prejudices, but he did not convince me. He, like Jacob, is emphatically a smooth man. This scheme has been presented to the House with many plausible representations, but none more plausible than that of the Solicitor

General, who speaks with great authority on this matter. The Solicitor General said, "Let them start with what the Catholics offered to accept, namely, what the Protestants have got." What have the Protestants got in Ireland?

COLONEL NOLAN: What have the Catholics got?

\*MR. MACARTNEY: Trinity College, Dublin, which is the principal university, was open to students of every religion, and its fellowships and governing body were open to persons of every religion. The governing body is not under the control of the bishops of the Irish Church or the Presbyterian Assembly, and it is quite possible to conceive that the Professor of Divinity at Trinity College, Dublin, might in his lectures teach theology repugnant to the prevailing opinions of the bishops of the Irish Church and of the General Assembly.

SIR EDWARD CARSON: That is not the case. The test applied.

\*MR. MACARTNEY: But the Professor of Divinity might survive the test, and having changed his opinions deliver any lecture he chose. I adhere to my opinion. The Professor of Divinity might deliver lectures which were repugnant to the bishops of the Irish Church, but they would not have the slightest control over him.

There is now a very strong feeling of dissatisfaction in certain sections of the Irish Church with regard to the teaching given by the professor at Trinity College. Is that the kind of university governing body which the Roman Catholic bishops are prepared to accept? This is one of the plausible forms in which this question is presented to the House, a form which when tested by examination fails entirely. There is no foundation for the argument of my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury, that because the primary education of Ireland is denominational so far as three-fourths of the country is concerned, the House ought to agree to a denominational university. Whether the schools are Protestant, Presbyterian, or Roman Catholic, the general teaching is undenominational, and I regret most strongly that the principle of unmixed schools has taken such a hold on the primary education of the country, and I cannot admit that having gone so far in the wrong direction in regard to primary education is any ground for applying to the higher education of the country a system which, in my opinion, is absolutely wrong. The proposal of the hon. Gentleman has the support of only one class in Ireland, and I fail to find that in that class there is any large majority which goes in for higher education. This is not a question merely of Trinity College; it is a question affecting the whole of the higher education of Ireland. All the graduates of the Royal University of Ireland are unanimously against this policy. On the 25th of June, 1900, there was a meeting of the graduates at which the following resolution was passed;

"We reaffirm our conviction that the establishment of State-endowed universities under sectarian control is repugnant not only to the fixed principles of modern educational policy, but also to the teaching of universal experience, and, being detrimental to the best interests of higher education, cannot be made the basis of a satisfactory settlement of the Irish university question."

That is the voice of educated Ireland, and the House may listen to it or it may not, but it is as much entitled to a sympathetic hearing in this House as the councils of social expediency. If you do not listen to the voice of educated

Ireland, how are you to be certain that this policy will succeed? Are you certain that the policy of my right hon. friend will settle all these difficulties? I have here the words of Dr: Alexander Dempsey, who wrote this letter to the Freeman's Journal in March last;

"Those who expect the Catholics of Belfast and the north of Ireland generally to be, satisfied with a college in Dublin to supply all their requirements for university education know little of the feeling of the people. The Catholics of this enterprising progressive city will not send their sons to Dublin where they have no friends or business relatives of any kind."

And he went on to postulate the demands of the Roman Catholics for the establishment of Roman Catholic university colleges in convenient centres throughout the country. The policy of social expediency is a long lane, the end of which no man can see, and we may rest assured if we once endow a denominational college in Dublin we shall have to go on endowing denominational colleges all over Ireland. As to the proposal to appoint a Royal Commission, no one will object to a Royal Commission investigating this subject in the fullest possible manner, but I cannot understand why Trinity or Maynooth College should be excluded from the purview of the Commission. If such exceptions are allowed, it can only end in the demolition of the scaffold upon which this policy has been erected. In the formation of this Commission I trust my right hon. friend will exclude from it everybody connected with education in Ireland. That is perfectly fair to all sides, but if my right hon. friend supposes he is going to obtain from the Commission a report upon which he can act, he is a much more sanguine man than my experience of Irish affairs would lead me to believe. It may be that the Commission is intended as only a stepping-stone, or an excuse, for the Government to carry out their policy. If that be so, I warn the Leader of the House that he cannot expect that its recommendations will be received with anything but the

most suspicious scrutiny. I cannot imagine why a Commission should be appointed at all, unless it is to inform the Lord Lieutenant, who seems to be one of the most uninformed persons in Ireland on education. It would have been much better for the Lord Lieutenant and his party if he had left the question alone. There have been useful Lords Lieutenants before him, who have been quite as successful, and who have failed in their attempt to deal with this problem. If ever this policy is carried out, the universities cannot but be deeply impregnated with a Roman Catholic atmosphere.

\*MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down has made a most interesting speech, one point of which it is very important to consider, which was that in no foreign country could we find university education so endowed. That was a curious statement, and shows that the right hon. Gentleman could not have regarded the university education system of the British colonies. I approach this question with all the greater feeling because, unlike the majority of my fellow Nationalists, I have had the advantage of a varied university education, having attended the universities at London, Bonn, and Oxford; and it is exactly because I have had this advantage that I can feel what it is for my fellow-countrymen to be deprived of the advantage of education in

their own country. In the British colonies we find that the position of the Catholics is recognised, and that there is what we call State endowment for universities for them. Last year, three weeks after the debate which took place on this question, a Parliamentary Paper was published showing the way in which university education was carried out in the British colonies, and within the last few days two volumes of Reports have been published by the Board of Education which add to the strength of my argument on this point. Let me quote from the introduction of Mr. Sadler;

"The chief characteristic of education throughout the British colonies is the freedom with which it has been allowed to adjust itself to the different needs experienced by different parts of the Empire. There has been no centralised control over educational policy, though literary and other traditions, have naturally had a strong influence on the scope and methods of instruction. The educational systems, as described in these volumes, are marked by the utmost variety of legislative enactment."

That is introductory to the whole of the volumes. Now let me come down to specific instances, and first; New South Wales. It will be found on page 2 of the Parliamentary Paper, page 239, Vol. 5, Education Report.

"In 1854, an Act of Legislature of New South Wales was passed to provide for the establishment and endowment of colleges within the University of Sydney. The preamble of the Act is as follows: 'Whereas it is expedient to encourage and assist the establishment within the University of Sydney (of colleges), in which systematic religious instruction and domestic supervision with efficient assistance in preparing for the university, teachers and examiners shall be provided for the students of the university, be it therefore enacted, etc. This Act provides, under certain conditions, for a grant from the Government of not less than £10,000 nor more than £20,000 for building purposes, in each case provided that an equal amount shall be raised by private subscriptions; and also for a grant of £500 per annum in perpetuity for the payment of the principal of each college."

The point I wish to come to is that, under that Act, the four Churches or religious denominations are the United Church of England and Ireland, the Church of Rome, the Church of Scotland, and the religious society denominated Wesleyan Methodists. I speak from personal experience. I visited this university, and have seen the particular college erected for the Catholics, and the Catholics of New South Wales are satisfied with the provision made.

Now I turn to the case of Canada (page 13, Parliamentary Paper; page 211, vol. 4, Education Report);

"The Laval University was founded in 1852 (two years previous to the founding of the Catholic University in Dublin by Cardinal, then Dr., Newman) by the Seminary of Quebec at the request of the Bishops of Lower Canada. The aim was to throw open to the French Catholic population an institute of higher education capable of equalling in importance those frequented by persons of other languages and religion. The then Governor of Canada, Lord Elgin, and his ministers wrote: 'We have no hesitation in acknowledging the justice and propriety of securing to the numerous and important body of Catholics in Canada the benefit of a University

of which they have been until now deprived."

Could anything more exactly fit the case of Ireland? This happened fifty years ago, but the Catholics of Ireland are still in the position then occupied by the Catholics of Canada. And with reference to the branch of the university established at Montreal, I find (page 18 of the Paper, page 214 of the Report) that there is a Government grant of 20,000 dollars distributed amongst the faculties

of law and medicine, general administration, and the polytechnic and veterinary schools. This is in the case of a university solely for Roman Catholics. I come now to the third case; that of Malta; an important case, because it resembles Ireland in that by far the greater proportion of its population is Catholic.

According to the Report;

"It appears that 99 per cent. of the people of these island are Roman Catholics, and that the instruction imparted in the University and in all Government Educational Institutions in this Colony is based on Roman Catholic principles."

I further find that for the year 1899 the expenditure provided for in the Annual Estimates for the university; attended solely by Catholics; was over £4,000.

Here, then, are three colonies in which the university education is carried out in a way which is entirely agreeable to the religious opinions of the Catholics.

Two of those colonies are self-governing, and the other is a Crown Colony. You say you have undertaken to govern Ireland better than she would do it herself.

If that is so, you have a double responsibility cast upon you. In your self-governing colonies the just claims of Catholics are recognised; in Ireland no provision is made for such recognition, and you pursue a totally different policy from that adopted in the colonies. It has been said that the Irish priesthood cannot compare with the clergy in other countries. In reference to this matter I cannot help quoting an article which appears in the current issue of the Edinburgh Review, dealing very largely with this particular question of Catholic university education, as it affects the priesthood of Ireland.

"It is remarkable," says the writer, "that a State like Prussia, which is mainly Protestant, not only supports Catholic theological faculties in mixed universities, such as Bonn and Breslau, but also subsidises the Academy at Münster and the Lyceum at Braunsberg, which are practically entirely devoted to training candidates for the Catholic priesthood."

The writer further goes on to say;

"It is remarkable that at Bonn and Tübingen there is a Protestant as well as a Catholic theological faculty working side by side apparently without hostility or friction. This university training may account for the fact that the Catholic clergy in Germany have amply shared in the general intellectual activity of their country during the quarter of a century."

In the debate last year special reference was made to the reports from foreign countries with regard to university education, showing that the Catholics in those countries are satisfied with the facilities afforded to them. It therefore is not necessary for me to go into that point, but I should like to point out that Catholics abroad have everything they want in the way of university education. It is admitted that they are successful. We are always told that the

Catholics of Germany have taken a high intellectual position, and we agree. Is it not a curious fact that you will not look into the case, and see that it is exactly because you do not give the Catholics of Ireland the fullest educational privileges that you are able to bring forward charges of a certain lack of culture; charges which are very difficult to refute, because the position is due to a lack of educational facilities? Sir Francis Bacon wrote in his letter to Lord Burghley, "I have taken all knowledge to be my province." If one man had taken all knowledge to be his province, surely a university should take all knowledge to be its province, and it is precisely because Dublin University has not done so that we come before you to-night and claim that you must enlarge the university facilities in Ireland. We have been told to-night that there is no reason to inquire into the case of Trinity College, but I consider that there is every reason for so doing. Remember, we on this side have no responsibility whatever for this Commission; but I would point out that this is not a question of merely founding a Catholic university, or a difficulty of which there is no other possible solution. Such is far from being the case. The Archbishop of Dublin, in a letter to the Dublin Daily Express, on November 16th, 1900, repeating the declaration of the Irish Hierarchy on this subject in 1871, points out that there are three possible solutions of the difficulty. He says; "I have not concealed my personal preference for the settlement of our University question on the basis (1) of one National university for Ireland, a university, of course so constructed as to provide the maximum of possible freedom for all its colleges. Failing that, a settlement on the basis (2) of the establishment of a second college in the University of Dublin has always seemed to me a good solution of the problem." And yet the Catholics of Ireland are charged with being veiled in their demands&#x0021;

"Both these lines of settlement have over and over again been considered at meetings of

our Episcopal Body, with the result that both have been regarded as satisfactory. But the preference undoubtedly has always been given to (3) that form of settlement which was originally claimed in Cardinal Cullen's time, that is, the establishment of a separate University for Catholics."

There are, therefore, three possible solutions of the question admitted by the Irish hierarchy, the second of which contemplates the establishment of a second college in Dublin University. If, however, Trinity College is excluded from this inquiry, how will it be possible to come to a satisfactory conclusion upon that proposal?

There are many other points to which I should like to refer, but, as several other Members desire to speak, I will mention only one. There is an educational movement going on in Ireland which is not thoroughly appreciated in this country, and one of which Trinity College; the only existing university in Ireland, the Royal University is a sham; has taken no notice. I refer to the revival of our national language. How can a university claim to be in any sense a national university which ceases to regard the movements of the people? How could Oxford University have ever claimed to be a national university if it had

not been thoroughly representative of the people and the great movements of the time? The great Tractarian Movement in the middle of the century is a case in point. But in regard to Dublin University we find nothing of the sort. A university which takes no interest in, or, as an hon. Member tells me, attacks a movement of such educational value as the Gaelic revival, cannot possibly be regarded as a national university. I would conclude by reminding the House that in the colonies this question has been treated as one of equity. Come nearer home, and look upon this claim of Irish Catholics as one which is at least deserving of as full and careful consideration as in any of your colonies, because we are older than any of them.

\*MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): The hon. Member who has just spoken has made a speech showing how the mind of young Ireland is moving on this question. Earlier in the debate we had another interesting maiden speech. The hon. Member for Galway, who made a brilliant first appearance, took his side with the majority of his fellow-countrymen.

He told us he was a Unionist. Until he spoke to-night I wondered how he contrived to get returned for a city which I conceived to be rooted in a creed of a different kind. After I had listened to his speech I felt that he at least had shown how it was possible to be permeated by the doctrine of governing Ireland according to Irish ideas. I congratulate him upon his brilliant speech, and I hope we shall have many more such interventions in this debate.

There is one thing in the course of this debate which I confess has struck me with astonishment, and I wish to refer to it because I think it has an important bearing upon the form the reference to the Royal Commission must assume. The motion before the House affirms two propositions which are distinct. The second one, important as it is, is the grievance which the Irish Catholic population are suffering under the existing system of education. The earlier part of the motion affirms a proposition which no speaker deems it worth while to deal with, and that is that the provision of education of the university type in Ireland is wholly inadequate. Is that a proposition which anybody in this House can controvert? I am not an Irish representative, but I have followed this question with keen interest, and I have studied these matters in Ulster and Belfast and upon the spot, and nothing has struck me so much as the total inadequacy of the speeches of the representatives of Ulster to represent the real grievance. The right hon. Gentleman who sits on the Front Bench below the gangway addressed this House as if there was really no question except one between Catholics and those who thought Catholic demands ought not to be granted. The right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh, who spoke earlier in the debate, took exactly the same line. They ask, What is the justification for this motion? They do not seem to be aware of what the position of Ireland is in this respect as compared with the rest of the United Kingdom. Ireland has one single teaching university. It has colleges, but for every one college it has got you can point to three in this country. Ireland has one teaching university for a population of 5,000,000, whereas Scotland, with the same population, has four, England has seven, and Germany, with a population of 50,000,000, has twenty-two, besides almost innumerable technical schools of university rank. At the present



moment Queen's College, Belfast, is making an effort to raise money to put itself in an adequate position, the funds with which it is endowed being totally inadequate. Thus the only college of the kind in the middle, of a great commercial city finds itself in such a position that it is not able to carry out its functions efficiently. The success of the industries of large cities depend upon the application of skill, knowledge, and of science. Any of the small insignificant German towns would put Belfast in the shade in this respect. Not long ago, through the courtesy of the authorities, I made a study of the technical institution at Berlin. This institution, which ought to have something corresponding to it in the Queen's College, Belfast, gives instruction in shipbuilding, in the application of chemistry to various industries, and in many sciences, and sends out 2,000 students annually, whom employers are glad to secure, and to the ablest of whom they give premiums for their inventions. It is a scandal that the industrial industries of the north of Ireland have not instruction of this type. A Royal Commission is to be appointed, and I share the misgivings of the hon. Member for East Mayo as to the utility of this. It is no new question. Sixty years ago Sir Robert Peel took the matter in hand and founded the Queen's colleges, and there have been innumerable inquiries and discussions since. I should have thought that a Government with a powerful majority could have offered something less jejune than a Royal Commission.: It is not long ago since the First Lord of the Treasury expressed his own opinion upon this question in an admirable letter, in which he vindicated the claims of Ireland with great courage. He put forward a scheme for two new universities, one for the north, in Belfast, and another for the south, in Dublin, which might form the basis for the general principles. Why not first lay down the general principles, and then appoint a statutory Commission to give effect to them, as was done in the case of the London University? It was for the Government to determine the principles.

Assuming that this Commission is going to be an accomplished fact, it is important that we should realise what the position in Ireland at this moment really is. There are at present three colleges; one in Galway, one in Cork, and one in Belfast; having an endowment of about £10,000 a year each. Galway educates a little over 100 students, Cork 200, and Belfast about 400, although Belfast used to educate more. The case of Belfast has been grossly neglected in this debate. I wish to emphasise the fact that the grievance which the House is invited to remedy is a Protestant grievance as much as a Catholic grievance. The Catholics constitute the majority, but you cannot leave out of account the important Protestant grievance. What is the position of Queen's College, Belfast? Until the year 1880 these three colleges constituted what is known as the Queen's University, which examined students and gave degrees to them. In 1880 the administration of Lord Beaconsfield took a very remarkable step. To begin with, it abolished the Queen's University, and constituted the Royal University as a mere examining board. But in the next place, while professing to do this, and this only, it founded a number of Fellowships of £400 a year apiece, with the intention that a large number of them should be assigned to the Roman Catholic

University College in Dublin. That was a Jesuit institution, and by this step Catholic endowment was brought about through a back door. With regard to the Jesuit Institution, he had seen something of its work, which would do credit to some much better-endowed institutions. It has a substantial endowment, and the income goes into the common fund. But it has got something more. It has a large influence in regard to the examination of the Royal Irish University. Its teachers are, in many cases, examiners. I hear from all quarters that the Queen's College students feel the injustice of this, and the disadvantage at which they are placed as compared with the students of the University College in competing in the examinations of the Royal Irish University. The result is that in Belfast there is a very real grievance felt in the advantage which the Jesuit College possesses over the colleges in other parts of Ireland. In that condition of things, what is the prospect which the Government has to face? The plan of the First Lord of the Treasury seems to me to be an admirable one. He proposed to constitute two universities, one for the north and the other for the south of Ireland. They were to take the place of the Royal Irish University, and they were to be teaching universities just as much as the London University, which includes King's and University Colleges. The new university in the north was to have its seat in Belfast, and would take in as colleges, not only the Queen's College, but probably the Magee College in Londonderry, and some of the teachers of the training college at Belfast. In the south the university was to have its seat in Dublin, and would have embraced certain of the teaching bodies in the south of Ireland. That was an intelligible policy, and why was it objected to? It was objected to upon the ground that inevitably the government of the university in the north would become in the main Protestant, while that in Dublin would become Catholic. I think that was very likely to be so. You cannot avoid it in a country where denominationalism permeates every institution. In Ireland undenominational education means the equal treatment of all denominations, and nothing more.

When people like myself have to choose between no education at all and education which is denominational, I for my part much prefer that there should be denominational education; as little denominational as possible; but education I must have of some kind. It is idle for people to come here and ask, Why cannot Catholics go to Protestant colleges, or to colleges with no religious features about them? The answer is that Catholics will not go, and I do not see why they should be punished for refusing. The House is dealing with a country where four-fifths of the people are Catholics, and how is it possible to set their tenets at naught? Distinguished members of the Catholic Church in Ireland have told me that they do not ask for an atmosphere in which the teaching should be directly Catholic, but for this as a minimum; an atmosphere into which they could send their sons and daughters with some certainty that they would not be exposed to influences which would undermine their Catholic faith; they would rather have influences that were Anglican, Baptist, or Plymouth Brother than the influence of Agnosticism. You may agree or disagree, but it is a perfectly intelligible proposition. When you go to the North you find an equal demand on the part of the great Presbyterian organisations which exist there.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland has taken an active part in this matter, and it has sent forth resolutions from time to time absolutely condemning the attitude of the right hon. Gentleman.

\*MR. MACARTNEY: The hon. Gentleman should quote them.

\*MR. HALDANE: I have read half a score of them, pointing out that the existing university education is absolutely unsatisfactory.

\*MR. MACARTNEY: I never said it was satisfactory. I was arguing against that particular fallacy.

\*MR. HALDANE: Now at last the right hon. Gentleman stands forth as a repentant sinner. The important point is that education of a university type, for Protestants and Catholics alike, is, so far as Ireland is concerned, totally unsatisfactory. There has been before the country for some time past a definite and perfectly clear view of what the situation is from the university point of view in Ireland. You have also to recognise that there has been a proposition put forward of a perfectly specific and definite order for remedying the difficulties existing there. I have seen no reason to doubt that by far the best scheme is that which, to his credit, will ever be associated with the name of the First Lord of the Treasury. I regret that the colleagues of the right hon. Gentleman in the Government do not show the same courage that he showed. With a majority of 140 on a matter which has been thought out and debated they thought it necessary to appoint a Royal Commission; This is not the way to get anything done, and I do not think anything will come of a Royal Commission. Apparently the Government regard Trinity College as like the Ark of the Covenant; that he who laid a hand upon it would surely perish. There is a real and substantial grievance to be dealt with, and it must be dealt with according to Irish ideas, and not according to British prejudices.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester E.): Every Member of the House who was a Member of it in the last Parliament is aware that I have on several occasions had to address speeches to it on the important subject before us now; and my views, which are personal views, and which do not commit my colleagues, as they were never intended to commit my colleagues, have so often been laid before this Assembly that I do not think it necessary or desirable to attempt to traverse the whole ground or cover all the issues which are raised by the resolution on the Paper. I am rather struck by the fact that but few English or Scottish Members have risen to oppose the motion. I do not wish to emphasise that fact, or to suggest for an instant that it indicates that there is anything like unanimity or general approval on either side of the House with regard to the motion. But I do think it indicates the fact that it is not very easy to argue that the needs of Irish education; for that is the fundamental point which we have to consider; are not of a kind which require the intervention of this House, or some further assistance than this House has yet been able to give. Do not let it be understood that I underrate the natural reluctance and objection which an Assembly in the main Protestant may feel towards the proposals which I or others have from time to time recommended for solving this problem. I do not underrate those objections. They are natural, and they suggest themselves without difficulty to the electors of English and Scottish

constituencies. And yet I am persuaded that they are objections which have in them no real weight or substance. My right hon. friend the Member for South Antrim quoted a statement of mine which I confess I had forgotten, but which I am quite ready to acknowledge if he fathers it upon me, that I am a person of bigoted Protestant tendencies; and he doubted whether the bigotry or, at any rate, the quality of my Protestantism was not open to some serious question. Let us just consider that point. My right hon. friend and those who think with him have two objections to a scheme for giving further facilities for the higher education of Roman Catholics in Ireland. The first is a political objection, the second is an

educational objection. Now, the political objection is that the Roman Catholic Church, as its history tells us, in Ireland and elsewhere, has not only been a great religious organisation, but also a great religious organisation which has intervened very powerfully in politics in a manner in which my right hon. friend and I agree, in many cases at all events, in deeply deploring. Granted that; I am speaking in the character of the bigoted Protestant of my right hon. friend; how is the proposal of giving higher education to Roman Catholics in Ireland likely to increase the political power of the Roman Catholic Church regarded not as a religious but as a political organisation? For the life of me I am unable to see it. My right hon. friend the Member for North Armagh quoted to-night a sentence of Mr. Gladstone's, written, I think, in 1874, in which he said that the Irish priest was the master of the Irish people, that the Irish bishop was the master of the Irish priest, and that the Pope was the master of all three. If that be the present condition of the Irish people; and that is my right hon. friend's hypothesis; how is that position made worse by educating the Irish people?

\*MR. MACARTNEY: My right hon. friend will admit that there is no university in Ireland to which the Roman Catholic laity can go except to Trinity College, Dublin. If a new university is created it would be under the authority of the Pope and the laity would be forced to go there under the authority of the bishops.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is a very argumentative interruption; but let us assume with him that the five per cent. of the Roman Catholics among the Trinity College students cease to go to Trinity College in future and go to some other college with equal liberality of statute as Trinity College. I want to ask him what difference that would make as to the control of the Irish priests over the Irish people, the Irish bishop over the Irish priest, and the Pope over all? I confess it seems to me almost inconceivable that any one should seriously suppose that the grip of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical organisation on the Irish people should be politically increased by the formation of such a university as is contemplated here.

I go from the political to the educational objection. I admit that the educational objection is one which naturally appeals to the Protestant mind. What is that objection? The objection is this, and I hope that no Roman Catholic in this House will object to my stating it as it appeals to me, at all events. I believe it to be the fact that in many universities on the Continent, and

perhaps elsewhere, the bases of education which have been under entirely Roman Catholic control have not shown that broad spirit of free investigation which we regard as one of the highest qualifications, one of the highest attributes of a modern university. Very well, let us assume that that is true, and my own view is that in some cases it has been true; but what then? Is it I not better that you should have a university of some kind in which education in science, in languages, in literature, in classics, in ancient history should be taught, than that you should have no I university? In these subjects there can be no clerical control. A Jesuit teaching Latin and Greek, a Jesuit teaching mathematics; [Ministerial cries of "History"]; a Jesuit teaching ancient history; (HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.) I am putting it from an extreme point of view; what can he do to pollute the pure spring of education He can do nothing. Well, is it not better from an educational point of view, supposing that these sinister ecclesiastical influences were to have all the effect which my light hon. friend attributes to them, at all events that there should be some place where our Irish fellow-countrymen should learn these great elements of a liberal education, than that they should have no place at all? Mark you, I am putting it at the worst. I am assuming, what I have no right to assume, that some portions of modern science would not be taught with that freedom of investigation which we all desire. I mentioned, I think, in the topics that could not be perverted, classics, ancient history, mathematics; I might add all the physical sciences. Yes, all the physical sciences. They cannot be touched by clerical influence. All the secular arts; they cannot be touched by clerical influence. Are they nothing? And because my right hon. friend supposes that the views of modern history; modern religious history especially; and of modern philosophy may possibly be perverted by clerical influence, are we, on that account to refuse to the great majority of the Irish people the blessings of the higher education in those great subjects which we all admit can be equally well taught, and are equally well taught, in every university where competent teachers are allowed? I therefore venture to say that from the extreme Protestant point of view neither the political danger nor the educational danger, taken at their extreme limits, are of a kind which ought to induce this Assembly, which is in the main a Protestant Assembly, to refuse to the Irish people those great benefits of higher education which are so freely given to Scotchmen and to Englishmen.

But, while I take that view, I confess that, speaking as a bigoted Protestant, I cannot follow my right hon. and gallant friend in the view he has expressed about Trinity College, Dublin. My right hon. and gallant friend said he would welcome Trinity College, Dublin, being flooded by Roman Catholic students from all parts of Ireland. I confess my Protestantism, my liberality, does not go that length. I look at the history of Trinity College, Dublin. I see it has from the very beginning of its history been associated with Protestantism. I see that now, although it is perfectly true, as my right hon. friend near me has pointed out, that it has thrown open the door to every form of opinion, and interposes no obstacle in the way of any student, whatever his religious or irreligious opinions may be, still the prevailing atmosphere of that university is

Protestant. Frankly, I rejoice at it. I am glad that in a country where the great mass of the population are not Protestant there should be this great historical place of education, Protestant by tradition, Protestant in fact, and I hope it will remain Protestant in fact, and that through all time Trinity College will be a place where a Protestant parent may send his son with the certainty that he will find in it, not, indeed, bigoted priests, not, indeed, narrow views, not any spirit of proselytism abroad, but those principles of intellectual freedom which we Protestants associate with university education. My right hon. and gallant friend differs from me. He would like to see the majority of the students

Roman Catholic. He would like to see, as a consequence, the provost Roman Catholic. [Cries of "No."] All these results follow logically, directly, and immediately from the view which my right hon. and gallant friend has presented to us. I hope I am not incapable of breadth of view, but my breadth of view does not lead me into those illimitable speculations of my right hon. and gallant friend. I hear him express some dissent; where is my logic at fault?

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I said nothing, Sir.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: My right hon. and gallant friend gave an inarticulate groan, but whether it was from any defect in the reasoning I presented or not I cannot say. In any case, my view is that, however regrettable it may be, you will not see the needs of Irish education satisfied unless you follow in the case of the higher and university education of Ireland the course which you have been driven, whether you like it or not, to take in the case of primary and of secondary education. I regret it, but the man who does not accept the facts which are thrust before his eyes by every incident alike in contemporary and past history surely is guilty of deliberate blindness.

The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Haddington called the attention of the House to what is, or what ought to be, our leading consideration on this occasion. Has Ireland, or has it not, an adequate practical machinery for the higher education of the youth of the country? I say it is behind England, Scotland, France, Germany, and America in that respect. Do you think it an adequate way of dealing with the situation to say, "If the Irish only knew their own business they would send their sons to Trinity College, Dublin." Well, they do not send their sons to Trinity College, Dublin, and the result is that the Roman Catholics of Ireland do not have those educational advantages which we desire for them. But have all Protestants in Ireland those advantages? When I was Chief Secretary for Ireland, a good many years ago, the representatives of the Belfast Queen's College came to me more than once and earnestly pressed upon me the obvious necessity of doing something considerable for that institution. I thought their case was unanswerable;

but I was obliged to tell them that the idea of giving sums of public money to the Queen's College, Belfast, which is, broadly speaking, a Presbyterian college; [Several HON. MEMBERS: No!]; well, which in the main is a Presbyterian college; [Several HON. MEMBERS. No!]; in order to equip it in the manner it ought to be equipped, was entirely illusory and absolutely impossible; that no Government would take it up, that no practical statesman

would look at it, until an attempt was made to put higher education in Ireland upon a rational basis; and from that day to this Protestant education in Belfast; the great manufacturing centre of Ireland, which has to compete with England, Germany, France, and America; is starved because we will not consent to deal in a broad spirit with this question. I earnestly press upon the House, irrespective of those religious prejudices which stand like a wall in the way of progress, to consider whether it is decent or tolerable that we should continue to starve the education, not only of the Roman Catholics, but of the Protestants in the north of Ireland, on account of views and feelings which, though they have their justification, and are natural, must on analysis vanish before the light of higher wisdom.

I am afraid I have plunged again into the broad merits of the controversy on which I have dwelt almost too often, but I will content myself now with saying a word or two about the Commission. The hon. and learned Member for Haddington complained that the Government had consented to the Royal Commission. He said we knew all about the question, that we were a strong Government, and that, therefore, we ought to have taken the matter in hand and dealt with it. To that I would point out, in the first place, that the Commission was not our suggestion. It was suggested by the Royal University of Ireland, who, irrespective of creed, unanimously begged us to appoint a Commission to investigate their own shortcomings; I do not use the word in a critical sense, but their own failure to carry out the work for which they were created. When a great body like that, representing men of all religious opinions, came forward, and said, "We have failed to do what we were constituted to do, we cannot do it under our authorisation, and we ask you to appoint a Commission to investigate the subject of university education in Ireland," was it possible for any responsible Government to refuse such a request? It was not possible. That alone was an adequate justification for the course which the Government have pursued. The hon. and learned Gentleman talked of this being a question to be taken up by the Government as a Government question. He knows very well that, by a tradition now existing for at least three or four generations, this is one of those questions which, in the nature of the case, are open questions. Then do not ask the Government as a Government to take it up, for that clearly is impossible. If the hon. and learned Member were Leader of a Government would he regard it as otherwise? I understand the two Front Benches are agreed as to that. I should say there is even less sympathy upon that bench than upon this. It is necessary in these circumstances that we should have the fullest information on the subject, and I trust that when the Commission reports; which I do not think will be very long; the result will be that public opinion in the country will render it perfectly possible for this House to deal practically with the problem which I have been endeavouring to elucidate. That is all I have to say on the merits of the question. I will just say one word on the Vote which is to be given to-night if the Amendment is carried to a division. The original motion before the House is that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, to which an Amendment has been moved dealing with the question of Irish University education. I may be permitted to say, as there may be some

Members in the House not quite familiar with its forms, that, according to the universal practice, it is necessary for all those who desire to support the Government to vote for the original motion, and of course everybody on this bench, including myself, will take that view, and all who desire to support the Government will follow their example. What will be the result? The result of that will be that a division, if it is forced, will in no sense represent the views of the House on this question. Many gentlemen on this side of the House who agree entirely with me must go into the lobby against the Amendment, and that being so I would venture to suggest to the hon. Gentleman who has moved the Amendment that he would probably serve the cause he has at heart by not enforcing a division, by contenting himself with the discussion and with the general expression of the feelings of the House, which are much better indicated by the speeches which have been delivered than they can possibly be by a vote given on the Amendment. In these circumstances I trust the hon. Gentleman will not press the motion to a division. If he does, I am sorry to say I shall have to vote against him.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I trust the House will permit me in the few moments which still remain to express very briefly some views upon this question. I desire to acknowledge in the fullest way the sympathetic tone in which the Leader of the House has spoken. This is not the first time he has spoken on this subject with sympathy, and expressed a desire to settle the question; but I must give expression to the feeling which is strong in my breast, and which must be strong in the breasts of all Irishmen who have followed this question for some years, and that is the feeling of how difficult it is to distinguish between the action of the right hon. Gentleman as an individual and his action as the representative of the Government. As an individual I admit in the fullest way the sympathy and support which he has given for many years past to this question, but I dispute altogether the proposition he has laid before the House to-night, that this is to be regarded as the one question of great and paramount importance which is to be left an open question to all Governments. What does he mean? When has it become the rule or the fashion that the Irish University question should be an open question with Governments? It was not so twenty or thirty years ago. I know not by what right he asserts that to-day it is a question upon which Members of various Governments may fairly be allowed to differ. I have not time to enter upon an elaborate argument, but I desire to put one argument before the House, viz., that there is no question affecting Ireland the history of which is such a conclusive argument in favour of Home Rule as this question of University Education. Here

is a grievance affecting an overwhelming majority of the people of Ireland, and affecting them in the most intimate way, admitted to be a grievance for the last thirty years from time to time by statesmen of different parties. For the last thirty years this has been admitted to be a grievance injuriously affecting the whole wellbeing of the Irish nation, and yet generation after generation of young boys have been allowed to grow up into manhood without the advantage of university education. There never was a question upon which Government pledges,



given in all solemnity to Ireland, were so flagrantly broken. In 1878 Lord Cairns, representing the Conservative party in the House of Lords, in introducing the Intermediate Education Act, said;

"This Bill is the necessary preliminary to a great measure dealing with higher education, the need for which is acknowledged by all political parties. This important Bill is the building of the walls of which a University Bill will be the roof."

In 1885, when the Conservative party were again in office, the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, then the Leader of the House, gave a specific pledge. It was not then the doctrine of the Conservative party that this was an open question. Upon that occasion the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, speaking on behalf of the Government, gave an absolute pledge on this question. He said;

"They would continue to regard this question with hope, with the wish to do something to make University education more general and widespread in Ireland; and, should it be their lot to be in office next session, with the determination to make some practical proposal that would deal in a satisfactory way with this important matter."

I submit that that was a specific pledge on behalf of the Government. The Conservative Government were in office the next year, and from that day to this, with the exception of the period from 1892 to 1895, they held the reins of office, and yet this pledge has never been redeemed. I respectfully say to the Leader of the House, when he declares to-night that he speaks only as an individual and not as the representative of the Government, that in 1889, when he spoke in this House, he gave an absolute pledge on behalf of this Government. He said, speaking on behalf of the Government;

"That the Government had no alternative but to try and devise a scheme by which the

wants of the Catholics of Ireland would be met,"

and when pressed by Mr. Parnell on behalf of the Irish Members for an even more definite pledge, he said;

"There is no possibility of dealing with the question except by a Bill, and I cannot give a pledge at this moment of the exact order in which the various questions will be dealt with by the Government next session."

I say with all respect that was a specific pledge, given in 1889, by the present Leader of the House, not as an individual, but as the representative of the Government. But from that day to this the pledge has remained unfulfilled.

It cannot be said that the Government has been impeded in this matter by the want of co-operation on the part of the representatives of the Catholic people of Ireland, for in, 1889 the present Leader of the House, in a speech delivered in Scotland, laid down the conditions on which the Government would deal with this question. Those conditions were specifically accepted by the Catholic hierarchy and the Nationalist Members of Parliament. Those conditions were, first, that there was to be no Catholic university in the sense of being so exclusively Catholic as to shut out people of other denominations; second, that no State aid was to be given for a theological chair; and third, that there

should be a conscience clause. All those conditions were accepted. They were formally accepted by a declaration of the Catholic hierarchy, and yet no progress has been made with the question since then. I repeat that the whole history of this question is one of broken pledges given by the Government to Ireland, and I say that if the case for Home Rule stood alone on this question of university education, there would be a conclusive case made out on behalf of remitting to the Irish people the management of their own affairs. Of all the grievances affecting Ireland this is the most practical. The idea that this question affects only the richer and higher classes is an absurdity. It affects every class in the community in Ireland. To give an instance. Only the other day I was making inquiries in Dublin as to the working of the new Department of Agriculture. What was the information

I obtained? That department is engaged in endeavouring to create schools of science and technical education in various parts of the country; but I was informed that the work is absolutely blocked; and why? They have found it almost impossible to get teachers for these schools in Ireland. The result will be that these schools will be permanently blocked, or else it will be necessary for the department to bring over teachers from England and Scotland. I think it would be impossible to prove in a more conclusive way the injury done to Ireland by the deprivation of the advantages of higher education.

In listening to some of the speeches to-night it struck me that there is still some apprehension as to what exactly the Catholics of Ireland are asking for in this matter. We are asking simply for equality. Allusion has been made to Dublin University by many speakers. That university was founded with the avowed object of planting the Protestant religion in Ireland. For over two hundred years that university was exclusively Protestant, and it is Protestant to-day in this respect, that the entire of its governing body is Protestant; its teaching body is Protestant; and it has a divinity school and a chapel within its walls with Protestant services. Its traditions, its spirit, and its atmosphere are all admittedly Protestant. It is unnecessary to labour that point. Trinity College is proud of its Protestant traditions, and I sympathise to a large extent with the

views of the First Lord of the Treasury on that point. I remember when the Test Abolition Act was passed the Irish Catholic Members protested against a policy of secularising Trinity College. We Irish Catholics do not desire to see Trinity College divested of its Protestant atmosphere. We far prefer that it should be a Protestant institution rather than that all religion should be banished from it, and that it should be lowered to the level of the godless colleges in Cork, Belfast, and Galway. All we ask for is that the Catholics of Ireland, the great bulk of the population, should receive an equality of treatment, and should have a university as Catholic in character as Trinity College is Protestant.

And, speaking of Ireland generally, let me say there is a large amount of agreement in that country on this question. The right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh does not represent the largest or most important section of Protestant opinion in this matter. Trinity College itself has spoken in no uncertain voice, and has declared by its most distinguished professors, and to-

night by one of the Members representing it in this House, that it is not opposed to a university for the Catholics of Ireland; and I say nothing is easier for the Government of the day than to propose a scheme carrying out the views which have the support of so large a number of the leading Protestants of Ireland. They have not, however, done so. They have instead proposed a Royal Commission, and on that question I desire to associate myself to the full with the remarks made by the hon. Member for East Mayo. We did not ask for this Commission. We were not consulted about the appointment of this Commission. I may say that if we had been consulted about it; speaking for myself; we would not have approved of it. I regard this Commission as an evasion of the solemn pledges of the Government, as an evasion of a plain duty, and as an attempt to postpone legislation because the Government fears to introduce a Bill. It is not the Irish opinion that on this great question, which you admit is a grievance, prevents you introducing legislation, but opinion in England. And this constitutes the strongest argument conceivable in favour of Home Rule. I have not time to deal with the question in reference to this Commission beyond saying that although an inquiry into the emoluments and management of Trinity College is to be excluded from the purview of this Commission, at the same time it will be impossible for any Commission to conduct this inquiry into university education in Ireland without taking Trinity College into account. There it is, with all its emoluments and all its educational advantages for the Protestants, and in considering how the claims of the Catholics can be fairly met this Commission will be forced to take that college as it stands, and our claim will be that they shall afford to the Catholic people of Ireland at least as high facilities and as good an educational medium as Trinity College for the benefit of Protestants. My opinion about the Commission; and I say it perfectly boldly and frankly; is that nothing will come of it. I hope the contrary will prove the truth. At the same time I would be sorry to take any responsibility in wrecking this Commission, and I do not want to do or say anything to discredit it in advance.

This brings me to the question of what advice I can give to my hon. friend with reference to taking a division. Of course I recognise the truth of what the First Lord of the Treasury has said. No division on this question to-night can fairly or honestly represent the opinion of the House, but there is something weighing on my mind above and beyond that. I believe a division taken on this question to-night, even it be an unreal majority; even if there is a large majority against the Amendment of my hon. friend; will be a discrediting beforehand of the work of the Commission. Therefore, under these circumstances I cannot advise my hon. friend to proceed to a division. My advice to him is to rest content with the debate that has taken place and with the position which we have taken. We do not take any responsibility in regard to this Commission. We do not wish to thwart or impede this Commission. We say, "Go on with your inquiry; if it leads to nothing, as most probably it will, the responsibility will not rest upon us; it will rest on you." Our hands will be untied; we will be free, as representing the laity of Ireland, to take what action we think fit in proposing a remedy, quite irrespective of any influences that are at work.

For these reasons I would advise my hon. friend to withdraw his motion.

MR. ROCHE said that in deference to the opinion of his hon. friend the leader of his Party, and in response to the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury, he would withdraw the Amendment.

Objection being taken;

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): On a point of order, if the Amendment is not to be withdrawn;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;

MR. T. M. HEALY: I submit that the closure not having been moved any hon. Member has a right to address the Chair, even though midnight is striking;

It being midnight, Mr. SPEAKER interrupted the business, whereupon;

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex F.

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Lawrence, William F.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Duke, Henry Edward

Lawson, John Grant

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Durning, Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham

Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden

Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage

Anson, Sir William Reynell

Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton

Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Faber, George Denison

Leveson-Gower, Fredk, N. S.

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.

Llewellyn, Evan Henry

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J (Manc'r

Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)

Arrol, Sir William

Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst

Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.

Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis

Finch, George H.

Lonsdale, John Brownlee

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitzroy

Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Bain, Colonel James Robert  
Fison, Frederick William  
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J (Manch'r)  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edw. Algernon  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)  
Flower, Ernest  
MacIver, David (Liverpool)  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds)  
Forster, Henry William  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Garfit, William  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Gibbs, Hn A. G. H. (City of Lond.  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs.  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb., W.  
Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B (Hants  
Gordon, Hn J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Malcolm, Ian  
Bond, Edward  
Gordon, Maj Evans- (T'rH'ml'ts  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Gore, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon  
Melville, Beresford V.  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim

Middlemore, John T.  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Milward, Col. Victor  
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Bull, William James  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Montagu, C. (Huntingdon)  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)  
Butcher, John George  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Gretton, John  
Morgan, Hn. F. (Monm'thsh.)  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)  
Hain, Edward  
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Hamilton, Rt Hn L'rd G (Midd'x)  
Moss, Samuel  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry  
Mount, William Arthur]  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robt. Wm.  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.)  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Wore.)  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Channing, Francis A listen  
Haslett, Sir James Homer  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Hay, Hon. (Maude George  
Nicholson, William Graham

Chapman, Edward  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Charrington, Spencer  
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Helder, Augustus  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Hermon-Hodge, Robert Trotter  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Higgin bottom, S. W.  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Horner, Frederick William  
Penn, John  
Colston, Chas, E. H. Athole  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Perks, Robert William  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.)  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)  
Purvis, Robert  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Hozier, Hon. Jas. Henry Cecil  
Rasch, Maj. Frederic Carne  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton  
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)  
Renwick, George  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'ml'ts, S Geo.  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
Keswick, William  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Ropner, Col. Robert  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Bound, James  
Doughty, George  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Rutherford, John  
MR. A. J. BALFOUR rose in his place and claimed that the Question be now put.  
Question put, "That the Question be now put."  
The House divided::Ayes, 235; Noes, 147. (Division List No. 134.)  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.  
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.  
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Wylie, Alexander  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Warde, Col. C. E.



Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)  
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Ta'nt'n  
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong  
Spear, John Ward  
Welby, Sir Chas, G. E. (Notts.)  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M Taggart  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Stock, James Henry  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)  
Hammond, John  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid  
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud  
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Harwood, George  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Asquith, Rt Hn. Herbert Henry  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
O'Dowd, John  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Bell, Richard  
Healy, Timothy Michael

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N  
Black, Alexander William  
Helme, Norval Watson  
O'Mara, James  
Boland, John  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Boyle, James  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
O'Shee, James John  
Brigg, John  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
Partington, Oswald  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Caine, William Sproston  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Caldwell, James  
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)  
Priestley, Arthur  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
Rea, Russell  
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
Reckitt, Harold James  
Bell, Richard  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Reddy, M.  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Joyce, Michael  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries  
Colville, John  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Labouchere, Henry  
Rigg, Richard

Craig, Robert Hunter  
Lambert, George  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Crean, Eugene  
Langley, Batty  
Roche, John  
Cremer, William Randal  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Cullinan, J.  
Leamy, Edmund  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Daly, James  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Delany, William  
Leng, Sir John  
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Levy, Maurice  
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire)  
Dillon, John  
Lough, Thomas  
Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
Doogan, P. C.  
Lundon, W.  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Spencer, Rt. Hn C R (Northants)  
Duffy, William J.  
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
M'Cann, James  
Sullivan, Donal  
Dunn, Sir William  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings)  
Edwards, Frank  
M'Govern, T.  
Thomas, J. A. (Glam., Gower)  
Emmott, Alfred  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan N.  
Farrell, James Patrick

M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Tomkinson, James  
Field, William  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Tully, Jasper  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Ure, Alexander  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Minch, Matthew  
Weir, James Galloway  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Mooney, John J.  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Gilhooly, James  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North  
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbert J.  
Murnaghan, George  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Murphy, J.  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth  
Grant, Corrie  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd  
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
Norman, Henry  
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Question put accordingly, and agreed to.  
MR. BALFOUR claimed, "That the Main Question be, now put."  
Main Question put accordingly.  
The House divided::Ayes, 239; Noes, 138. (Division List No. 135.)  
AYES.  
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.  
Fison, Frederick William  
Malcolm, Ian  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Manners, Lord Cecil  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Fitzroy, Hn. Edw. Algernon  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden  
Flower, Ernest  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Foster, Henry William  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Garfit, William  
Middlemore, Jno. Throgmorton  
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.  
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.  
Milward, Col. Victor  
Arrol, Sir William  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Ashmead-Bartlett, Sir Ellis  
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Morgan, David J (Walthamst'w  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Gordon, Maj Evans (T'rH'mlets  
Morgan, Hn Fred. (Monm'thsh.  
Bain, Col. James Robert  
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Mount, William Arthur  
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds  
Graham, Henry Robert  
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute  
Ban bury, Frederick George  
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry

Bartley, George C T.  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Gretton, John  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants.  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Hain, Edward  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens-  
Bond, Edward  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'ry  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Parkes, Ebenezer  
Brigg, John  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Paulton, James Mellor  
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley  
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Penn, John  
Bull, William James  
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Bullard, Sir Harry  
Heath, J. (Staffords., N.W.)  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Butcher, John George  
Helder, Augustus  
Purvis, Robert  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.

Hermon-Hodge, Rbt. Trotter  
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.  
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)  
Rentoul, James Alexander  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Horner, Frederick William  
Renwick, George  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.  
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversh.)  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Hozier, Hn. Jas. Henry Cecil  
Round, James  
Chapman, Edward  
Hudson, George Bickersteth  
Rutherford, John  
Charrington, Spencer  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Churchill, Winston Spencer  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Clare, Octavius Leigh  
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.  
Kenyon, Hn. Geo T. (Denbigh  
Sandys, Lieut.-Col. Thos. Myles  
Cohen, Benjamin L.  
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)  
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.  
Keswick, William  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln  
Colston, Charles Edw. H. A.  
King, Sir Henry Seymour  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Lawrence, William F.  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Lawson, John Grant  
Spear, John Ward  
Cubitt, Hon. Hemy  
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Stock, James Henry  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'inlets, S Geo.  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles  
Long, Col. Charles W. (Evesham  
Tollemache, Henry James  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Long, Rt Hn Walter (Bristol, S.)  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Lonsdale, John Brownlee  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
Doughty, George  
Lowther, Rt Hn. W (Cum. Penr.  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward



Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Wanklyn, James Leslie  
Dske, Rt. Hn. Sir Wm. Hart  
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison  
Warde, Col. C. E.  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)  
Faber, George Denison  
MacIver, David (Liverpool)  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton)  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.  
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Wharton, Rt. Hn. John Lloyd  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
M'Calmont, Cl. H. L. B. (Cambs  
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und Lyne  
Finch, George H.  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Whitmore, Charles Algernon  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Firbank, Joseph Thomas  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Wills, Sir Frederick  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Wortley, Rn. Hon. C. P. B Stuart-  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Wylie, Alexander  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George

TELLERS FOR THE AYES;

Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath  
Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm  
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong  
NOES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud  
Harwood, George  
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Dowd, John  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.  
O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Mara, James  
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.  
Helme, Norval Watson  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Bell, Richard  
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.  
O'Shee, James John  
Boland, John  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
Perks, Robert William  
Boyle, James  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Horniman, Frederick John  
Priestly, Arthur  
Caine, William Sproston  
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)  
Rea, Russell  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.  
Jameson, Maj. J. Eustace  
Reckitt, Harold James

Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton  
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.  
Reddy, M.  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Joyce, Michael  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Kearley, Hudson E.  
Reid, Sir R. T. (Dumfries)  
Colville, John  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Lambert, George  
Rigg, Richard  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Langley, Batty  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Crean, Eugene  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Roche, John  
Cremer, William Randal  
Leamy, Edmund  
Roe, Sir Thomas  
Cullinan, J.  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Daly, James  
Leng, Sir John  
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)  
Delany, William  
Levy, Maurice  
Shaw, Charles E. (Stafford)  
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Lundon, W.  
Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
Dillon, John  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Soares, Ernest  
Doogan, P. C.  
MacNeill, John Gordon Swift  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (Norh'nts  
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)

M'Cann, James  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Duffy, William J.  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Sullivan, Donal  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
M'Govern, T.  
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings  
Dunn, Sir William  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Thomas, J A (Gl'morg'n, Gower)  
Edwards, Frank  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.  
Emmott, Alfred  
Minch, Matthew  
Tomkinson, James  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Mooney, John J.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Field, William  
Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford)  
Tully, Jasper  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Moss, Samuel  
Ure, Alexander  
Fuller, J. M. F.  
Murnaghan, George  
Weir, James Galloway  
Gilhooly, James  
Murphy, J.  
White, George (Norfolk)  
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Grant, Corrie  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Williams, O. (Merioneth)  
Grey, Sir Edw. (Berwick)  
Norman, Henry  
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
Nussey, Thomas Willans

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
G'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Md  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.  
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.  
Hammond, John  
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.  
SUPPLY.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

CIVIL SERVICE AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS ESTIMATES, 1901&#x2013;2.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Wednesday.

WAYS AND MEANS.

[19TH APRIL.]

Resolution reported.

LOAN.

"That, towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty for the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, nineteen hundred and two, sums not exceeding sixty million pounds may be raised by all or any of the following methods::

(a) by means of the creation of two and three-quarter per cent. Consolidated Stock within the meaning of the National Debt Conversion Act, 1888; or

(b) by means of the issue of further War Stock or War Bonds under the War Loan Act, 1900; or

(c) by means of the issue of Treasury Bills; or

(d) by means of the issue of Exchequer Bonds;

and that the principal of, and interest on, any sum so raised be charged on the Consolidated Fund."

Resolution read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Committee in the said Resolution."

MR. JOHN REDMOND said it would be in the recollection of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the House that the other night the right hon. Gentleman made an appeal to the House to allow the resolution to go through, on the ground that it would be a serious inconvenience to have the discussion prolonged. Speaking on behalf of the Irish Members, he agreed then that the right hon. Gentleman should get the resolution, stating, of course, that there would be an opportunity for discussion on Report. He felt sure that under the circumstances the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not persist with the Report that night. He had no desire to obstruct business, or to prolong discussion on this matter, but it was a clear understanding that there would be an opportunity for discussion on Report.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.) said he did

not wish to press the matter further that night.

MR. JOHN REDMOND said he was obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for the statement that he would not force the matter on that night.

Debate adjourned till to-morrow at Two of the clock.

ARMY ANNUAL BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4::

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean) moved an Amendment on line 9 in order to ascertain from the Government whether the Bill applied to "all"

courts of inquiry. The authorities

on this subject were very much divided. A great number of courts of inquiry had been held during the present war in South Africa which were not held subject to the rules laid down in the rules of procedure. If the Government denied that, then they would know where they were, and they would come to the discussion of the Amendment which the hon. and gallant Member for Taunton had on the Paper with a clear opinion of what it was they were going to discuss.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 3, line 9, to leave out the word 'all.'"; Sir Charles Dilke.

Question proposed, "That the word 'all' stand part of the question."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford) said he could not accept the Amendment, because it was exactly contrary to the intention of the clause. The intention of the clause was to give power in certain cases to courts of inquiry held under Clause 70 of the Army Act to administer oaths in order to make the inquiry more formal. It was not intended to affect courts not held under Clause

70.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he understood the right hon. Gentleman in the first part of his speech to imply; although he did not distinctly state it; that he took the view which he (Sir Charles) had put before the House, namely, that this change in the law would not apply to all courts of inquiry. But in the last words of his speech the right hon. Gentleman seemed to go back on that, because he said that in South Africa some persons had been involved who had not been heard, but had been reported on by courts of inquiry as though these had been formal courts. If the Amendments were not to apply to all courts of inquiry he would withdraw his word

"all," which was moved in order to elicit this fact.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.) said that the clause took one's breath away. He had understood that the evidence was in all cases to be taken on oath, but it seemed to read that evidence on oath could only be taken in one, the first, class of courts mentioned in the clause. Officers ought to have some better and clearer guidance.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.) thought the hon. Member for North Louth was right in his contention. Section 70 of the Army Act applied only to courts of

inquiry constituted under that Act, and the proposed Amendment on Clause 4 would also be restricted to that class of courts of inquiry. He understood that the point raised by the right hon. the Member for Forest of Dean was that there were investigations which might not be courts of inquiry in the sense of the Act, but which were held under the general prerogative of the Crown as head of the Army, and the question was whether the proposed new rule that evidence might be taken on oath would apply to these courts.

MR. BRODRICK was understood to say that it would not.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE said if the amendment to Clause 70 of the Army Act was only to apply to statutory courts, the evils against which his hon. and gallant friend the Member for Taunton wished to protest would continue to exist. Having elicited the facts, he asked leave to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. BRODRICK said that the rules of procedure actually carried the Amendment standing in the name of the hon. and gallant Member for Taunton.

COLONEL WELBY (Taunton) said his object was to get the words inserted in the Act, and to add "or efficiency," which words were not in the rules of procedure.

As a matter of fact, in courts of

inquiry in South Africa the rules of procedure had been left on one side, and the reason given was that the word "character" did not involve an officer's military efficiency. Efficiency ought to be added, because efficiency was a very great portion of an officer's military character. His reason for inserting the words in the Act of Parliament was to make it beyond dispute that, whenever evidence was taken on oath, the officer should have an opportunity of being present, of cross-examining the witnesses, and of making his defence. He believed that courts of inquiry had been held in South Africa which had seriously affected officers and non-commissioned officers, who had been judged in their absence. Evidence taken on oath could be produced at a court-martial, and therefore it would be inevitable that the person incriminated would have an opportunity of being present at the proceedings, of cross-examining the witnesses, and stating his own defence. It was perfectly true that during a campaign it might be necessary to hold advisory courts to collect evidence, but that evidence could be collected in the ordinary way by a prerogative court, and what he wanted was that, in cases like the surrenders in South Africa, the persons implicated should have the right to be present at the courts of inquiry, and to cross-examine the witnesses, and that the evidence should be taken on oath.

If evidence of that kind were to be given, he believed it would be the means of greatly increasing a serious defect in the organisation of the Army as compared with that of the Navy, namely, a want of responsibility in taking action against those who were inefficient in the field. He was sure that that could not be said of his right hon. friend, for he had acted bravely in his position, and he admired him for it. But what was the practice of the Army as a whole? The practice was to avoid responsibility, and for a general to shield himself behind a court of inquiry. It would be very simple for a general if he wished to get rid of an officer, instead of taking the responsibility himself, to fall back on

the proceedings of a court of inquiry taken upon oath and to say to the officer that that evidence was taken on oath, that there could be no doubt about it, and that, therefore, he must recommend that the officer be removed from his command. He believed that the great object of the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman was to deal with the cases of surrender which had occurred in South Africa, and to abolish the present system of first having a court of inquiry and then a court-martial, in favour of a system of one inquiry upon oath, which would finally decide how a surrender had been caused. Very great injustice might result. He did not think it was possible in all cases to assimilate the procedure in the Army to that in the Navy. In the Navy the commander of a ship was responsible, but a military commander might be tied by an order just received before a disaster. Military officers, therefore, could not be tried as naval officers invariably were. What he desired was that if the rule of collecting evidence on oath by courts of inquiry were to be enforced, then most decidedly the safeguards for the officers and men incriminated should be inserted in the Act of Parliament and not left to rules of procedure, which, although they had to be laid on the Table of the House, might be overlooked, and a change might creep in which the House did not desire. As an officer, he unhesitatingly said that the words he proposed should be inserted in the Act. If they were not he believed it would be far better to leave things as they were. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 3, line 11, after 'that purpose,' add 'provided that whenever any such inquiry affects the character or efficiency of an officer or soldier, full opportunity shall be afforded to the officer or soldier of being present throughout the inquiry, and of making any statement he may wish to make, and of cross-examining any witness whose evidence, in his opinion, affects his character or efficiency, and producing any witnesses in defence of his character or efficiency.'";(Colonel Welby.)

Question proposed, That those words be there inserted.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton) said he agreed with the hon. and gallant Gentleman that the words proposed by the right hon. Gentleman were hardly needed. In the rules of procedure it was laid down that courts of inquiry were to give no opinion as to the conduct of any officer or soldier. Why, then, was evidence to be taken on oath, when it was not to be admissible at any subsequent court? The court of inquiry had no judicial power, and was in strictness not a court at all. Why, therefore, have evidence upon oath? He would further point out that the officers forming a court of inquiry were not themselves sworn, whereas in the case of a court-martial the first thing that was done was to administer an oath to each officer composing the court to well and truly try the case. As far as he could understand it, a court of inquiry was merely an assemblage of persons directed by the commanding officer to collect evidence with respect to a transaction as to which he could not conveniently make inquiries himself. It

seemed to him to be merely a preliminary inquiry to satisfy the commanding officer, who would decide, after having studied the evidence, whether there was



a prima facie case against the officer concerned. He could not conceive why the right hon. Gentleman wished to insert the words, because the court was not a judicial court but merely a court, to collect facts.

MR. BRODRICK: said that the court of inquiry would assemble not to give a verdict, but in order to provide the Commander-in-Chief with reliable information as to what had occurred, and experience showed that the more formal the evidence was made, by placing witnesses upon oath, the more certain would be the assurance of obtaining reliable information. His object was to make a court of inquiry a reality, and to make it reliable, not for the purpose of using the evidence as evidence before a court of law or a court-martial, but for the purpose of providing accurate information for the guidance of the Commander-in-Chief. He would ask the hon. and gallant Gentleman to accept his assurance that the rules of procedure would achieve the object he desired, and he was prepared to amend them by adding the words "or efficiency" as proposed, but he did not think it necessary that the Amendment should be inserted in the Bill.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he thought that the right hon. Gentleman had fully met the point raised by the hon. and gallant Gentleman. He would, however, respectfully submit that the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman was really putting a soldier or an officer in a position of greater danger than an ordinary civilian when his character or conduct was challenged. All laws made in a time of panic were bad, and the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman was meant to meet a particular grievance which had suddenly arisen, and which could not be considered as fairly as if it had arisen in the ordinary course. The right hon. Gentleman said he proposed to invest courts of inquiry with a solemnity which they otherwise would not have. That was the very vice of the clause. It should be remembered that an officer or a soldier was not empanelled before a court of inquiry. He neither got a verdict of acquittal nor was he adjudged guilty, yet his character was ripped up and torn to pieces, and he went blasted before a court-martial. He would ask the Government, was it fair as a result of the war to start a novel procedure and to subject a soldier or an officer to a position of difficulty and doubt to which an ordinary person was not subject? He did not think the proposal was an improvement, or that it should be considered in Committee after midnight. He thought it should be considered by a Select Committee, upon which Army experts should be represented. The only case in which evidence could be taken on oath behind the back of the accused was that of a deserter. Now, forsooth, the Government proposed to place an officer or a general in command on a level with a deserter. That would be the effect of the clause. So far as he, was concerned, personally he had not the smallest interest in the matter except the constitutional interest one took in the trials of one's fellows. But he would beg of tin; Government to pause before they introduced such a fatal change. Let the officer have the option of a court-martial in the first place, and let not his character be blasted beforehand by a court of inquiry.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE asked whether it was the intention of the Government to discourage non-statutory courts or prerogative courts, and to substitute courts of inquiry on oath in their stead It was difficult to discuss the question as if

the Committee had not certain cases in their minds; but when they were discussing what was to be done, they ought to consider whether in effect they were making a change which would in future guide such cases, or whether such cases would continue to be dealt with as in the past? The hon. and gallant gentleman referred to officers who would be affected in their absence, but in another part of his speech he showed that courts were in the habit of conducting proceedings in the absence of the officer concerned. That was because such courts were outside the section, and the Committee ought to understand that the proposal they were now discussing did not touch them at all. The case the hon. and gallant Gentleman

had in his mind was the case of an officer who was affected by an inquiry into the conduct of another officer. In that inquiry all the things which the rules of procedure laid down should not be done were done. The Committee ought to know from the Government whether they proposed to substitute the procedure now under discussion for the ordinary procedure. The courts which were held for the collection of information for future use were not under the provisions of the law, or of the proposal by which they were now reforming them. The Secretary of State for War had adopted that view. He knew that high legal authorities held a contrary view. Undoubtedly many courts held during the present war have been outside the statutory courts, because they had done things which the statutory courts were forbidden to do. Surely the Committee ought to know whether it was the intention of the Government to supersede the existing procedure by the procedure now proposed.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs) said his right hon. friend assumed that the law only referred to what he called statutory courts. On reference to the Act of 1881, however, it would be seen that the rules of procedure dealt with all courts of inquiry. He was not aware of any statutory court of inquiry except that referred to in Section

72. The heading of Rule 124 was as follows: "Regulations for Courts of Inquiry other than Courts of Inquiry held under Section 72." Therefore the Secretary of State for War, who among his many advantages had not the advantage of being a lawyer, would find that very grave doubt existed on the matter. His own opinion was that the Amendment would refer to all courts of inquiry. For his own part, he agreed that it was desirable to give solemnity to evidence by taking it on oath on all inquiries affecting character. His hon. friend the Member for North Louth did not agree with him, but the only question, if they were to have such courts of inquiry now, was whether the evidence was to be taken in a more solemn and formal manner than in the past. He thought it was better that the evidence should be solemnly and formally than

taken without any formality at all. On the larger point, he was of opinion that the Amendment referred to more the statutory courts. He thought it would refer to all courts of inquiry such as the courts referred to in Rule 124.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs) said there seemed to be a general agreement that the Secretary of State for War had fully dealt with the Amendment before the Committee. The hon. Member for North Louth seemed to think that there might be some aspersion cast on an officer or soldier if the

evidence were taken on oath, but he would remind the hon. Member that the character of an officer or a soldier was protected to the same extent as if the evidence had not been taken on oath, and it was from that point of view he asked the Committee to accept the proposal. With reference to the remarks of the hon. and learned Member for Dumfries Burghs. Section 72 dealt with the case of soldiers absent without leave.

MR. ASQUITH: thought it extremely desirable that the amendment of the law proposed by the Government should be made, whatever might be the scope of the inquiry. Whenever a question arose affecting the character or efficiency of an officer, it was infinitely better that the evidence, instead of being more or less a haphazard collection of gossip and irresponsible statements, should be evidence which had attaching to it the solemnity of an oath, so that if false statements were made prosecutions for perjury could follow. But notwithstanding the explanation of the Attorney General, the Committee were still in doubt as to the scope of the proposals. It was quite true that Section 72 of the Army Act referred only to courts of inquiry in cases of desertion, and in that case the statute conferred the power to administer an oath. Therefore, as far as that case was concerned, there was no necessity for this Amendment. What, then, were the

"other courts" referred to under Section 70? No other courts were mentioned in the Act of Parliament; therefore, Section 70, which was perfectly general in its terms, and gave power to the Secretary of State to make rules as to the procedure, etc., of courts

of inquiry, must be referring to courts of inquiry other than or beyond those mentioned in Section 72. Prima facie there was no restriction whatever as to the courts of inquiry to which it referred. Section 124 of the regulations apparently applied in terms to all courts of inquiry of any sort or kind except those under Section 72, and the only power to make Regulation 124 was the power contained in Section 70 of the Act. It seemed to him to follow that Section 70 of the Act applied to all courts of inquiry of any sort or kind; that Regulation 124, which otherwise would be ultra vires, applied also to all courts of inquiry; and thirdly, that the amendment which the Government proposed to introduce, namely, that evidence might be taken on oath, applied equally to all courts of inquiry. Before the matter was disposed of he thought the Committee should come to some understanding, because this point had a very vital bearing on the future administration of the law.

MR. T. M. HEALY asked what would become of Regulation 124 if this clause became law. The position would be that they would have a court which was not a court, evidence which was not evidence, and oaths, apparently, which had no effect whatever. The regulation said "a court of inquiry has no judicial power," and yet the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife thought there might be prosecutions for perjury if false witness was borne on oath before a court which had no judicial power. He might be right in that view, but certainly His Majesty's Ministers were putting forward a new puzzle. The Regulation further stated that the court "is in strictness not a court at all." Was there ever such a proposition as that a man's character might be blasted for ever by evidence

taken upon oath before a court which had no judicial power and which was not a court at all? The Government had recently issued an order that any man who in future exhibited the white flag should be court-martialled. The opening section of the Army Act stated "any person who shamefully abandons or delivers up any garrison, place, post, or guard, should on conviction by court martial be liable to suffer death." Here was a case, then, in which a man's life might actually be at stake; but being a military man he would be in a position of greater inferiority than the humblest servant or subject of His Majesty. All this was being done because of the panic which had arisen in consequence of the unfortunate occurrences in South Africa. But if, as they were told, the war was nearly over, why could not the matter wait a bit? This was an important clause, affecting about 300,000 men. Where would these courts be held? On the veldt, perhaps, in some ramshackle place, with the men up to their knees in water, without any of the forms or decencies of judicial procedure. Without rhyme or reason the whole British constitution was being turned topsy-turvy. As the clause stood, the court would have no power to compel witnesses to attend; in other words, the accusing party, which would always be the party of discipline, would have power to compel men to come forward, but the accused would not have the power even to issue a subpoena. One side only, and that the accusing side, would be presented, with the result that the moment the court of inquiry started there would be a presumption of guilt. Further, "the court of inquiry will give no opinion on the conduct of any officer or soldier." The Committee were told that the court was really intended to assist the Commander-in-Chief, and yet it could not even make a Report. Such regulations would not be allowed even for an Irish petty sessions court, and yet it was calmly proposed to pass this important clause between one and two o'clock in the morning.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) thought the clause might do great harm and produce a very extraordinary state of affairs. The members of a court-martial were practically selected in turn, and the individual opinions were not recorded. Such a body could, therefore, be very independent. With a court of inquiry it was totally different. The Commander-in-Chief put whatever men he liked upon a court of inquiry, and it could be ascertained how each member voted. The proceedings were secret, and the evidence was really only a string of affidavits, not subjected to the sifting of cross-examination. This proposal would put an

enormous power into the hands of a central clique. If, however, the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Gentleman were accepted, so much harm would not be done.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY, in reply, submitted that the section alluded to did give a, very considerable protection to those who might be in danger from courts of inquiry.

MR. LAMBERT thought an opportunity should be afforded the men of being present during the inquiry. The verdict in regard to the Lindley surrender was that Colonel Spragge could have held out longer had not some irresponsible person held up the white flag, yet those men were not called. Was an Amendment to remedy this going to be inserted in the Act, or did they intend to discharged

it? They practically charged the men in this case with cowardice;

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member misunderstands the finding of the court, which was that persons not directed by Colonel Spragge to raise the white flag had raised it; and therefore no blame attached to Colonel Spragge.

MR. LAMBERT pointed out that the inquiry was to investigate the circumstances under which Lieut.-Colonel Spragge and others became prisoners of war. A lieutenant and a corporal were accused by this court of inquiry of having held up the white flag when they had no business to do it. The lieutenant was severely wounded, and could not attend, and the corporal had been discharged before the inquiry was held. Was it not plain that those men ought to have a right to be present at the court of inquiry? He thought this case afforded a very good reason for inserting the hon. and gallant Gentleman's Amendment in the Act.

MR. BRODRICK: it is impossible to provide that all men, wounded or unwounded, shall be present. These matters had to be brought to an issue promptly, and if such conditions were made obviously no court-martial or inquiry could be held at all.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE: We have had several questions put pointedly to the Government. My right hon. friend

the Member for East Fife and my hon. and learned friend have asked questions which have not been answered, and after all this discussion we shall still be legislating absolutely in the dark upon the main question. We do not know whether the law we are making is to apply to the principal courts, nor do we know whether the Government are going to discourage the holding of these inquiries. The hon. and gallant Member seemed to think that in courts held during the present war these rules had been observed, but that is not so. Inquiries have been held, and they have been called courts of inquiry, and their decisions have been printed in the usual form, and action has been taken on the decisions of those courts. That is entirely contrary to these rules, for those courts were entirely outside what we are dealing with to-night. The Member for East Fife has argued that these words must apply to all courts. I prefer the other alternative, that these courts have been courts outside the statute. I think some answer ought to have been given to the argument of my right hon. friend the Member for East Fife. We are still being asked to legislate in the dark.

MR. BRODRICK assured the right hon. Gentleman that the intention of the Government was to discourage prerogative courts, and as far as possible to employ the new machinery of courts on oath under the rules of procedure.

MR. T. M. HEALY said he thought the Attorney General was in error. Why, in a matter so important as this, should not the statute he made perfectly clear? The object they all had at heart was the same.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Dickinson, Robert Edmond

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Brookfield, Col. Montagu  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)  
Doughty, George  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Arnold Forster, Hugh O.  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Arrol, Sir William  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r  
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)  
Chapman, Edward  
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r  
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)  
Charrington, Spencer  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol  
Ceilings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Fisher, William Hayes  
Black, Alexander William  
Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
Blundell, Colonel Henry  
Colville, John  
Forster, Henry William  
Bond, Edward  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Fuller, J. M. F.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said he could not see that the definition clause affected the question in the least.

MR. T. M. HEALY said if that was really the case, why should it be left in any

doubt?

COLONEL WELBY said he was satisfied with the explanation of the Secretary for War that the object he had in view was provided for, and he therefore asked leave to withdraw the Amendment. [Cries of "No" from Irish Members]

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said he thought this a most useful Amendment. He objected to the sanction of an oath being given to camp gossip. Africa had been called the land of lies, but if this clause was carried in its present form they would have in addition to call it the land of blasphemy. He thought the procedure to be set up under this proposal was something very like the procedure adopted by the French, and which we had been condemning, in the case of Captain Dreyfus. That was the procedure we were going to apply under this section to our own officers.

Amendment negatived.

Question proposed, "That Clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

MR. T. M. HEALY: suggested that the questions which had been referred to in the debate on the Amendment should be considered by the Government.

MR. BRODRICK: assured the hon. and learned Member that they would take care to consider these matters.

Question put.

The Committee divided;

Ayes, 148; Noes, 64. (Division List No. 136.)

Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (City of Lond.

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)

Ridley, Hon. M. W (Stalybridge

Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th

Rigg, Richard

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

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson

Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)

Macdona, John Gumming

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Gordon, MjEvans- (T'rH'mlets

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim

M'Calmont, Col. H. L. R (Cambs

Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)

Graham, Henry Robert

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

Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles

Greville, Hon. Ronald

M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W

Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)

Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x

Majendie, James A. H.  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'ry  
Malcolm, Ian  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Rbt. Wm.  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Hare, Thomas Leigh  
Max well, W J H (Dumfriesshire  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Spear, John Ward  
Hayne, Rt. Hn. Chas. Seale-  
Middlemore, John T.  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanl'y  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Stock, James Henry  
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.  
More, Robt. Jasper (Shropshire  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Higginbottom, S W.  
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightsde  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Valentia, Viscount  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Mount, William Arthur  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.  
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute  
Warde, Colonel C. E.  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkn'y)  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander



Welby, Lt-Col. A C E. (Taunton  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Nicholson, William Graham  
Willox, Sir John Archibald  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Nicol, Donal Ninian  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, R. E.  
Lawrence, William F.  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. E (Bath)  
Lawson, John Grant  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Wylie, Alexander  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Partington, Oswald  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Feel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley  
Wyndham-Quin, Major H. W.  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Levy, Maurice  
Penn, John  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham  
Purvis, Robert  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)  
Grant, Corrie  
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
O'Dowd, John  
Boland, John  
Hammond, John  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Boyle, James  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Mara, James  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Healy, Timothy Michael

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Caldwell, James  
Hope, John D. (Fife, West)  
O'Shee, James John  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
Reckitt, Harold James  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Joyce, Michael  
Reddy, M.  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Lambert, George  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Crean, Eugene  
Leamy, Edmund  
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)  
Cullinan, J.  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Sullivan, Donal  
Daly, James  
Lundon, W.  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N  
Delany, William  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Tully, Jasper  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
M'Govern, T.  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Doogan, P. C.  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Duffy, William J.  
Minch, Matthew  
Woodhouse Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd  
Edwards, Frank  
Murnaghan, George  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Murphy, J.  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Flynn, James Christopher

Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.

Gilhooly, James

Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.

Goddard, Daniel Ford

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Clause 5 agreed to.

Schedule;:

COLONEL NOLAN wished to draw attention to the schedule, which provided that only one penny was allowed for the soldier's breakfast. That was absurd, especially when they remembered that sugar was taxed now. The allowance ought to be threepence at least.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: Do I understand the hon. Gentleman to move an Amendment on the schedule?

COLONEL NOLAN said he would sooner have no schedule at all, and he moved that these words be omitted.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Gentleman will look at Clause 3 he will see that it refers to the schedule. There must be a schedule to the Act.

COLONEL NOLAN said he moved to leave out all after line 18 to end of the schedule.

Amendment proposed;

"To Leave out from line 18 to the end of the schedule.";(Colonel Nolan.)

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

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) said licensed victuallers were only allowed 1s.

3d. for a hot meal to soldiers billeted on them, and 4d. for lodging.

Where no hot meal was served only

4d. was allowed for lodging, attendance, salt, pepper, and vinegar. That seemed unfair, apart from the great inconvenience which was caused to publicans by billeting soldiers upon them. It dislocated the whole of their domestic life, especially when servant boys and girls had to give up their beds to the soldiers. For the 1s. 3d., for the hot meal, the publican had to provide 1 lb. meat, 1 lb. bread, 1 lb. potatoes or other vegetables, vinegar, salt, pepper, and two pints of small beer, and that could only be supplied at a loss. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would be able to offer some explanation with reference to the breakfasts, and why there was no reference to them in the Act of 1881.

MR. BRODRICK said it was clear that the hon. Member was not aware that in 1891, as a result of complaints from the licensed victuallers, the whole question of billeting was reconsidered. At the same time it was decided that a simple breakfast, consisting of half a pound of bread and a cup of tea, should be provided for 1s. 3d. The hon. Member was probably not aware that the State provided a soldier with bread and meat, and that he provided himself with the remainder; therefore only bread and meat was paid for by the State on billet. He did not think that the licensed victualler had much to complain of, and it was

always

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. E.

Arrol, Sir William

Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol

Anson, Sir William Reynell

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

Black, Alexander William

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)

Blundell, Col. Henry

Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.

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

Bond, Edward

held that the country had the right to call on him to provide billets.

COLONEL NOLAN said he had not received a reply with reference to the breakfasts.

SIR ROBERT FINLAY said that a breakfast consisting of half a pound of bread and a cup of tea was introduced by the Act of 1891.

MR. O'SHEE said that, there was no mention whatever of breakfasts in the Act of 1881.

MR. BRODRICK said the Act had been reprinted.

MR. O'SHEE said there should have been an amending Act.

MR. BRODRICK said that the Act was reprinted in 1893, having been amended in 1891.

COLONEL NOLAN said that if the Secretary of State for War would make the price of breakfasts 3d. he would not divide on the question.

MR. BRODRICK said that the question had been considered over and over again, and there was no reason whatever for making further provision.

MR. O'SHEE said that if the Act of 1881, which he had in his hand, were correctly printed his point was good. The Act could not be changed by merely reprinting it. There should have been an amending Act.

MR. BRODRICK said that the Act of 1881 had been amended from time to time, and he should be glad to furnish the hon. Member with the Act as reprinted.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 131; Noes, 56. (Division List No. 137.)

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Hare, Thomas Leigh

Nicol, Donald Ninian

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John

Harris, Frederick Leverton

O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanl'y  
Partington, Oswald  
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire  
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)  
Pemberton, John S. G.  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Helme, Norval Watson  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Purvis, Robert  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)  
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Howard, John (Kent, Faversh.)  
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge  
Channing, Francis Allston  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
Rigg, Richard  
Chapman, Edward  
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.  
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.  
Charrington, Spencer  
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.  
Law, Andrew Bonar  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Lawrence, William F.  
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)  
Cranborne, Viscount  
Lawson, John Grant  
Sandys, Lt.-Col. Thos. Myles  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Doughty, George  
Leveson-Gower, Fredk, N. S.  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Levy, Maurice  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.  
Spear, John Ward  
Edwards, Frank  
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth  
Stock, James Henry  
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)  
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne  
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B (Cambs  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
Fisher, William Hayes  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward  
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon  
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W  
Valentia, Viscount  
Forster, Henry William  
Majendie, James A. H.  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
Malcolm, Ian  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Middlemore, Jno. Throgmorton  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Molesworth, Sir Lewis  
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald  
Gordon, Maj Evans- (TrH'mlets

More, Robt Jasper (Shropshire)  
Wilson, A. S. (Yorks, E. R.)  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Morgan, D. J. (Walthamstow)  
Wylie, Alexander  
Grant, Corrie  
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Mid'x  
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'y)  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Nicholson, William Graham  
NOES.  
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)  
Gilhooly, James  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Hammond, John  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Boland, John  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)  
Boyle, James  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Dowd, John  
Burke, E. Haviland-  
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Caldwell, James  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
O'Mara, James  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Joyce, Michael  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Reckitt, Harold James

Colville, John  
Lambert, George  
Reddy, M.  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
Leamy, Edmund  
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)  
Crean, Eugene  
Leigh, Sir Joseph  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Cullinan, J.  
Lundon, W.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Daly, James  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.  
Delany, William  
M'Govern, T.  
Tully, Jasper  
Doogan, R. C.  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
White, Patrick (Meath, North)  
Dully, William J.  
Minch, Matthew  
Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
Murnaghan, George  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Murphy, J.  
Colonel Nolan and Mr. O'Shee.  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Schedule agreed to.  
Preamble agreed to.  
Bill reported without amendment.  
MR. BRODRICK said he hoped the House would allow the Bill to be read a third time. It was necessary it should be passed during the week.  
MR. JOHN REDMOND said he thought the right hon. Gentleman was absolutely insatiable. He had obtained the Committee stage very easily.  
Bill to be read the third time to-morrow at Two of the clock.  
Adjourned at ten minutes before Three of the clock.  
HOUSE OF COMMONS.  
Tuesday, 23rd April, 1901.  
The House met at Two of the clock.  
PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.  
MIDLAND RAILWAY BILL.  
King's consent signified. Read the third time, and passed.



TAFF VALE RAILWAY BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

COLWYN BAY AND COLWYN URBAN DISTRICT GAS BILL. (BY ORDER.)

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

LONDON UNDERGROUND RAILWAYS. (BY ORDER.)

Ordered, That a Select Committee of Five Members be appointed to join with the Committee of the Lords on London Underground Railways as desired by their Lordships.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

Ordered, That Sir William Arrol, Mr. Ashton, Mr. Cawley, Sir Michael Foster, and Sir John Dickson-Poynder be Members of the Committee.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum. (The Chairman of Ways and Means.)

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 3) BILL.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 1) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL.

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (HAM) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

METROPOLITAN COMMON SCHEME (ORPINGTON) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP H).

MR. ARTHUR ELLIOT reported from the Committee on Group H of Private Bills, That the parties promoting the Dublin Equalisation of Rates Bill had stated that the evidence of John Mallon was essential to their case; and, it having been proved that his attendance could not be procured without the intervention of the House, he had been instructed to move that the said John Mallon do attend the said Committee on Monday next, at Twelve of the clock.

Ordered, That John Mallon do attend the Committee on Group H of Private Bills on Monday next, at Twelve of the clock.

HORLEY DISTRICT GAS BILL, AND CRAWLEY GAS BILL, CONSOLIDATED INTO "THE HORLEY DISTRICT GAS BILL."

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

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolutions reported from the Committee;

1. "That, in the case of the North British Railway Bill, Petition for additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with; That the parties be permitted to introduce their additional Provision, if the Committee on the Bill think fit."
2. "That, in the case of the Barry Railway, Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with; That the parties be permitted to proceed with their Bill."
3. "That, in the case of the West and South London Junction Railway Bill [Lords], the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with; That the parties be

permitted to proceed with their Bill, provided that the following Clause be inserted::

Nothing in this Act shall authorise the West and South London Junction Railway Company to enter upon, take, or use (except by agreement) any cellar or vault in or under any street belonging to or connected with any building, or the sub-soil under such cellar or vault, unless such cellar or vault, or the building with which it is connected, is described in the deposited books of reference.

And also a Clause to the effect that they shall not take or use (except by agreement) not only the cellars or vaults belonging to or occupied by the memorialists. His Grace the Duke of Northumberland, K.G., the Right Hon. the Lord Iveagh, K.P., the Hon. William Frederick Danvers Smith, M.P., but also the sub-soil under such cellars or vaults.

That the Committee on the Bill do report how far such Order has been complied with."

4. "That, in the case of the Winsford Urban District Gas, Petition for leave to deposit a Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with::That the parties be permitted to deposit their Petition for a Bill."

5. "That, in the case of the Belfast and Northern Counties Railway, Petition for leave to deposit a Petition for Bill, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with::That the parties be permitted to deposit their Petition for a Bill."

6. "That, in the case of the North British Railway Bill, Petition for dispensing with Standing Order 129 in the case of the Petition of Sir James Sivewright against the Bill, the said Standing Order ought to be dispensed with."

7. "That, in the case of the Great Central Railway Bill, Petition for additional Provision, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with::That the parties be permitted to introduce their additional Provision, if the Committee on the Bill think fit."

Resolutions agreed to.

BARRY RAILWAY.

Report [this day] from the Select Committee on Standing Orders read.

Bill ordered to be brought in by Mr. Alfred Thomas and Mr. David Thomas.

SHANNON WATER AND ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence and Proceedings taken before the Committee on the Shannon Water and Electric Power Bill, 1899, be referred to the Committee on Group H on the above-named Bill.:(Mr. Caldwell.)

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the Sheffield District Railway Company to raise additional capital by the creation and issue of debenture stock for the purposes of their undertaking." [Sheffield District Railway Bill [Lords].

SHEFFIELD DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

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

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL

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

## CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

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

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

Petitions for alteration of Law, from Bradford; and Aspatria; to lie upon the Table,

## LOCAL AUTHORITIES OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION BILL

Petitions in favour, from Staines; Dorking; Weardale; Burton on Trent; Twrcelyn; Menai Bridge; and Norwich; to lie upon the Table.

## LICENSING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition of Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs of Scotland, in favour; to lie upon the Table.

## LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SCOTLAND) ACT (1894) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Carluke, against; to lie upon the Table.

## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER BILL

Petitions against, from Plymouth; and Selby; to lie upon the Table.

## MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL

Petitions in favour, from Waverley; Brook; Varteg; Pwllbach; Poynton; Cwauncaegurwen; Treeton; Nunnery (No. 1); Penrhier and Woodfield; Park Lane; Cannock Chase; Chase Town; Brereton (No. 2); Ashton Moss; Bagworth; West Cannock (No. 1); Oakwell; Balgonie; Westfield; Lumphinnans; Halbeath and Kingseat; Lassodie; Windygates; Crossgates; Methilhill; West Wemyss; Rosebank; Kelty; Lochore; Donibristle; and Cardenden Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

## POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Cathcart, against; to lie upon the Table.

## SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL

Petitions against, from Rochester; Whitchurch; Berkhamstead; Reading (two); Shrewsbury; Derby; Osgold-cross; Nottingham; Westbury-on-Trym; Thornbury; Hawkesbury Upton; Chipping Sodbury; Morley; Oldland Common; Birmingham; Fishponds; Idle; Upper Hackney; Matlock Bridge; Matlock Town; Hartlepool; Kingswood; and Hythe; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Rotherham; Derby; London; Sheffield (two); Halifax (four); Rhayader; Swansea; Gorseion; (two) Llansamlet; Goole; Masham; Rothesay; Failsworth; Hallifield; Plaistow; Stanwix; and Royal, Parliamentary, and Police Burghs of Scotland; to lie upon the Table.

## SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL

Petitions in favour, from Sheffield; Epsom; Halifax; and Queensbury to lie upon the Table.

## SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL

Petitions in favour, from Lochmaben; Annan; Barry; Thornliebank (five); Cathcart; Lonmay; Rathen; Kinning Park; Lesmahagow; Dunfermline; Logie Port; and Swinton; to lie upon the Table

## RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

## ALIENS

Address for "Return showing the names of all Aliens to whom Certificates of Naturalisation have been issued, and who have taken the oath of allegiance, between the 1st day of January, 1900, and the 31st day of December, 1900, giving

the country and place of residence of the person naturalised, and including information as to any Aliens who have during the same period obtained Acts of Naturalisation from the Legislature (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 113, of Session 1 of 1900).";(Mr. Jesse Callings.)

IMPRISONMENT OF A MEMBER-MR. PATRICK ALOYSIUS M'HUGH.

MR. SPEAKER acquainted the House that he had received the following letter from the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland relating to the imprisonment of Mr.

Patrick Aloysius M'Hugh, a Member of this House::

In the High Court of Justice in Ireland,

King's Bench Division,

Four Courts, Dublin,

22nd April, 1901

Sir,;I have the honour to inform you that Mr. Patrick Aloysius M'Hugh, Member of Parliament for North Leitrim, having been prosecuted by the Right Honourable the Attorney General for Ireland, by ex officio information, for publishing in his newspaper the Sligo Champion certain seditious libels charged as calculated to prejudice and affect the administration of Justice, and having been found guilty was this day sentenced by me to six calendar months imprisonment as a first-class misdemeanant for such offence, and committed to Kilmainham Prison accordingly.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant

Brien,

Lord Chief Justice of Ireland

To the Right Honourable

The Speaker of the House of Commons

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I be allowed to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether, as a matter of privilege, it will be competent for me to draw the attention of the House to the circumstances of the conviction.

MR. SPEAKER: No; not in the case of a criminal conviction.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Under those circumstances I will presently ask the First Lord of the Treasury to put the Attorney General for Ireland's salary down for discussion on an early date.

MR. SPEAKER: Notice of that question must be given in the ordinary way.

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;JAMESON RAID;POSITION OF THE CHARTERED COMPANY,

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether the assets of the late Transvaal Government which he is advised do not pass to His Majesty's Government, for example, the claim against the Chartered Company in respect of the Jameson Raid, will be made available to meet pro tanto the just and lawful liabilities of the late Transvaal Government incurred before the outbreak of hostilities; and how His Majesty's Government propose to deal with the proportion of these liabilities which may not be met out of such assets.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): I have already pointed out that such assets cannot be made available. With regard

to the just and lawful liabilities of the late Transvaal Government, in so far as they are just and legal liabilities against his Majesty's Government, they will be recognised to the extent to which they can be fulfilled out of the revenue of the Transvaal.

MR. BLACK: Does the answer to the first paragraph apply equally to such assets as arrears of taxation and arrears of royalties?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: That point does not arise out of the question.

MR. MERRIMAN'S LETTER OF 14TH NOVEMBER, 1899.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL (Donegal, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is aware that the Hon. J. X. Merriman, who has been a Cabinet Minister in several Governments at the Cape, from his place in the Legislative Assembly of Cape Colony moved on 17th September for information as to the methods by which his private letter, dated 14th November, 1899, came into the hands of the British authorities and was published in a Parliamentary Paper issued by the Colonial Office on 23rd August, and that Sir Gordon Sprigg, the Prime Minister of Cape Colony, promised a post office inquiry; and what was the result of that inquiry.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The manner in which the letter came into the hands of Sir Alfred Milner is described as follows in a Parliamentary Paper presented to the Cape Parliament;

"All that the Governor knows about the matter is that this letter fell into the hands of the military authorities after the second occupation of Dordrecht, and was sent to him in the same way as other correspondence captured from the enemy. The idea that the letter was intercepted in the post is entirely erroneous."

This statement was made at a later date than the promise of a post office inquiry, and the information it contains appears to have rendered that inquiry unnecessary.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: Did the right hon. Gentleman himself suggest to Sir Gordon Sprigg that it should be merely a post office inquiry?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Certainly not.

COST OF THE WAR.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the approximate war cost of £1,500,000 per week is in addition to the ordinary expenditure on the military services.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Yes, Sir. LORD ROBERTS'S TELEGRAMS.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether there would be any and if so what objection to laying upon the Table of the House of Commons a reprint of the various telegrams, not primarily designed for publication, which Lord Roberts sent to the late Secretary of State for War in the course of the campaign, having regard to the difficulty incidental to the comprehension of the despatches without the aid of the telegrams.

MR. BRODRICK: I cannot undertake to publish telegrams which have passed, nor am I aware of any telegrams despatched by Lord Roberts to the late Secretary of State for War, not primarily designed for publication, which would facilitate

the comprehension of despatches as suggested by the hon. Member.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: IS the right hon. Gentleman aware that Lord Roberts's despatch about Paardeberg consists of twelve lines only?

[No answer was given.]

MEAT CONTRACTS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the advice of the Law Officers of the Crown was taken with reference to the action of the South African Cold Storage Company in supplying troops in the field with 2,250,000 lb. of frozen meat instead of freshly-killed meat, under the terms of the contract entered into on the 27th October, 1899.

I beg also to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether the contract with the South African Cold Storage Company, dated the 27th October, 1900, was entered into in this country or in South Africa.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton): The reply to the first question is in the negative. The reply to the second is that the contract was made in South Africa.

AID FOR DISCHARGED SOLDIERS.

MR. LEVY (Leicestershire, Loughborough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that Private S. Groves, 5,046, 1st Battalion Leicestershire Regiment, who contracted enteric at Lombard Kopt and was discharged from Netley in November last as unfit for further service, has up to the present been in receipt of only 1s. per day, although still unable to walk without the aid of a stick and altogether incapacitated for employment, and if there is any special reason in this case why the 2s. 6d. per day to which he is entitled on the authority of the Paymaster-General has not been paid.

LORD STANLEY: The man is reported by the medical authorities as partially able to earn a livelihood. At the time of his discharge 1s. a day was the maximum rate provided by the Royal Warrant, but under a new regulation he is now eligible for a rate of 1s. 6d. His case is one of a large number which are being considered as rapidly as possible.

RETURN OF TROOPS.

MR. RUTHERFORD (Lancashire, Darwen): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can hold out any hopes of immediately relieving the Militia regiments now serving and who have been serving in South Africa for more than twelve months.

MR. BRODRICK: In view of the arrival of four fresh battalions of Militia who volunteered for service in South Africa, Lord Kitchener has intimated to us that he is sending home 6th Battalion Warwickshire, 4th Battalion Derbyshire, 3rd Battalion Durham Light Infantry, which were the first three battalions to embark, and the 4th Battalion Scottish Rifles, which is relieved by the 3rd Battalion of the same regiment.

MR. RUTHERFORD: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can hold out any hopes of immediately relieving the different companies of the Imperial Yeomanry now serving and who have been serving in South Africa for more than twelve months.

LORD STANLEY: I am not at present in a position to state when the Imperial

Yeomanry companies can be relieved. Special consideration has been shown in cases of hardship reported by commanding officers.

#### MILITARY COURTS OF INQUIRY.

MR SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the fact that non-commissioned officers and men punished for offences and dissatisfied with the award of the commanding officer are entitled to demand trial by court-martial, whereas officers aggrieved by the action of the authorities, taken after the consideration of the proceedings of a court of inquiry, are not entitled to trial by court-martial if they should desire it; and whether, having regard to the fact that courts of inquiry can be and are held in the absence of the accused, who are at times not informed of the evidence brought before them or of the gravamen of the charge of which they have been found guilty and condemned, the privilege of open trial by court-martial will be accorded to officers who demand it.

MR. BRODRICK: I must refer the hon. Member to my reply to a very similar question put by my hon. friend the Member for Chester on the 28th February.

#### LINKED BATTALIONS.

MR. BLACK: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether in the Government scheme of reorganisation the system of linked battalions, one battalion in each regiment being liable to be sent abroad, will be adhered to.

MR. BRODRICK: Yes, Sir, so far as two-battalion regiments are concerned.

MR. BLACK was understood to ask if the answer applied to army corps designed for purely home defence.

MR. BRODRICK: That would not affect the linked battalions.

#### ARMY REORGANISATION; HIGHLAND REGIMENTS.

MR. BLACK: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the Government scheme of army reorganisation, the Highland regiments will all be attached to the army corps having its headquarters in Edinburgh.

MR. BRODRICK: No pledge can be given, but the desirability of quartering Scotch regiments in Scotland will not be lost sight of.

#### CHINA; COMMAND OF ALLIED FORCES; CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs will he state when the Correspondence embodying the negotiations between Great Britain and the Powers with reference to the affairs of the Generalissimo of the Allied forces in China will be published; and whether he can state the reasons on which the objections of the Powers to an English Officer as Generalissimo were based.

\*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): Corre-

spondence on this subject will be found in China No. 1, 1901, pages 60 to 74. No

question of a British Commander-in-Chief was ever brought forward.

#### FIGHTING IN CENTRAL ARABIA.

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAG-GREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he has any information to the

effect that a battle has been fought between the followers of Mubarek, the Sheikh of Koweit, and Ibu Raschid, the original ruler of Nejd, in Central Arabia, and that about 5,000 men were killed; and can he state whether Ibu Raschid has recovered his kingdom of Nejd; and whether he has any information regarding the fate of Mubarek.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: According to the information which has reached His Majesty's Government, a fight is reported to have taken place on the 17th of March last between the forces of Mubarek, the Sheik of Koweit, and those of Ibu Raschid, the Ameer of Nejd. The losses are said to have been heavy on both sides, but no details have transpired. Mubarek, who is now at Koweit, is said to have been defeated. The Ameer of Nejd is at Boreyda, a place in Nejd near which the battle was fought.

#### KHORAT RAILWAY CONTRACT.

\*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if compensation has been obtained from the Siamese Government for Messrs. Jardine, Matheson, and Co., who were forcibly ejected in August, 1896, by that Government from their contract known as the Khorat Railway Contract; and if he will state the total amount obtained and also the amount offered in full settlement by the Siamese Government and refused by Messrs. Jardine, Matheson, and Co.

\*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The contractor for the Bangkok-Khorat Railway was Mr. G. Murray Campbell, and the dispute between him and the Siamese Government in regard to the execution and cancellation of the contract was referred to the arbitration of Sir Edward Clarke, whose decision was announced on the 28th ultimo. I will inquire whether there is any objection to publishing the terms of the award. We have no information of any previous offer being made by the Siamese Government and refused by the contractor.

#### THE NEW SUGAR DUTY

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will state how his new taxation would apply in the case of a merchant who has sold to a brewer sugar for delivery weekly during 1901, and can he state who will have to pay the duty; and how will his proposed new duty apply in the case of a merchant who has sold to a brewers' sugar maker raw sugar for forward delivery; will the brewers' sugar maker be obliged to accept delivery notwithstanding the fact that raw sugar will no longer be available for brewers' use, owing to the duty which puts it at a disadvantage in comparison with malt and flaked maize.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): In the case referred to in paragraph one the merchant who imports the sugar will pay the duty, but will be entitled to increase his contract price with the brewer by the amount of the duty. The imposition of the duty will not entitle the brewers' sugar maker to break his contract. I cannot admit the assumption that the result of the duty will be to render raw sugar no longer available for brewing.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether with a view to avoid the further dislocation of many trades now occasioned by the Customs delaying delivery of consignments pending analysis for duty



purposes, he will consider the possibility of accepting declarations by the producers in the country of origin as to the amount of added sugar, subject to occasional checking by the Customs Laboratory.

I beg also to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that the Customs are assessing and collecting duty on condensed milk upon the assumption that the full bulk weight comprises sugar, whereas the quantity contained is far less than half the amount charged, and whether he will take immediate action to prevent the continuance of this action.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: So far as the Customs is concerned, no delay is taking place in the delivery of imported articles subject to the new sugar duties. In regard to the sugar not cleared at the highest rate, the foreign certificate of polarisation is accepted, subject to no question arising as to authenticity. In regard to articles partly composed of sugar, I do not think such declarations could be accepted; duty is at present being charged, in accordance with the law, on their full weight; among them is condensed milk. But samples of such articles are being taken in order that the amount of duty on them may in such a case be ultimately adjusted as far as may be possible with reference to the amount of sugar, under powers which will be inserted in the Finance Bill.

MR. KEARLEY: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman make it a little more clear?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: We have to act under the Customs Tariff Act, 1876. We cannot fix the duty until the amount of sugar in the articles has been ascertained.

Samples are now being taken, and we shall soon be in a position to come to a decision.

MR. KEARLEY: Am I to understand that every article which comes into the country will be charged the full sugar duty on its total bulk?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: When the matter has been properly adjusted, any over duty will be returned. We are obliged, in accordance with the law, to charge articles on their full weight.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): Is it in accordance with the law? Does the Act of 1876 not prescribe that as to an article containing spirit the duty shall be levied on the spirit? Has the right hon. Gentleman seen the schedule of the Act?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Yes, Sir.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Shall I read it for him?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: On this point I think I know as much as the hon. Member. The schedule of the Act of 1876 has two provisions; one relating to spirit and one relating to all other articles. The duty with regard to spirit is charged on the amount of spirit, and the duty on all other articles is charged on the weight. I assure the hon. Member that the delay will not be as great as he imagines.

MR. KEARLEY: May I ask;

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; This matter cannot be discussed in the form of questions across the floor of the House.

THE NEW COAL DUTY; AGRICULTURAL LAND RATING ACT.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the objections to the proposed duty on exported coal, the Government will withdraw that proposal in favour of an equivalent gain to the Exchequer by the

non-renewal of the Agricultural Land Rating Act.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No, Sir.

\*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the operation of the Customs Order, G. O. 32, 1901, 18th instant, will in effect injure the business of steamers engaged in bringing into port catches from the fishing fleet, by causing delay in entering and clearing on account of shipping two or three tons of bunker coal; and whether, having regard to the element of time being of importance in such transactions, he will cause the matter to be investigated with a view to ascertaining whether arrangements should be made to enable entry omnibus forms to be given, say, weekly or fortnightly.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No delay will be caused to steam fishing vessels on entering the fishing ports in connection with the duty on coal, and no delay need occur on their departure, inasmuch as the entry for shipment of such bunker coal as they require may be passed in anticipation. There will be no objection to the entries being passed weekly or fortnightly, as may be most convenient, and steps will be taken for giving effect to this.

EXPORT STATISTICS.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer if he can state the total weight of all goods exported from the United Kingdom in 1900.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am afraid that the information for which the hon. Member asks cannot be given.

FOOD ADULTERATION PROSECUTIONS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he is aware that a person charged with selling articles of food in contravention of the Sale of Food and Drugs Acts must be informed to the exact nature of his alleged offence, and of the alleged adulteration, as stated in the analyst's certificates, while persons charged with selling diseased meat under the Public Health Act, 1875, are not informed of the exact nature of the disease, but are vaguely charged with selling meat which is diseased or unsound or unfit for food; and, as under these circumstances the defendant cannot prepare his defence, whether he will take steps to oblige sanitary authorities to state the exact nature of all such charges, and medical officers of health to furnish to the person whose meat is seized a certificate of the exact nature of the disease affecting the meat seized.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): I am aware of the different requirements of the Sale of Food and Drugs Acts and of the Public Health Act with regard to the matters referred to. I may point out that the adulteration

of food and drugs can ordinarily be discovered only by the application of chemical tests. This is not so as regards meat which is diseased or unsound or unfit for food. The two classes of cases do not therefore seem to be parallel. I cannot say I think there is any sufficient ground for proposing such a change in the law as that suggested in the question.

MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the local Government Board whether he will grant a Return showing how many medical officers of health there are in England and Wales, and distinguishing those part of whose salary is paid by Parliament, and showing how many have diplomas in public health.

MR. WALTER LONG: I do not think it necessary that there should be a Parliamentary Return on this subject, but I shall be happy to give the hon. Member the information which he desires. It will take some little time to prepare, but I hope to be able to send it to him in the course of a week or ten days.

#### LONDON COUNTY COUNCIL'S TOTTENHAM HOUSING SCHEME.

MR. JOSEPH HOWARD (Middlesex, Tottenham): I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether his attention has been directed to the proposed scheme of the London County Council for the erection of workmen's cottages on a site in Tottenham for the purpose of housing about 35,000 persons, at a cost of £1,500,000; and whether, as this will necessitate an outlay for the erection of new board schools, and also an expenditure for sewerage and other necessary works, any and what relief can be afforded out of public funds to the ratepayers of the district; and what steps should be taken for this purpose.

MR. WALTER LONG: I am aware of the proposed scheme. Assistance of the kind referred to in the second paragraph of the question could not be given, but I may point out that the erection of dwelling houses on vacant land largely increases the rateable value of a district, and from investigations which I have caused to be made elsewhere, I do not think it should be assumed that the result of the scheme would necessarily be to increase the burdens on the ratepayers.

MR. JOSEPH HOWARD: Will the local authorities be given an extension of borrowing powers?

MR. WALTER LONG: I am not quite sure I follow the hon. Member. Does he mean an extension of the time for repayment of the loan they may have to contract in order to carry out the works? Of course any such application will be considered, but I do not think there are any special grounds in this case for differentiating it from similar cases.

#### PENRHYN QUARRY DISPUTE.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether any endeavour has been made by the Board of Trade to settle the Penrhyn Quarry dispute, and whether any steps will be taken to bring about an amicable settlement.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The Board of Trade have received no application from the parties to take any action with reference to the Penrhyn Quarry dispute, and they have no reason to believe that such action would lead to any useful result.

MR. BELL (Derby): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether, in accordance with the powers conferred upon him by Section 2, Sub-section (a), of the Conciliation Act, 1896, he has inquired into the causes and circumstances of the dispute existing between Lord Penrhyn and his workmen; and, if so, will he present a Report to the House.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: It is not the practice of the Board of Trade to institute a formal inquiry with regard to a dispute unless they consider that such an inquiry is likely to promote a settlement. In the dispute referred to in the question they have no reason to think that this is the case.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid): Would it not conduce to a settlement if the fight hon. Gentleman were to send some one down to ascertain the real facts?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I have paid close attention to the progress of the dispute, and I do not think any intervention on the part of the Board of Trade, at any rate at present, would be effectual.

BELFAST ORDERS FOR AMERICAN STEEL.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that Messrs. Harland and Wolff, Belfast, have placed an order to the value of £156,000 sterling with Messrs. Carnegie, Pittsburgh, from the importation of which manufactured steel under our free import system no revenue will be derived; and whether he can state how much duty would be levied by the American Government upon a similar order placed in Great Britain.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, I have no information as to the dealings of Messrs. Harland and Wolff, and in the absence of particulars of the nature of the goods referred to in the question it is impossible for me to make any statement with regard to the duty leviable thereon by any foreign country.

LOCOMOTIVE EXPLOSION ON LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE RAILWAY.

MR. BELL: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has yet received the report of the inspecting officer who held the inquiry into the cause of the explosion of locomotive 676 on the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway, and if so, when will it be published.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, and the necessity of making some chemical inquiries will probably delay the preparation of the report.

INSTRUCTION IN FORESTRY.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he can state what provision has been made by the Government for instruction in forestry in the United Kingdom.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): In England provision is made for instruction in forestry at the Durham College of Science, at the South-Eastern Agricultural College at Wye, at the Yorkshire College at Leeds, and by the Board of Agricultural Studies at Cambridge University, to all of which institutions grants are made by the Board of Agriculture. Lectures in forestry are also given at the colleges at Cirencester and Downton and other institutions not in receipt of grants from the Department. Examinations in forestry are conducted by the Surveyors' Institution. Perhaps the hon. Member would be so good as to address inquiries with regard to the analogous grants in Scotland to my right hon. friend the Lord Advocate, and with regard to instruction in forestry in Ireland to my right hon. friend the Chief Secretary.

BRUCE GROVE POST OFFICE;PROVFSION OF CHANGE.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been called to the refusal to

supply postal orders at Bruce Grove Sub-Post Office, when a £;5 and a £;10 Bank of England note were offered in payment, on the ground that there was not sufficient change in the office; whether he has satisfied himself that this is the case; and, if so, what means are being taken to prevent inconvenience to the public by such offices having insufficient money to cash postal orders when presented if they exceed in the aggregate £;10, or to enable the public to secure postal orders or money orders when bank notes are tendered.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): Yes, Sir. A representation was received at the post office, dated the 6th instant, to the effect that an application had been made on the 4th instant at the Bruce Grove Post Office for a postal order for five shillings and for three stamps, and a Bank of England note for £;10 tendered in payment; and that the sub-postmistress had been unable to change the note. It appeared on inquiry that the sub-postmistress could not give change of a £;10 note at the time without inconvenience and risk of leaving herself without sufficient cash for other customers, and she asked the person who tendered the note for something smaller. On a recent occasion change for a £;5 note had to be refused under similar circumstances. There was nothing irregular in the matter, so far as the sub-postmistress is concerned, as, according to the rules of the Department, postmasters are not bound to give change, although they may do so when no inconvenience is likely to be caused. The circumstances were all fully explained to the person who wrote to complain.

#### POSTAL ACCOMMODATION AT THORPE HESLEY.

MR. HOLLAND (Yorkshire, W.R., Rotherham): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he is aware that the post office at Thorpe Hesley has been closed since 15th April, to the inconvenience of a population of about 3,000, who are compelled to walk nearly two miles in order to obtain stamps or postal orders; and if he can state what steps are intended to be taken to provide proper postal facilities for the place.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The closing of the post office at Thorpe Hesley, Rotherham, is due to the fact that the late sub-postmaster has resigned his appointment, and that no eligible candidate for the sub-postmastership has as yet come forward. All possible efforts shall be made to avoid inconvenience to the public and to fill the appointment as soon as possible.

#### IRELAND;MORTALITY AMONGST CALVES.

MR. DALY (Monaghan, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that much mortality has taken place for some time past among calves in Ireland, which has caused losses to the farming classes in Ireland, and whether he can recommend any remedy.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The Department of Agriculture is now investigating the causes of the serious mortality amongst calves, and for this purpose has secured the services of the eminent bacteriologist, Professor Nocard. The principal of the Royal Veterinary College of Ireland will assist him in his researches.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): Will Irish farmers be invited to give evidence in the

course of the investigation?

MR. WYNDHAM: That I cannot say.

MR. DILLON: I will put down a question.

MR. DALY: Will a copy of the Report, when presented, be furnished to the Irish county and district councils?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am quite alive to the importance of this question, and will do my best to communicate the results of the investigation to all concerned.

GRAZING LAND TENANCIES.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is now in a position to state the decision arrived at by the Congested Districts Board as to the status of eleven months tenants in the occupation of grazing lands about to be purchased by the Board.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Board purchases directly from the owner of estates in the congested districts, and consequently steps into the position of a landlord.

This introduces no modification into the status of tenants on estates so purchased.

LAND PURCHASE IN CO. WEXFORD.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he will state what are the intentions of the Government with regard to land purchase in the county of Wexford, in view of the fact that in that county a large number of tenants have arranged to purchase their holdings, but that the purchase of these holdings cannot be proceeded with owing to lack of funds.

MR. WYNDHAM: In view of the fact that time will not, in all probability, admit of any comprehensive land legislation during the present session, the Government has prepared an interim Bill to deal with the difficulty in county Wexford and with similar difficulties which may arise elsewhere. Such a Bill cannot, however, be introduced and passed unless some assurance be given that it will be discussed as an interim measure to meet an emergency.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE: When will the Bill be printed and circulated so that we may see its provisions?

MR. WYNDHAM: If I can receive any assurance; I do not wish to press it too far; there will be no objection to circulate it on an early day.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): The right hon. Gentleman must see that we cannot give any assurance about a Bill which we have not seen. Is the Chief Secretary's statement to be taken as a declaration of the Government's abandonment of the promise contained in the King's Speech to deal with the question of voluntary land purchase?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir. It is premature to make any statement as to the business of the House.

MR. SWIFT MACNEILL: It has just been made.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I asked the Chief Secretary, arising out of his answer to the question on the Paper, whether the Government abandon their promise to introduce a Voluntary Land Purchase Bill.

MR. WYNDHAM: I made no declaration. I merely alluded to a possibility.

LAND DISTURBANCES IN COUNTY LONGFORD.

MR. J. P. FARRELL (Longford, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any report has been received from the Edgeworthstown Police Station as to a disturbance created in the townland of Lisnanagh, county Longford, by the two emergency men guarding the evicted farms there; is he aware that one of them bombarded the house for several hours with stones, and was only prevented from committing further excesses by the arrival of the police; and will any steps be taken to bring these disturbers of the public peace to justice for such conduct.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member has been misinformed. The occurrences referred to in the first and second paragraphs did not take place.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that I have not been misinformed, but he has by his subordinates.

#### LONGFORD GUARDIANS' SURCHARGE.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Local Government Board have issued a sealed order confirming a surcharge of 8s. upon three members of the Longford Board of Guardians, the price of a coffin granted in which to inter the remains of a poor man who had died near Ardagh; whether, seeing that this poor man was on outdoor relief and had no friends or relatives to see to the interment of his remains, he can explain on what grounds the auditor made the surcharge; and did he know that the man was virtually a pauper, and as such entitled to be buried at the expense of the union; and, will he call his attention to the fact that no surcharge should have been made in such a case.

MR. WYNDHAM: The provisions of Article 4 (4) of the Union Accounts Order were not complied with, and in the evidence adduced the auditor could not find that the expense was incurred in the burial of the deceased. I am making further inquiries. It is not a very large matter.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: But there is a principle involved.

#### LABOURERS' COTTAGES IN THE GRANARD UNION.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that at the recent inquiry into representations under the Labourers (Ireland) Acts in Granard Union two evicted tenants named John Farrell and John Heslin, both of Lisnanagh, county Longford, were refused cottages mainly because they were evicted tenants; whether he is aware that there is a scarcity of labourers in the portion of the county in which they applied, and that for nearly seven miles the country round Lisnanagh is a grazing plain on which there are but few dwellings; and will he call for an explanation from the inspector of his reasons for advising the rejection of these men's representations.

MR. WYNDHAM: The inspector who held the inquiry reported that three cottages had already been erected under the Labourers' Acts in the townland of Lisnanagh, and that there were also in the locality six or seven other houses, two of which were unoccupied and fit for human habitation. Under these circumstances there was no case for erecting these cottages.

MR. J. P. FARRELL: Did the inspector tell the right hon. Gentleman that the two houses in question were houses from which men had been evicted?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not think that is material to the question.

BUTLER ESTATE, CO. GALWAY.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can state the reasons for the delay in the sale of the Butler estate in county Galway.

MR. WYNDHAM: A request for an inspection of this estate under the 40th section of the Act of

1890 was received by the Land Commissioners in January last, and an assistant commissioner was deputed for the purpose of carrying out the inspection. I have drawn the attention of the Land Commission to the matter.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: How many years have these negotiations been going on?

MR. WYNDHAM: We have no knowledge of the negotiations until the matter comes before the Land Commission and an agreement has been arrived at.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' (IRELAND) SUPERANNUATION.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Irish Poor Law Officers' Association has made itself responsible for a statement to the effect that the passage into law of the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation (Ireland) Bill would mean a saving to local rates, and that solely on the strength of this representation certain boards of guardians are giving sanction to the Bill; whether the Government will obtain a report from a competent actuary as to the probable effect of the Bill on local rates, having regard to the experience of the working of the English Act of 1896, and to the fact that the Bill proposes to include those giving only a portion of time to the service; and whether the information so obtained will be placed in the hands of Members before the Second Reading of the Bill.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Bill is down for Second Reading on Friday, 3rd May. The Government will be prepared to accept the Second Reading on the understanding that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee, with a view to ascertaining the ultimate actuarial effect of the measure on local rates. For this purpose it is proposed to employ a competent; actuary.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that before the English Bill became law the cost was £6,200 annually, whereas it is now £74,000?

MR. MURNAGHAN: Does not the right hon. Gentleman consider it his duty as the representative of the Irish Government in this House to place in the hands of hon. Members a statement as to the probable effect of this Bill on the rates of Ireland?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, and I propose to accomplish that object by placing the information at the disposal of the Select Committee.

MR. MURNAGHAN: But we want it before the Second Reading.

MR. WYNDHAM: I cannot give it before the Second Reading, but if hon. Members will allow the Bill to be read a second time;

MR. DILLON: Certainly not.

MR. MURNAGHAN: This is a matter of the utmost importance.

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order&#x0021;



MR. DALY: Considering the importance of this measure to the ratepayers of Ireland;

\*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is not entitled to preface a question by arguments and comments.

MR. DALY: Cannot we have the information before the Second Reading?

\*MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. Gentleman has twice answered that question.

MR. MURNAGHAN: The right hon. Gentleman has stated that the Government are prepared to take the time of the House to promote the interests of a certain organisation in Ireland. Why will he not also take time for necessary legislation?

\*MR. SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. Member to resume his seat.

FRENCHPARK WATERWORKS.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state on what grounds the Local Government Board propose, in opposition to the wishes of the Rural District Council, to make a union charge of the cost of the French-park Waterworks, which will serve only a few hundred people.

MR. WYNDHAM: The action of the Board in this matter has been in accordance with their general policy as to

chargeability of rural sanitary expenses since May, 1899. The area of charge in this case has not yet been fixed. The district council wish to fix an area of so limited an extent that the annual charge thereon in respect of the loan would be about 10d. in the £; whereas if the dispensary district were adopted it would be only 4d., and if the whole rural district were adopted it would be about 7d. This was fully explained in a letter addressed to the council on the 1st instant.

CARRICK-ON-SHANNON PETTY SESSIONS CLERK.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any objection has been received to the election of Mr. Devenish by a majority of one vote as clerk of Carrick-on-Shannon Petty Sessions district on the 12th instant; whether he is aware that Mr. Devenish resides in the county Roscommon, and is already a petty sessions clerk in that county; and whether, as he has no residence in the county Leitrim, his appointment under these circumstances to an important centre like the county town of Leitrim will be sanctioned by the Lord Lieutenant.

MR. WYNDHAM: The reply to the first and second paragraphs is in the affirmative.

Mr. Devenish resides four miles from Carrick-on-Shannon. A petty sessions clerk is not required to reside in the district of which he is clerk. The appointment of Mr. Devenish has been sanctioned by the Lord Lieutenant.

IRISH RAILWAYS-STATE PURCHASE ; GERMAN STATE RAILWAYS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the German State railways realised a profit of £23,200,000 last year; and whether he will consider the advisability of introducing the system of State ownership in Ireland, with a view to decrease the burden of taxation, and to increase transit facilities by cheaper rates for goods and passengers.

MR. WYNDHAM: This question is similar to one put by the hon. Member

and answered by me on Friday last.\* As soon as I obtain information on the first paragraph I will communicate with the hon. Member.

#### ROAD LABOUR IN IRELAND.

MR. TULLY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, before laying upon the Table of the House the draft Provisional Order regarding direct labour, he will communicate to the Irish Members the decision of the Government as to the Amendments suggested by them and forwarded to him.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes. Sir; but I must not exclude from myself the right to insert or object to any amendment of the provisions of the Bill on the Committee stage.

#### DAVID FINLAY'S ESTATE, CO. CAVAN.

MR. M'COVERN (Cavan, W.) I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland can he state on what date the tenants on the estate of the late David Finlay and others, situate in the county of Cavan, signed agreements to purchase their holdings through the Irish Land Commission; on what date were these agreements lodged with the Irish Land Commission; and what were the reasons that these agreements had not been lodged at an earlier date.

MR. WYNDHAM: No agreements have been lodged between the landlord and tenants of this estate, and consequently I have no cognisance of any proceedings in respect of its sale.

#### THE KING'S ACCESSION; PROCLAMATION AT LIMERICK.

MR. LONDON (Limerick, E.) I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on the proclamation of King Edward the Seventh as King the high sheriff for the county of Limerick requisitioned the Dublin Castle authorities for a guard of honour composed of a half battery of artillery, a half squadron of cavalry, and a half battalion of infantry

\* See page 789.

for the proclamation in the towns of Bruff, Rathkeale, and Newcastle: whether the Castle authorities refused on the grounds that they could furnish no expenses unless the high sheriff would in person defray expenses from his own private purse; and whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the correspondence connected therewith.

MR. WYNDHAM: The high sheriff, in February last, communicated to the Executive Government a copy of a correspondence that had passed between him and the military authorities, who felt unable to comply with his requisition for troops for the purpose mentioned. The high sheriff was informed that the matter was not one calling for the intervention of the Executive. The answer to the last paragraph is in the negative.

#### CULLOVILLE (IRELAND) POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. DALY: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will inquire into the inconvenience caused to the people of Culloville by not having a Sunday delivery of letters, as is the case in the surrounding post office districts; and whether he will arrange a collection of letters, for this district each evening later than that now existing, and also erect a pillar box at Culloville.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has caused inquiry to be

instituted, and the result shall be communicated to the hon. Member as soon as possible.

MR. DALY: How soon? The people of this district are greatly inconvenienced.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I cannot say, but the result shall be communicated as soon as the Postmaster General has had time to form an opinion on the inquiry.

CORK POST OFFICE REVISION.

MR. T. M. HEALY (Louth, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can explain why, although the revision of the Cork Post Office staff took place on the 4th July, 1899, under which the clerks' class was increased with the authority of the Treasury given on that date, the sorting clerks and telegraphists promoted on the 16th February, 1900, only received the increased pay from the latter date, notwithstanding that in the case of the superintendent of telegraphs and the female supervising officer at Cork the increased pay was allowed from the date of the Treasury letter; and seeing that in the case of the revision of the Dublin telegraph staff the promoted officers' promotions were eventually antedated to the date of the Treasury sanction, and that this is the practice at large offices, whether it will now be arranged that the officers in Cork are paid from that date.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: In regard to the superintendent for telegraph duty, the revision merely authorised an improvement in his scale of salary, and as regards the woman supervisor the revision merely converted the assistant supervisorship into a supervisorship, so in these two cases the revision could be carried out at once. As regards the promotions to new appointments arising from the revision considerable difficulties were experienced in making the selections, and it was not until the 16th of February that the recommendations received the Postmaster General's approval. It is the practice to date all promotions from the day on which they receive the Postmaster General's approval unless there are any special circumstances in the case which justify a different course, and the Postmaster General sees no reason to depart from the practice in this case.

HIGHER ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education what steps, if any, it is proposed to take to place beyond challenge as to legality the right of school boards to assist the maintenance out of the school board rates of schools recognised under the Higher Elementary Minute now incorporated in the Education Code for 1901.

\*THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): I have nothing to add to the statement I made a day or two ago, that the Board of Education are advised that higher elementary schools under the conditions of the Code may be maintained by school boards out of the School Fund.

REX v. COCKERTON.

DR. MACNAMARA: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in the event of the School Board proceeding no further with the appeal against the Cockerton judgment, the Government will undertake to deal with the matter in the present session.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I cannot give any pledges at the present time with regard to the legislation of the session, as I informed the hon. Gentleman a few days ago.

#### ROYAL DECLARATION AGAINST ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

MR. T. M. HEALY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state the present intentions of the Government with regard to repealing that portion of the Royal Accession. Declaration, which describes Roman Catholic beliefs as idolatrous.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers that question, may I ask him if the Royal declaration by which King Edward VII. sits upon the Throne is not part of the Bill of Rights and of the Act of Settlement?

\*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order; That is a comment, and not a question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that the present position of the matter is as follows:;There was originally a proposal in the House of Commons to appoint a Committee to investigate the terms of the Oath. It appeared to me that if the subject was to be investigated it had better be by a Joint Committee, and I threw that suggestion out in the House. The Opposition have intimated that they do not propose to serve on the Committee, and therefore that proposal falls through. I presume that the Committee appointed by the House of Lords will investigate the subject on their own account, as was originally proposed.

#### SATURDAY SITTINGS.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can arrange to have the House meet on Saturdays for Government business, with a view to preserve the rights of private Members on Tuesday.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir: I cannot imagine that any arrangement for Saturday sittings would meet with the approval of hon. Members.

#### DECIMAL SYSTEM OF COINAGE.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government propose to take the necessary steps to substitute the decimal system of coinage for the system at present in use.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

#### ROYAL COMMISSION ON IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is yet in a position to name the members of the Royal Commission on Irish University Education and to give the terms of reference.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir, we are not in a position as yet to state the names of the Members of this Commission. It will be in the recollection of the hon. Gentleman that an appeal was made to us not to settle finally either the members of the Commission or the terms of reference until the debate which took place last night had been concluded. We hope to proceed very rapidly now with the business of appointing the members of the Commission, and finally settling the terms of reference.

#### ROYAL COMMISSION ON LOCAL TAXATION.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can state when the Royal Commission on Local Taxation is expected to report; and whether that Report will be in the hands of Members before the Agricultural

Rating Bill is renewed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that no date can yet be fixed, but every effort is being made to press on the Report. It is impossible to give the pledge asked for in the second paragraph.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will postpone the discussion on the Report of the coal tax resolution until next week. On Thursday there is to be a meeting of the Federation of Miners from all parts of the kingdom. The right hon. Gentleman will see that the miners are not able at once to place their views before him as the coalowners and merchants can do; and yet it is highly desirable that they should have an opportunity of placing their objections to the tax before the Government. That cannot be done if the Report is taken on Thursday.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Of course I shall be very happy to receive and consider any views which the minors may present to me on this subject. I may say that I have already undertaken to receive deputations from other interests affected; and of course I shall consider anything which may be said. But I confess I do not quite see why the Report of the resolution should be postponed. The invariable course has been; and both I and the right hon. Gentleman remember the opposed Budget of 1885; to allow the Report of the resolution to be adopted by the House and to be embodied in the Finance Bill, before the House is really asked to express a decision on the subject. There will be ample time before the Second Reading of the Finance Bill for any representations to be made and considered; and therefore I hope I shall not be pressed to postpone the Report of the resolution, which is treated invariably as a formal stage binding the House to nothing. The postponement would make a very inconvenient delay in the introduction of the Bill.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: It is quite true that there have been occasions on which this resolution has been passed without discussion; but that has not been the usual course. There are very special reasons in this case why the right hon. Gentleman should have an opportunity of knowing the feelings of the miners on this subject, and that there should be a full discussion on the resolution. That being so, I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be able to make arrangements for postponing the resolution, because the opportunity of which he speaks may not occur for a considerable time.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Of course I will consider the suggestion, and I will communicate with the right hon. Gentleman on the subject; but I may add that I am not convinced by what he has said.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury, who no doubt is aware of the communication which you, Mr. Speaker, read to the House at the commencement of business, whether he will put down Irish Supply and the Attorney General's Vote on the earliest possible day, to give to Irish Members an opportunity of discussing the prosecution of the lion. Member for North Leitrim.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will do my best to meet the views of hon. Gentlemen; but though I cannot at present give an absolute pledge without consultation, as at present advised, I see no obstacle to putting down the Vote on Friday week. As I

understand, hon. Members will not be able to discuss in Committee of Supply the sentence passed on a Member of this House or the action of the judge in passing it. The only subject of discussion would be the conduct of the Irish Executive in ordering the prosecution.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: As to the point of order, that may be dealt with when it arises. All we ask is that the Vote for the Attorney General's salary shall be put down at the earliest possible day. I understand the right hon. Gentleman to say he cannot put it down before Friday week.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have already announced that Votes in Class III. will be put down on Friday next, and there is considerable objection to upsetting an arrangement already made.

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.): Inasmuch as we have had Irish debates during almost the whole time of the session, could not the right hon. Gentleman allow Friday week to be given to something connected with England?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not quite see the point of that request. Next Friday will be devoted to English questions, and there must be a certain number of days in the session devoted to Irish Supply. I do not know that it is more inconvenient to

discuss Irish Supply on Friday week than on any other Friday. If any special inconvenience could be shown either for English or Irish Members, alterations might be made.

\*SIR JOHN COLOMB: When will the Army resolutions be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am anxious to bring them on as soon as possible, for it is inconvenient to the War Office that the final decision should not be quickly taken. But progress must be made with the Budget and the Civil List proposals before those resolutions can be brought on.

MR. T. M. HEALY: Will the right hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of providing English Members with a Parliament for themselves?

THE NEW SUGAR DUTY; MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

MR. KEARLEY: I beg to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House to call attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance; namely, the levying by the Customs authorities of duty on the bulk weight of articles containing sugar, instead of on the sugar itself.

\*MR. SPEAKER: That can hardly be said to be a matter of urgency. It has already been stated that the Report of the sugar tax resolution is to be taken very shortly, and is to be followed by the Finance Bill. Therefore the question can hardly be said to be urgent.

MR. KEARLEY: It is a matter of extreme urgency. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer knew that he was going to levy the duty, my complaint is that he did not make his investigations beforehand. The matter is urgent in this way. Unless we get an assurance that this will be rectified, it is impossible that the trade can be carried on. The whole trade is demoralised.

\*MR. SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. The hon. Member is making a speech on the question.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am as anxious as the hon. Member can be that the matter should be settled, and I will do my best to settle it.

MR. KEARLEY: Why did you not make your inquiries beforehand?

WATER COMPANIES (LIABILITY FOR STORAGE OF WATER) BILL.

Ordered, That the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills do examine the Water Companies (Liability for Storage of Water) Bill, with respect to compliance with the Standing Orders relative to Private Bills.:(Mr. Louis Sinclair.)

NEW BILLS.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION ACT (1897) AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Infant Life Protection Act, 1897, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Spear, Mr. Lawrence, Mr. Duke, Mr. Peel, Mr. Schwann, and Mr. Cawley.

INFANT LIFE PROTECTION ACT (1897) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Infant Life Protection Act, 1897," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st May, and to be printed. [Bill 146.]

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Local Government Act, 1888, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Spear, Mr. Duke. Mr. Oldroyd, and Mr. Taylor.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT (1888) AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Local Government Act, 1888," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Wednesday, 1st May, and to be printed. [Bill 147.]

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

INCOME TAX.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Income Tax shall be charged for the year beginning the sixth day of April, Nineteen Hundred and One, at the rate of one shilling and twopence.";(Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.)

\*MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Isle of Thanet) said the proposals contained in the Budget with regard to the augmentation of the income tax had very properly been taken great exception to. But he wished rather to draw attention to the general features of the Budget taken as a whole. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had had a great opportunity presented to him in connection with the Budget, and he had missed it, although he had advanced somewhat from the hopeless and impracticable attitude which had been the vogue for many years past. They were used to being told on these annual occasions how our glorious and beneficent fiscal system had enabled this country to surmount all difficulties

and dangers. But he noticed the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not this year passed the usual eulogies upon our broken-down financial system. The right hon. Member for West Monmouthshire had indeed spoken of it;possibly reading from some old notes;as the envy and admiration of the world. But the world had shown its envy of the system by universally discarding it.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I must remind the right hon. Gentleman that the only subject that can be discussed on this resolution is the incidence of the income tax. He cannot enter on a general review of the fiscal position.

\*MR. JAMES LOWTHER: We were assured by the Government that as they were most

anxious to get certain resolutions involving new taxes passed at once, that being a matter of urgent necessity, the Committee would be allowed to take the general discussion upon the remaining resolutions.

\*SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I asked for an assurance from the Government, and received it, that there should be a general discussion.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: That understanding only applied to the next day; Friday; when the general discussion was taken; if I may be permitted to say so; very inconveniently. I never understood that the undertaking would apply to this day.

\*MR. JAMES LOWTHER: The Chairman has, no doubt, quite correctly stated the general practice. But on this occasion it was pointed out that it would be extremely inconvenient for these new duties to remain in abeyance while the whole Budget was being discussed. I certainly understood the Government to undertake that indulgence would be extended to those hon. Members who had in the public interest refrained from taking part in the general discussion of the Budget on the earlier resolutions. Anyhow the Government deliberately pledged themselves to such a course in the face of Parliament. The Chairman of Committee was not a party to the under

taking, which was, I think, given in the whole House, but the Government distinctly made the promise.

\*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I am sure that nothing which I said ought to have given rise to that impression. On Friday night the discussion was certainly general, including as it did a disquisition on the South African war, but I did not understand that the general discussion of that evening was to apply to every day upon which the Budget was put down.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): May I remind the right hon. Gentleman that there was not a whole night's debate on Friday, but only half a night's. It commenced at half-past nine.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I certainly understood that there was to be a general discussion now. There was some doubt about the arrangement at the time, and I asked a question specifically in order to obtain a definite answer. I asked whether the arrangement would apply not merely to the duties which were then discussed, but to the other duties.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): Mr. Speaker refused to allow my motion, for the adjournment of the House on the sugar question, on the ground that the matter was to be discussed to-night.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is mistaken. It was refused on the ground that it could come up on the Report stage.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: But can we discuss it on Report? We are told we cannot.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I never said that. It certainly can be discussed on the postponed Report. As soon as the other resolutions in the Budget are passed in Committee the resolution on sugar will come up for discussion; probably on Thursday, as far as I can judge.

\*MR. JAMES LOWTHER: In these circumstances I understand that the discussion now will be a general one.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid I must stop the right hon. Gentleman. That is certainly not my understanding of the agreement entered into. I was not



consulted with reference to the setting aside of the ordinary rules of the House, and was no party to any such arrangement. My duty, therefore, now is to see that the ordinary rules of the House are maintained. The general discussion can take place on the first or second resolution of the Budget, but when subsequent resolutions are reached, then the debate should be confined to the subject-matter of those resolutions. I understood the agreement come to on Thursday evening to be limited to the next sitting of the Committee, but not to extend beyond that day. [Cries of "Move to report progress."]

\*MR. JAMES LOWTHER said a suggestion had been made to him that he should move to report progress, but he recognised that the Chairman's duty was to carry out the rules of the House. The Government, however, distinctly undertook to sanction the arrangement of a general discussion now, and they had the statement of the right hon. Gentleman opposite that he had received an assurance that a discussion of a general character would be allowed to take place on all resolutions. But he did not wish to press the point, and he would therefore deal with that most obnoxious imposition the income tax. He would, however, tell his right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer that he had introduced a very unpopular Budget, and that he was trying to smuggle it through without discussion. The income tax was the impost of all others most closely associated with the Cobdenic school. It had gone up by leaps and bounds. Designed originally as a war tax, it had since become a favourite instrument for constructing sensational Budgets in time of peace. It had been the refuge of those who wished to evade their difficulties and to retard the fulfilment of their obligations. Our fiscal system had been described as the "envy and admiration of the world."

But the "envy and admiration of the world" for the income tax had not hitherto been very marked. Foreign countries had discarded it; indeed, the income tax was highly unpopular in all the countries of the world. No Government;autocratic, a limited monarchy, or a Republic;appeared to approve of it. Our own colonies had not followed the example of the mother country in this respect. They preferred to extract taxes largely from the foreign producer; and it was worthy of notice that the affection of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for this form of taxation exclusively was cooling somewhat. The foreigner hitherto had been a sacred person whose pocket must in no way be touched, but now he was getting somewhat out of favour. One of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's imposts was openly avowed by him as intended to relieve the British taxpayer out of the needs of the foreign consumer. The war was not responsible for the breakdown of our much-vaunted economic system, which it was at last admitted had signally collapsed; it had been the growth of our normal expenditure, which had caused the present difficulties, and no one could predict where it would stop. It was not expenditure upon the defensive forces of the nation which could be held mainly responsible for our difficulties. How about the bloated Education Estimates, the money flung at the heads of the county councils to squander on so-called technical education and matters of that kind, and which was recklessly spent? They did not raise the money, and they did not care how they spent it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer spoke about holding a fair balance between direct

and indirect taxation, but he had pointed out before that this balance was based on erroneous premises, because the payers of income tax were relatively also large contributors to indirect taxation. The right hon. Gentleman entirely ignored the fact that the income-tax payers were also large contributors to indirect taxation. Let them take as an instance the increased duty on sparkling wines: was it not the income-tax payer who had also to pay that, and could that be fairly quoted as a contribution from the classes who do not pay income-tax, and which made it necessary to increase direct taxation to balance it. For such really was the argument of the Chancellor of the Exchequer when he spoke of the equal apportionment of direct and indirect taxation. He quoted that to show that the right hon. Gentleman on this point was entirely erroneous in his premises. At the present moment the, direct taxpayer was far more heavily burdened than the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated to the House. His system was the knocking off of the duty from the numerous articles which formerly contributed to the revenue, and the concentration of all the efforts of the Exchequer upon a few selected articles.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Hear, hear.

\*MR. JAMES LOWTHER: But that system had broken down and collapsed. To increase the income tax at a time when direct taxation had been contributing far more than its fair share of the total liabilities appeared to be indefensible. His right hon. friend had been afforded a great opportunity in connection with the Budget, and it was in his power to have taken I advantage of the patriotic outbursts throughout the, British Empire to draw closer the commercial ties which were the surest means of maintaining the unity of the Empire. There was a general desire for the free interchange of commodities as far as could be in the various parts of the Empire. The right hon. Gentleman had always had strong objection to the cultivation of friendly commercial relations with their colonies. He always treated the foreigner and the British subject upon identical terms, and he knew no difference between the Belgian and the Canadian; indeed he thought that the right; hon. Gentleman preferred the Belgian, as being nearer home. That was what he called Little Englandism. If ever there was one principle which had made greater progress during the last few years it was the establishment of preferential duties between this country and the various parts of the Empire. The Chancellor of the Exchequer must not think that he was asking him to adopt some reactionary protection doctrine, because he was talking of revenue, and as a substitute for his income tax he might have done better if he had consulted an eminent gold medallist at the Cobden Club. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. That gentleman was received with open arms at the Cobden Club, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer might even hope to get the gold medal himself if he would only adopt the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. What had he done? Why he had so arranged the duties as to accord preferential treatment to inter-British trade? Sir Wilfrid Laurier had, in fact, given a preference of 25 per cent., since increased to 33&#x2153; per cent., to inter-British trade, and was forthwith decorated with the gold medal of the Cobden Club. Why did the Chancellor of the Exchequer not adopt some statesmanlike and patriotic attitude of that kind? Why was the right hon. Gentleman so devoted to Little England

finance? The missing of this opportunity had caused great disappointment, not merely in Canada where they had shown the lead and given us for some years past great commercial advantages, but it had also created great disappointment in the new Commonwealth of Australia where they relied upon the Customs revenue but were perfectly ready to reciprocate friendly overtures. This was a principle which his right lion, friend need not think was by any means dead. He might pass it over, but it was making the greatest progress throughout all parts of the Empire, and he would find himself confronted with a strong demand that he should no longer stand in the way of what was a true British demand. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had consoled himself with an addition to the income tax and certain other imposts which it would be irregular to discuss at the present time. Without any very great effort he could have supplied himself with the sum which his income tax was expected to produce without any substantial interference with the habits or the mode of living of the people. The right hon. Gentleman took credit to himself that at any rate this duty would not benefit any British subjects more than the inhabitants of the most distant realms. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would realise that he had missed a great opportunity, that he had created vast disappointments, and he had done more to retard the general advance of the British Empire than any of his predecessors.

\*MR. McKENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he experienced the greatest difficulty in following the line taken by the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He complained of the income tax being put at 1s. 2d. in the £; and in that complaint he was cheered by hon. Gentlemen opposite. Those very hon. Gentlemen who were applauding the right hon. Gentleman had supported this Government through thick and thin, and the Government were responsible, not for 2d., but for 6d. on the income tax. The right hon. Gentleman and his friends must recognise that as a consequence of their support of the present Government in its extravagant ways they must accept not only an occasional twopenny increase in the income tax, but a shilling in the £; 1 as a permanency. It was their duty to examine the reasons for this expenditure. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had told them that they had got to provide for a permanent increase of expenditure, amounting in the last five years to no less than £;28,000,000 a year. What did that mean? That the 1s. income tax had become permanent. [Cries of "No, no."] They could not point out to him any probable new sources of revenue which were likely to reduce that shilling to a lower figure. They could not look to any reduction so long as they had at the head of affairs a Prime Minister who had publicly rebuked the Treasury for its parsimony, Before Lord Salisbury could have got to the point of declaring in public that his difficulties were increased by the parsimony of the Treasury what an amount of pressure he must have put upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer to induce him to consent to every kind of extravagance; an extravagance which had landed them to-day with an income tax of 1s. 2d. in the £;. Personally, he should not blame the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but rather defend him; he had been attacked, not from the Opposition side, but by the Prime Minister.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No.

\*MR. McKENNA said it was within the recollection of the Committee that an attack was made upon the Treasury, and the right hon. Gentleman was responsible for the policy of the Treasury. The hon. Member for King's Lynn the other evening declared himself unwilling to drive home the responsibility of the Government for the increase of expenditure, and in very forcible language he appealed to the Government not to imperil their existence, because he saw no possibility of an alternative Government. It was surprising to hear the hon. Member say that he could see no possible alternative to a Ministry of which he was not himself a member. But although the hon. Member might hold that opinion as to the necessity of maintaining those particular gentlemen in office, he for one did not believe that any such opinion was held by the country at large. On this side of the House they had been twitted that they were not a united Party. [Ministerial cries of "Hear, hear."] Hon. Gentlemen opposite cheered that statement, but those who were present when the Chancellor of the Exchequer made his Budget statement had a very extraordinary spectacle presented to them. Hon. Members opposite could not see it, but it was apparent to Members sitting on the Opposition side. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, after making a brilliant, capable, and honest Budget statement, lasting a very considerable time, sat down between two right hon. colleagues, one on his right and the other on his left, who received his speech with stern silence, with implacable coldness, almost with resentment. In order to bring himself in order he would suggest that that resentment was due to the proposed increase of the income tax, but if he might give his honest opinion he should be inclined to attribute it to the light hon. Gentleman's frank statement that during the last five years the expenditure of the country had been increased by £28,000,000 sterling. It was said that the Government were not responsible for that expenditure, but that the House as a whole was responsible. More than that, it was said that the constituencies were responsible. That statement might very well be made upon a public platform, but he was astonished that anyone should adduce it in that House, where "a miserable and divided Opposition" had learned through bitter experience that they were absolutely impotent in opposing the Government. With the knowledge that year by year they had had their rights and privileges taken from them, were they to be told on this side of the House that they had been responsible for the extravagance of the Government? Not so very long ago Lord Salisbury told the country that the Treasury were too parsimonious. They must look to the head of the Government for the responsibility for the extravagance, and not to those on the Opposition side, who, in season and out of season, had endeavoured by every means in their power to resist that extravagance. It was difficult to put one's hand on each particular item of expenditure, and to say whether it ought to be reduced. He would give the House one instance of extravagance. There was the question raised by the hon. Member for King's Lynn, with respect to the docks which were being built at Gibraltar. A scheme was introduced in the 1892 Parliament which was to cost something like £2,000,000 for the Gibraltar docks.

\*THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that this matter was not relevant to the resolution

before the Committee.

\*MR. McKENNA admitted that he laboured under a difficulty in referring to the subject. He would only name it, without going into detail. The hon. Member for King's Lynn, after personal examination of the subject on the spot, found that a very large increase in the expenditure, covering several millions, undertaken by the present Government, was wasted money. A Commission was appointed, of which the hon. Member was chairman. He understood that the Commission had unanimously reported; the Report had not yet been made public; but it was quite obvious, since it was unanimous, and the hon. Member for King's Lynn had already made up his mind on the subject, what the nature of the Report would be. It was a Report that would justify the pamphlet written by the hon. Member, in which he charged the Government with having wasted

a considerable amount of money. If they went to any part of the world where the Government had been carrying on warlike or peaceful operations, they would find that there had been extravagance after extravagance of small sums here and there, contributing largely to the total increase of £28,000,000 during the five years the Government had been in office; apart altogether from the war in South Africa. In the three years during which the late Liberal Government had been in office the public expenditure had increased by only three millions. During the previous twenty years it had increased by only twenty-three millions. Had there been anything in the condition of the world during the past five years to justify an increase of twenty-eight millions in the public expenditure?

Germany, which had not been behindhand in pushing its policy, had increased its expenditure during the same period by only ten millions. He did not understand the objection of hon. Gentlemen opposite to the increase in the income tax. As they had to swallow a pill, they ought to do it with cheerful countenances. They told their constituencies that they had Heaven-sent Ministers to guide them, but in the House they grumbled and said those Ministers were extravagant. Let them be true to themselves either in the House or in the country.

MR. VICARY GIBBS (Hertfordshire, St. Albans) said he did not propose to wander quite so far as the hon. Member had done in his speech, but certainly he was encouraged to do so by the amiable indulgence which the Chairman had shown to the hon. Member. He wished to join his right hon. friend the Member for Thanet in expressing regret that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had thought it necessary to increase that onerous and most unfair impost, the income-tax.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: Hear, hoar.

MR. VICARY GIBBS said the satirical cheers of his right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouthshire did not disturb him. It was not because the increase in the tax fell upon him or upon his friend that he objected to it, but because it was morally unjust in its incidence. That

tax fell alike upon the man who had a wasting security and the man who had a permanent security; it fell upon the man who had to earn his livelihood by his own labour or brains, which were subject to exhaustion; and it fell no more heavily upon the man who had a settled income from Consols. It might be said that the middle-classes, to whom the increase in the income tax was a serious matter, had made a mistake in returning the Government to office. Constituents

wrote to him saying that they were not going to vote for him again. He was sure that hon. Members would be pleased to hear that these constituents were not going to vote for him; but that did not distress him particularly. He might, however, say that these gentlemen would only get out of the frying-pan into the fire, and he did feel a very great sympathy with them in this matter. A constituent had written to him that day on a small matter, but evidently under a misunderstanding. He inquired if the amount which he was entitled to deduct in respect of the landlord's property tax would be limited to 1s. He did not think there was any difficulty in the matter; for of course the answer was that when the tax was 8d. the deduction was limited to 8d.; when the tax was 1s. the deduction was limited to 1s.; and when the tax was

1s. 2d. the deduction was limited to 1s. 2d. He would be glad, however, if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would make the point clear. The hon. Member who last spoke joined the Chancellor of the Exchequer in a strong demand for economy. He sympathised with that demand; although he fully recognised that there was no party in the House; at least not more than half a dozen Members; who acted together in insisting on economy in national expenditure at all points. Where there was continuous temptation to extravagance, and to which the House fell a victim, was owing to the fact that civil servants had been given votes. [Cries of "Oh, oh."] He knew that that was an unpopular argument, but it was the true thing to say. It was a thing which every man would say in private, but not in public. Here were large bodies of civil servants organising and pressing hon. Members by notes and circulars and in every way to grant their demands, with the implied

threat that the votes of a considerable body of men in their constituencies would be withdrawn from them if they did not grant these demands. Well, human nature was human nature, and great was the temptation put before any hon. Member who very much desired the honour of a seat in this House, and who had a very small majority, to succumb to the demands of, say, a very fine body of postmen in his constituency. He did not say that the postmen were unjustified in the demands which they made; but even if they were unjustified they would find Members of Parliament to support them. He asked the House seriously to consider whether a grave blunder had not been made in granting the franchise to the civil servants. It was a serious question, which affected in a most material degree the complaint which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made. He was debarred, owing to the unfortunate misunderstanding which he and almost every Member of the House had fallen into in regard to the bargain which the Government had made with them, from touching on any other subject than the income tax, and he would only ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer to seriously consider what he had urged as to the strong distinction which existed between wasting securities, whether of brain or capital, and those which were maturing. DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he need not traverse the general unfairness of the incidence of the income tax, but he wished to point out the extreme unfairness of an increase without readjustment. The impost would fall with extreme severity on the smaller class of income tax payers. In 1894 the late Chancellor of the Exchequer; the result of whose financial statesmanship must be

very agreeable to the present Chancellor of the Exchequer just now, although he opposed it strongly at the particular time; increased the income tax from 7d. to 9d., but in such a way that no fewer than 500,000 income tax payers paid less at 8d. than they would have done under the old system at 7d. That was to say, the smaller class of income tax payers got off more cheaply, for the Chancellor of the Exchequer of that day raised the exemption from £150 to £160, and widened the range of abatements. He wanted to know why that policy had not been pursued now. Why should not the Chancellor of the Exchequer be able to get all the additional revenue he required without increasing the impost on the smaller income tax payers? There were no more estimable and blameless members of society than the small middle class people, who were ground down with taxation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer might find cold comfort in saying that the income tax was 2s. in the £1 at the time of the Peninsular War: but the men for whom he pleaded had to bear far heavier burdens, in the way of local taxation particularly, than were known at the time of the Peninsular War. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that at the time of the Crimean War the income tax was 1s. 1d., and therefore 1s. 2d. should be paid cheerfully now. But there was then a differential rate of income tax; the small payer paid 11d. and the larger class paid 1s. 4d. He confessed he did not know whether that was good political economy, but he would like to go back to the differential rate, and put a much heavier impost on the larger incomes. He pleaded for the lower middle class of people, who had so many burdens on them, and who lived a godly, righteous, and sober life, and who were the cream of the community. The education of their children was expensive, the State not having provided cheap secondary education. They were, perhaps, buying their houses through a building society, and had often poor relatives to assist. Convention demanded a measure of respectable living and clothing which was a severe drain on their small incomes. He would take the opportunity to test the question as to whether or not, even in this Budget, some plan could be devised to relieve that class from additional imposts on incomes up to and including £500 a year. It ought not to tax the ingenuity of the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his officials to lay out a scheme in the Schedule on the lines of his own scheme of 1899, and to go back to the days of the Crimean differential rate by relieving incomes up to £500 of any further impost, and yet be able to get the revenue he required. It was said that they ought to be punished for "Mafficking," but there was no public policy in telling a man that, because he was deluded into a mistaken act two years ago, he should be overburdened with taxation. Moreover he did not think that it was the class for whom he was pleading that did the "Mafficking."

MR. BARTLEY (Islington, N.) said he would like to say a few words on the income tax. There was no doubt that the extra 2d. was necessary at the present time, but it was a fact that it was causing a great deal of annoyance among a most estimable body of the community. Inasmuch as the Chancellor of the Exchequer had raised two thirds of his additional revenue from indirect and only one third from direct taxation, he thought all would agree that, taking it as a whole, it

was a fair arrangement. He strongly urged on the Chancellor of the Exchequer to consider the question whether some arrangement could not be made on the lines of the suggestions of the hon. Member for the St. Albans Division. A good many years ago he himself had brought forward a scheme of differential rating on incomes from old investments and on the reward of present-day labour; and he was sure there would never be a perfectly fair income tax until a distinction was made between these two sources of income. Of course a change of this sort involved a great deal of trouble, and a Chancellor of the Exchequer did not like to embark on a new and difficult system of taxation which involved that. The tax would be less unpopular if a differentiation could be made between incomes derived from labour and incomes derived from investment. All taxes were unpopular, especially the income tax, and therefore the Chancellor of the Exchequer should levy it with as much consideration as possible. He was afraid that that was not now done. He brought before the House last year an instance as to the system of claiming arrears of income tax on the higher rate, a matter which he supposed concerned a great many persons, and which seemed to him to be sharp practice on the part of the Treasury. In some instances especially most extortionate demands had been made in connection with arrears. He would again mention the case of the Jamaica Railway, which was established practically by the English people in order to promote the well-being of Jamaica. The great bulk of the money required to build the railway was raised on debentures, and there was a clause in the agreement that if the railway did not answer they should be exchanged for Colonial Bonds. Of course the railway did not answer, and the debentures became Jamaica Bonds. Three years elapsed before the arrangement was completed, and in the meantime the income tax had been raised from 8d. to 1s., and because the income tax for the three years was paid on the 10th of April instead of on the 30th of March, a 1s. tax was claimed for the entire period. That seemed to him to be a system of imposing the income tax which made the tax very much more unpopular than it otherwise would be. It was not fair, and if a tradesman had acted in that way he would not be supported by the law. No doubt the Chancellor of the Exchequer was acting within his right, but such a system as that tended to make people dislike and resent the payment of the tax.

The whole question of the income tax had been many times debated in the House of Commons during the last half century. Mr. Gladstone had an idea of amending its various anomalies, but the matter proved too difficult even for him to carry out. With the income tax at its present enormous high rate; and in his opinion it would not be much lower; it was essential that it should be levied on a fairer and more equitable system. What the Chancellor of the Exchequer said about the enormous increase of expenditure was a matter which should be considered by all who had the interests of the country at heart. No doubt the enormous increase in the national expenditure was largely due to hon. Members themselves. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was about the only man in the House who really seemed to try and control expenditure. With reference to the remarks of his hon. friend on the various phases of the public service, the Chancellor of the Exchequer once said that it might be necessary to disfranchise public servants,



if they went on clamouring in the way they did for more pay, while their appointments were clamoured for by hundreds of people who could not get them. The Government should be fair and liberal, but it was never intended that an organised body should exist for the purpose of increasing the salaries of the class to which they belonged. While being fair and liberal to the servants of the country, the system of always endeavouring to increase payment, whether it was deserved or not, ought to be discouraged. The current expenditure of the country was growing in a way that was very alarming, apart altogether from the war. The enormous expense of war was, to a certain extent, an advantage, because it prevented people going into war as readily as they otherwise would, and he thought it was providential that war was so enormously expensive. How could the increasing national expenditure be stopped? It was quite clear that unless the Government with the largest majority of modern times was firm and strong; and it ought to have, if any Government ever had, the power of putting a stop to unnecessary expenditure, whether it was popular or not; unless they had the pluck and determination to arrest the development of expenditure, they would have to regard 1s. as the normal income tax, and would have to increase taxation in many directions. The infliction of suffering on the part of the poorer people was a matter which should also be considered, and they would not be worthy of the position they held in the House of Commons unless they insisted on the Government doing something to prevent the enormous growth of national expenditure from year to year.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said that after discussing several subjects on the Budget they had at last settled down to the income tax, but he was afraid that it was very unfortunate that they were confined to one subject. After the ruling of the Chair, he did not desire to revert to the general question, as no doubt there would be another opportunity of dealing with it. The hon. Member who had just sat down desired an income tax which would fall with equal weight on every income-tax payer. He desired to tax the individual income, but that was an impracticable position. It had been attempted more than once, and had been found impossible. In 1853 Mr. Gladstone proved, as far as a proposition could be proved, that it was impossible to deal with the individual income, and that incomes must be dealt with by taxing them at their source. The hon Member would distinguish between one class of income and another. Personally, he did not pay any income tax as an individual. His sources of income were already taxed before they reached his hand; but under the system of individual taxation he would have to make a return of his full income, and he was afraid his inclination would be not to put his income higher than he possibly could. Permanent income at the present moment was derived from realised property, which was subject to a tax which was not unreasonable. The high death duty did away with a good deal of the injustice of the inequality of taxation. Year by year the actual pressure of the tax on precarious incomes had been diminished by abatements and concessions. The system of graduated taxation upon free incomes of the lower class, under which incomes up to £160 were altogether exempt, was a complete system of graduated taxation so far as it went, and he thought that that system should be extended to a much higher figure. He should not hesitate to graduate income tax in that

way up to incomes of £1,000 a year or more. That was a proposition which any Government might accept, because Governments of both parties had from time to time given greater exemptions and abatements in regard to income tax. He was in accord with the hon. Member for Camberwell that when the income tax was raised it should be graduated to a greater extent. He regretted that he could not support this proposal as a whole, He was not, he said, one of those who thought the additional 2d. ought not to have been placed on the income tax. In his opinion a yet further addition of 2d. should have been placed upon it. We were in the middle of a long war, which was to cost £170,000,000, and yet it was only proposed to raise £27,000,000 by extra taxation. In his view the amount raised by extra taxation was inadequate to the total amount of the war. His general objection to the whole Budget was that the Government were not raising enough by extra taxation to meet the great burden placed upon the country. That observation also applied to indirect taxation, which did not produce sufficient revenue, taking into account the cost of the war and the disturbance to trade that would be involved by the imposition of the sugar and coal duties. He was glad that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not given way to the clamour against taxing the rich at all, on the ground that the poor relations of the rich would suffer. He should support this resolution.

MR. DAVID MACIVER (Liverpool, Kirkdale) said that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had done as well as he could under the circumstances. He cordially supported the proposals as to sugar and coal; but he accepted the increase of the income tax as a disagreeable necessity, forced upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer by the desirability of winning some measure of support from the front Opposition bench. The income tax was one which was levied mainly on British industries, while incomes derived from investments abroad were largely exempt, not theoretically, perhaps, but for all practical purposes, because those who held shares in British concerns had their income tax deducted from the dividends when paid. In the case of those who had investments abroad the dividends had first to be traced. It was not too much to say that there was a large amount of leakage in that respect, and that many persons who ought to pay income tax paid nothing at all. There was also a good deal of money which ought to be collected which was not collected. There were a great many people employed in the colliery districts who were well known to be in receipt of £200 or £300 a year who never contributed. He supported the Budget, and would vote for the extra 2d. on the income tax because he believed the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not avoid, placed in the position he was, putting it on. The speech of the hon. Gentleman who had preceded him represented largely the view of the opposite side of the House

that there ought to be more than 2d., but with that view he could not agree. There could not be in a large form a worse tax than the income tax. He greatly regretted that it had not been possible for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to propose that the foreign importations into this country, which contributed nothing to the revenue, and many of which entered into competition with our industries, should bear some portion of the burden, instead of it being imposed

upon the unfortunate British taxpayer in the shape of income tax. He should, however, not oppose the income tax resolution, but support it as a disagreeable necessity forced upon the Government by the obvious common sense position in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer found himself, of being obliged to follow the line of least resistance.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said that many extraordinary economic heresies had from time to time been put forward in the Committee, but the view of the hon. Member for the Kirkdale division really beat all. If hon. Members who held such opinions attempted to put their theories into practice they would all within a couple of years cease to represent any commercial community in the country. With regard to the income tax, he thought that where it was desirable that direct taxation should bear the largest possible proportion of the taxes Irishmen would be in favour of the direct taxation being in the form of an income tax. The incidence, of course, whether between individuals, employments, or countries, was quite another matter. He and his colleagues were all in sympathy with the graduation of the tax, so that the higher the income the larger the proportion of the tax imposed. Up to 1853 Ireland was recognised as a separate fiscal entity as regarded the income tax. Owing to the disastrous years of scarcity in 1847&#x2013;8, large local sums for relief became due, and these amounts were paid by the English Treasury. Shortly afterwards Mr. Gladstone imposed for the first time the income tax in Ireland, in order to counterbalance the sums the Treasury had paid. The tax was avowedly imposed as a temporary charge;for eleven years;but forty-seven years had since passed, and still the income tax remained. In discussing the general financial relations, the Treasury usually urged the difficulty of arranging the matter with regard to indirect taxation generally without erecting custom-houses and creating trade barriers in Ireland, but here was a tax in regard to which the Treasury could, without any such alteration, give some effect to the findings of the Royal Commission of four or five years ago. One could not help having a feeling approaching contempt for the men who hurrahed and shouted for the war, but were now grumbling through The Times and the Standard at the paltry addition of 2d. on the income tax which they were called upon to pay. If there was any portion of the Empire which under present circumstances ought to escape this additional income tax it was Ireland, not only because of the historical fact to which he had alluded, but also because the increase was undoubtedly due to the enormous expenditure on the costly and bloody war in South Africa, against which Ireland had always protested, and therefore for which she should not be called upon to pay.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT (Sheffield, Ecclesall) considered that the Budget as a whole was as fair a Budget as could under the circumstances have been devised, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer was to be congratulated on having made the additional burden of taxation fall as equally as possible on all classes and interests. Those who were disposed to criticise the income tax should remember that such questions had to be regarded not only from their financial and economic aspect, but also from their political aspect, and it would not be possible for any Chancellor of the Exchequer to put taxes on sugar and coal;both

of which were commendable under present circumstances; without also increasing to a moderate extent the income tax. The hon. Member for Poplar was not likely to get many to join in his regret that an additional 4d. was not put on the income tax, and that the taxes on coal and sugar were not 2s. 6d. per ton and 1d. per pound respectively.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON pointed out that his regret was that the taxation imposed this year was not twice as much, considering the amount of the debt.

SIR E. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT said that was practically the same thing. From that point of view the criticism of the hon. Member was very unfair. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had hit upon a very happy mean in the amount he had imposed upon present taxpayers and that which posterity would have to pay. The war was one for which posterity would gain to a much larger extent than was the case with regard to many wars in which this country had been involved, and therefore the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government were quite justified in placing a very considerable portion of the burden upon the shoulders of posterity. British trade with South Africa amounted to about £20,000,000 before the war. He believed that ten years after the war had finished and peace been restored that trade would have doubled, and no one could say that that would not be a great benefit to future generations and to the present generation. The hon. Member who had just sat down took the same line which was taken the other night by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire and other speakers on the opposite side in throwing the whole responsibility for this great expenditure upon the present policy of His Majesty's Government. He held that that was a most unjust charge, for the persons who were really responsible for it were those who caused the war originally by the capitulation after Majuba.

This extra 2d. on the income tax was due to their action far more than to the policy of His Majesty's Government. All the expenditure upon this war might have been averted by timely action, but who were the persons responsible for preventing that timely action? Why, the hon. Gentlemen sitting on the opposite benches. In every single case they carried on a policy of inaction. In 1884, 1894, and 1896, they were the persons who prevented action being taken when it would have saved all this expense. Hon. Gentlemen

opposite had no right to throw the responsibility for these increases on His Majesty's Government. The war in South Africa was forced upon this country, and a great British conspiracy in South Africa

rendered the war inevitable. [Nationalist cheers.] Hon. Members opposite were always ready to take advantage of a slip. He should have said that a great anti-British conspiracy had rendered the war inevitable, and the persons who could have avoided that war, or at least made it easy and

inexpensive, were those persons who should have dealt with that anti-British conspiracy in time. He protested against the way in which hon. Members opposite had charged the Government with responsibility for this expenditure, when they themselves were the cause of it.

With regard to the incidence of taxation, he was not aware that the income-tax payers had raised any outrageous cry against the tax. There had been a certain amount of correspondence in the press, and he had heard much complaint from the

Ministerial Benches. Although everyone regretted the increase in the income tax, yet he thought the income tax payers as a whole had behaved much more creditably than the coalowners and great coal merchants, who had made an outcry of which he was thoroughly ashamed. Nobody had gained so much by this war from the increased price of coal, carriage, and transport as they had; they ought to pay, and he was glad the Chancellor of the Exchequer was going to make them pay, although he believed that in the long run the tax would fall rather on the foreign consumer. He congratulated the right hon. Gentleman on his Budget, in which he had made a very equal division of the taxation. He believed this Budget was an original, bold, and fair one, and one which would be popular with the country.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport) said that the hon. Member who had just sat down had managed to wander somewhat from the strict subject of the debate. The whole of the speakers on the opposite side of the House had, with the exception of the hon. Member who had just spoken, been harping upon the imposition of 2d. upon the income tax, and he could not help feeling that underlying some of the speeches made on the other side was the desire, perhaps unconscious, to return to protectionist theories and practices in the taxation of this country. Two hon. Members; the Member for Thanet and the Member for Liverpool; blurted out that they did desire to return to protection; indeed, one hon. Member had spoken of the exploded theory of free trade. The income tax was of all existing forms of direct taxation the one against which most reasons might be urged, and there were, he understood, insuperable practical difficulties in the way of graduating it. But, after all, he approved of that form of direct taxation far more than the two other methods by which the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to raise additional taxation.

The hon. Member for Thanet had made his contribution towards the settlement of this difficult question of the finances of the country which they were considering at the present moment, and he had spoken of the bloated expenditure upon education. He could understand the hon. Member saying that until his anti-educational policy was carried out there would be little chance of inducing the mass of the people to agree to his theories with regard to protection. If it were accepted that £11,000,000 was to be raised by the three distinct methods proposed, then he thought the right hon. Gentleman had not proposed a sufficient increase of the income tax in proportion to the other methods. If they took the average family of a labourer with a wage of £1 a week, they found that the indirect taxation he would pay on sugar would amount to

1<sup>54</sup>th of his income, whereas the increase in taxation to the man with an income of £1,000 a year, owing to the increase of income tax plus the tax on sugar, would amount to 1<sup>105</sup>th part of his income. So that the labourer with £1 per week would pay almost double the proportion of his income that the man with £1,000 a year and upwards would pay. Seeing that every additional penny added to the income tax yielded loss than the last one, he could not help thinking that it would have been a more just and economical way of dealing with the question if the Chancellor of the Exchequer had gone as far as to increase the income tax by 4d. in the £1. He knew perfectly well that he was excluded from considering the scheme of the Chancellor of the Exchequer as a whole, but

he presumed he was not precluded from expressing the utmost possible dissent from the principles that underlay the speeches of hon. Gentleman opposite with respect to the increase of the income tax. The view that underlay those speeches in most cases was that this country should return to the protective system. He believed that such, an attempt was hopeless. He believed that the people of this country were convinced by two generations of human life as to the enormous advantages we derived as compared with foreign nations from the system of free trade. Our national finance was based to a greater extent than that of any other nation in the world upon direct taxation. It seemed somewhat late in the day to have to argue that in the House of Commons. We could not by putting a duty on imports tax the foreigner. We were often told that good trade was the result of having a Unionist Government in office. But we had now removed almost all restrictions on trade, and there was no opportunity for a Government by its policy to produce good trade. But, although a Government could not produce good trade, it might by its legislation produce bad trade. It was the duty of every free-trader to nail to the counter such a false coin as the suggestion that we should return to the evil system of protection which sixty or seventy years ago well nigh ruined the country. By getting out of it, practically the recent prosperity of this country was wholly due.

\*MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said the hon. Member for the Ecclesall Division had alluded to certain points on which he desired to say a few words. The hon. Member had endeavoured to put the blame for the war on previous Governments. He had no desire to enter into useless discussion in regard to the origin of the war, because the constituency he represented, and the people of Ireland generally, were opposed to the war, and had been from the commencement. They could not understand why they should be called upon to support a war upon which they were not consulted, and of which they disapproved. In regard to the way in which the war was begun, he could hardly understand the want of system that existed in this country, which was supposed to be a constitutionally governed country and under the management of the House of Commons. This war was manipulated and brought about by a capitalist clique altogether outside this House, but when the cost of the war was to be paid an appeal is made to Parliament which was not consulted, and they were obliged through their constituents to meet the expenditure. It appeared to him that a great constitutional principle was being lost sight of by the House, and he thought it would be well in future, when war was looming in the distance, that the First Lord of the Treasury should call the House of Commons to consider the question, and to consult it as to the advisability and necessity of plunging into war which the country would have to pay for in men, money, and social suffering.

The object of just taxation ought to be to adapt the financial burden to the capability of those who were called upon to bear the tax. He held that the wealthier classes did not pay a proportionate share of the income tax. A business man was called upon to make a hypothetical return of the amount of profit he was likely to realise in the ensuing year. That was a preposterous way

to levy taxation. The poor governess was disproportionately burdened. Brains were taxed entirely out of ratio with rentals or royalties. The whole subject required to be reformed, and greater gradations of payments introduced. The income tax in Ireland was introduced in 1853 by Mr. Gladstone, who said it was to be a tax for seven years, but it had been continued ever since. British financiers when they got hold of a tax seldom relinquished it. The Irish people were told that it was in exchange for the payment of £;260,000 a year, in connection with the Consolidated Fund annuities, that the income tax was imposed. The income tax amounted to double the amount of the Consolidated Fund annuities, and the result was that they had paid something like £;30,000,000 in income tax since then. In his opinion Mr. Gladstone was the most expensive friend that Ireland ever had, from a taxpayer's point of view, and the sooner his system of taxation was abolished the better. For what had been the result of that

financial policy? It had increased taxation and decreased population. For according as the population decreased, the incidence of taxation increased. Now that was a result that had not been attained or attempted by the Government of any civilised country in the world. While the population had decreased by one half since Her late Majesty came to the throne, the taxation had increased three-fold. These were very serious facts, and demanded the immediate attention of everyone in this House who had any interest in Ireland. He entirely traversed the statement made by the last speaker in regard to free trade. He did not believe that it was a policy of free trade. It was a policy of free imports; for they received everything from all parts of the world, while there was a wall of protection against British and Irish products and manufactures wherever they were exported. The Manchester school and all those who had obtained prosperity under so-called free trade looked upon a man as an utter fanatic who had the courage of his convictions on this question; but he believed that the time was approaching when the whole fiscal system of this country would have to be reconsidered and reconstituted, because if they went on as they were going; \*THE CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. Gentleman that the income tax is the subject of debate.

\*MR. FIELD said he was coming to the income tax. If the community of Great Britain ceased to earn money, then they could not pay anything, even income tax. That was what he was trying to prove. If the exports decreased and the imports increased to the same extent as had occurred during the last few years, then the income tax, instead of increasing, would diminish to such an extent that they would be obliged to put the taxes on something else. He maintained that they must reconsider the basis and the principles which governed the whole fiscal system of this country, because if it was continued, and the main burden of taxation was paid by the producer for the benefit of the consumer, the system could not last. England was living on its capital rather than its earnings; manufactures were declining, and the cultivation of land did not pay. In regard to Ireland and the Irish income tax, he found that it had decreased between 1896 and 1900 by no less a sum than. £;10,000. Now, that was a very important fact, and the Government naturally desire to keep up their

Imperial revenue. This might be accomplished by revaluation through a Government department. The city of Belfast had recently been revalued, and the result was that the people of that city had to pay £13,000 per annum more in income tax. And what did they find? Loyal Belfast, which was supposed to open its arms to receive the burden of taxation, or any other gift, from this country was up in arms against that increase of the income tax. If this revaluation was to go on all over Ireland, and was calculated on the same basis as in Belfast, the result would be that the over-taxation of Ireland would be increased by more than a million a year. That was a very serious consequence. They were overtaxed by a sum of no less than three millions; and under this new Budget it would be almost four millions. What did that mean? There was a population of only 4,000,000; millions, and it meant that every man, woman, and child would pay £1 of Imperial over-taxation. If the money was spent in the country there might be some justification for it; but it was nearly all exported and spent out of Ireland, so the financial ruin of Ireland was accelerated. As a Nationalist he protested against the income tax being increased, because after all he had no desire to see the wealthier classes of Irishmen leaving the country. On the contrary, his desire was that every Irishman should be able and willing to live at home. But if this system of increasing the income tax, and taxation generally, was persisted in, it was not alone the working people that would leave the country, but also the wealthier classes, and there would be fewer people to tax by and by. [Laughter.] Hon. Members might laugh, but that was a very serious statement. The population had decreased by nearly five millions in the last fifty years. He had been examining the emigration statistics, and he found that there had been a larger emigration last year than the year before. That was a subject which ought to interest the sympathy of humane men, instead of exciting laughter. After all, the people were the State, and if they had no people they would have no State, and if they had fewer people in Ireland they would get less taxes. He protested against this increase of the income tax in Ireland, though he did not object to an increase of the taxation on the wealthier classes by further graduating the income tax. He suggested that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should give them some scheme whereby he would remit to Ireland the same amount which he proposed to take out of it by the increase in the income tax. An equal sum ought to be given back in the shape of a grant for some useful reproductive national purpose; some practical proposal should be offered and considered. A suggestion had been made in the Report of the Financial Relations Committee of giving a grant for reducing the rates of freight and fares on the Irish railways, which he commended to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. When Sir Robert Peel introduced his Income Tax Bill in 1842 it was strongly pressed on him to include Ireland, but he declined to do so on the ground that, having regard to the relative resources of both islands, Ireland as a whole already contributed to the Imperial revenue a quota relatively to her means quite as heavy as the people of Great Britain would have to contribute with the addition of income-tax, therefore the justice and necessity of remission and restitution to the overburdened Irish taxpayer.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Orkney and Shetland) said that an hon. Gentleman who had



spoken had criticised the system which allowed the Government to go to war without the consent of Parliament. The Government did not go to war; it was the Boers who commenced to raid our territory and destroy the property of our settlers. There was no country in the world, so far as he knew, in which Parliament was consulted in regard to war. In the great American Civil War; which was the only one that had any resemblance to this war with the Boers; war was not declared by Congress but by the rebels. This war was also declared by the rebels.

An HON. MEMBER on the Irish Benches: They were not rebels, but a free people.

MR. CATHCART WASON said he did not know what constituted a rebel in the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite. Loyalty and rebellion in their minds seemed to him to be very mixed up. It was a rebellion. [Cries from the Irish Benches of "It was not."]

\*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is getting far from the resolution before the Committee.

MR. CATHCART WASON said that he would not have intervened in the debate were it not for the refreshing remarks of the hon. Member for Devonport. The hon. Member resembled the worshippers in a barbaric country who set up an idol for themselves, worshipped it, then took it down, turned it inside out, put a bit of gilt paper on it, and then set it up again. The very suggestion of Protection had induced the hon. Member to tell the Committee what free trade had done for the country, and what would be the result of any modification of the present fiscal system. He was quite certain that the time would come when the country would have to reconsider its entire fiscal arrangements. Recent events had shown that the country stood almost alone, though not quite alone, as she had the hardy sons from her colonies around her. Just as America, a great nation which could stand alone against any foreign combination, had declared itself a Protectionist State, as had also the colonies, England would have to resort to Protection.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must connect his remarks somehow with the resolution before the Committee:

MR. CATHCART WASON said, with reference to the taxation of incomes, he did not altogether hold with the system proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. He thought the time had arrived when some distinction ought to be made as regards the source from which incomes were derived. Whether an income came from a man's professional work or from realised wealth should be considered, and an increase might be put on incomes from the latter source. It would also be an improvement to carry the graduation of the income tax very much further. He agreed that it was a very difficult matter to impose new taxation, and he was sorry that the Government had not seen fit to throw the whole cost of the war on the Transvaal and Orange Free State.

\*THE CHAIRMAN: That does not arise. The matter has been discussed on another resolution and cannot be reopened.

MR. CATHCART WASON said that he would only say in conclusion that in his opinion it would have been much wiser and better if a graduated tax had been imposed, graduated not only in reference to the amount of the income, but also in

reference to its incidence, so that it would not press too heavily on professional men whose incomes died with them, but should rather press on persons whose incomes were derived from realised wealth without having to work for it. The position of the taxpayer was not altogether a fortunate one, and he would simply have to make the best he could of it.

\*MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) said he had no intention of following the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken into the realms of idolatry. But there were two suggestions made by the hon. Gentleman with which he heartily agreed. During the debate very little attention had been paid to what, in his opinion, was the most important question connected with the resolution; namely, the incidence of the income tax. When the tax stood at 8d. it was a very annoying and very oppressive one, but now that it had advanced to 1s. 2d. it was for certain classes of the community an almost intolerable tax. He did not propose that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should receive from the income tax less than he proposed to raise by his present scale, but he suggested that some regard should be paid to the taxable capacity of the various classes who would be called upon to pay the tax. Five years ago he put down a series of Amendments to the Finance Bill, his object being to obtain a graduated scale of taxation so far as the income tax was concerned. The right hon. Gentleman then said that it was practically impossible to adopt a graduated scale, but in the following year he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to extend the principle of graduation which existed as regards incomes up to £;500, and the right hon. Gentleman did extend it to incomes up to £;700. It was perfectly possible to graduate the income tax by means of exemptions. There was absolutely no difficulty whatever in taking that course, because the right hon. Gentleman and the Department over which he presided would only be following on the lines of existing legislation and existing administration. Was it right that a man with an income of £;500 should only receive an abatement on £;120, whereas a man with an income of £;5,000 or £;10,000 from invested funds was not required to pay a penny more in proportion, always excepting the small allowance he had mentioned. He would very earnestly support the appeal made by the hon. Member for Orkney and Shetland that a distinction should be made between incomes earned by a man's own exertions and incomes derived from investments. Such a distinction was drawn in one of the great colonies of the Empire and there was no reason why it should not be drawn in Great Britain also. He would urge on the right hon. Gentleman that there was absolutely no difficulty whatever in graduating the income tax up to any desired point by means of exemptions.

\*MR. MOULTON (Cornwall, Launceston) said he fully appreciated the importance, as regarded public convenience, of restricting the discussion to the resolution. He did not mean to traverse the ruling of the Chairman that the discussion must be thus restricted, and yet there was never an occasion on which it was more difficult, he might almost say impossible, to discuss the resolution without entering on the question of alternative taxation. When expenditure was such as to require further taxation, it was idle to criticise a

proposed tax merely on the ground that it created inconvenience. Every tax must do so. The only effective criticism was to show that the money could be obtained in some other way with less inconvenience. But the importance of thus treating the question was specially great on the present occasion. In the speech on the introduction of the Budget; a speech which they all felt did the right hon.

Gentleman great honour; the Chancellor of the Exchequer claimed for his Budget that it should not be regarded as a temporary expedient. He unflinchingly put before the House of Commons all the difficulties of the country, all its new indebtedness and all its increased expenditure, and he said that they should no longer consider the taxes he proposed as temporary expedients to tide over a temporary difficulty, but that they should be looked upon as changes in the normal taxation of the country. Therefore, they had to consider the income tax now proposed as being substantially the normal income tax in the future, and would have to compare it not with the 1s. tax of last year, which was confessedly temporary, but with the income tax as it stood before the war.

Viewed in this light the normal income tax had been raised from 8d. to 14d., and they would have to consider whether it was right to almost double the income tax as a permanent measure. They could not of course criticise the tax properly without considering what substitute should be provided for it, but he did not propose to examine generally the alternatives that might be suggested. He was going to assume that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was right, and that he was obliged to raise by direct taxation as much as this increased income tax would yield. But the fact that the sum was to be raised by direct taxation did not necessitate its being raised entirely by the income tax. Our system of taxation would be a very unfair one if the income tax was the only form of direct taxation. Both the previous speakers had pointed out that one of the greatest objections to the income tax was that it fell alike on those who earned their incomes by their own skill

or brains, and on those who derived their incomes from realised property. It taxed the owner and the earner alike, and now that the income tax was doubled the inequality of taxing the earner as much as the owner had become more serious. A man with an income from £10,000 in Consols paid neither more nor less income tax than a clerk who earned £275 a year. But those hon. Members had not realised that in this matter of direct taxation the inequality between those who earn and those who own was redressed in this country by means of the death duties. These fall solely on realised property, and though for the sake of general convenience they are levied once for all at a man's death, they are equivalent to an annual tax which is paid on realised property by those who own it, and which does not fall on the year's earnings. Thus a fair adjustment can be made between the direct taxation falling on owners and earners by properly proportioning the rates of the income tax and the death duties. When those duties were fixed the income tax was at 8d., and very careful calculations showed that in those circumstances those who derived their income from earnings paid just about half the rate per pound paid by those who derived their income from realised property. No one could say that such a proportion was unduly hard upon those who derived their income from realised property. But that balance had

now been wholly destroyed, because the income tax had been nearly doubled, and there had been no increase in the capital tax levied by the death duties. The consequence was that by adopting this as a permanent method of raising revenue an undue proportion of the new burden was laid on the weaker shoulders. He did not attach any religious sanction to this particular balancing of the two sources of income, although he thought the proportion of two to one very reasonable under existing circumstances, but the arrangement was made by Parliament as being a fair proportion between those who had realised property and those who had not, and the burden on the back of the earner ought not to be increased without taking care that this proportion was being kept, and in this manner they could best satisfy the aims of those who wished to introduce a graduated income tax. It was easy to graduate the death duties, and therefore those who desired a graduated income tax could get all they wanted by making the death duties increase *pari passu* with the income tax. That not only enabled them to fairly divide the burden between the owners and earners and to effectually graduate the income tax, and what he regretted was that this great increase had been made in the income tax instead of the money being raised by increasing simultaneously and in the same proportion the income tax and the death duties.

MR. TULLY (Leitrim, S.) said the House was indebted to the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down for the advice which he had given to it. It was largely owing to his advice that the death duties had been the success they were, and he hoped that the views of the hon. Gentleman would receive due consideration from the Government. He could not agree with those who had protested against the increase of the income tax; it was they who had returned to power the gentlemen responsible for the policy which had resulted in the war and this increased taxation, and he had no admiration for the men who, having voted for the war, now came squealling to the House because an additional 2d. was put upon the income tax. In his opinion the increase should have been 2s. The gentlemen responsible for the war should be made to pay. One hon. Gentleman suggested a universal income tax of 4d. in the £; so that a labourer earning £50 a year would have to pay 17s.; he would not imagine that such a tax would be popular, and thought it would be a pity that hon. Gentlemen who advocated it did not address their constituents upon that subject. If they did, the House probably would not be burdened by their presence for long. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had truly said that much more taxation could not be put upon Ireland; the result of increasing the income tax from 8d. to 1s. had only been to secure an increased amount of £24,000, and such figures told the tale of poverty that all classes in Ireland suffered from when increasing the income tax by half only brought in such a paltry amount. When the income tax was imposed in 1873 upon Ireland it was distinctly stated by Mr. Gladstone that it was only to be levied for seven years; nevertheless, it was still being levied, and it had been increased until it had reached the straining point. The way in which this impost was levied in Ireland was absolutely iniquitous. Every year the persons responsible for gathering the tax increased their demands, until the unfortunate people who had to pay were forced to appeal to the courts, and the small traders

of Ireland who were so forced had to disclose their poverty at the very worst time of the year for them, and the result was, in several cases, to his knowledge, within a very few months of applying to the court, those unfortunate persons found themselves in the Bankruptcy Court. He protested against such a system being allowed. Irish Members were entitled to protest on every possible occasion against any increase in the taxation imposed upon Ireland, as since 1893 the total amount levied in that country had increased from £7,568,000 to £8,664,000, and the present proposals would mean the addition of another £500,000. The persons mainly responsible for the present increases were the small income taxpayers, who, through their jingoism, forced on the war in South Africa. These were the people who were now complaining, but they had previously had very little regard for the suffering and desolation caused by the policy of fire and sword, which, through their votes, they were the means of bringing into South Africa.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I will not attempt to go into the question raised by the hon. Gentleman who last sat down, because, after all, I think if there be a grievance in Ireland with regard to taxation it is not in regard to the income tax. I have never been able to see why a person who is above the income-tax limit should not pay income tax in Ireland just as well as in Great Britain, and to excuse persons from the payment of income tax because they live in Ireland would seem to me to be an utterly unreasonable proposition to I advance in regard to the taxation of the United Kingdom. This debate has been an interesting one to me. From one side have come theories as to taxation; from the other side have come other theories, but I do not think anybody has questioned the fact that we must raise more taxation this year, and that we must raise part of it at any rate by direct taxation. My right hon. friend the Member for the Isle of Thanet has with great skill utilised the opportunity for ventilating his peculiar theories upon the subject of our fiscal system. He almost suggested that if we would follow those theories we might abolish the income tax. At any rate, I think he went as far as this; that if I had adopted his theories no increase of the income tax would be necessary this year. Sir, I prefer the increase of the income tax to the adoption of his theories. I believe it to be better for the country, and I believe it to be fairer. Though I hope he may live for many years, I do not think he is likely to see the adoption of those theories by any Chancellor of the Exchequer, no matter to what Government he may belong. Hon. Members on the other side of the House, so far from objecting to the resolution which is now before the House, have rather blamed me for not proposing that, instead of 2d. additional to the income tax, 4d. additional should be levied this year. I endeavoured very carefully to balance the burden which this Budget has thrown upon the taxpayers of the country, together with the burdens which they were already bearing, and I think if I had adopted such a proposal as that it would have been unfair to the payers of direct taxation. Those who argue in favour of this, with the exception of one hon. and learned Gentleman, the Member for the Launceston Division, forget the heavy burden thrown on the payers of direct taxation in other ways. A good deal of the afternoon has been occupied with the

discussion initiated by my hon. friend the Member for Hertfordshire with regard to the taxation of what he calls wasting incomes, or incomes derived from brain power, as compared with incomes derived from property; and the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Launceston went so far as to say; so I understood him; that any addition to the income tax, as compared with 8d. in the pound, at which it stood in the year 1894, ought to be balanced by a corresponding addition to the death duties. That certainly is not my view. I think the death duties were put in 1894 at an extremely high point. And I think the hon. Member has omitted to consider this, that to make the death duties a varying tax, which you might increase or decrease as you increase or decrease the income tax from year to year, would be extremely unfair to persons whose estates might be subject to the death duties within a particular year in which the tax was increased, while it would be extremely favourable to those persons whose estates became subject to the death duties when the duties were diminished.

MR. MOULTON was understood to express the belief that it was to be a permanent increase.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am a little more sanguine than the hon. and learned Gentleman. I do not look forward, though he may, to a permanent income tax of 1s. 2d. in the pound. I have hopes still lingering in the bottom of my mind that the additional taxation proposed in this year will turn the thoughts of the country, as I think it has already turned the thoughts of many members of this House, to the virtues of economy. Therefore a 14d. income tax may not be one of our permanent institutions. Another suggestion was, I think, made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Flint Boroughs, who has taken great interest in this question, and has always been good enough to do me justice with regard to it, that there should be some further graduation of income tax in favour of the possessors of small incomes. One hon. Member, speaking from that side of the House, went so far as to suggest that the possessors of all incomes not exceeding £500 should be free from the additional income tax imposed for this year. I think such a proposal as that would be by no means a fair one. I should be very sorry myself in a year with an increased income tax to single out a particular class of income-tax payers as a class to be relieved of that increase. I think that that, financially, would be an extremely immoral course: it would be almost purchasing the support of that class in favour of an increase of

taxation which, however unpopular it may be, ought to be levied by Parliament, so to speak, all round. And when the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Flint Boroughs invites me to a further graduation this year I must remind him that my last proposals of abatements, though accepted by Parliament, were not by any means universally approved of at the time by this House. There were comments precisely of the nature which I have just made myself, although in that year the income tax was not increased. I should be sorry to raise the rate of exemption from income tax. I think you could hardly make a greater mistake in our financial system.

With regard to the increase of abatements to a higher level, I confess that to

my mind a limit of £700 does seem a reasonable point to which abatements may extend. It is too often forgotten by the possessors of small incomes and by those those who advocate their cause that with regard to the lowest grade of incomes on which income tax is paid the abatements system does give a very large relief now. I think it ought to. I do not say it might not be increased, but I should not think it right to make a proposal for increasing it at such a time as that with which we are now dealing. There is no difference, so far as I know, in the House as to the necessity of further taxation, and I think there is very little difference as to the necessity, at any rate, of a considerable part of that taxation being raised by an increase of the income tax. Therefore, as we have had a discussion of some length dealing with many aspects of the income tax, I would venture to ask the Committee whether we might not now be allowed to come to a decision on a matter on which, I think, we are generally agreed; that there should be an increase of the income tax to the extent of 2d. in the pound. So far as I have noticed there is only one other point in the discussion to which I ought to refer. My hon. friend the Member for North Islington criticised the administration of the tax with regard to the question of arrears. He referred to a matter that happened last year, and has not been repeated now, at any rate. The tax is levied, and must I be levied on income which accrues to the possessor in the course of the year

That income accrued; though the possessors were unfortunately kept out of it for some time; in the course of the year in which the tax was increased. That was unfortunate for them. But it might have accrued in a year in which the tax was lowered, and then we should not have heard any complaint. I by no means say that the income tax is a perfect one. I do not know any tax that can be so described; but if any hon. Members think that they can easily make the income tax more perfect than it is now, I cannot give them better advice than that given by the hon. Member for Poplar; namely, to read that remarkable speech made by Mr. Gladstone on the income tax in 1853. A good many points have been raised as to the unfairness of the incidence of the income tax as between incomes derived from trade and brain work and incomes derived from those sources which are permanent; but of this I am quite certain; that as a new kind of direct taxation has been derived from the enormous increase of the death duties, the burden is now practically fair as between persons who derive their income from their brains on the one side and those who are the possessors of property on the other side. Although it may be possible in quieter times and with less difficulties in regard to taxation to amend the income tax, still I do not think it would be easy, and I do not think that any other country has ever devised a better system on the whole than that system which we now possess.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: I agree so entirely with what has fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the course he has adopted that I shall not detain the Committee more than a few seconds in referring to the income tax. All taxes are bad, but taxes are the fruit, as the Chancellor of the Exchequer has shown, of extravagance, and whenever this House or the country makes up its mind no longer to have extravagance,  
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.  
Arkwright, John Stanhope  
Bain, Col. James Robert  
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte  
Arrol, Sir William  
Baird, John George Alexander  
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel  
Ashton, Thomas Gair  
Balcarres, Lord  
Aird, Sir John  
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r  
Allan, William (Gateshead)  
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John  
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds).  
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.  
Austin, Sir John  
Banbury, Frederick George  
Anson, Sir William Reynell  
Bagot, Capt. Josceline Fitz Roy  
Bartley, George C. T.  
Archdale, Edward Mervyn  
Bailey, James (Walworth)  
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.

then we shall diminish the income tax, and not before. But I observe that the people who most denounce the income tax are those who most promote extravagance. You will find that extravagance is not really discouraged in this country; on the contrary, it is encouraged, and encouraged to a very great degree by those who most complain of the income tax. There is a great desire, no doubt, that the whole burden of taxation should be cast upon those who have an income of less than £160 a year, which is the low limit of the income tax. The people who want to get rid of the income tax are those who wish to levy the whole of this extravagant expenditure on the poorest classes of the community. ["No, no."] It is so. I cannot now go into an argument on the subject. Allow me to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is able now to make any reply to the appeal which I made to him earlier in the evening, at question time, to postpone the Report stage of the resolution as to the coal tax until an opportunity has been given for the miners to make representations to him on the subject.

\*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Yes, Sir; I have considered that matter, and I will undertake that the Report of the resolution shall be postponed until next week; but may I express the hope that the Committee will decide as to the present resolution now, and then the remaining resolutions can be taken on Thursday?  
MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) argued that there were many reasons why the proposed increase in the income tax should not apply to Ireland. Within the last seven years there had been a great falling off in incomes in Ireland. There was also a historical reason why the increase should not apply to Ireland;



Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 363; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 138.)

Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol

Faber, George Denison

Kearley, Hudson E.

Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B. (Hants

Fellowes, Hn. Ailwyn Edward

Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.

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

Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh

Beckett, Ernest William

Finch, George H.

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.

Black, Alexander William

Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne

Keswick, William

Blundell, Col. Henry

Fisher, William Hayes

Kimber, Henry

Bolton, Thomas Dolling

Fitz Gerald, Sir Robert Penrose-

King, Sir Henry Seymour

Bond, Edward

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Kinloch, Sir John G. Smyth

Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

Kitson, Sir James

Boulnois, Edmund

Flannery, Sir Fortescue

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.

Bowles, T. G. (King's Lynn)

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

Langley, Batty

Brigg, John

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry

Law, Andrew Bonar

Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John

Fuller, J. M. F.

Lawrence, William F.

Bull, William James

Galloway, William Johnson

Lawson, John Grant

Billiard, Sir Harry

Garfit, William

Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage  
Burt, Thomas  
Gibbs, Hn. A G H. (City of Lond.  
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie  
Butcher, John George  
Gibbs, Hon. Vicary (St. Albans)  
Leighton, Stanley  
Buxton, Sydney Charles  
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John  
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.  
Caldwell, James  
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederi'k  
Lewis, John Herbert  
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J A (Glasgow  
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn  
Llewellyn, Evan Henry  
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.  
Gordon, J. (Londonderry, S.)  
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.  
Causton, Richard Knight  
Gordon, Maj. Evans-(T'rH'm'ts  
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham)  
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)  
Gord, Hon. F. S. Ormsby-  
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S  
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire  
Gorst, Rt Hn. Sir John Eldon  
Lowe, Francis William  
Cawley, Frederick  
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim  
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)  
Cayzer, Sir Charles William  
Goulding, Edward Alfred  
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)  
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)  
Green, Walford D (Wednesbu'y  
Loyd, Archie Kirkman  
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)  
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)  
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth  
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.  
Greene, W. Raymond- (Cambs.  
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred  
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r  
Grenfell, William Henry  
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.

Channing, Francis Allston  
Gretton, John  
Macdona, John Cumming  
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Greville, Hon. Ronald  
MacIver, David (Liverpool)  
Chapman, Edward  
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)  
Maconochie, A. W.  
Charrington Spencer  
Griffith, Ellis J.  
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)  
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.  
Guest, Hon. Ivor Churchill  
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)  
Coddington, Sir William  
Gunter, Colonel  
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)  
Cohen, Benjamin Louis  
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton  
M' Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W  
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse  
Hain, Edward  
M'Kenna, Reginald  
'Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready  
Haldane, Richard Burdon  
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)  
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole  
Hall, Edward Marshall  
Malcolm, Ian  
Colville, John  
Halsey, Thomas Frederick  
Manners, Lord Cecil  
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas  
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (Midd'x  
Mansfield, Horace Rendall  
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)  
Hamilton, Marq. of L'nd'nderry  
Maple, Sir John Blundell  
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)  
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.  
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe  
Craig, Robert Hunter  
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William  
Markham, Arthur Basil  
Cranborne, Viscount

Hare Thomas Leigh  
Mather, William  
Crombie, John William  
Harmsworth, R. Leicester  
Maxwel L Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigt'n  
Cubitt, Hon. Henry  
Harris, Frederick Leverton  
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.  
Cust, Henry John C.  
Haslem, Sir Alfred S.  
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William  
Dalrymple, Sir Charles  
Haslett, Sir James Horner  
Melville, Beresford Valentine  
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)  
Hay, Hon. Claude George  
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton  
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan  
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-  
Milward, Colonel Victor  
Denny, Colonel  
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.  
Mitchell, William  
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-sh.)  
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley  
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)  
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets, S Geo  
Heath, James (Statfords, N. W.  
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy  
Dickinson, Robert Edmond  
Helme, Norval Watson  
More, Robert J. (Shropshire)  
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.  
Henderson, Alexander  
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh  
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-  
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter  
Morley, Rt. Hn. John (Montrose  
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles  
Higginbottom, S. W.  
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.  
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield  
Hoare, Edw Brodie (Hampstead  
Morrison, James Archibald  
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon  
Hoare, Sir Samuel (Norwich)

Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford  
Dorington, Sir John Edward  
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)  
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)  
Doughty, George  
Holland, William Henry  
Moss, Samuel  
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-  
Hornby, Sir William Henry  
Moulton, John Fletcher  
Doxford, Sir William Theodore  
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry  
Mount, William Arthur  
Duke, Henry Edward  
Howard, J. (Kent, Faversham  
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.  
Duncan, J. Hastings  
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham  
Muntz, Philip A.  
Dunn, Sir William  
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil  
Murray, Rt Hn A. Graham (Bute  
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin  
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.  
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)  
Edwards, Frank  
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)  
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)  
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton  
Button, John (Yorks, N. R.)  
Myers, William Henry  
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas  
Jacoby, James Alfred  
Newdigate, Francis Alexander  
Emmott, Alfred  
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton  
Newnes, Sir George  
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)  
Johnston, William (Belfast)  
Nicol, Donald Ninian  
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan  
Joicey, Sir James  
Norman, Henry  
Norton, Capt. Cecil William  
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-  
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward

Nussey, Thomas Willans  
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander  
Ure, Alexander  
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens  
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)  
Valentia, Viscount  
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay  
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert  
Walker, Col. William Hall  
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)  
Schwann, Charles E.  
Walton, John Lawson (Leeds, S.  
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)  
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)  
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)  
Partington, Oswald  
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)  
Warde, Col. C. E.  
Peel, Hn. Wm Robert Wellesley  
Seton-Karr, Henry  
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.  
Hemberton, John S. G.  
Sharpe, William Edward T.  
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan  
Percy, Earl  
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)  
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney  
Perks, Robert William  
Shipman, Dr. John G.  
Weir, James Galloway  
Pierpoint, Robert  
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire  
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton)  
Pilkington, Richard  
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)  
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.  
Platt-Higgins, Frederick  
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)  
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne  
Plummer, Walter R.  
Smith, H. C (North'mb, Tynes'e  
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)  
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp  
Smith, Samuel (Flint)  
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer  
Price, Robert John

Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)  
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)  
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward  
Soames, Arthur Wellesley  
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm  
Purvis, Robert  
Spear, John Ward  
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald  
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert  
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (North'nts  
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)  
Rankin, Sir James  
Spencer, Eriest (W. Bromwich)  
Wilson, John (Falkirk)  
Ratcliffe, R. F.  
Stanley, Hn. Archur (Ormskirk  
Wilson, John (Glasgow)  
Rea, Russell  
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)  
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.  
Reid, James (Greenock)  
Stevenson, Francis S.  
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)  
Remnant, James Farquharson  
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart  
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. B. (Bath  
Renwick, George  
Scone, Sir Benjamin  
Wolff Gustav Wilhelm  
Rickett, J. Compton  
Stroyan, John  
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd  
Ridley, Hn. M. W (Stalybridge  
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley  
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-  
Rigg, Richard  
Sturt, Hon. Humphry Napier  
Wrightson, Sir Thomas  
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson  
Talbot, Rt Hn. J G. (Oxf'd Univ.  
Wylie, Alexander  
Robertson, H. (Hackney)  
Taylor, Theodore Cooke  
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George  
Hoe, Sir Thomas  
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)

Wyndham-Quin, Major W. H.  
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.  
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.  
Yerburgh, Robert Armstrong  
Ropner, Colonel Robert  
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings  
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)  
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter  
Thornton, Percy M.  
Younger, William  
Round, James  
Tomkinson, James  
Royds, Clement Molyneux  
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray  
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;  
Russell, T. W.  
Trevelyan, Charles Philips  
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.  
Rutherford, John  
Tritton, Charles Ernest  
NOES.  
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)  
Healy, Timothy Michael  
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)  
Allen, Chas. P. (Grouc., Stroud  
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Chas. H.  
O'Donnell, J. (Mayo, S.)  
Ambrose, Robert  
Horniman, Frederick John  
O'Dowd, John  
Atherley-Jones, L.  
Jameson, Major J. Eustace  
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)  
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)  
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)  
O'Mara, James  
Bell, Richard  
Jordan, Jeremiah  
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.  
Blake, Edward  
Joyce, Michael  
O'Shee, James John  
Boland, John  
Kennedy, Patrick James  
Philipps, John Wynford  
Boyle, James



Lambert, George  
Power, Patrick Joseph  
Cameron, Robert  
Layland-Barratt, Francis  
Reddy, M.  
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)  
Leamy, Edmund  
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)  
Clancy, John Joseph  
Levy, Maurice  
Redmond, William (Clare)  
Cogan, Denis J.  
Lundon, W.  
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)  
Condon, Thomas Joseph  
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.  
Roche, John  
Crean, Eugene  
M'Neill, John Gordon Swift  
Shaw, Charles E. (Stafford)  
Cullinan, J.  
M'Dermott, Patrick  
Soares, Ernest J.  
Daly, James  
M'Govern, T.  
Sullivan, Donal  
Delany, William  
M'Killop, W. (Sligo, North)  
Tennant, Harold John  
Dillon, John  
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin  
Thompson, E. C. (Monaghan, N.  
Doogan, P. C.  
Minch, Matthews  
Tully, Jasper  
Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)  
Mooney, John J.  
Wallace, Robert  
Duffy, William J.  
Morgan, J. L. (Carmarthen)  
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)  
Farrell, James Patrick  
Murnaghan, George  
Whiteley, G. (York, W. R.)  
Kenwick, Charles  
Murphy, J.

Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)  
Field, William  
Nannetti, Joseph P.  
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)  
Flynn, James Christopher  
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.  
Yoxall, James Henry  
Gilhooly, James  
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)  
Goddard, Daniel Ford  
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)  
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;  
Hammond, John  
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)  
Sir Thomas Esmonde and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.  
Harrington, Timothy  
O'Brien, P. J (Tipperary, N.)  
Hayden, John Patrick  
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)

And, it being after ten minutes to Seven of the clock, the Chairman left the Chair to make his Report to the House.

Resolution to be reported to-morrow; Committee to sit again to-morrow.

EVENING SITTING.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Judges appointed to try the several Election Petitions the following Certificate and Report relating to the Monmouth Boroughs;;

MONMOUTH ELECTION PETITION.

The Election Petition for the Monmouth Boroughs.

The Parliamentary Elections Act, 1868.

The Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Acts, 1854&#x2013;1895.

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

We, Sir William Raun Kennedy and Sir Charles John Darling, Judges of the High Court of Justice, and two of the Judges on the rota for the time being for the trial of Election Petitions in England and Wales, do hereby certify, in pursuance of the said Acts, that, upon the 29th and 30th days of March and 1st and 2nd days of April of this year, we duly held a Court at the Town Hall, Newport, Monmouth, for the trial of, and did try, the Election Petition for the Monmouth Boroughs between Thomas Embrey and Christopher Sweeting, Petitioners, and Frederick Rutherford Harris, Respondent.

And, in further pursuance of the said Acts, we report that at the conclusion of the said trial we determined that the said Frederick Rutherford Harris, being the Member whose Election and return were complained of in the said Petition, was not duly elected and returned, and that the Election was void on the ground of illegal practices by the said Frederick Rutherford Harris and by his agent; and we do hereby certify in writing such our determination to you.

And whereas charges were made in the said Petition of illegal practices having been committed at the said Election, we,  
in further pursuance of the said Acts, report as follows::

(1) That an illegal practice was proved to have been committed by the said Frederick Rutherford Harris, in that he during the said Election, for the purpose of effecting the return of a candidate at such Election, made and published false statements of fact in relation to the personal character and conduct of such candidate.

(2) That the following persons were proved guilty of illegal practices, namely:  
Frederick Rutherford Harris,  
Henry Longstaff,  
Reginald Bath Cleaver,  
Thomas Jeke.

(3) That although it was proved that illegal practices were committed at the said Election, it was not proved, nor have we reason, upon the evidence before us, to believe that illegal practices extensively prevailed at the said Election.

(4) That the said Frederick Rutherford Harris was guilty by his Election agent, Henry Longstaff, of an illegal practice, in that the said Henry Longstaff failed without such authorised excuse as is mentioned in the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act, 1883, to make a true return respecting the Election expenses of the said Frederick Rutherford Harris.

(5) That, in the course of the investigation of the last mentioned charge, it appeared to us that the said Frederick Rutherford Harris was by his said Election agent, Henry Longstaff, guilty also of an illegal practice under the Corrupt and Illegal Practices Prevention Act, Section 9, Sub-section 1, in that the said Henry Longstaff induced and procured Thomas Jeke aforesaid to vote at the said Election knowing that he was a person prohibited; but no charge under this section was alleged in the said Petition.

(6) That we have given certificates of indemnity to the several persons whose names are set out in paragraph (2).

A copy of the evidence and of our Judgment, taken by the deputies of the shorthand writer of the House of Commons, accompanies this certificate.

Dated this 22nd day of April, 1901.

WILLIAM RANN KENNEDY.

CHARLES DARLING.

STEAMSHIP COMMUNICATION; GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES.

\*MR. EVELYN CECIL (Aston Manor) rose to call attention to the absence of direct British steamship communication between Great Britain and East Africa; and to move, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system of subsidies to steamship companies under foreign Governments, and the effect thereby produced on British trade; and to consider and report upon the political and commercial advantages to be gained by encouraging British steamers to circumnavigate Africa, especially having regard to the East coast, and to report upon the best means of giving them such encouragement." He said: I have been fortunate in the opportunity of raising this subject both in regard to time and

to form. So far as the form is concerned it is important, because the Foreign Office, the Colonial Office, the Post Office, so far as it deals with the mails, and the Board of Trade are interested; and had I raised the question on the Votes of any one of these offices I should probably have been ruled out of order in respect of what I wished to say regarding the other three, and the House would have missed the importance of the subject through its being argued in dribblets. I am fortunate as to the time, because this year the German Government has increased the subsidy to the German East African line of steamers, in order to enable them to go right round Africa, from £;45,000 to £;67,500. I am also perhaps fortunate in bringing forward this motion, because, with the exceptions of the hon. Member for Bermondsey and the hon. Member for Ormskirk, I believe I am the only Member of the House who has travelled the whole distance along the East Coast of Africa.

There is, I submit, much to inquire into with regard to this subject. It raises many wider issues than it at first sight appears to do. It deals with our trade throughout the world. In mentioning more particularly East Africa I do not want to exclude the question of subsidised lines of foreign steamers in other parts of the world. The North German line is subsidised, and it runs to every continent except America. The Messageries Maritimes line is subsidised, and runs to every continent. The difference between our system of subsidies hitherto; with one exception, which has now been established in the West Indies; and that of foreign Governments has been that we subsidise for value received only, that is for carrying mails, or for obtaining if necessary in time of war the right to seize the best ships of the merchant shipping companies; but foreign Governments subsidise to obtain better ships, better accommodation, and, if necessary, a higher rate of speed, and also to encourage trade and shipbuilding. Therefore I do not wish to confine this subject in any respect solely to East Africa. I have no doubt that many of my hon. friends will be able to adduce evidence of subsidies which have done harm to British trade in various parts of the world; but I have chosen East Africa because I think it is much the gravest case. If you travel to China you can go by the P. and O. Company's steamers, which run in competition with the North German Lloyd and the Messageries Maritimes lines; but if you travel to East Africa there is no line of British steamers by which you can go the whole distance without transhipment. That is a fact which makes a very serious case so far as our trade is concerned. I should like to lay before the House some of the facts and some of the difficulties which our British trade has to encounter.

Take our great emporium of Zanzibar. People here, perhaps, do not realise what an important centre of trade that is. To the Indian merchants who come over there it is almost as important as London is to this country, or as New York is to the United States; and if we respect at all the prestige in which the natives of that part of the world are disposed to hold British power, it ought to be one of our primary objects to improve and maintain direct communication with Zanzibar. Statistics show some very remarkable particulars. The tonnage of vessels for 1899 entering Zanzibar; the last figures obtainable; show that there entered into the harbour; German, 168,113 tons, total vessels, 98; British,

103,457 tons, total vessels, 69; French, 26 vessels: Norwegian, 3 vessels; and United States, 2 vessels. There is no question, therefore, if you measure merely by the tonnage of the ships, that that of foreign ships is greatly in excess of that of the British. But that is not all. We have, as I have suggested, to tranship our goods. The only large British line which runs to Zanzibar is, I believe, the British India, but to get to Zanzibar by the British India from this country you have to change steamers at Aden; and if this is an inconvenience to passengers it is not difficult to understand that the transshipment of cargo is much more serious. The additional risks run by delays all add naturally to the cost of carriage, to say nothing of exposure to the weather and thefts by natives.

Another difficulty arises in respect of passengers. Not unfrequently the plague breaks out at Aden, and supposing a traveller wanted to come home from Zanzibar via, Aden, he might be put in quarantine; the only alternative being for him to go the long round-about journey to Bombay and join the P. and O. steamer. It is perfectly obvious that these disadvantages are very great; but, strange to say, both the passenger fares and the freight for cargo are higher by the British than by the French and German lines. The first class fare of the British India steamers; entailing the change at Aden; is £57 15s.; by the German East African line it is only £42 10s., and by the Messageries Maritimes from Marseilles, £40 14s. But the French and German lines have certain advantages in addition. If the traveller happens to be an official, say a consul of any country, he is allowed a rebate on his fare of 10 per cent. on the German East African line and the same for his wife and family, and by the Messageries Maritimes line a rebate of 15 per cent. Therefore, with all these disadvantages it is not surprising that the tonnage of British ships going out to Zanzibar is much below that of foreign vessels, although Zanzibar is the most important British territory on the east coast of Africa.

But I turn to the other ports. The Consular Report respecting the trade of our East Africa Protectorate for 1899 states;

"A direct line of British steamers between London and Mombasa would go far to stimulate

trade in British goods, as importers are strongly adverse to the delays and damages which transshipment entails. The gross registered steam tonnage which entered the port in 1899 was 218,089 tons, represented by 142 steamers. Of this tonnage 90,126 tons was English and 127,903 tons German."

I believe also that American trade, which I am informed is increasing there with considerable rapidity, is carried in German ships almost entirely. Mombasa is not the only place involved. The circumstances also concern Uganda. Mombasa is a port which has a fair chance of almost equalling Zanzibar if the prosperity of Uganda increases. We have over and over again discussed the question of Uganda in this House, but I cannot see the use of all the money and trouble we have expended in connection with the Uganda Railway if we allow foreign ships to carry away all the trade. The Government have on various occasions, I believe, been approached with reference to running British steamers direct to Mombasa. When it was a matter of material being conveyed for the Uganda Railway it was

found necessary to charter a steamer at Cardiff, which ran on an average once every six weeks, because it was found impossible to use any of the other British steam ship lines, as transshipment was too serious and rates were too high. Advantageous offers were made to the Government, but the steamer from Cardiff was the arrangement they preferred. When a debate occurred in this House in April, 1899, with reference to the Uganda Railway and the transshipment of railway material, the Secretary of State for War, in his then capacity as Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, said there were already six lines of steamers on the east coast of Africa running from England, and that therefore it was quite unnecessary to have a direct British line. When the hon. Member for Kilmarnock Burghs interrupted with the remark that all these steamships went round South Africa my right hon. friend made this rather remarkable statement; "Whether they go round the south of Africa or the north of Africa does not matter; so long as they arrive at their destination the Foreign Office is willing to take advantage of them."

I do not think I need comment on that remark. I can only conclude that my right hon. friend's better judgment had on this occasion been swallowed up by his official responsibility. Uganda, with all its prospects of development, seems in itself a sufficient ground for establishing a direct line of British steamers, which could run to Zanzibar and Mozambique. The only Consular Report which does not advocate the establishment of this line is the report with reference to Mozambique, but, after all, Mozambique belongs to Portugal, the whole hinterland is Portuguese, and it is not in any sense on the highway to our British possessions. The Consular Report with reference to Mozambique, after mentioning the German East Africa line and the Messageries Maritimes, states that "there is little inducement for other companies to enter into competition as yet"; and this comment, I assume, also applies to another small port, Quilimane, which is still further south, and which also belongs to Portugal.

When we come to Chinde, the case is again somewhat different, as it could supply British Central Africa, where there are prospects of coffee, and possibly ivory, india-rubber, and other products, if it were not for the serious obstacle of the bar in the river Zambesi. This does not by any means complete the evidence of the Consular Reports, which urge that the Government should assist direct steamship communication with East Africa. The one dealing with Beira states; "The end of the year 1900 should show a very great increase of trade at this port; the opening of the railway at Salisbury with extensions to Gwelo and Bulawayo, the importation of machinery, the opening up and satisfactory returns from the mining districts of Manica and Rhodesia with the necessary sequence of increase in population, will all materially tend to this result."

If this forecast is true with regard to Beira, I would ask what will the trade be with the Transvaal colony through Delagoa Bay as soon as peace is established? I should like to quote from a letter which I received a few months ago from Sir Arthur Hardinge, when he was still Consul-General at Zanzibar. He writes;

"I hope the impetus which the restoration of peace will give to trade with the Transvaal may help to get on an English line direct from home to Lourenco

Marques and Durban via Zanzibar."

After all, Lourenco Marques is only fifty-six miles from the Transvaal frontier. The railway transport is very much less than from Cape Town or Port Elizabeth. The distance from Cape Town to the Transvaal frontier is 964 miles, and from Port Elizabeth 663, which compare very markedly with the mileage from Delagoa Bay. From London to Delagoa Bay via Cape Town is only about 600 miles less than from London to Delagoa Bay via Aden. I took the trouble to get figures from the Royal Geographical Society, and they are as follows:;London to Delagoa Bay via Aden,

7,794 miles; London to Delagoa Bay via Cape Town, 7,170 miles. I think that is an additional argument in favour of my suggestion that the circumnavigation of Africa is the proper course to pursue. If we get to Delagoa Bay by running down the east coast of Africa we might just as well complete the circuit by calling at our various ports around Africa. The circumnavigation of Africa has been started by the German East Africa Company this year, and with regard to German trade I should like once for all to make it most emphatically clear that I am speaking from a sincere feeling of friendship for Germany, and not from any desire for a hostile or offensive rivalry. I have lived too many months of my life in Germany not to value and highly appreciate German friendship. There is ample room in the whole world for the German and British Empires to exist in perfect accord, and if we do imitate the Germans, it is merely in the spirit of that imitation which is the sincerest form of flattery. The German Imperial Government have this year increased the subsidy to the German East African Company in order that they should continue their line right round Africa. They run a fortnightly service alternately by the east coast and by the west coast, and in addition, a monthly service, which runs down the East African coast as far as Beira, returning the same way. If they can do that with regard to their territories, and also with regard to ours, I cannot see why we cannot do something of the same kind, thereby benefiting our possessions, from Somaliland to British East Africa and Uganda, Zanzibar, British Central Africa, Natal, and Cape Colony, and returning by the west coast to the advantage of the Niger Territory, the Gold Coast, Ashantee, Sierra Leone, and Gambia, altogether forming a complete connection between our different colonies in Africa, which ought ultimately to be a very useful and profitable commercial enterprise.

I also hope that the Committee, if it is appointed, will bear in mind the question of through bills of lading, by means of which the German Government is endeavouring to attract British trade to German lines. Part of the scheme is the largely reduced rate on the German State Railway; I do not say we could reduce railway freights for through goods here, because without a State railway it is obvious the same agreement might not be arrived at; but I think it is a matter for railway directors to consider in this country should through bills of lading be introduced and found profitable. The through bills of lading and the reduced rates of Germany cause the entire traffic of the Continent to be attracted to the German line. Through connection was made between that line and the Pretoria and Delagoa Bay Bail-way at particular rates for goods, and now that the country

is in our possession, I cannot see what should prevent us from adopting a similar arrangement for the Transvaal trade if it could possibly be concluded. Let me call the attention of the House in substantiation of what I have stated to some of the figures. The purely German goods traffic on the German East Africa line in the year 1891 amounted to £;300,900, and in 1898 it amounted to £;955,600;an enormous increase in those seven years. If I compare that with the British imports at Zanzibar and Pemba, which may be taken as a means of comparing the relative increase of British and German trade, I find in 1892 (the first year for which figures are obtainable) they amounted to £;105,670. In 1898, the year the German line showed such an enormous increase, they only amounted to

£;114,217. In 1899, they amounted to £;113,914. and in 1900 the actual figures are not yet available;but the Board of Trade states them approximately as £;76,509. Whether the war has anything to do

with that reduction I cannot precisely say, but the figures I have quoted are sufficient to show that our trade has remained practically stationary, while German trade has increased very disproportionately.

Two contrary statements may be argued in respect of these facts. It is alleged that the reason, partly, why German trade seems to have increased so much, is because British goods are shipped to Hamburg for further shipment by German steamers, and though I have tried to obtain figures to show to what extent British goods do go by the German route to East Africa, I have not been able to obtain them except on a very hypothetical basis, but the general belief in well-informed quarters is that these German steamers carry mainly German goods, and that the carriage and imports of German goods have very largely increased. The other contrary statement is made by the shipowners, who say it is a fact that the greater part of the trade between East Africa and this part of the world is not through the United Kingdom but through the continent of Europe. I am disposed to think that this is true. Why? Because the rates of freight are lower and communication more direct, and the subsidies granted to foreign companies enable them to run their steamers at a cheaper rate than we are able to do. How can we expect our trading companies to compete against steamers which are superior in every way and have so much larger a money reserve? I do not think foreign subsidies are the only cause why our trade has remained stationary and that of Germany has so much increased. I think in part our manufacturers are to blame. They do not take the trouble to find out what class of goods is wanted in any particular part. It is the old story of the Atbara bridge in the Soudan;where it was found the bridge could be made in America just as well and just as cheaply as here, and in the time and on the pattern required, which our manufacturers could not undertake. It applies to small things just as much as to large. If the natives of Zanzibar like a particular kind of calico for clothes there is no reason for supplying them with another kind. When I was in Natal I went over the plantations of a large tea-grower. He told me that he wanted a number of a particular kind of pruning hook, that he sent the order to England, but that the British manufacturers sent what he did not want, something somewhat more expensive than that which he had ordered, and told him they were



not exactly what he asked for, but were much better than what he ordered; he said that that was not what he wanted, and he gave the order to an American firm and obtained the hook that he required. Mining machinery of a particular pattern is ordered in Johannesburg or Rhodesia from here, and instead of supplying it the manufacturers say they have better patterns than that which the customer has asked for, and that he had better take that. But the customer refuses to accept the machinery, and gives his order to German or American firms, from whom they get the thing they desire. It is no good offering persons goods which they do not want, and it would be much wiser for British manufacturers to establish plant to enable them to make the patterns which are required abroad rather than to continue to manufacture the patterns which are not required. I would suggest also to the Board of Trade whether it would not be possible to establish, not merely a centre of information at the Board of Trade, giving figures, statistics, and illustrations of what particular articles are required for trade in the different parts of the world, but a bureau, such as exists in Germany, to show the actual patterns of the materials wanted, which could be imitated and manufactured here.

Now, this motion concludes by referring to the best means of giving encouragement to the steamship companies. That embraces the whole question, which sooner or later will have to be dealt with, if a remedy for the present state of things is required. There are one or two possibilities, or at any rate suggestions with regard to it. One is that we should grant subsidies on the same system as the foreigners do, and I trust that if the facts justified some intervention of that kind, the jealousy of the companies would not stand in the way of a patriotic purpose if a subsidy were given to one company rather than another. Nor do I think the Treasury objections should stand in the way, as it could not be said that it would be impossible to find the money. What is the object of Germany in granting subsidies?; a policy the more striking because I find from a perusal of the annual report of the German East Africa line that it would not at present pay its way but for the Government subsidy which it receives. In

1899 the shareholders received 6 per cent. dividend. In 1900 the dividend was 8 per cent. But this 8 per cent. was obtained by the distribution of 600,000 marks among the shareholders, and as the Government subsidy was 900,000 marks, it is plain that without the subsidy the company would have been 300,000 marks or £15,000 to the bad. And when it is borne in mind that the receipts for 1900 included a sum of 400,000 marks paid by the British Government for arresting the "Bundesrath," "Herzog," and other steamers of the line on suspicion of contraband which they were not proved to contain, the balance-sheet does not show any very enviable result. The Bill before the Reichsrath advocating the increased subsidy to the German East Africa line contained explanatory statements as to what were the reasons which induced Germany to adopt this policy. Among those reasons is the freeing of German commerce from the agency of foreign nations, both as regards foreign business houses and in shipping matters; the avoidance of damage resulting from transshipment; the possibility of transmitting mails independently of foreign countries; the

economic importance of Cape Colony for the development of German commerce; the opening up of harbours of communication with the important territory of the Transvaal Republic in addition to Delagoa Bay; the improvement of merchant ships for transport of troops and for service in time of war: and in general the considerable expansion of German export and import trade.

Whether the German policy is right or wrong is another matter, but by way of showing how anxious the Germans are to push the policy it is interesting to know that quite recently the Germans bought up an English line of steamers, which traded from Bangkok to Singapore, for what was approximately three times its value; and I have no doubt that some of my hon. friends around me could give instances of similar attempts that have been made by the German Government to buy up other lines in the Yangtze and other parts of the world. Therefore, there is no doubt that they have a very firm belief in the excellence of their methods, and that is why I am

anxious that this Select Committee should be granted. The only possible remedy for counteracting the policy of foreign Governments is sometimes said to be that of countervailing duties on foreign ships and cargoes. I will not say I am very much in agreement with that proposal, because I think there are very serious objections to it, but if we are considering the question of remedies it would be an omission on my part if I did not mention that it has been suggested. In such a case there would not be the subsidising of one shipping company as against another, but on the other hand no doubt the colonists would obtain their goods at somewhat higher prices. I do not, however, see any objection to that, because they would obtain the goods at the natural, and not the fictitious, price. But I do see an objection in other respects as regards East Africa, because, although it might be practicable to put on countervailing duties in dealing with a place like India, which is a compact whole, you cannot do it in East Africa, where the coast does not belong solely to us, but also to Germany, Portugal, and other nations. Obviously, if countervailing duties were put on foreign ships and cargoes, there would be a great disposition to smuggle into our possessions, and there would be the even greater misfortune that traders would go away from our possessions, and take up their centre of trade in the places in which these countervailing duties were not levied. But perhaps the most serious opposition with which I may be met is what I may call the free-trade objection. I know perfectly well that when some Members first saw this resolution on the Paper, they had the idea that it involved an infringement of the principles of free trade. I venture to dispute that there is any breach of free-trade principles. I am a free-trader myself, and, that being

so, I should not be likely to come forward with a motion of this kind unless I thought there was a very great distinction to be drawn between an infringement of free trade and the present proposal. Consumers throughout the world should be able to buy the best goods at their natural cost in the cheapest market. That is a fundamental doctrine of free trade. But free trade does not aim at bolstering up a fictitious price. If a price is made fictitious by disturbing and extraneous circumstances, free trade is prepared, I imagine, to adopt means to set the matter right, and I do not suppose that in a question of this kind

subsidies can be said to be an infringement of free trade, seeing that we are asking only to have set right an arrangement which has upset the principles of free trade. A hostile subsidy disturbs the natural price of goods and creates an inequality, and it does this when equality of competition and exchange between different countries in the articles which they are respectively best able to produce are the very essence and kernel of free trade. We are not without precedents in this matter. There are recent precedents for the proposal of a subsidy, even as regards ourselves. Before referring to the more recent precedents, I should like to remind the House of what occurred more than fifty years ago, when free-trade doctrines were at their height. It was in 1849 when the first guaranteed railway was established in India. I should like to ask what difference there is between a proposal to subsidise a steamship company and a proposal for the Government to guarantee a particular railway company. In 1849 the Great Indian Peninsula Railway was first established in India, and it was established under a guarantee, and the Act of Parliament which created that guarantee was passed by this House with full knowledge of what was being done. But I need not go so far back as 1849. We have some very recent precedents. There is the subsidy granted to the Imperial Direct West India Mail Service to Jamaica. That subsidy was recommended in 1897 by the Royal Commission which was appointed to inquire into the West Indian trade, and consists of £40,000, half of which is paid by Jamaica. That action was taken in deference to colonial wishes; a very proper reason. This House was disposed at the time to listen to the argument that colonial wishes in such a matter should be respected, and I do not know why they should not be disposed to do the same now. Is not the evidence from the various consular reports to which I have referred sufficient to show what the unanimous opinion of our colonies is? And if we have any desire to respect colonial wishes in this matter, and to cement more closely the different colonies in various parts of the Empire, we have very good precedents for doing so. We have also the precedent of the countervailing duties, which were granted in 1899 in India against foreign sugar bounties. Both these precedents are of some service in favour of the proposal for a Select Committee to inquire into this matter. No doubt the ideal would be to wait until some steamship company to East Africa would pay. That is the ideal, but it will not do in practice, because the figures show that German trade is increasing by leaps and bounds. The German contention is that the cost to the German taxpayer of pushing trade by subsidies is amply repaid in the long run by the vastly increased volume and prosperity of the trade, and I do not stop now to argue whether that policy is right or wrong, but it is certainly a matter for inquiry by this country. German trade is increasing largely everywhere, presumably in part owing to steamship subsidies which are granted. The accommodation provided and the means of transport by their steamers are all exceedingly good, and I could see myself at Zanzibar that the merchants were very much struck by the excellence of these steamers, and they had every intention of retaining their services, and acknowledging in that way that they appreciated them. Merchants are very conservative, and when they have been well served by steamship companies we cannot suppose that they will easily desert them when we find it

pays to introduce a steamship company of our own. I would like to urge that it might be worth while to establish as an experiment direct British communication with East Africa for four or five years. If it failed we should profit by the experiment, while if it succeeded it might in the end pay itself, and it would also bring many subsidiary and incidental advantages to our colonies. At any rate, I repeat that it is a matter for inquiry, and I think a strong case is made out for the Select Committee for which I ask. I am very much afraid that some day we shall awaken from our present attitude to find we have made a serious blunder, and that the trade we might have obtained has been permanently and irremediably lost. I beg to move the resolution which stands in my name.

\*SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): The hon. Member who has moved this motion has been very lucid and comprehensive in his statement, and therefore my observations need only be of the briefest possible character. He has the great advantage of a personal knowledge of this matter, for he has been in the localities concerned. The reason we ask for a Select Committee upon this question is because there has been a great decline in British trade and shipping in East Africa, and that the decline is so serious and the retrogression so unmistakeable that some inquiry into the contributory causes is imperatively demanded. The figures furnished by my hon. friend who moved this motion seem abundantly to justify the demand for a thorough investigation. The trouble is not, as one would from a superficial examination suppose, to be found in the decline of British commercial intercourse simply with the littoral of East Africa. Our case is not based merely upon a "setback" in the character of our commercial intercourse. Above and beyond these circumstances, untoward as they certainly are, there is the paramount question of the enhancement or diminution of prestige consequent upon the comparative volume and extent of the trade carried on under the flags of the different nations competing for that trade. Prestige in oriental countries is an asset of incalculable value. This is a truism, and what unfortunately is also a truism is that the Government; not necessarily this Government, for both parties are tarred with the same brush; seem to be singularly incapable or unwilling to go adequate lengths in consolidating their prestige in backward countries. I happen to know something of the apathy and languor which invariably creep over public departments when it is a question of taking a broad and statesmanlike view in matters of great public importance. Take, for instance, the question of cable communication, which is a matter of great economic importance to an empire such as ours, with possessions in the four corners of the globe. The case which has been pointed out by my hon. friend is only an illustration of what I have been advancing. Only this afternoon we had a somewhat heated discussion on both sides of the House in regard to the increase in our public expenditure, upon which my hon. friend the Member for North Monmouthshire made a very spirited and eloquent speech. I wish, however, to point out that that speech was not directed against expenditure of a reproductive character such as that at which the motion of my hon. friend contingently aims. I think my hon. friend aims rather at those ill-considered and improvident outlays in which the Governments of both parties are

so often involved. What have we been doing in East Africa ever since we dispossessed the British East Africa Company and took over their responsibilities? We have been spending money very freely on the construction of the Uganda Railway. But what earthly use or what possible commercial benefit can accrue from that expenditure if you do not take steps to provide proper feeders for it in the shape of sea-borne commerce? My hon. friend has laid stress upon the importance of considering British influence in East Africa, including Zanzibar, which, valuable as it is from a political aspect, is still more so from its proximity to the Indian Empire. If we desire to have a system communicating with Seychelles, which, as an hon. friend behind me points out, has been discontinued, if the railway is to be conducted on commercial lines and maintained as a going concern, we must see to it that similar facilities to those which are granted with so much foresight, and in anticipation even of any demand for them, by Germany, France, and even Austria, are forthcoming in the case of our own people.

My hon. friend the mover of this resolution also referred to the action of the right hon. Gentleman the Colonial Secretary. I turn with pleasure to the contemplation of the statesmanlike sagacity displayed by the Colonial Secretary in developing the Colonial possessions of this country. Bitter experience has taught me that you can get nothing in this world unless you keep on pegging away and sometimes making yourself disagreeable all round. We must assume that the Colonial Secretary is a past master in this laborious but sometimes fruitful operation, and he must have plied the Treasury with unswerving persistence to have succeeded in obtaining the substantial subvention for the establishment of a direct line of communication to and from the West Indies. I respectfully invite the President of the Board of Trade to closely imitate the tactics of his masterful colleague the Colonial Secretary. At any rate, the right hon.

Gentleman might agree to this Committee, and then endeavour to carry into effect as far as practicable its recommendations. I ask the House if it is not an immense advantage and a tower of strength to this country that it possesses the most powerful mercantile fleets in the world, such as that of the P. and O.

Company, which is presided over with so much ability by Sir Thomas Sutherland?

My hon. friend foreshadowed some misgivings as to the obstacles which he thought might possibly be raised against the granting of subsidies, and he said that the argument of interfering with free trade principles would probably be thrown at our head. But, swearing fealty as I do to free trade principles, I frankly confess to the House that my allegiance in this respect falls short of a pedantic adherence to those doctrines irrespective of any modification or adaptation to present needs and requirements. We want a real and genuine, and not a spurious and meretricious free trade. At any rate, if foreign Powers are enabled by means of lavish bounties and profuse subsidies to jockey us out of markets to which we have every legitimate claim, then I assert that one of two things must happen; either free trade as it exists and is enforced in this country will have to haul down its colours, or else British shipping and British trade in East Africa will have

to go to the wall. I think I have said enough to cause some searchings of heart

among those hide-bound doctrinaires, some distinguished representatives of whom I see opposite, who cherish with unceasing and undiscerning faith the doctrines of Mr. Cobden. In conclusion, I implore my right hon. friend to inaugurate the tenure of his office by some generous and substantial boon to British shipping. I cannot conceive why he should refuse the very moderate claims put forward by the mover of this resolution, and in that confident hope and belief I have much pleasure in seconding this motion.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system of subsidies to steamship companies under foreign Governments, and the effect thereby produced on British trade; and to consider and report upon the political and commercial advantages to be gained by encouraging British steamers to circumnavigate Africa, especially having regard to the East coast, and to report upon the best means of giving them such encouragement.";(Mr. Evelyn Cecil.)

\*SIR FRANCIS EVANS (Maidstone): I have listened attentively to the various reasons why we should go to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to ask for some assistance to run a line of steamers along the East coast. It is an unfortunate moment to go to the Treasury, and it is a perfectly safe thing to go there now, because the Chancellor of the Exchequer has got a good excuse. I can assure the hon. Member for Aston Manor that I have made as careful a study as is possible of the various ports he has mentioned. The company with which I am connected has run a line first to Zanzibar and then to Beira, but in neither case did the line pay, and, after we had lost a certain number of thousands of pounds, which we thought sufficient to show our good faith as English shipowners, we decided to retire to Delagoa Bay. At that port we have remained and intend to remain, but nothing will stop us from going back to Beira and on to Zanzibar and Mombasa through the Mediterranean the moment it will pay. Frankly, although I like to have Government subsidies when they are freely given, I am against Government subsidies unless very good value to the nation can be shown for them. The moment has not come when any Chancellor of the Exchequer can make a good case for giving a subsidy to a line of steamers passing from Delagoa Bay round by the Red Sea to this country.

The resolution which has been moved provides for the appointment of a Select Committee to consider and report upon the political and commercial advantages to be gained by encouraging British steamers to circumnavigate South Africa. What is the advantage of circumnavigation of that great country? The hon. Member has spoken of these various ports, but apparently he has not had much experience of shareholders who want dividends. If you want to go on a yachting expedition, the hon. Member's proposal is a beautiful scheme. I wish to tell the hon. Member that his case is not supported by the instance of the German East African line, for that line has only just managed to pay a dividend by writing down its capital one-half. It has done this by the aid of subsidies granted by the German Government and in part by the circumstances attaching to the Transvaal war. Why are the German East African line passing down by West Africa now? Because they cannot make the East African line pay. Am I to go to the British Treasury and say in forma pauperis that I cannot maintain myself against German competition?

No, never. The Germans had a right to go there if they liked. I do not object, but we will meet them on their own ground and struggle with them on their own ground, and I hope that, backed up by the merchants of this country, we shall successfully compete with the Germans wherever we find them. There are a good many practical things which can be done by the Board of Trade to assist us in this matter, and it is the duty of the merchants of this country to demand from the Board of Trade such action as will enable us to expand more rapidly our trade in the various articles manufactured in this country. I believe that a Committee established to inquire as to how we can; benefit English trade might do a great deal of good. An Act has been passed called the Merchandise Marks Acts, and I venture to say that it is the most foolish Act which has been passed in my time. It has taken away from this country a large business, which can never be recovered, and this will continue as long as we oblige the German merchants to put upon their goods "Made in Germany." I do not believe the motion of the hon. Member, well conceived as it is in the interest of commerce, would do any good in this case, because you are going to ask a Committee to inquire into that which I may tell the hon. Member I know beforehand to be an impossibility. You cannot make the circumnavigation of Africa a paying trade. If that is the case, why have a Committee to report upon it? I saw the Secretary of State for the Colonies a few years ago, and I said if he wished to develop the trade north of Delagoa Bay a service would be provided if the Government would take part of the risk for a time. I cannot say, much as I should like to receive money for the purpose, I should be in favour of the Government of this country going in that direction. I believe there are as good shipowners in England as elsewhere, but they love money for all that. We would have friends in Liverpool saying "Really, Liverpool ought to have a say in this extension," and showing good reasons why the Treasury should put its hands in its pockets to help Liverpool. I do not believe any of us are going in that direction. I believe Liverpool shipowners are as much against it as I am, and while I may congratulate the hon. Member on the way he has put the case before the House, yet at the same time I cannot believe in its being a useful thing to do. I therefore regret that I cannot support it.

MR. ARTHUR STANLEY (Lancashire, Ormskirk): I must apologise for saving a few words on this question to hon. Gentlemen opposite, and for coming between them and their socialist commonwealth resolution. The only advantage in favour of the resolution now before the House is that the East Coast of Africa does exist, and I have, seen it, while the socialist commonwealth does not exist, and I do not believe it ever will exist. If any speech could tell in favour of the motion of my hon. friend the Member for Aston Manor, I think it would be the last speech to which we have listened. I need only take one sentence out of the speech to prove my ease. The hon. Member in the name of British shipowners refused in a thoroughly British spirit this offer of assistance. He said he would be perfectly willing to meet other countries on the same footing. Well, that is exactly what we are proposing to do by asking this subsidy. If we get this subsidy he will be able to meet foreign countries on the same footing, and British shipowners will be able to hold their own; but he knows they cannot do

so at present because it does not pay. If it did pay, we should not have this motion for a Committee put before the House. I think the only advantage I can claim in speaking on this motion is that I have been down the coast. I do not believe that going through a country in a railway train makes one qualified to speak upon it. There is one thing, however, that can be said about going down the East Coast of Africa, and that is that you are qualified to speak about the ports on the coast. One who has gone down that coast in a small yacht has more than lively recollections of intricate calculations as to whether your coal will hold out to the next port you are likely to reach. The Germans are the people who are competing with us down that coast. I have reason to be grateful to the Germans at Suez. The only charts we had were those lent to us by the German mail steamers, although the charts were fifty years old, and if we had in any sense trusted to them we should inevitably have gone down. But the loan of these charts was well meant. Our own Admiralty may not be superior in all respects, but at any rate they hold their own from the point of view of charts. It is very difficult to realise the extreme importance of the ports along the East Coast of Africa. By navigating the coast it is brought home to one, in a way no map could do, that Africa is a vast continent of enormous wealth, with practically no outlet except one or two ports. I need not go into figures; my hon. friend has dealt with that; but anybody who chooses to look at the figures will see that the Germans are undoubtedly taking the trade from us. We have, at a great deal of cost to ourselves, been maintaining British supremacy in the interior of that country. British supremacy in the interior of Africa is absolutely useless to us unless we maintain British supremacy outside. If we are simply to create trade in the interior of Africa in order that German ships and German firms may profit by it, then I should be the first to say, Better let the Transvaal go to the wall.

As my hon. friends have said, we shall, of course, have the free-trade bogey brought up. We shall be told, "You are advocating protection by advocating this subsidy." First of all I would point out that we are not advocating a subsidy at all. We are simply advocating the appointment of a Committee to consider a subsidy. Secondly, I would point out that this subsidy can in no sense of the word be called protection. It is simply doing what I maintain we have a perfect right to do; putting our own people on an equal footing with the rest of the world, in order to make them better able to compete on their own merits. I hope that my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade will see his way to grant us this Committee. There is only one alteration I would venture to suggest. It seems to me that my hon. friend who moved the resolution has made it a little too comprehensive. His argument dealt only with East Africa, and I think if we confine the resolution to East Africa we shall be doing well. I cannot quite agree with him in thinking that the circumnavigation of Africa is necessary. If he would limit his motion to the words;

"That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system of subsidies to steamship companies under Foreign governments, and the effect thereby produced on British trade,"

I believe we should have a better motion, one the House would be more likely to



agree with, and one the President of the Board of Trade would be more likely to accept. I earnestly hope that my right hon. friend will accept, if not the whole motion, at all events this amended version of it.

\*SIR CHARLES CAYZER

(Barrow-in-Furness): I think my hon. friend the Member for Aston Manor may congratulate himself on getting a hearing on a question of great importance to the varied interests of this country, and it is not of less importance because it has been brought forward by a private Member. If we were to wait for action on these subjects on the part of any of the Governments we have in this House we should have to wait a very long time. Although any Government may think themselves able to govern this country well, I fail to remember that any Government have dealt with the commercial affairs of this country and taken such an interest in the welfare and preservation of our trade interests in the way the German Government have done with theirs. This resolution calls attention to the British steam communication between Great Britain and East Africa. I cordially agree with what my hon. friend the Member for Maidstone said about this trade. From my knowledge, and I have an intimate knowledge of the trade of Africa, I do not think there is sufficient reason at present to ask for a subsidy for a British line to East African ports. As has been shown this trade is greatly carried by the Germans. I think I can give reasons for that. When the Germans went to Africa it was part of an understanding that they should go through the Suez Canal and to the ports on the East African Coast. They have since extended their service from the south, but to say that British trade in East Africa is neglected is to state, to my mind, what is not the fact. There are six lines of steamers trading to the East African ports. These steamers go as far as Beira regularly, and we should be quite prepared to go further when there are inducements for us to go. I consider that to ask for a subsidy for a line to circumnavigate Africa is entirely out of the question.

But there are other reasons which I shall submit to the House very briefly why we have a right to ask for this committee of inquiry. This question is of great importance to British shipowners, and to the traders and manufacturers of this country. British shipowners are at present greatly handicapped by the steamship subsidies and preferential railway rates granted by the German Government. Germany first commenced with a subsidised line to Australia. It next subsidised a line to the Far East and afterwards to Africa. This has led to an enormous increase in the German mercantile fleet, which now includes some of the finest ships in the world. By running these subsidised lines they have encouraged trade in Germany, and now German manufacturers are closely competing with us in our own colonies in consequence of the facilities which these subsidised lines afford. Well, what does the German Government get in return? Not only direct postal facilities, but no doubt the markets for their trade have been very largely increased, so that what the German taxpayer pays in subsidies is very well repaid to him in an increase of his trade. There are the additional national advantages which the Germans have gained by granting these subsidies, the establishment of a large mercantile fleet and a naval reserve in case of

war. Now, I have no complaint to make about Germany taking this action. To my mind it is a very wise policy for a large and powerful nation like Germany, with increasing colonies, to provide proper facilities for their communications and the promotion of their trade with their colonies, especially when we remember that within the memory of some of the youngest Members of this House Germany had hardly any mercantile fleet at all. They have now one of the finest mercantile fleets afloat. I do not complain of the Germans putting on these ships and pressing their trade wherever they can; but what I complain of is that they are competing at our ports with British trade under unfair conditions. It is on that ground that I ask the President of the Board of Trade to grant this committee of inquiry. It is a well-known fact that no manufacturer, trader, or shipowner can compete on fair terms when steamers running on the same lines, and manufacturers putting on the market similar articles with our manufacturers are subsidised by an Imperial Government. Supposing a German manufacturer is 200 miles inland from a seaport, and a British manufacturer is the same distance from the port of shipment, the German manufacturer has an advantage in preferential railway rates for his goods. And why? Because the German railways are State railways, and the German Government encourage their manufacturers by giving them cheap rates for their goods to the seaport. English and Scotch manufacturers have not the same advantage, for our railways are private railways, and they cannot get cheap rates. I feel sure that I shall have the sympathy and support of the President of the Board of Trade in this matter, and that he will appoint this Committee. He cannot do anything better to inaugurate his term of office than by giving close attention to the preservation and promotion of our trade throughout the world. I do not advocate subsidies. The maritime supremacy of Great Britain has not been built up on subsidies. I think I may fairly state to the House that the subsidised lines do not represent 5, or at any rate more than 10 per cent. of the shipping tonnage of the United Kingdom. How has that great tonnage, which is very largely privately owned, been created? It has been created by the enterprise and energy of the shipowners of the country, and I do not think that we need fear that that enterprise and energy is at all on the wane. But trade is altering. Once these imperial subsidies are granted and extended it becomes a question whether, if some remedies are not found, we will be able to maintain our supremacy in the future as in the past. Do not the Government owe a great deal to the shipowners and traders of the country? Where would they have been without the large mercantile fleet in the late war? Did they wish that by foreign subsidies and bounties our trade should be taken from us? I think it would be a sad day for this country and the colonies if our trade was diverted from British into foreign ships. I complain that we have not got more support from all Governments in the past. I point to the fact that the Government are shipping from ports in the United Kingdom cargoes under their own control for railways in countries under their own Government; and where the capital largely belongs to the Government; not in British ships, but in foreign bottoms; in steamers subsidised by a foreign Government. I refer to the shipment of stores for the Indian State railways. I do hope my right hon. friend the President of the Board of Trade will see his way to appoint this

Committee, not simply for the purpose of inquiring into direct steamship communication between Great Britain and East Africa, but into the whole question, and I ask my hon. friend to agree to substitute for his motion a shorter one for a Select Committee to inquire into the system of subsidising steamships by foreign Governments and the effect produced on British trade, and to suggest remedies. I claim the support of hon. Members opposite, above and below the gangway. The motion commits them to nothing except obtaining true information for the benefit of the country at large.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.) said that the population and resources of East Africa did not justify the subsidising of a line of steamers to run there. The population of the entire East Africa was only two and a half millions, scattered thinly over a thousand square miles. In a Report by Sir Arthur Hardinge it was stated that the German merchants trading to East Africa were quite content to get their own money back without any loss. Their principal trade, in the steamers subsidised by the German Government, was a low-class brandy which was sold at 3s. 7½d. per dozen imperial quarts, and a low-class whisky which sold at 5s. 6d. per dozen imperial quarts. That vile stuff was thrown at the unfortunate savages in Jubaland and other countries in East Africa. No wonder there were disturbances and fighting. If his voice could reach these savages he should recommend them to purchase a large quantity of dynamite, and use it to blow up the German steamers which carried that vile whisky and brandy. He hoped the House would refuse to assent to the appointment of this Committee.

\*MR. CHARLES McARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I think the motion before the House should be modified in the sense suggested by the hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness. We are indebted

to my hon. friend the Member for Aston Manor for the very practical and suggestive address in which he brought this subject before the House. He has shown conclusively how British shipping may be injured by the bounty system of foreign Governments. All those who support the motion do not support the granting of bounties in this country. There is nothing about bounties in the motion. All we want is inquiry. The hon. Member for Maidstone has reminded us that the British shipowner is a very independent man, and does not want to be bolstered up by the Government. He is quite content to hold his own by his own ability against all competitors, provided he has a fair field and no favour. But when foreign Governments come behind their shipowners and support them with all the influence and wealth of the State, then the case is entirely different. It becomes an unequal and unfair contest between the British and the foreign shipowners. I further wish to say that the foreign bounty system, as regards shipping, is increasing to a most alarming extent, and I think the mind of the country requires to be aroused upon this question. May I refer, for the sake of illustration, to the West Indian sugar trade? There is a trade which has been killed by the foreign bounty system. What is to prevent that system being turned first to one and then to another of our industries, each being attacked in turn and ruined? In 1895 the Board of Trade published a Report on the subsidies given by foreign nations. There are three kinds of subsidies. First, there is the mail subsidy; there is no kind of bounty in that at all; it is simply a payment for

services rendered. Such subsidies are given by every maritime State. The second kind is a subsidy on construction. A bounty of this character is given by three States; France, Italy, and Hungary, which pay so much for every ton of every vessel built in the ports of the respective countries. The third kind of subsidy is that which is a simple encouragement; a bounty pure and simple; and that is given by six States; namely, France, Austria, Denmark, Italy, Russia, and Sweden and Norway. That was in 1895, and I understand the Board of Trade are now collecting statistics of the subsidies given at the present time. Those particulars have, however, to a large extent been obtained unofficially, and the figures show that vast increases in subsidies have taken place during the last five years. In Great Britain they have increased, in round figures, from £592,000 to £704,000 (that is not any increase in remuneration, but simply an increase in the amount of business done); United States, from £107,000 to £357,000; Germany, from £249,000 to £389,000; Italy, from £70,000 to £449,000; France, from £420,000 to £1,700,000; and Japan appears for the first time in any figures with subsidies amounting to £710,000. A subsidy Bill is before the United States Congress at the present time, which, if carried, will have the effect of enormously increasing the subsidies granted.

I would also draw the attention of the House to the sums paid to particular lines. The Nord-Deutsche Lloyd, £279,000 per year; the International Navigation Company, £158,000; the Cie Generale Transatlantique, £446,000; Messageries Maritimes, £554,000; Navigazione Generale, £380,000. What is paid to our lines which compete with those I have named? The White Star and Cunard together get only £126,000; the P. and O., in one service, £243,000; and in another, with the Orient, £167,000. These figures are sufficient to show how extensively handicapped the British shipowner is by the foreign subsidies. What are the effects? One result is a diminution in the number of British fast steamers of high speed. Some years ago we had five lines of "express" steamers, whereas now we have only two. The reason is that shipowners cannot afford to run these very fast vessels for commercial purposes alone, and the result has been that the blue ribbon of the Atlantic has been wrested from this country by Germany. That result may be considered a sentimental one, but there are many proofs of the great loss, not only as regards our shipping trade, but also with regard to our commerce and mercantile trade, which has followed the application of the foreign bounty system, because, as a general rule, it may be taken that the trade follows the flag. As showing the views of British shipowners upon this subject, I should like to read a resolution passed at the last meeting of the Chamber of Shipping, namely; "That the urgent attention of His Majesty's Government be directed to the question of foreign bounties on shipping, and especially to the development of the question which has taken place in foreign countries whereby the interests of the British Mercantile Marine are seriously threatened."

That is the view of shipowners through their association. The question is, how is this position to be met? We are not here to-night to prescribe any particular method of dealing with the matter. It may be met, of course, by countervailing duties, or by counter-subsidy; but that is only one way of dealing with the question. In many respects by our own Government foreign shipping is placed in a preferential position as regards our own shipping. For instance, foreign Governments provide at their own expense very large dock and harbour works for the use of shipping, which in this country are provided mostly by local effort, and have to be paid for by shipping. Foreign Governments to a large extent light their coasts free of charge, whereas the entire cost of lighting our coasts has to be borne by the British shipowner. Even our Navy, which uses those lights, does not pay a penny towards the cost. Then there is the question of the load-line. The British shipper loading in a British port can load only up to a certain line. The foreign shipper is free to load to any extent, the only restriction being that the ship must not be, in the opinion of the Board of Trade, unseaworthy. In point of fact, the test is not applied, and foreign ships are never stopped by the Board of Trade on account of unseaworthiness; so that foreign shipowners have a free hand in the matter, whereas the British shipowner is strictly bound by the load-line imposed by the Board of Trade. Then there are other restrictions by regulations on the British shipowner. He has to carry life-saving apparatus, to have a certain weight of crew's provisions, and is bound by regulations as to passengers, whereas the foreign shipowner is free from all these regulations. I think it is a great hardship that ships of the North German Lloyd's should be allowed to come to Southampton and take passengers without complying in any way with our statutory regulations.

Therefore, I say there is ample scope for this inquiry, and I heartily support the resolution, more particularly as modified by the hon. Member for Barrow-in-Furness. It is a mistake to lay too much stress on East Africa. Of course, we believe that in time to come it will be a very important centre of trade, but at present it has not that character, and there are many other parts of the world which are much more important to shipowners and merchants than East Africa. I say that the subject is a general one, and should be looked at from a general standpoint. Therefore, I hope the House will pass this resolution in some form; I should like to see it amended, but I would rather have it as it is than not at all; and I hope in the interests of commerce and shipping the President of the Board of Trade will see his way to appoint this Committee, which can do no harm, and may do a great deal of good.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) rose in his place, and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put"; but Mr. Speaker withheld his consent, and declined then to put that Question.

Debate resumed.

MR. BANBURY (Camberwell, Peckham): The hon. Member who has just spoken stated that there is nothing in the motion before the House with reference to subsidies, but the whole of the debate has been directed to showing that the ship-owning industry is injured by the subsidies granted by foreign governments,

and the speech of the hon. Member for the Ormskirk Division of Lancashire was wholly devoted to the fact that the German Government give subsidies to certain steamers running to East Africa. His argument was that because the German Government did this the British Government should do the same. Earlier this afternoon we listened to many speakers who told us that our expenditure was rising tremendously, and that the first thing we ought to do was to see in what way we could economise. Now only a few hours later, the hon. Member comes down and says that the first thing we ought to do is to expend more money in subsidising; what? An industry which is decaying? An industry which is not prosperous? No. On the contrary, we are asked to subsidise an industry which has been more prosperous during the last three years than during the fifteen years previous. If we are to subsidise the shipping industry because the German or any other Government subsidise their shipping industry, there are other trades and interests which are subsidised by foreign countries, and why should we not subsidise those also? Where are you going to draw the line? Why should you select an industry which is extremely flourishing, and say that the taxpayers should contribute towards subsidising that particular industry and no other?

\*SIR CHARLES CAYZER: There is no question of subsidies before the House now that my proposal to alter the resolution has been accepted by the hon. Member who moved it.

MR. BANBURY: No, but the whole of the speeches of the hon. Member who moved for the inquiry and of the hon. Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool were devoted to showing the difficulties with which the British shipowner is met because he has to compete with foreign shipowners who are subsidised by their respective governments; and the hon. Member for the Exchange Division read out a long list of the subsidies which were given.

\*MR. CHARLES McARTHUR: I think I must correct my hon. friend if he will allow me. I objected to foreign subsidies, and I certainly do not support British subsidies.

MR. BANBURY: If that is so, though we have had an extremely interesting discussion, we might have been talking about something else. I should like to say a word upon the point of view of the German Government. The German Government and nation have a very small shipping industry, and it is natural that they should wish to encourage that industry. We have a very large shipping industry, and we do not want any particular encouragement. The hon. Member opposite said quite truly that he was prepared to face any opposition provided he could make the trade pay, and that really is the secret of the whole matter. What this motion seeks to do is to make the Government find dividends for shareholders in ships, whereas I hope with my hon. friend opposite that shipowners will in the future, as they have done in the past, compete with their own industry and perseverance. My hon. friend said that the Indian guaranteed railways were a precedent for subsidies being granted to shipowners. I think he hardly understands the conditions under which the Indian railways have been guaranteed by the State. In the first place, they have been guaranteed on the understanding that the whole of the first net profits go to the State until the

guarantee is fulfilled. Then in the majority of instances the railways revert to the State after a given period. I do not know that shipowners want their ships to revert to the State in consideration of receiving a subsidy. I am sorry to have occupied the time of the House, but I sincerely hope that, as the hon. Member says he does not want any subsidies, there will not be any inquiry.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): My hon. friend has raised a very interesting question, and we have listened to some excellent speeches. I gladly acknowledge the great care my hon. friend has bestowed on his case and the evident knowledge of his subject, partly derived from personal experience, he has exhibited. He devoted his speech principally to the absence of direct steamship communication with East Africa, and, so far as I was able to check them, I have no complaint to make of the accuracy of his statements. Undoubtedly it is a fact that, whereas both Germany and France have provided by means of subsidies direct services between Europe and East Africa via the Suez Canal, no such British service exists at the present time. I ought further to add that the Foreign Office are now considering the question of a subsidy to a steamship company for the establishment of a direct service between this country and Zanzibar. That, perhaps, is a reason that will satisfy my hon. friend if the Government decline to accept his motion in the form in which it appears on the Paper. It will be, I think, undesirable to appoint a Committee "to consider and report upon the political and commercial advantages to be gained by encouraging British steamers to circumnavigate Africa, especially having regard to the East coast," at the very time when the subject is actually under the consideration of a department of Government. But I have no objection to consent to the first part of the motion, namely, "That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system of subsidies to steamship companies under foreign Governments, and the effect thereby produced on British trade." That, however, would be a perfectly general inquiry, not an inquiry limited, as my hon. friend proposes, to steamship lines in connection with Africa, and especially East Africa. There is a further reason I would urge on the House why we should not entrust a Committee with the consideration of the political and commercial advantages to be gained by encouraging British steamers to circumnavigate Africa, especially having regard to the East coast, and the duty of reporting upon the best means of giving them such encouragement, and the reason is this. I think my hon. friend will admit that when he speaks of encouragement to British steamship services, what he means is encouragement by means of subsidies. One or two Members who have spoken this evening suggested that there is nothing in the resolution in reference to bounties, but I am afraid I cannot altogether agree to that. It is perfectly true that they are not directly mentioned, but my hon. friend will admit that, when he speaks of "encouragement," we can only interpret it as meaning by subsidies. Now, subsidies given by foreign Governments are of various kinds, and the hon. Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool has referred to them. There is a direct navigation bounty given by France. Italy, and other countries, but I cannot imagine that will be suggested for our

enormous mercantile marine. Such a bounty would certainly result in emptying our Treasury. Then there are indirect bounties, which are given through the granting of reduced rates on State railways for goods which are being exported by particular lines of vessels. Here, again, as railways in this country are not in our hands, it is not in our power, even if it were desirable, to adopt that form of bounty. I take it that the subsidies

given to the German Steamship Company and to the Messageries Maritimes are nominally for services rendered, but are in reality in the nature of bounties.

Then there are what may be called legitimate subsidies, which are given for services rendered, and represent the value of such services. It is these subsidies, and these alone, which have been given to steamship lines in this country. That being so, I think the House will see that if the obvious suggestion contained in my hon. friend's motion, it would practically mean the acceptance on the part of the House of the idea that steamship companies in this country should be assisted by means of subsidies, which would really be bounties. That has never been done.

I do not wish to deal with the subject pedantically. I do not suggest that under no circumstances would it be justifiable to give bounties, but it is a matter which the House itself should decide, and which should not be referred to a Select Committee. The case of Jamaica is unique, and cannot be quoted as a precedent. The subsidy given to the Elder, Dempster line for services rendered to Jamaica is not a subsidy to that line, but a subsidy to Jamaica. It is an eleemosynary gift to that colony, and was the result of an inquiry by a Commission appointed to inquire into the condition of the West Indies, which seemed to demand some assistance from this country. This recommendation was made by the Commission, and it was carried out by the Government. The question is whether you will look at this matter from the point of view of the British shipping trade or that of a particular colony which it is desired to benefit. The hon. Member for Aston Manor referred to the German service to Africa. I will give the House a proof

that the German service is subsidised entirely from the point of view of German commerce and shipping, and not from the point of view of German colonies. The proof is that while the German service calls at all the important English ports, it does not call at the German South-west African

colony at all. That shows that the German companies have not got the interests of the German colonies at heart. In the case of Jamaica, we look at it not from the point of view of British commerce, but from the point of view of Jamaica. If we had not given a subvention in that form we should have had to have given it in another. I have now explained why I am unable to assent to the second part of the reference to the proposed Committee, but I have no objection to the first part. I am aware that this is a subject on which grave apprehensions are entertained. This inquiry may be of service if it proves; as I am disposed to think it will; that the fears entertained on the subject are exaggerated. If, on the other hand, those fears are well founded, it is important that we should know exactly where we stand.

\*MR. EVELYN CECIL: I am quite willing to accept the alteration of the motion



suggested by my right hon. friend.

SIR JAMES FERGUSON (Manchester, N. E.): I suppose it would be in accordance with what the Government has agreed to, if I moved to leave out all the words after

"trade."

MR. WOLFF (Belfast, E.): I beg to second the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, "To leave out all the words after the word 'trade' to the end of the question."; Sir James Fergusson); agreed to.

Main question, as amended, put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That a Select Committee be appointed to inquire into the system of subsidies to steamship companies under Foreign Governments, and the effect thereby produced on British trade

SOCIALIST COMMONWEALTH.

\*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr, Tydvil): I rise to move the motion that stands in my name. After the discussion to which we have just listened, in which one section of the community has claimed support from the State, and shown that German steamship lines have an advantage over British lines because they are subsidised by the State, I trust the House will listen to the logical outcome of these arguments. I make no apology for bringing the question of Socialism before the House of Commons. It has long commanded the attention of the best minds in the country. It is a growing force in the thought of the world, and whether men agree or disagree with it, they have to reckon with it, and may as well begin by understanding it. In the German Empire Socialism is the one section of political thought which is making headway, and to an extent which is, I believe, alarming the powers that be. Over fifty Socialist members occupy seats in the German Reichstag, between forty and fifty in the Chamber of Deputies in France, and between thirty and forty in the Belgian Parliament. Socialism on the Continent therefore is an established and recognised fact so far as its entry into politics is concerned, and if it be argued that while that may be true of the Continent it is not true of this country, I reply that the facts and conditions now existing in this country are such as to make it extremely probable that the progress of Socialism in this country will be at a more rapid pace than in any other country in Europe.

Needless to say at this hour of the evening it is impossible for me to treat this subject adequately, and I will therefore summarise briefly the principal arguments that it was my intention to submit to the House had time permitted, I begin by pointing out that the growth of our national wealth instead of bringing comfort to the masses of the people is imposing additional burdens on them. We are told on high authority that some three hundred years ago the total wealth of the English nation was a hundred millions sterling. At the beginning of the last century it had increased to two thousand millions, and this year it is estimated to be thirteen thousand

millions. While our population during the last century increased three and a half times, the wealth of the community increased over six times. But one factor in our national life remained with us all through the century, and is with us still, and that is that at the bottom of the social scale there is a mass of

poverty and misery equal in magnitude to that which obtained 100 years ago. I submit that the true test of progress is not the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few, but the elevation of a people as a whole. I admit frankly that a considerable improvement was made in the condition of the working people during the last century. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the nation industrially was sick almost unto death. It was at that time passing from the old system of handicraft, under which every man was his own employer and his own capitalist, and traded direct with his customer, to the factory system which the introduction of machinery brought into existence. During these hundred years the wealth of the nation accumulated, and the condition of the working classes as compared with the early years of the century improved, but I respectfully submit to the House that there was more happiness, more comfort and more independence before machinery began to accumulate wealth. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] "No" is not an argument. I ask hon. Gentlemen opposite to listen, and refute my statements if they are incorrect. I will quote an authority on this point whose words deserve respect. I mean the late Professor Thorold Rogers, who supports that view in his "Six Centuries of Work and Wages." The high standard of comfort reached by the labouring classes at the end of the last century has not brought them that happiness which obtained in England three hundred years ago, when there was no machinery, no large capitalists, no private property in land, as we know it to-day, and when every person had the right to use the land for the purpose producing food for himself and his family. I said that an improvement was made during the last century, but I would qualify that statement in this respect; that practically the whole of that improvement was made during the first seventy-five years. During the last quarter of the century the condition of the working classes has been practically stationary. There have been slight increases of wages here and reductions of hours there, but the landlord with his increased rent has more than absorbed any advantage that may have been gained. I could quote figures, if that statement is disputed, showing that in all the industrial parts of the country rents during the past twenty years have been going up by leaps and bounds. I will refer to one authority whom even hon. Gentlemen opposite will not dare to call into question. Viscount Goschen, when First Lord of the Admiralty, in defending the Government for refusing to give increased wages to labourers at Woolwich Arsenal, said on 14th April, 1899; "If the position of the labourers at Woolwich and Deptford was as described, it was rather due to sweating landlords than to the rate of wages. The wages had been raised 20 per cent. in the last ten years, and the house rents 50 per cent. it was constantly the ease in those districts that the increase of wages only led to a larger sum going into the pockets of the landlords, and he was even told that some of the men who were locally the loudest in the cry for justice to the labourers were owners of cottage property, who would benefit if the wages were raised."

In view of a statement of that kind, made by such an authority, I submit that my assertions is not without substance.

I come now to the causes which have forced thinking people of all ranks of society to reconsider their attitude towards socialism. I refer particularly to

the great and alarming growth of what are known as trusts and syndicates in connection with industry. We have hitherto been accustomed to regard a trust as a distinctively American product. That cannot be said any longer. Let me name a few of the trusts and combinations which have been formed in this country within recent years. Amongst others there are the Cotton Thread Trust, with a capital of £9,750,000; the Fine Cotton Spinners and Doublers, with a capital of over £5,000,000; the Bradford Dyers, £3,750,000; the Bleachers' and Calico Printers' Association, £14,000,000; Cory and Co., London. £2,600,000; Rickett and Co., London, £900,000; Armstrong, Whitworth, and Co., engineers, over £4,000,000; the Associated Cement Makers, over £7,000,000; the well-known Castle Line, £2,000,000; the Wilson, Furness, and Leyland and the Leyland Line, between them, £3,450,000. These are figures which might well give the House of Commons pause, and cause it to reconsider its attitude towards the whole question of political economy. So long as industry is conducted by individuals competing one with another there is a chance of the article produced being supplied at an approximation to its market value, but competition has been found to be destructive of the interests of the owners and possessors of capital in this as in every other country. Three or four firms which formerly entered one market and competed with each other find it conducive to their interests to combine, thereby creating a monopoly which enables them to charge whatever price they like, and to treat their workpeople in any way that seems good to them. I approach this question of trusts from two points of view: first, from that of the consumer, who is at the mercy of an uncontrolled and, it may be perfectly unscrupulous combination which cares only for dividends; and, secondly; and this is to me of greater concern from that of the worker. The consumer may protect himself, but the worker is helpless. I could quote instance after instance of the most scandalous and shameless persecution of workmen by these big trusts and combinations, railway monopolies and the like. I will refer only to one case, which occurred last year in connection with the Great Eastern Railway. An employee was elected to serve on the Poplar Borough Council, exercising a right conferred upon him by this House, and being elected to a body created by this House. He was dismissed from his employment because he had permitted himself to be elected to apply a part of his own time to the public welfare without having obtained the leave of his employers. As John Stuart Mill; himself a convert to socialism, despite the fact that as a political economist of the older school he had written against the system before he understood its full meaning and the necessity for it; wrote; "The social problem of the future we [referring to himself and his wife] consider to be how to unite the greatest liberty of action with a common ownership in the raw material of the globe and an equal participation in all the benefits of combined labour."

We are rapidly approaching a point when the nation will be called upon to decide between an uncontrolled monopoly, conducted for the benefit and in the interests

of its principal shareholders, and a monopoly owned, controlled, and manipulated by the State in the interests of the, nation as a whole. I do not require to go far afield for arguments to support that part of my statement concerning the danger which the aggregation of wealth in a few hands is bringing upon us. This House and the British nation knows to their cost the danger which comes from allowing men to grow rich and permitting them to use their wealth to corrupt the press, to silence the pulpit, to degrade our national life, and to bring reproach and shame upon a great people, in order that a few unscrupulous scoundrels might be able to add to their ill-gotten gains. The war in South Africa is a millionaires' war. Our troubles in China are due to the desire of the capitalists to exploit the people of that country as they would fain exploit the people of South Africa. Much of the jealousy and bad blood existing between this country and France is traceable to the fact that we went to war in Egypt to suppress a popular uprising, seeking freedom for the people in order that the interest of our bondholders might be secured. Socialism, by placing land and the instruments of production in the hands of the community, eliminates only the idle, useless class at both ends of the scale. Half a million of the people of this country benefit by the present system; the remaining millions of toilers and business men do not. The pursuit of wealth corrupts the manhood of men. We are called upon at the beginning of the twentieth century to decide the question propounded in the Sermon on the Mount as to whether or not we will worship God or Mammon. The present day is a mammon-worshipping age. Socialism proposes to dethrone the brute-god Mammon and to lift humanity into its place. I beg to submit in this very imperfect fashion the resolution on the Paper, merely premising that the last has not been heard of the Socialist movement either in the country or on the floor of this House, but that, just as sure as Radicalism democratised the system of Government politically in the last century so will Socialism democratise the country industrially during the century upon which we have just entered. I beg to move.

MR. BELL (Derby): I formally second the resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed. "That, considering the increasing burden which the private ownership of land and capital is imposing upon the industrious and useful classes of the community, the poverty and destitution and general moral and physical deterioration resulting from a competitive system of wealth production which aims primarily at profit making, the alarming growth of trusts and syndicates able by reason of their great wealth to influence Governments and plunge peaceful Nations into war to serve their interests, this House is of opinion that such a condition of affairs constitute a menace to the well-being of the Realm, and calls for legislation designed to remedy the same by inaugurating a Socialist Commonwealth founded upon the common ownership of land and capital, production for use and not for profit, and equality of opportunity for every citizen."; (Mr. Keir Hardie, Merthyr Tydvil.)

MR. BANBURY: Assuming this subject is worth speaking upon at all, the twenty-five minutes which have been devoted to the question are hardly sufficient to inaugurate a socialistic commonwealth. The hon. Member who proposed the resolution, speaking of the Associated Cement Makers, and using this as an

argument against trusts, said that;  
It being midnight the debate stood adjourned.  
Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve of the clock.