

<url><https://api.parliament.uk/historic-hansard/sittings/1901/jun/12></url>

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 12th June, 1901.

An Asterisk (*) at the commencement of a Speech indicates revision by the Member.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

ECCLES CORPORATION BILL.

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

BROADSTAIRS AND ST. PETER'S WATER AND IMPROVEMENT BILL [Lords].

CHESTER CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

CHESTERFIELD IMPROVEMENT BILL [Lords].

FAVERSHAM WATER BILL [Lords].

HANDSWORTH URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL BILL [Lords].

LONDON, BRIGHTON, AND SOUTH COAST RAILWAY BILL [Lords.]

LYNTON AND BARNSTAPLE RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

POULTON-LE-FYLDE GAS BILL [Lords].

PORTMADOC, BEDDGELERT, AND SOUTH SNOWDON RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

RODGERS' PATENT BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

SOUTH ESSEX WATER BILL [Lords].

SOUTH LANCASHIRE TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

SOUTHPORT WATER (TRANSFER) BILL [Lords].

TYNESIDE TRAMWAYS AND TRAM-ROADS BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

DUBLIN, WICKLOW, AND WEXFORD RAILWAY (NEW ROSS AND WATER-FORD EXTENSION) BILL.

"To amend the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway (New Ross and Waterford Extension) Act, 1897; and to enable the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company to alter the level of a certain public road in the town-land of Rosbercon and county of Wexford, and to carry Railway No. 1 authorised by the said Act across the said road on the level; and for other purposes; read the first time, and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

LONDON UNITED TRAMWAYS BILL.

Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee on the Bexley Tramways Bill of the present session be referred to the Committee on Group 8 in respect of the London United Tramways Bill.;(Mr. Caldwell.)

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolution reported from the Committee;:

"That, in the case of the Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords], originating and now pending in the Lords, the Standing Orders ought to be dispensed with;:That the Bill be permitted to proceed, provided that proof be given before the Examiners, and that a report be made to the House of the deposit of the statement of the number of houses of the labouring classes proposed to be taken, in the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons and at the Office, of the Central Authority."

Resolution agreed to.

PETITIONS.

ALKALI, ETC., WORKS REGULATION BILL.

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

BURIAL GROUNDS (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Aberdeen, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

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

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

COAL MINES (EMPLOYMENT) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Cwmaman; Treaman; Nantmelyn; and Padell and Bwlch Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION BILL.

Petitions against, from Gravesend; and Sunderland; to lie upon the Table.

HABITUAL DRUNKARDS.

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

LICENSING (SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS).

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

LIGHT RAILWAYS BILL.

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

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Hafod Rhondda; George Pit; Lletty Shenkin; Gwrhyd; Lower Duffryn; Blaennant; Aberaman; Cwmaman; Fforchaman; Treaman; Bwllfa; Padell and Bwlch; Nantmelyn; Werfa; Treaman; and Merthyr Collieries; to lie upon the Table.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions against, from Kinross; and Aberdeen; to lie upon the Table.

Petition from Govan, for alteration: to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions against; from Keighley, Halifax; Dukinfield; Southport; Norwich (two); and East Bristol; Norwich (two); and East Bristol; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Sheffield; Birmingham; Deptford; York; Hammersmith; Hackney (two); St. Giles; Otley; Streatham (four); Altrincham; Utoxeter; Kensington; Everton; East London; Middlesbrough; Woodford; Southsea; Shoreditch; Liverpool; Southport (three); Colchester; Garston; Gainsborough (fifteen); Morton (three); Hove; Heath; London; Macclesfield (three); Halifax; Hardington; Wisbech; Tower Hamlets; Hampstead; Newbury; Davenham; Poplar; West Hartlepool; Timsbury; and Newcastle-upon-Tyne; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; Urquhart (two); Fodderty; Aberdeen; and Creich; to lie upon the Table.

TROUT FISHING ANNUAL CLOSE TIME (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Aberdeen, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOTANICAL WORK COMMITTEE.

Return [presented 6th June] to be printed. [No. 205.]

GLASGOW (EXPENDITURE ON VACCINATION).

Return [presented 6th June] to be printed. [No. 206.]

LOCAL TAXATION (ROYAL COMMISSION).

Copy presented,;of Final Report of His Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the subject of Local Taxation [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (INCORPORATION OF EALING).

Copy presented,;of Charter of Incorporation of the Borough of Ealing, dated 3rd June, 1901 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EAST INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION).

Copy presented,;of Statement exhibiting the Moral and Material Progress and Condition of India during the year 1899–1900. Thirty-sixth Number [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION (SCIENCE AND ART SCHOOLS).

Copy presented,;of Directory, with Regulations for establishing, conducting, and inspecting Schools and Classes in connection with the Board of Education, South Kensington (from 1st August, 1901, to 31st July, 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented,;of Directory, Part II., comprising syllabuses and Lists of Apparatus, etc., for use in Schools and Classes in connection with the Board of Education, South Kensington (from 1st August, 1901, to 31st July, 1902) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ULSTER CUSTOM (No. 2) BILL.

To be read a second time to-morrow.

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

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

*MR. RENSHAW (Renfrewshire, W.) moved as an Amendment on Clause 2, page 1, line 12, to leave out "From the school board of the district." The question involved in this Amendment was, he said, whether or not the managers of voluntary schools in Scotland would, in consequence of the passing of this Bill, be placed in a worse position than they were at present. The existing system, which had obtained for many years, was to grant labour certificates; it was a well-understood system, and had worked efficiently and well. It was regulated by Chapter 5 of the Scotch Education Code, Sections 113 to 117. Power was granted to inspectors to issue these labour certificates after examination, and the examination took place on the special application of a school board or the managers of a voluntary school. Throughout the whole of the clause in the Education Code the school board and the managers of the voluntary schools were placed in exactly the same position. That being so, up to the present time there had been no greater difficulty in obtaining labour certificates on behalf of children in voluntary schools than for children in board schools. It was a little difficult to estimate the number of labour certificates issued in the course of a year, and so far as he knew no return was made of them. According to the Report of the Scotch Education Department for this year, the total number of children in Scotland between twelve and thirteen and between thirteen and fourteen years of age aggregated 192,265, but only 140,588 of these were attending school, leaving 51,677 who were not at school. That showed the total number of scholars who might be affected by the new legislation of this Bill. The returns published by the Scottish Education Department last year showed that

there were 81,749 scholars at voluntary schools, and 626,089 at public schools; that was to say, 15 per cent. of the total number of scholars were in attendance in voluntary schools. The question he wished to raise was whether the power of exemption should be given by the school board alone, or by the managers of voluntary schools as well. He had great confidence in the administration of school boards, but there were districts wherein the parents of children attending voluntary schools formed a very considerable proportion of the population. They were not of the wealthier classes, but of the class most likely to avail themselves of the exemption. If in those districts the school boards, for some reason or other, pursued a policy under which there would be no exemptions, there was nothing in the Bill to compel them to grant examination for exemption. The consequence would be that there would be a large number of children who would be denied the privilege which the Bill proposed should be placed within their reach. The object he had in view was a very simple one. It was desirable that the managers of voluntary schools should continue to have in this respect the power which they practically possessed at present, and therefore he moved the Amendment.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 12, to leave out the words 'from the school board of the district.'"; (Mr. Renshaw.)

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

MR. MAXWELL (Dumfriesshire) said that the Bill had been so entirely altered in Committee that a great change had been made in the administration of education in Scotland. The point raised by the Amendment was the relation of the school boards to the voluntary schools. It was quite plain that the school boards would compel children up to the age of twelve to attend school. Hitherto exemption had been granted to children between twelve and fourteen; but before granting exemption inquiry was made into the circumstances of each child. There were two points which had to be considered in regard to the circumstances of the children. First, the position of the parents, and whether it would be a hardship to them if the children were compelled to continue at school; and, second, the standard of proficiency which the children had reached. It was in regard to the standard of proficiency that there would be difficulty. How were the school boards to find out the standard of proficiency the children had reached? At present it was quite easy to do so, for all they required to do was to ascertain whether the children had obtained a labour certificate. But now under this Bill there was to be no labour certificate; and it would be for the school boards to obtain a report from the managers of the voluntary schools as to what standard the child had reached, so that in granting exemption they would be acting, not on their own knowledge, but on the report of the managers of the voluntary schools. Looking to the provisions of Clause 3, where power was given to reduce the time of compulsory attendance, it would be rather hard on the school board to compel them to grant a certificate on knowledge supplied by other people, and to suffer in the matter of grants in consequence. If power were given to the managers to grant exemption certificates, the school board should require the

managers of voluntary schools to state why the exemption had been granted. That would place them in exactly in the same position as they were at present.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick) said that the Amendment was quite inconsistent with the whole idea of the Bill. There was to be a fixed and rigid standard, but a discretion to modify that standard was to be placed in the hands of an authority. That authority was one which everybody in Scotland believed was well capable of exercising the discretion; but he would not say that the same confidence would be felt in a casual body of voluntary school managers. At present labour certificates were granted to children in voluntary schools, not through the school boards, but as the result of an independent examination by the inspector, and that was the principle on which they were pretty well agreed in Committee upstairs. The question raised by the Amendment of his hon. friend was that a fixed and rigid standard of exemption should not be laid down, and that if exemption were to be granted it should

be on the merits of each individual case. That discretion it might be perfectly safe to put in the hands of the school boards, but he did not think that they could have the same confidence in a casually appointed board of managers of voluntary schools; Roman Catholic or Episcopalian. He thought it would have a very, dangerous effect on occasion, and it would certainly have a very great effect on the standing of the children attending voluntary schools. Instead of sending their children to the board school some parents would send them to the voluntary schools, in the hope that they would get a certificate of exemption without examination. He objected entirely to the principle of leaving the discretion in the hands of the managers of voluntary schools.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire) said that it was, of course, no fault of his hon. friend that he had to move his Amendment on this clause, but it did not conduce to the clear understanding of the House. The Amendment dealt really with the third clause, and not with the second. It was only because there was a mention of the word "school-board" in the second clause that his hon. friend had put this Amendment on the Paper.

MR. RENSCHAW said he had to propose his Amendment in order to raise the question.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said he entirely agreed with his hon friend, and in fact was explaining the point. But it was as well to understand that what they were really discussing was not the second clause at all, but the body which was to give the exemption certificate which was dealt with in the third clause. He entirely agreed with the provisions in the Bill, and had full sympathy with them. He believed that the managers of the voluntary schools; were deserving of every confidence, quite as much as one would give too the school boards; but still this general dispensatory power should be given too one recognised authority, and, of course, the proper authority was the school, board. This was to take the place of

the labour certificate, and in the past the labour certificate was managed, not by the school board, but through the school board. There had never been the slightest friction with any of voluntary school managers on that account, and there was no reason to anticipate friction in the future with the exercise of common sense on the part of both the school boards and the managers. As to the

suggestion of the hon. Member for Dumfriesshire, that the Education Department might cut short the grants to the school boards, that, of course, could only be done in the event of the school boards going in for a general system of exemption, and would not apply to individual cases. Therefore, upon the whole, he

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert W.

Rentoul, James Alexander

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Haslam, Sir Alfred S.

Roe, Sir Thomas

Anstruther, H. T.

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-

Russell, T. W.

Arrol, Sir William

Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.

Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)

Austin, Sir John

Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.

Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.

Smith, James P. (Lanarksh.)

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)

Soares, Ernest J.

Bill, Charles

Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)

Spear, John Ward

Brigg, John

Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick

Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.

Broadhurst, Henry

Joicey, Sir James

Stone, Sir Benjamin

Brookfield, Col. Montagu

Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U

Strachey, Edward

Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)

Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.

Taylor, Theodore Cooke

Burns, John

Langley, Batty

Tennant, Harold John

Caldwell, James

Law, Andrew Bonar
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Colville, John
Levy, Maurice
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Craig, Robert Hunter
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Ure, Alexander
Crombie, John William
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir W. H.
Denny, Colonel
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
M'Crae, George
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Malcolm, Ian
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Morrell, George Herbert
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Elibank, Master of
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Emmott, Alfred
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Ma'dstone)
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.
Fardell, Sir T. George
O'Neill, Hn. Robert Torrens
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)

Yoxall, James Henry
Fenwick, Charles
Paulton, James Mellor
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Percy, Earl
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Plummer, Walter R.
Mr. Pirie and Mr. Cochrane.
Green, W. D. (Wednesbury)
Purvis, Robert
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Rea, Russell
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Doogan, P. C.
Kennedy, Patrick James
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Field, William
Knowles, Lees
Blake, Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Flower, Ernest
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Boland, John
Flynn, James Christopher
Lundon, W.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Galloway, William Johnson
M'Govern, T.
Crean, Eugene
Gilhooly, James
Mooney, John J.
Cullinan, J.
Hammond, John
Murnaghan, George
Delany, William
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Myers, William Henry
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Hickman, Sir Alfred
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork).
thought the House would do well to accept the clause as it came from the
Standing Committee.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.) hoped the hon. Member for West Renfrewshire would not press his Amendment to a division, as it affected the first principle of the Bill. The relationship of the school boards in Scotland to the managers of the voluntary schools in Scotland had hitherto been very friendly, and there had been no friction, and therefore the less change there was made in the system the better.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 97; Noes, 49. (Division List No. 247.)

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Sullivan, Donal

O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)

Power, Patrick Joseph

Tollemache, Henry James

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyds

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Reid, James (Greenock)

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

O'Dowd, John

Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)

Mr. Renshaw and Mr. Maxwell.

O'Mara, James

Sheehan, Daniel Daniel

Pilkington, Lieut.-Col. Richard

Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart

*MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet) said he wished to move an Amendment to lines 14 and 15. The purpose of the Bill seemed to be to raise the age of compulsory attendance at school from twelve or thirteen to fourteen years of age. There was no doubt that Scottish Members seemed to think that it was almost an impertinence for anyone born south of the Tweed to intervene in Scotch debates.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): No, no!

*MR. JAMES LOWTHER said that, at any rate, English Members must recollect that it was frequently stated in Parliament, when proposals were made for legislation, that the principle had already been adopted by the House of Commons; therefore English Members must beware how precedents were established which would affect England, even if they did not take up the ground he himself did, namely, that all Members had an equal right to discuss every question that came before Parliament. The whole of this subject had been threshed out by the House of Commons only two years ago, when the hon. Member for South Shields succeeded in carrying a Bill to raise the age limit for compulsory attendance at school to thirteen years. In the present Bill they were asked to raise the age limit by another year, and to depart from the principle which was then fixed. He

was sorry that the Leader of the House was not present, although he was not finding fault with him for the occasion of his absence. But the right hon. Gentleman had laid down only on the previous day a very sound principle when he said that, in his judgment, it would be distinctly wrong for the Government to seek to establish principles of a controversial character and carry them into legislation by means of a Wednesday Bill which they made, in its later stages, part of the Government programme. He would like to know who was responsible for the present Bill. There were certain names on the back of it, but he was rather surprised that a representative of the Government had risen to defend the clause, and had apparently already become the sponsor of the measure. His right hon. friend the Leader of the House, had he been present, would have seen, that this Bill was a very grave departure from the principle which he had laid down only the day before. He would ask the Lord Advocate whether His Majesty's Government were themselves prepared to take the responsibility of asking Parliament to depart from the principle laid down two years ago, when the age of thirteen was placed on the Statute-book as the extreme limit of this meddlesome interference with the responsibilities of parents. His right hon. friend the Leader of the House had strongly condemned the practice of a Government getting non-official Members to introduce Bills, and getting them through the preliminary stages, and then taking them up.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I understand that the right hon. Gentleman is proposing to substitute thirteen for fourteen in the clause; but he is, not addressing himself to that point.

*MR. JAMES LOWTHER said he wished, to know to whom he could address his inquiry as who was responsible for this departure from the precedent set in England only two years ago as to the limit of compulsory attendance at school. He objected altogether to this meddlesome interference with the responsibility of parents. He knew that very likely it would be urged that that principle had been infringed upon in the compulsory attendance section of the Act of 1870; but he had always considered that that was an unwarranted interference with parental control, and was a substitution of the authority of the State for that of the father of the family.

He had denounced it then as a very large interference with the liberty of the subject, and had divided the House against the compulsory attendance clause; he had never regretted having done so, and if the same set of circumstances again arose he would do precisely as he had done thirty-one years ago. He wanted to know why the principle laid down by Parliament only two years ago was to be departed from and the age of compulsory attendance at school be raised in Scotland to fourteen years.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said he would remind the right hon Gentleman that Scotland had always been ahead of England in the matter of education.

*MR. JAMES LOWTHER said that that practically confirmed his objection to piecemeal legislation. He knew that his hon. friend was in favour of Home Rule, but he objected to the Imperial Parliament, without any guidance or direction, being launched on this course of piece-meal legislation. They heard a great deal about technical education nowadays, but he ventured to say that a child between

twelve and fourteen years of age, in a rural district, could learn a great deal of technical work which would strengthen him for his career in after life. His point was that a child at the age of between twelve and fourteen was practically learning in the rural districts the ordinary calling which he would pursue in after life, and if in these years he was kept away from that employment it would be a distinct disadvantage to him. The principle of inducing the children of agricultural labourers to drift away from rural occupations into the towns and obtain a footing in some other class of work ought not to be encouraged. He begged to move that in lines 11 and 15 to substitute 13 for 14.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 15, to leave out the word 'fourteen,' and insert the word 'thirteen.'";(Mr James Lowther.)

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

MR. PIRIE said that the right hon. Gentleman had made his meaning only too clear to the House. He was evidently in opposition to the entire Bill. So far from his having been suborned by the Government to introduce this Bill, it was the outcome of a widespread agitation in all parts of the country, and it was the universal desire in Scotland that it should become law. He trusted that the House would not yield in any way to the factious opposition of the right hon. Gentleman, and that his Amendment would not be carried.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL (Wigan) said that as an English Member he might be allowed to say a word on behalf of the southern kingdom. His right hon. friend, who took a very great interest in the Act of 1899, had not quite accurately stated the case. In that Act thirteen years was not the maximum, but the minimum, therefore the comments of his right hon. friend were not well grounded. But even since that time Parliament had been active, though his right hon. friend had not shared that activity, for in 1900 another Act was passed, which enabled the local authorities to make fourteen years the standard. He hoped he might be allowed to express his respectful and profound admiration as an educationist of the manner in which the Scottish Members had attended and taken part in the discussions in Committee. It was most cheering, and encouraging, and hopeful; and he thought that the example set by Scotland should be followed by England. He trusted that the House would not allow any modification of the Bill in any direction.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Thanet, whose great ability in questions of procedure they all recognised, had referred to the principle which had been laid down by the First Lord of the Treasury on the previous day; but the First Lord of the Treasury only spoke of a Government putting up a private Member as a "bonnet" to introduce a Bill, in order to make it a Government Bill afterwards; but that certainly had not happened in this case. Under this Bill they were not making any great change in the law, for the right hon. Gentleman seemed to be unaware that exemption could be made to the age of fourteen. At this stage of the Bill they were only dealing with the standard exemption; and the right hon. Gentleman's Amendment would interfere with the principle of the Bill.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. PARKER SMITH said he wished to move an Amendment dealing with a subject of much importance, and in regard to which the School Board of Glasgow had taken a great deal of interest. He meant the question of casual employment of children in the early hours of the morning. That subject was particularly pressing, not only in Glasgow, but in other parts of Scotland. He did not know that public opinion had ripened so far on the matter that it would be possible to introduce any provisions on the subject in this Bill, but he hoped by raising the question in the House now such an expression of opinion might be called forth that it would be helped on in the country very materially, and that some Bill such as that introduced by his hon. friend opposite would be brought in next year, and, after full discussion by the school boards of Scotland, would be passed, as he trusted the present Bill would be. Of course it was well understood by the House that the employment of children was divided into labour and casual employment. Labour they had already dealt with. Casual employment was defined as vending in the streets or other places any article whatsoever, and also employment of any other kind outside the child's own home. Now, miscellaneous employments, such as selling newspapers or milk, and a great deal of agricultural work in the country, had been subject to definite restriction since the Act of 1878, but the force of these restrictions was being increased by the present Bill. There was a limitation in regard to the hours at night. Under the Bill the casual employment of children attending school was not allowed after nine o'clock at night in summer, or after seven o'clock in winter. He wanted to put a limit at the other end also. Many of the children when they attended school in the morning were already tired out by the work they had done, and were therefore unfitted to benefit by the education they received. The school board desired to ensure that the attendance should not only last for a certain number of years, but that it should be continuous and effective while it took place. There were various points in which they wished to improve the existing law in order to get more effective benefit for the children during the years of their attendance, but as these were outside the scope of the Bill he must not enlarge upon them. On the question of truancy, and in regard to the desertion of children by their fathers, the school boards hoped to have stronger powers put into their hands of moving the sheriffs. The ambition of the school boards was to have more control of the children in different ways, in order to make their school attendance more regular and more effective, and one of the ways in which, in Glasgow in particular, they thought they ought to have more control over the children was in regard to this employment in the early morning. It was a difficult question, and he confessed that he did not think either his own proposal or the proposal in the name of the hon. Member for North Camberwell would be a satisfactory way of dealing with it. His own proposal was, he thought, too weak. But he was anxious not to go too far, and he put it down on the principle of making several bites at the cherry. The hon. Member for North Camberwell had gone a good deal further, and had put down a proposal that no child should be allowed to have any casual employment before the time of morning school. He was quite sure that was a proposal which would not carry public

opinion in Scotland. There was a lot of Work, both in towns and in the country, that children could very well do with advantage to themselves, and it would be hardly possible to prevent altogether the casual employment of children before school hours. He thought it would be found that local circumstances differed so much that they could not lay down any hard and fast rule that would apply equally to all parts of Scotland, town and country. They would, it seemed to him, have to go rather on the lines of the principle of this Bill, and give school boards discretion to deal with cases as they arose. They were doing that in the case of attendance, and he thought the real solution of this question would be to give school boards power to forbid casual employment in the morning if it was such as to render a child incapable of properly benefiting by the teaching provided in the school. If it were desired to give further protection, they might allow an appeal to the sheriff, who would decide whether or not there had been an undue interference on the part of the school board. This Bill was a wide and strong measure, one which was getting through the House more easily, perhaps, than it would if it were fully understood in the country, and it might, if it were further widened, raise a good deal of feeling in the country. He therefore thought it would be wiser to reserve any further limitation of the employment of children for a further opportunity. But he felt very strongly that this was the line on which the school boards would desire to act, and on which Parliament ought, either now or presently, to give them full power. He begged to move his Amendment.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 18, after '1878' to insert the words 'before five o'clock in the morning or.'";(Mr. Parker Smith.)

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

MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) hoped the House would not accept the Amendment. If it were included in the Bill it would almost appear to be an invitation to employers of labour to employ young children between the hours of five and nine in the morning. He did not think that they needed to legislate in the sense that employers of labour would employ these infants before five in the morning, and he could not understand why the hon. Member should desire to insert such a provision in the Bill. His own sympathy was wholly with the Amendment of the hon. Member for North Camberwell. He would be quite ready to assent to the principle that young children should be prevented from being casually employed between the hours of seven or eight and nine in the morning, and his reason was simply this: the casual employment of these young children after school work was over might be defended, but from an educational point of view he could look upon nothing more hazardous, and possibly dangerous, not only to the health of the children, but to their intellectual progress, than that they should be sent to work, more particularly in large towns, and should then go in an exhausted condition to school to have their intellectual instruction proceeded with. What they surely ought to desire was not an Amendment of the character now before the House, but such an Amendment as would strengthen the hands of the local authorities in excluding even from casual employment these young people. He did not say there might not be something in what the hon. Member for Partick had

said as to certain districts being distinguishable from others, and that there might be here and there cases in which there might be legitimate casual employment for an hour or two in the morning; but the idea of inserting the hour of five o'clock in the Bill, as if it was the intention of school boards to sanction the employment of children from five to nine in the morning, was one to which he hoped the House would not assent. If the House would accept the suggestion that seven o'clock in the morning should be the hour fixed, he thought it would be a very good compromise.

MR. RENSRAW said he would be exceedingly sorry to see any change made in the existing position as laid down in the Act of 1878. The hon. Member for Partick approached the question from the point of view of the great city of Glasgow. He was not so qualified to speak in that respect, but, as representing a rural district, he ventured to say that if this proposal to limit the hours, either in the direction suggested by the hon. Member for Partick; which really amounted to nothing, because no child was employed before five o'clock; or on the line suggested by the hon. Member for Camberwell, were adopted, it would be a fatal blunder. What was the child labour which was done in the rural districts of the country? His own district was a dairy district, and it was not an unusual thing for children to carry milk in the morning, but the Amendment would prevent a child from carrying a can of milk to a neighbour's cottage or to the village in which he was going to receive his education. He would exceedingly regret, in the interests of education, that they should take a step which, in his judgment, would be prejudicial to the interest of the children themselves and of no possible benefit to their education. What would be the alternative supposing these children had no little occupation of that kind? Very often it was the most mischievous children who were taken out to do this work; it was the only way to control them effectively; and to intrude upon the domestic life of the homes in Scotland by a proposal of this kind would be unwise and, in the interests of education, undesirable.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.) said he was very glad this question had been raised. He looked upon this as constituting one of the gravest national scandals that cried aloud for reform. He would endeavour to justify that statement, and he hoped the advocates of the eight-hours day for miners would be patient with them, because by this Bill they were endeavouring to regulate the hours of labour for children, and to secure that they should not work fourteen and twelve and ten hours, as in so many cases they did at the present time. There were no official figures for Scotland, but they had an official Return for England and Wales, which was presented in 1899, and that Return disclosed a measure of suffering which to him constituted a bitter and ironical comment upon our greatness as a nation. The Vice-President of the Council made it the theme of his speech in introducing the Estimates on 28th April, 1899; more than two years ago. Although the right hon. Gentleman then said that the Return cast a lurid light over the social condition of the artisan classes of the country, absolutely nothing had been done. He himself had had the privilege of being asked by the School Board for London to summarise and compile a Return of the state of the facts for London, and he never remembered the facts which came

under his notice then without a feeling of shame and indignation that such things should be permitted to continue. In addition to twenty-seven and a half hours a week in school, little youngsters of the most tender age were subjected to the most exacting physical toil for fifty, sixty, and sixty-five hours. He found school-teachers stating that children fell asleep at their desks because of the rigour of this employment before school-hours. He found that children were taken out of their beds at two or three o'clock in the morning and subjected to all sorts of toil, sent to school at nine, leaving at twelve, and engaging in two hours toil at mid-day, going back to school at two, leaving at 4.30, and then continuing till midnight at newspaper selling or other work. The Glasgow School Board had prepared a Return dated 18th February, 1901, and he commended the figures to the hon. Member for Renfrewshire. That Return showed that there were 4,628 children engaged in certain labour after they had been twenty-seven and a half hours a week in school. As to the ages of the children, fourteen were between six and seven, fifty-eight between seven and eight, and 157 between eight and nine.

MR. RENSRAW: Can the hon. Member tell me what the occupations are?

DR. MACNAMARA: I propose to give them. With regard to the education qualification of the children, 42 were in the infants' department, 186 were in Standard I., and 371 were in Standard II. As to the occupations, 2,164 spent their time in distributing milk, 899 in carrying round and selling newspapers, in many cases, of course, right up to midnight, 530 were engaged in grocers' shops, 144 in butchers', 108 in barbers', 214 in bakers', and 569 in miscellaneous occupations. As to the hours of employment, in addition to the twenty-seven and a half spent in school, 719 worked from twenty to twenty-five hours a week, 461 from twenty-five to thirty 313 from thirty to thirty-five, 167 from thirty-five to forty, eighty from forty to forty-five, twenty from forty-five to fifty, and in one or two cases they went up to sixty. The number working from two to three hours in the morning was 467, from three to four hours 338, and twelve worked from four to five hours. With regard to the question of poverty and the contention that it was the people

in straitened circumstances who made use of casual employment, a statement was made by the clerk to the Glasgow School Board, at a conference held in Edinburgh during Whit-week, to the effect that their experience in Glasgow was that the children engaged in selling on the streets were not by any means to be regarded as the children of parents in desperate poverty, and that it was rather the careless, thriftless, self-indulgent, often criminal parent who subjected his child to this toil, and such parents existed, he fancied, even in Scotland. As to the proposal before the House, what would it mean? In summer time that a child might work four hours in the morning, then go for five and a half hours to school, and then work for four and a half hours in the evening, or fourteen hours a day; and in the winter time it would mean three hours work in the morning, five and a half hours in school, and two and a half hours work in the evening, or eleven hours a day. Now, if this question was to be tackled; and it must be at a very early date; it would not be on the lines of the Amendment now before the House. If they were going to regulate this thing let them regulate it

generously. If the Amendment were carried it would be said by parents that that was the level of their moral obligation, that the Statute-book said so, and they would start their children at five o'clock in the morning accordingly. He had an Amendment upon the Paper saying that no child should work before school hours, and he was prepared to back it through thick and thin. He heard flamboyant references to the greatness of this country, but these children were the heritors of the greatness of this country. Surely it became us to equip them in such a way as would enable them to carry their responsibilities properly. Yet because he suggested that little youngsters of tender years should not engage in physical toil it was said that he was a visionary, and not at all practical. He would rather have the matter left where it was now, with the small proposal with regard to evening work which the Bill contained, and for which he was very grateful, than see the entirely reactionary Amendment of the hon. Member carried.

MR. COCHRANE (Ayrshire, N.) said everyone had listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. Member for North Camberwell, who was a very great authority on all educational questions, but, like most experts on educational questions, he allowed his enthusiasm to carry him rather far. He forgot, in the first instance, that this Bill did not deal with London but affected Scotland, where the conditions were totally different in every respect from those existing in the metropolis. The hon. Member said this was one of the gravest national scandals, and then quoted figures from Glasgow affecting children of the ages of six or seven. He had no doubt the hon. Member had every cause to have his feelings stirred by the experience he had gained in London and elsewhere; there were the very gravest scandals affecting small children, but the law in Scotland already dealt with the point raised by the hon. Member. The hon. Member spoke of children of six or seven doing fifty or sixty hours work a week, but that ought to be impossible in Scotland under the existing law. He would refer the hon. Member to the Act of 1878. Under Clause 6 of that Act no child under the age of ten could be employed in any casual employment. What more could Parliament do? If the law was not properly enforced in Glasgow, surely the school board was responsible. But when they were dealing with such matters they could not go in advance of public opinion if they wished to benefit the children themselves. This Bill would raise the age from ten to twelve. Did the hon. Member mean to say that a boy of twelve in a country district was not to be allowed to deliver a pint of milk or a basket of potatoes on his way to school? He did not know what would be the result of education in this country if educational experts were allowed a free hand. There would be a revolt against education altogether. Do let hon. Members be sensible. He had been a supporter of the Bill and had done his best to get it through, and he did not want to see raised against it a hostile feeling on the part of a large portion of the population of Scotland. He hoped the Amendment would not be agreed to.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): I agree entirely with my hon. and learned friend the Member for the Border Burghs that it would be very undesirable for the House to accept this Amendment.

As my hon. and learned friend said, it would almost amount to an invitation to a

kind of employment which is rare and, I am glad to say, becoming increasingly rare. But I rise for the purpose of making one observation. I entirely sympathise with the spirit that animated the speech of my hon. friend the Member for North Camberwell; but the difficulty in a case of this kind is not so much to frame a law as to enforce it. A great many of the shocking cases referred to by my hon. friend of children, six, seven, and eight years of age, being employed for three and four hours in the morning are absolutely illegal at the present moment. But how are you to enforce the law? That is the real difficulty. In a factory or workshop, or any place where labour is habitually and systematically carried on, the process of inspection which is necessary to the due enforcement of the law is comparatively easy, but when you are dealing with casual employment in the streets or in the fields, unless you have a very much larger army of inspectors and police than the local authorities at present possess, it is extremely difficult to find out the offence, and still more difficult to bring it home to the offender. I have taken a great interest in this question for a great many years, and have constantly pressed it upon the attention of the Government, and my object in rising is not so much to enlarge upon the difficulties as to ask a specific question, because I see a representative of the Home Office on the Treasury bench. The Vice-President of the Board of Education told us a year ago in connection with another Bill which we were considering in the Grand Committee upstairs that a Departmental Committee had been appointed by the Education Department and the Home Office to consider the whole question of child labour in its relation to education and in its relation to what I may call labour legislation also. I desire to ask what progress that Committee has made, whether it has reached the stage now of presenting a Report, whether the Government can give us any kind of indication as to the lines on which that Report proceeds, and whether they are prepared to take any steps to deal legislatively or otherwise with this, which is undoubtedly a most urgent social reform?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. JESSE COLLINGS, Birmingham, Bordesley): I will inquire.

*SIR FRANCIS POWELL could not help feeling that a case had been made out, not only to-day but on former occasions, in favour of legislation respecting casual labour. It seemed almost an absurdity that we should have laws affecting factories and workshops, but that casual labour should be pursued almost altogether without interference by the Legislature. He hoped that when the Report to which reference had been made was published, and the Government had had time to consider it, legislation would be submitted to the House. In dealing with this difficult subject they must bear in mind that they could not have the same law applicable to every district of the country. The circumstances of the towns differed from those of the rural districts, and even as between towns themselves the conditions differed. Now, Parliament had dealt with casual employment in local Acts. Some of these Acts came before him when he was a member of the Police and Sanitary Committee. That Committee considered the wants of each case, and the condition of each town, and they passed Acts to meet those conditions. The latest decision of Parliament, so far as he knew, on this

subject related to the great city of Liverpool. In that case the law was not made rigid. But a clause was inserted in their Bill of 1899 which he believed worked admirably, and had done a great deal to relieve Liverpool from the scandal and disgrace of child labour in casual employments. This clause authorised the Corporation of Liverpool to make regulations as to the hours during which, the places where and the conditions under which, such labour should be pursued. He thought that if they clothed the different authorities with powers of that kind, and defined certain limits of age within which labour should under no conditions be pursued, that would really meet the case in the most effective manner. The House might remember that the restriction under this Bill extended to fourteen years of age. Now, they knew the great difficulty there often was in exercising control, authority, and discipline over young persons between the ages of twelve and fourteen. He believed it was better that they should have some employment, and be under some discipline, and be taught habits of responsibility. He believed employment within moderate limits, properly conducted under healthy circumstances, was a benefit rather than a mischief, and he felt certain that Parliament would not act wisely if by one drastic and rigid law affecting the whole country they interfered with the conditions of labour, which varied so much in different parts of the country.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: Nobody is in favour of the Amendment now before the House. The hon. Member for Partick himself admits that it is too weak; the hon. Member for West Renfrew thinks it goes too far, and the hon. Member for Camberwell thinks it does not go far enough. Those who are very anxious in this matter should, I think, accept the considerable step given by this Bill. The right hon. Member for East Fife said the difficulty was not to make laws but to enforce them, and surely the corollary of that is that, if you have a class of laws which it is very difficult to enforce, it would never be very wise to make your laws very much in advance of ordinary public opinion. We have got a sufficient guarantee, I think, that public opinion is with us to the extent to which we have gone, because hon. Members will remember that this clause was passed through the House of Lords more than a year ago, and I am not aware that in any public discussion of the subject, in the press or elsewhere, any serious objection has been offered by the people of Scotland. However admirable may be in theory the changes suggested by the hon. Member for North Camberwell, we should get ahead of public opinion if we adopted them, and then, as the right hon. Member for East Fife truly pointed out, although we should have an excellent law upon the Statute Book we could not possibly enforce it.

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) said the question of casual labour was a very serious one from the manufacturer's point of view. In factories children learned a particular trade, but casual labour did them no good whatever, and it was a considerable grievance that the position of children in factories should not be the same as that of children in casual employment. Three-fourths of the agitation two years ago on the half-time question arose because children were kept from school by all sorts of casual employment, and yet, instead of finding a remedy by dealing with that

casual employment, Parliament raised the age in connection with those employments where the system of inspection was now perfect. He very much agreed with the sentiments of the hon. Member for North Camberwell. In theory he was right, and he hoped, if it could be done, that the rules and regulations that applied to factories and other places where inspection was perfect would be applied to casual work, which really did children no good. He certainly would vote against the Amendment.

MR. PARKER SMITH said that in view of the satisfactory discussion that had arisen he would ask leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

DR. MACNAMARA moved, in Clause 2, page 1, line 18, to leave out 9 and insert 8. The proposal of the clause, he said, was that children should be allowed to work till nine o'clock at night during the summer months. That meant, assuming a child worked three hours in the morning, a thirteen hours day. He proposed that the hour at night should be eight o'clock instead of nine. It was a very small concession, and he hoped it would meet with the approval of hon. Members opposite. Even if it were made, the hours of work would still be quite long enough.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 18, to leave out the word 'nine' and insert the word 'eight.'"; (Dr Macnamara.)

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

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: It is always rather ungracious to have to refuse an hon. Member who appears in such a reasonable mood as the hon.

Member who has just addressed the House, and who has, I think, very frankly acquiesced in the general feeling of the House, and not proceeded with his larger Amendment; and it is really, therefore, with sorrow that I must stick to the Bill as it is. I would remind the hon. Member that as regards the question between eight and nine, it is not altogether a question of an extra hour's labour for a child; it is the question also of the time at which it may be convenient to do a particular thing. The difference in the Bill between seven o'clock in winter and nine in summer does not mean that you think a child ought to work two hours more in the summer than in the winter. It simply goes by daylight; and it might be convenient to do a certain thing at these hours. Therefore, my advice would be that the House should stick to the Bill as it stands.

DR. MACNAMARA asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*SIR ALFRED HICKMAN (Wolverhampton, W.) rose to move, in Clause 2, page 1, line 18, after the word "might," to leave out the words to end of line 20. The right hon. Member for Thanet had, he said, thought it necessary, as an English Member, to make some apology for intervening in the discussion of a Scotch Bill. He did not feel that in his case any apology was necessary, because he had an Amendment later which would extend the Bill to England. The 11 made a distinction between employment in summer and in spring, autumn, and winter. But he submitted that in many kinds of employment it was equally reasonable that boys should be allowed

to engage in work after seven o'clock at night in October or in March. The hon. and learned Member for the Border Burghs said a difference should be made between country districts and; towns. But this Bill applied to all districts and to all towns. The hon. Member for North Camberwell, in his eloquent speech, said that it was for the most part the thriftless and the criminal parent who sent his child to work at a tender age. But this Bill would apply equally to the case of the poor widow,

to whom the shilling a week earned by her boy might mean a very important addition to her income. We all agree that education is a most excellent thing for children, but we must also agree that food is a most excellent thing, and even more necessary than education, and there might be plenty of cases where the few shillings the children earn make all the difference between a sufficient and insufficient supply of food. Employment itself was also education, for the boy was taught to earn something. It was not desirable with legislation of this character to go in advance of popular opinion; it would be a very difficult matter to enforce a rule that a child should not be allowed to go out after seven o'clock at night after the 31st of September, he having been allowed to do so up to that date. He therefore hoped the Committee would accept his proposal.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 18, after the word 'night, to leave out the words to the end of line 20.";(Sir Alfred Hickman.)

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

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I not only think I am bound to resist this amendment as a question of even justice to the hon. Member for North Camberwell, but I think the hon. Gentleman has temporarily forgotten that this rule is already part of the law at present, and that by accepting the Amendment we should be going back on the existing law.

Question put, and agreed to.

MR. RENSCHAW said the question he desired to raise had been raised by the memorandum issued by the Govan School Board, which pointed out that there would be a diversity of opinion under this Bill unless there was some test examination. The effect of leaving the proposal as it stood in the Bill would be that it would create differences in various parts of Scotland. His Amendment proposed that the power of granting exemptions should still be left with the school board, but that their power should only extend to granting exemptions to those children who were able to satisfy the inspectors that they had attained a certain stage of efficiency.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 27, after the word 'age,' to insert the words 'who have obtained a certificate of ability to read and write, and of a knowledge of elementary arithmetic from one of His Majesty's inspectors.'";(Mr. Renshaw.)

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

SIR MARK STEWART (Kircudbrightshire) said he hoped the Amendment would not be persisted in, because it would, if carried, produce a great amount of hardship in most schools. It was surely for the school board to determine what standard

to adopt. If there was a stupid boy who failed in the examination, it did not follow that he would be stupid in all things, but only in education, and if that boy were the only son of a widow it would be hard to prevent him from earning his livelihood. In the ordinary way he would be learning nothing, and to keep him at school labouring to master the elements of education, which he had shown up to the age of fourteen he could not do, was most unfair.

MR. PARKER SMITH said with regard to the school board for Govan, which he partly represented in this House, he might say that he was not convinced by the representation which they had sent round, and therefore he should oppose the Amendment. He did not see the cogency of the argument of the school board for Govan that it did not do to have variety, and that it was necessary to have a uniform standard; the circumstances in various parts of the country were so entirely different that it would be much safer to allow school boards to take their own standards, and not to enforce a uniform standard, which must necessarily be a low one. He hoped that in Govan they might go a great deal further. He would like them to demand a merit certificate as the condition upon which children should be allowed to go away from the school, but that would be impossible in all districts. He, however, thought that it would be found that all school boards would act in harmony and pull together. The school board for Govan did not like the responsibility of deciding in particular cases which was given by the Bill, but that was, in his opinion, the right principle, because a great deal more had to be considered than the requirements of the child. He hoped the school boards, in deciding the question of examination, would be able to look into the character of the child and also into the circumstances of its family and be able to ascertain whether it was imperative that the child should go away and commence work or whether it might be properly kept at school for the benefit of longer education. Those were the considerations which would come forward, and very soon rules and practice would come into being and school boards would lay down certain principles. There was nothing to prevent school boards making different rules, and if they said a labour certificate should be the condition for allowing a child to go to work they could do so. There was, of course, a power of control at the Education Department, and if the Education Department thought the rules were too lax they could reduce the grant, but he was certain the Department would not use that kind of control, He thought the school boards were perfectly capable of using their discretion, and therefore he opposed the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment made.

"In page 2, line 9, by leaving out the words from the word 'exempted,' to the word 'and' in line 11."

MR. MAXWELL said the question he desired to raise by the Amendment he proposed to move was a question of some importance. Under the Bill very great responsibility would be laid upon school boards in granting exemptions, and it would be desirable, therefore, for the Department to keep closely in touch with the school boards to learn how they were acting under the Bill when passed into law. It would be desirable that a return should be made by the school boards to

the Department, so that the Department might know how they were acting in this matter. He begged to move.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 14, to leave out the words from the word 'that,' to the word 'a,' in line 51.";(Mr. Maxwell.)

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

MR. PARKER SMITH submitted that such a proposal would put a long and elaborate duty upon school boards which they would find extremely onerous. He thought that the Department, through their inspectors and their general powers of inquiry into everything done by the school boards, would have abundant means of ascertaining whether a school board had been unduly lax, and that it would be better to let the provision stand as it was at present.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: This clause was framed by the Department, and they evidently thought it sufficient for their protection. The truth of the matter is that there cannot be much exemption going on without their being alive to it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 37, to leave out the words 'and Employment of Young Children Regulation,' and insert the words 'children school attendance.'";(Sir Francis Powell.)

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

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY called the hon. Baronet's attention to the fact that there was a regulation in the Bill applying to young children.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Another Amendment made.

Amendment proposed;

"In Title, after the words 'Regulate the,' to insert the words 'Employment and,' and to leave out the word 'Young.'";(Sir Francis Powell.)

MR. ASQUITH said it was an unconscious stroke of humour on the part of the draftsman to describe the title as "short title." He suggested it should be called the "Education (Scotland) Bill."

MR. JAMES LOWTHER thought that such a "short title" would be most inapplicable and inadequate.

Amendment agreed to.

Bill to be read the third time upon Wednesday next.

MINES (EIGHT HOURS) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

Clause 1::

COLONEL PILKINGTON (Lancashire, Newton) said the Amendment which stood in his name was to postpone Clause 1. The reason for postponing Clause 1 was because it was the usual procedure in very many Acts to make it the last clause of the Bill instead of the first. It was difficult to say what this Bill might be when it

emerged from the stage of a Bill into an Act of Parliament, but if this Bill were to pass in its present form it would be the first Act of Parliament containing a restriction on the hours of labour of men over twenty-one years of age.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): No, no.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. and gallant Member is now discussing the Bill as a whole. He cannot do that on a motion to postpone the first clause. He must confine himself to reasons for postponing the first clause.

COLONEL PILKINGTON said his reason for moving an Amendment to postpone the clause was that until the character of the Bill was made evident, and until it was seen what it would be, they could not give it any name. They could not say that the Bill when it was finished in Committee would be an Eight Hours Bill, for it might not be an Eight Hours Bill at all. Then there was the question of precedent. The description of a Bill was generally given much later in the Bill than was done in the present measure. The precedents that he would bring to the notice of the Committee were, first of all, the Employers' Liability Act of 1880, 43

& 44 Vict. In that Bill the concluding section (Section 1) was as follows; "This Act may be cited as the Employers' Liability Act of 1880, and shall continue in force until the 31st day of December, 1887,' and the end of the next session of Parliament and no longer, unless Parliament shall otherwise determine, and all actions commenced under this Act before that period shall be continued as if the Act had not expired."

That was one precedent. It had to do with labour, it had to do with workmen, and so it seemed to him that that of itself ought to induce the House to vote for his Amendment. But if it was the fact that one precedent was not good enough, he would quote the Canal Boats Act of 1877, 40 and 41, Vict. c. 60. The concluding section of that Act was as follows;

"This Act may be cited as the Canal Boats Act, 1877."

The next Act that he would draw attention to was the Customs Act of 1876, 39 and 40 Vict., the concluding section of which was as follows;

"This Act shall come into operation on the day of the passing of this Act, and when cited in any other Act of Parliament shall be called the Customs Consolidation Act of 1876."

But what might be considered on this occasion a more important and more convenient precedent was the Coal Mines Regulation Act of 1876, 59 and 60 Vict., c. 43, the concluding section of which was as follows;

"This Act may be cited as the Coal Mines Regulation Act of 1877 to 1896."

It would seem that all the precedents he had so far given had connection with miners and mines. The next precedent that he came to was the Truck Act of 1896, 59 and 60 Vict., c. 44. [An HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.] An hon. Member said "Hear, hear." He must have had something to do with the passing of the Truck Act of 1896, and probably he would remember that what he was stating was the fact and was a precedent to follow in this case. The concluding section to which he referred;[Ironical laughter.] Of course, some hon. Members ought to know all these things. They were well up in these legal matters, but he believed there

were many new Members of Parliament who, though probably well-informed long before they came to this House, had found it impossible to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with all

these intricate subjects. He would suggest with regard to Acts of Parliament which did not attract general attention that they might still be most important, and that it was well on occasions such as this that as much information as possible should be communicated. The last Act of Parliament that he would put before the House as a precedent was the Conciliation Act of 1896, 59 and 60 Vict., the concluding section of which was as follows;

"This Act may be cited as the Conciliation Act of 1896."

Almost all Acts of Parliament that he had cited had reference to mines and mining regulations, or had something to do with mines, and he therefore thought that it would be far better for the House to insert the clause much later, and postpone it now, so that when the Bill had been thoroughly discussed and amended, and made into a thoroughly good measure, which he thought it was not at the present time, then they could give it a good name.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 1 be postponed."; (Colonel Pilkington.)

MR. LEES KNOWLES (Salford, W.) supported the Amendment, and said that it seemed to be the general feeling of the Committee that Clause 1 should be postponed.

Supposing some alteration was made later on with regard to the limiting of the hours of labour, what would happen? If they passed the first clause, after discussing the other clauses and various Amendments, and taking all sorts of divisions, they would finally have to amend the Bill, and amend the first clause by altering the title. The altering of titles by side notes was no use whatever.

The title must appear in one of the clauses, and it seemed a most reasonable proposal that the clause giving the title to the Act should be postponed until the other clauses had been considered. The Bill was an absolutely unworkable measure, and even if they passed it verbatim as it stood at present, the supporters of the measure would find it absolutely unworkable. It must be admitted all round that Amendments were necessary, and if Amendments were carried there was every probability that the title would require alteration. At the present moment it was a very one-sided

Bill, and was not worth passing into law in its present form.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Durham, Mid) said that this measure was purely an Eight Hours Bill.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Hear, hear.

MR. JOHN WILSON said he could quote even the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean as an authority in favour of this clause being postponed.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: You cannot.

MR. JOHN WILSON said that upon one occasion the right hon. Baronet came down to speak in the North of England, his mission being to convert the people there to his way of thinking. In his speech he spoke of the difficulty of applying an eight hours day to the various trades of this country, and he instanced the railways, the shipping, and agriculture, and he said that there were obvious difficulties in applying a rigid Eight Hours Bill to those trades. The right

hon. Baronet in the same speech went on to say that there was no occupation in which the conditions of work varied so greatly as in the mining industry. He thought that now the right hon. Baronet would be inclined to agree with his contention.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: No.

MR. JOHN WILSON: If the right hon. Baronet will belie his own thoughts, then I must pass him by. There was an Amendment on the Paper providing for forty-eight hours a week, and there were many reasons why the making of a rigid eight hours day would affect the miners very unfairly. He thought he could quote even the Secretary for the Colonies in favour of this contention. There were deep and shallow mines, and the miners had to travel a very long way in some mines to their work, whilst in others they had not to travel so far. Then, again, there were different degrees of hardness and easiness in the working of the mines, and a Committee of experts considering the question of shortening the hours of labour should take into consideration those different degrees. If the first clause was carried, then this measure would be an Eight Hours Bill for everybody. Having regard to the complications and the various conditions of work, it was necessary that some men should work longer than the others.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The question before the Committee is the postponement of this clause.

MR. JOHN WILSON said what he wished to point out was that if the first clause was adopted as it stood at present, many of the Amendments on the Paper could not be introduced. What harm could it do to the Bill to postpone the first clause? He supported the motion of the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite, and he hoped the House would agree to the postponement of the clause.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): The reluctance of the opponents of this Bill to accept this very reasonable proposal seems to rest on some occult reason with which we are not fully acquainted. This proposal is undoubtedly a reasonable one, which I think the Committee might accept. I cannot see under ordinary circumstances that it will make the smallest difference whether the title appears in the first clause or not. This induces me to ask a question upon a point of order. I wish to know if this clause is affirmed now will it be competent for any hon. Member of the House to move any Amendment which would have the effect of altering the eight hours principle, whether up or down? It seems clear that if my supposition that this clause carries the whole principle of the Bill is correct it would be out of order to move any such Amendment, for then the whole question would have been debated upon this clause. Therefore I wish to ask you, Mr. Lowther, whether, if this clause is affirmed by the Committee, it will be in the power of any hon. Member to move an alteration of the eight hours, either up or down?

*THE CHAIRMAN: In reply to the right hon. Gentleman, I do not think that any Amendment controverting the main principle would be admissible if the Committee assents to the title "Mines (Eight Hours) Bill." Such an assent would naturally be taken as an assent to the principle that the hours of labour are to be limited to "eight hours." Any Amendment in direct opposition to that could not

be put.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: The right hon. Gentleman opposite has asked whether there is any occult reason for objecting to this clause being postponed. I think it is only right that we should be perfectly frank with the Committee upon this point. Those who were in the House on the last occasion when this Bill got into Committee after being read a second time will remember that the promoters dropped the Bill altogether upon a certain Amendment being carried. It is the case that we regard eight hours as the fixed principle of this Bill, and if any other figure is carried we should abandon the Bill altogether rather than accept anything else.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln) asked if it would be in order if Clause 1 were adopted to afterwards move that the Bill should not apply to certain mines.

*THE CHAIRMAN: That possibly would be in order, because it does not controvert the general principle of the Bill.

*MR. RITCHIE: Under your ruling, I presume that the whole question of the principle of this Bill is now open for discussion. [Cries of "No, no."] I think I am right in saying that the whole question of the eight hours principle is before the Committee.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think that would arise on the next Amendment, which proposes to leave out "eight" and insert "ten."

*MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil) asked whether it was not the usual practice of the House to consider the title of a Bill last. He wished to know whether the bringing on of this clause first would not defeat this practice.

*THE CHAIRMAN: There is no Standing Order with regard to that. The Standing Order provides that in any Bill which is of a temporary nature the duration of the Bill should appear last. There is no Standing Order to the effect that the short title must come last.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.) May I ask the right hon. Gentleman opposite what objection he sees to taking the opinion of the House upon the question of eight hours, because, after all, that is really the important thing. That is the real question, and the sooner it is determined the better, for it would save them a great amount of time.

It would, in my opinion, be a clear advantage if the opinion of the House was taken upon the question of eight hours.

*MR. RITCHIE: I do not see any objection to taking the opinion of the House upon the question of eight hours, but when I rose I did so, not to make any objection, but to get to know exactly how we stood in the matter.

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.) asked whether they would be able when they came to the next Amendment to discuss the question whether the hours should be ten instead of eight. He understood from the Chairman's ruling that it would be impossible to discuss the question of the limiting of hours at all if Clause 1 was agreed to.

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the words "eight hours" are struck out of the first clause, then Clause 1 would read, "This Act may be cited as the Mines Act, 1901." Therefore, when we reached the second clause any Amendment limiting or extending the hours might be in order. But if the words "eight hours" remain in the first

clause, I think I shall be bound to accept the decision of the House upon it, and exclude all Amendments which would alter that decision.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Glamorganshire, Rhondda) said it was all very well for hon. Members to ask them to postpone this clause, because they all knew what postponement really meant. The object of postponing the clause was simply to endeavour to defeat the Bill. It was not at all likely that hon. Members opposite would vote for ten hours instead of eight, and they were not afraid of this Bill on account of any danger of increasing the number of hours. If the question of the principle of the Bill was to be fought, it might as well be fought at once, because people would be able to see the real reason for this motion if they took the division at once. They did not need to enter into the question as to whether this, that, or the other could be done afterwards. His object in rising was to endeavour to clear what was supposed to be a great difficulty out of the way.

MR. YOXALL (Nottingham, W.) pointed out that the limitation of eight hours was the very essence of this Bill, which principle was affirmed on the Second Reading. Although there were points of detail in connection with the Bill which might be fairly considered during the Committee stage, he did not think that the promoters would assent to any alteration which would defeat the object of the Bill, and which would defeat the intention of the Second Reading. He appealed to the Committee to take a division at once.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think I ought to point out to the Committee that at the present moment this discussion should be limited to the question of postponement. We really have not yet reached Clause 1. When it is reached I shall then be called upon to decide the principle. Until the Committee has settled whether it will postpone the clause or not, hon. Members are not entitled to discuss this question.

MR. HENRY HOBHOUSE (Somersetshire, E.) wished to know whether, under the Chairman's ruling, the promoters of this Bill would be able to fight the principle of the measure all over again on the first clause, which professed only to deal with the title. If so, it was a grave departure from their usual Parliamentary practice, and if upheld, would undoubtedly land them on future occasions in very great difficulties. He thought as a businesslike assembly they ought to consider the actual proposals to be made in this Bill, in order to see how many of them could be amended, rather than have a Second Reading discussion on the principle of this clause. It was not in the interest of the Bill itself that this clause should be taken first, and in the interests of Parliamentary procedure they ought to assent to the motion to postpone this clause.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The hon. Member who has just sat down has stated that it is the usual practice to settle the principle of a Bill last. My experience is that the draughtsman always puts the principle in the Bill as early as possible, in order that it may be disposed of. That is the principle which I think we have always pursued. As a rule, the whole object of the draughtsman is to put the most controversial part in the first clause, so that we may know what the opinion of the House is upon it. This Bill is either an eight hours Bill or it is not; therefore the opinion of the House may just as well be taken, in order

to decide that principle at once, instead of going on fighting a number of small details without determining the principle.

*MR. RITCHIE: The right hon. Gentleman has appealed to me upon this point, and I can confirm what he says in regard to drafting. We always endeavour to put the vital clause at the beginning. That, however, is different to what has been done in this particular case. I do not remember in all my experience that there has ever been a case in which the title has appeared first as a title embodying the whole principle of the Bill, and shutting out all Amendments and alterations. I do not believe that a single case of this kind can be quoted. I know there are many cases in which the title has appeared in the first part of the Bill, although in a great majority of the Bills the title appears at the end. I do not believe that any Member of this house can give an instance in which the title has been placed first when that title embodies the whole principle of the Bill, thus shutting out all Amendments afterwards. I do not believe that there is another case of this kind.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: The title in this case is the Bill, just as Egypt is the Nile.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Durham, Chester-le-Street) said he had never known a case before where the whole principle of the Bill was embodied in the name of the measure. He presumed that the reason for this was that the House recognised that if the whole principle was fixed in the name it would prevent many hon. Members from discussing important details, which were absolutely necessary if the measure was to be made a useful one. He could not understand why the promoters refused to pursue the course which was usually followed in connection with matters of this kind. The promoters of the Bill pretended to be frank in this matter, but he was not satisfied with the character of their frankness, and he was inclined to believe that they had not shown all their mind upon this question. He had an Amendment on the Paper to provide that instead of eight hours being the

limit per day it should be fifty hours per week. He looked upon this Bill as a measure to reduce or regulate the hours men worked in coal mines, and he maintained that if it had been known upon the occasion of the Second Reading that the details of the Bill would have been controlled in such a way as the promoters now proposed to control them, many of those who supported the Second Reading would not have done so. He thought this was an attempt to take an unfair advantage of the House, and evidently what they wanted to do by this course was to prevent hon. Members who opposed the Bill from stating their case. And why? Because they believed that the opponents of the measure had such a strong case that they would be able to influence the House, and that they would be able to introduce such Amendments as were demanded by many parts of the country. If the House allowed this Bill practically to be settled by the principle contained in the first clause, he was satisfied that, instead of draughtsmen preparing Bills in the usual form, they would try and put the most important matter of the Bill first, so as to prohibit the discussion of details. He hoped the House would not agree to their hands being tied in this matter, because he was satisfied that there were many questions which would be shut out from discussion if they agreed

to this motion for postponing Clause 1.

MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said the promoters of this Bill were asking the Committee to sanction an innovation of the most objectionable kind, and they were taking up an attitude in regard to this question for which the miners would not be grateful.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: May I be allowed to point out that when this Bill was defeated in Committee upon the last occasion the objection now raised was not taken, and this clause was discussed without the slightest difficulty.

EARL PERCY said he thought it was advisable that they should thoroughly understand what effect the postponement of this clause would have. He understood that the Chairman ruled that, if this clause were passed, it would not be competent to discuss the number of hours which should be worked in all mines. He wished to ask whether it would be out of order to move to exclude any part of the country upon that ground.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think that a motion for "local option" in the adoption of an eight hours day for miners would be out of order.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: This clause contains the words "eight hours." I presume that it would be competent for anybody to substitute anything for "eight hours" by an Amendment. My hon. friend behind me might have put fifty hours a week, or else might propose nine hours or eight and a half hours as an Amendment to the word "eight." I imagine, Mr. Lowther, that this is so, and that this proposal will not shut out any Amendment that may be proposed.

*THE CHAIRMAN: What I said was that if the clause passed in its present form, then I could not admit any Amendment varying it. Until the House has assented to the day being eight hours it is possible to amend the title.

*MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.) asked if it would be competent for him or any other Member upon Clause 2 to move instead of "one day of twenty-four hours," say a week or a month.

MR. FENWICK (Northumberland. Wansbeck) asked, when Clause 1 was put from the Chair, would it be competent to discuss the principle of eight hours, or would that clause be put from the Chair and accepted without any further discussion?

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member asks me what would happen if the motion now before the Committee were to be withdrawn or rejected. In that case I should have to call upon those hon. Members who have given notice to move their Amendments on Clause 1. Then the clause as amended would be put in the ordinary way. When that clause was disposed of it would not be competent to admit, on Clause 2, any Amendment which controverts the principle laid down in Clause 1. The whole principle of the Bill could be discussed on that clause.

MR. FENWICK: Supposing there is no Amendment carried to Clause 1 and the question is put "that this clause stand part of the Bill," would it be open to discuss the general principle embodied in that clause or not?

*THE CHAIRMAN: That is rather a difficult question to answer. If the discussion has really ranged round the question of eight hours and then I put Clause 1, I think I should have to rule that the whole question was open. There might be some details with regard to it to be filled in on Clause 2, and that really is one of the difficulties in dealing with the principle of the Bill on the short

title.

MR. PICKARD (Yorkshire, W.R., Normanton) said he had very little to say on this point. He took it for granted that those who were trying to postpone Clause 1 would oppose everything else throughout the Bill. He believed that their main object was to continue talking so that they would not get beyond a certain point. He had worked in the pits himself for twenty years, and he considered eight hours was long enough for any man to work in a coal mine. He could not see the utility of talking any further upon this question, which they would carry to a division. They claimed the support of the Government in carrying this Bill into law. The supporters of the measure believed that this was a fair and a just Bill, and eight hours was the principle of it. He wished that principle to be maintained so that it could be carried into law, and then the Tory Government would have the honour of having passed the Eight Hours Bill.

MR. LEES KNOWLES thought the suggestion made by the Chairman was an admirable one. The words "eight hours" might be omitted altogether from the clause, and the Bill would then be called "the Mines Act, 1901." He thought the Chairman's suggestion might be very well adopted by the promoters of the Bill.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I did not make that as a suggestion. What I said was that it would be competent for the House to strike out the words "eight hours," and that would have left the discussion open.

MR. LEES KNOWLES thought that almost amounted to a suggestion, and it was a very valuable one. The Bill was described as one to restrict the hours in mines to eight hours per day from bank to bank. He wished to know if those words "from bank to bank" would be imported into the clause if it was carried as it stood at present. This was a most important point, for he had always felt that eight hours a day was enough to work in a mine, but when they adopted the bank to bank principle it was a very different thing.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think the words per day must be understood to mean an eight hours day. As to when those hours begin or cease, that is a matter for future decision.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydfil) said he hoped the House would go to a division on this point. He thought that every Member of the House who was returned pledged to vote for an eight hours day in mines had no option but to vote for Clause 1 of the Bill.

*COLONEL BLUNDELL (Lancashire, Ince) was understood to say that he had been returned by a mining constituency pledged to vote against the Eight Hours Bill, although he knew that at that time many mining organisations were in favour of it, but the older miners individually felt, he believed, that if the Bill passed they might be forced to work six days instead of five per week.

SIR JAMES JOICEY wished to know exactly where they stood. Were they by this motion going to tie up the whole Bill? This was the first time he had known a case where the title of a Bill had shut out the debate upon any other part of the measure. Had they known their hands would have been so tied they would have raised the question before. This was a matter of vast importance.

MR. MALCOLM (Suffolk, Stowmarket), suggested as a compromise that Clause 1

should be postponed until after Clause 2.

*MR. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk) said as one who had had a lifelong experience of the practical working of coal mines, and who had voted for the Second Reading of the Bill, he was bound to say that the title of the Bill had placed him in a considerable difficulty, If the promoters intended to beg the question in this way, and thus exclude what he considered reasonable amendments, then, although he was one of their supporters, he must at this stage vote against them.

MR. YOXALL said the question was

whether they should or should not discuss the principle upon Clause 1.

SIR J. FERGUSSON (Manchester, N.E.) said that he apprehended that the title of a Bill was always postponed so that it could be amended in accordance with any Amendments made to the clauses. He thought the hon. Member for Falkirk was under a misapprehension upon this point.

MR. BANBUEY (Camberwell, Peckham) said he could not possibly conceive why any person should object to the title being postponed. It seemed to him that the only reason why the promoters opposed this course was that they were determined to pass this Bill without any amendment of any kind. If that was so, as soon as the Committee understood it the better. He was certain that a Bill of this kind was not going to get through without any amendment. If the promoters desired that no time should be wasted they ought to agree to postpone Clause 1. This was a very serious question, because they were really considering whether they should have a fair discussion of the Bill or not. The question of what the measure was to be called really did not arise at all, and he sincerely hoped that they would go to a division, and that this clause would be postponed.

*MR. JAMES HOPE (Sheffield, Brightside) asked, if Clause 1 was passed, would eight hours be the maximum and not the minimum? Would it be possible for a mine owner to move an Amendment of which the effect would be that anyone going down to work in his mine would have to stay for the full eight hours?

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Denny, Colonel

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Allsopp, Hon. George

Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield

Anstruther, H. T.

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Doughty, George

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Bullard, Sir Harry

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Burt, Thomas

Duncan, J. Hastings
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Cameron, Robert
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Edwards, Frank
Balcarres, Lord
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph D.
Baldwin, Alfred
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds
Chapman, Edward
Fenwick, Charles
Banbury, Frederick George
Coddington, Sir William
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Bill, Charles
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Fisher, William Hayes
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Bond, Edward
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Forster, Henry William
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Dalkeith, Earl of
Furness, Sir Christopher
Brassey, Albert
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Galloway, William Johnson

*THE CHAIRMAN: I will rule upon that point when I see the Amendment.

COLONEL PILKINGTON said his desire was to get a full and thorough discussion of the measure, and he wanted to get rid of this stifling clause.

MR. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.) said he was one of those who liked to see an Act of Parliament brought before the House in such a manner that, when it had to be enforced by His Majesty's judges, there would be some reasonable chance of them

understanding it without leading to innumerable lawsuits. He was astonished that there should be any discussion as to the postponement of this clause. If the Bill was an Eight Hours Bill, everybody would know from its title what it proposed to do. Therefore he could not understand why hon. Members on either side of the House should propose to postpone the clause, unless it were for the purposes of obstruction. Many of them were quite prepared to fight this question upon its merits, and the tactics of those who desired to postpone the clause were very unwise. He held his own opinion as to the advisability of controlling the hours of labour in regard to persons of adult age, and he certainly thought this clause ought to be fought out upon its merits, and they should vote upon it before they proceeded further. [Cries of "Divide, divide."] He should divide in time no doubt, If this Bill was going through at all, then he thought that Clause 1 ought to be a part of it.

Question put.

The Committee divided.;Ayes, 167; Noes, 201. (Division List No. 248.)

Garfit, William

Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred

Rentoul, James Alexander

Godson, Sir Augustus Fred.

Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.

Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson

Gore, Hn. G. R C Ormsby-(Salop

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Ropner, Colonel Robert

Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)

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

Rothschild, Hn. Lionel Walter

Graham, Henry Robert

M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.)

Majendie, James A. H.

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Greville, Hon. Ronald

Malcolm, Ian

Sharpe, William Edward T.

Hardy, L. (Kent, Ashford)

Manners, Lord Cecil

Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-

Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F.

Smith, H C (North'mb Tyneside

Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)

Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir F. G.

Smith, James Parker (Lanarks

Heath, Jas. (Staffords., N. W.)

Montagu, Hon. J. S. (Hants.)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Hermon-Hodge, Robert T.
Morgan, Hon. F. (Monm'thsh.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Morrell, George Herbert
Stock, James Henry
Higginbottom, S. W.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Hill, Arthur
Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford
Tollemache, Henry James
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)
Mount, William Arthur
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Hobhouse, H. (Somerset, E.)
Muntz, Philip A.
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Hope, J. F. (Sheff'ld, Brightside
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Houston, Robert Paterson
Myers, William Henry
Walker, Col. Wm. Hall
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. L.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Joicey, Sir James
Palmer, Sir C. M. (Durham)
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Parkes, Ebenezer
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Kimber, Henry
Paulton, James Mellor
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Kitson, Sir James
Pease, Herbt. P. (Darlington)

Willox, Sir John Archibald
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Pease, Sir J. W. (Durham)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Percy, Earl
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid)
Lawson, John Grant
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Plummer, Walter R.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Purvis, Robert
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Pym, C. Guy
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Rankin, Sir James
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Lucas, Col. F. (Lowestoft)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Lieut.-Col. Pilkington and
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Mr. Knowles.
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Griffith, Ellis J.
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Crean, Eugene
Hain, Edward

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc. Stroud
Crombie, John William
Hammond, John
Arrol, Sir William
Cullinan, J.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
Atherley-Jones, L.
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Austin, Sir John
Delany, William
Harwood, George
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Hayden, John Patrick
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Dillon, John
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
Bell, Richard
Donelan, Captain A.
Helder, Augustus
Black, Alexander William
Doogan, P. C.
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Blake. Edward
Duffy, William J.
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Boland, John
Dunn, Sir William
Holland, William Henry
Boyle, James
Elibank, Master of
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Ellis, John Edward
Horniman, Frederick John
Brigg, John
Emmott, Alfred
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Broadhurst, Henry
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Bull, William James
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Field, William
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U
Burns, John
Fison, Frederick William
Kennedy, Patrick James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Caldwell, James
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Flower, Ernest
Labouchere, Henry
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Flynn, James Christopher
Lambert, George
Causton, Richard Knight
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Langley, Batty
Cawley, Frederick
Fuller, J. M. F.
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Gilhooly, James
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Clancy, John Joseph
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Leamy, Edmund
Cochrane, Hon. T. H. A. E.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Cogan, Denis J.
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Levy, Maurice
Colville, John
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury)

Lewis, John Herbert
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Gretton, John
Lloyd-George, David
Lough, Thomas
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Lundon, W.
O'Malley, William
Shipman, Dr. John G.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Mara, James
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarsbire)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
M'Crae, George
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Soares, Ernest J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
O'Shee, James John
Spear, John Ward
M'Govern, T.
Partington, Oswald
Spencer, E. (W. Bromwich)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)
Strachey, Edward
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Perks, Robert William
Sullivan, Donal
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Philipps, John Wynford
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Markham, Arthur Basil
Pickard, Benjamin
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Pirie, Duncan V.
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
Milton, Viscount
Power, Patrick Joseph
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Mooney, John J.
Price, Robert John
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r

Moss, Samuel
Priestley, Arthur
Tomkinson, James
Murnaghan, George
Randles, John S.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Rea, Russell
Ure, Alexander
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Reddy, M.
Wallace, Robert
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Warner, Thos. Courtenay T.
Norman, Henry
Reed, Sir E. James (Cardiff)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Weir, James Galloway
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Richards, Henry Charles
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Robinson, Brooke
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Roe, Sir Thomas
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Russell, T. W.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Wilson, F. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Scott, C. Prestwich (Leigh)
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Seely, Charles H. (Lincoln)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Seton-Karr, Henry
O'Dowd, John
Shaw, Charles E. (Stafford)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick, B.)
Mr. Yoxall and Mr. Jacoby.

COLONEL PILKINGTON said the Amendment which he now begged to move was to leave out "eight" and insert "ten" in Clause 1. The object of the Amendment was to make this a thoroughly satisfactory workable Bill. It must be remembered that at the present time there was no limit. Supposing, for instance, the men were to work ten and a half hours, they would be outside the limit he proposed, and they or their employers would be subject to be penalised according to the clauses which would be found in this Bill, if ever it became an Act of Parliament. The reason why he proposed ten hours was because at the present time the operations in the mines were practically comprised in ten hours, or within possibly some thing a little less, so that in making it ten hours they would provide a very moderate time, and it would be more elastic than eight hours. In fixing eight hours they would be pressing the work of the mines into a time within which it would be difficult to do it. It would be very much like taking an Englishwoman into a London shop and making her put her feet into Chinese shoes. The fact was that eight hours from bank to bank did not afford sufficient time for the operations of the miners. It would be far better, having regard to the customs of the trade, that some time should be fixed within which the miners would be able to do their work without great discomfort and great confusion. If anything less than ten hours were fixed they would create immense loss and great disturbance in the working of the mines. An eight hours limit would really result in only six hours, or even perhaps less, actual work in getting coal. By allowing a reasonable time for doing the work they would have it done more easily and satisfactorily, and they would prevent the continual hurry and skurry of the men, and the continual tendency on the part of the employers, officials, and workmen to evade the provisions of the Bill. The Committee had listened to a discussion already, and he contended that very few people know the effect which an eight hours arrangement from bank to bank would have, and that was the reason why he proposed that it should be ten. He held that what had to be gone through in these eight hours could not be done. What were the operations of miners now? In the first place the miners assembled at a certain time in the morning at the pit, near the cage or lift apparatus. Possibly there might be from 400 to 600 men there. The lift would hold from six to twelve people at a time. In other words, only a very few indeed would be able to go down at once. Some of these shafts were not very deep, while others were just the contrary. They varied in depth from 200 to 1,000 yards. The men descended in

relays, and he should think it would take at least half an hour for all the men to get down. When they got to the bottom of the shaft they had in many cases a long way to travel in order to get to their work, and that took time. Of course, it was not like walking down Regent-street or Oxford-street, or even down a country road. They had to go along an underground passage and walk circumspectly. Very well; the miners set about their work, after finding whether the place was safe. The Government had passed enactment after enactment that the place should be properly timbered and the roof all right before the men began to work. The Committee did not suppose that a man came to his place and found everything ready for work. It sometimes happened that there had been a fall during the night, and that had to be put right. He thought most reasonable men would agree that it took an hour for all this to be done. Then the man went on with his work. But in the course of his work he had to take meals. It was said that in 1873 the miners had lobster salad, but that, he thought, was not true. But a miner required to have good sustenance, and he was told two meals while at work. It was most likely that he would take half or three-quarters of an hour, and he thought three-quarters of an hour should be allowed to any man who wanted a reasonable meal. Gentlemen on this side of the House knew perfectly well that when they went out shooting in Scotland they allowed an hour after the work of the forenoon. Therefore the miner must have a proper time for his meals. What about the end of the day's work? The miner had to go back to the mouth of the pit. He had to collect his tools and see that his place was ready for to-morrow, so that it required a certain time to prepare for the return journey. He travelled back again along the underground passage to the lift which took him to the top of the pit. They had to ascend in relays, taking perhaps half an hour again. Under these circumstances an eight hour day from bank to bank would be absolutely impossible. He complimented his hon. friends who represented the miners on the way they attended to the interests of miners. At this time, however, they had made a most extraordinary mistake. If they would adopt these Amendments in the interest of the workmen and in the interest of all concerned they would have a Bill such as might be worked. He thought there was another question which ought not to be quite forgotten, and that was the different kinds of coal. There were hard coal and soft coal. It took longer to get the hard coal. There were mines where the seams were thick and others where they were thinner, and there again they had a question which affected the time required for working. In connection with this measure they had also to look to the fact that collieries in different districts paid different rates of dividend or no dividend. He thought the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean had not considered all these conditions. The question was, Is this Bill going to do good or ill for the miners of the country? Those who believed that it was going to hamper them greatly and do them great harm were obliged, in fairness to their constituencies, to take the opportunity of stating the case against the proposals, in the Bill. They would see at once, from the arguments he had used and from his statement of the case, that probably the hours of labour would be restricted by at least two hours. That was to say, instead of having something like seven and a half or eight hours at the face,

they would have five and a half or six hours. They would see, therefore, that if this Bill was going to knock two hours off the eight it was going to decrease the output of coal by 25 per cent. The result would be that the price of coal would rise, and manufacturers would find that they had to pay 25 per cent. more for their coal, and thus they would be hampered in carrying on their arrangements. The householders would also be pinched, for they also would find that they had to

pay 25 per cent increase. Another matter of great importance was that the Navy would have to pay 25 per cent. more for its coal. This increase was going to be put on the great product on which the industry, strength, and power of this nation rested. How Members of this House could join together and put their names on the back of this Bill passed his comprehension. Why should they put this restriction on the body of men who worked their coal? It was not done in America or Germany, which were our two great competitors. Were we to confine our market for coal to the United Kingdom? If twenty-five per cent. was put on the price of coal, what was to become of our steamships? His Amendment did not say that the men must work ten hours. He must explain that, because he had been twitted and taunted on the subject. They said that he intended to ask the people in the mines to work ten hours. He did not want anything of the kind. He wanted ten hours to cover everything, whether seven, eight, nine, or ten, from bank to bank. He only wanted that the miners should not be crushed into a time limit in which they could not possibly do the work. He thought Members of Parliament had lost sight of the fact that the miners did not work much more than four and a half days per week. That was a subject that wanted careful consideration. If they put eight hours instead of ten in the Bill, and if the men worked only four and a half days per week, they made a thirty-six hour week. Looking to the fact that the miner was perfectly comfortable, that he worked pretty much as he pleased, that he made good wages as things were, and that the price of coal was coming down, he asked the House on all scores to fix the limit at ten hours, which would cover everything and leave everything as it was now.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 7, to leave out the word 'eight' and insert the word 'ten.'";(Colonel Pilkington.)

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

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE (Durham, Barnard Castle) said he objected to the word "eight," but he could not stand the word "ten" as a substitute. The word "eight" was not palatable to many of his constituents, because they thought that if it stood in the Bill they would be expected to be eight hours in the pit, which was contrary to the Northumberland and Durham practice. Therefore he objected to these figures altogether. Everybody who knew anything of the conditions of mining knew that there must be variety in the hours of working and in the employment. The question of the limitation of the hours should be carefully gone into by the Committee with the view of placing the men in the position which would best enable them to discharge their duties to themselves, their families, and their employers. He was quite certain that a rigid line would be a fatal mistake in the interests of the coalowners, and also in the

interests of the shilling which the Chancellor of the Exchequer hoped to get from them. The matter was comparatively simple. There was a variety of employment, and there should be a variety of hours for working. Instead of inserting eight or ten or any other number of hours, let the Bill be a Bill for the "limitation of hours," and in that way the matter would be settled very speedily. If the word "eight" were taken out of the Bill it would be open to him to move an Amendment in the direction he indicated, which he was prepared to do.

MR. LEES KNOWLES said he agreed to a great extent with the remarks of the hon. Baronet. He considered that eight was objectionable, but thought that ten was objectionable also. He took it that his hon. and gallant friend intended the eight hours to apply to men at the face of the coal, and that ten hours was to mean from bank to bank, but there was no explanation as to why the one was substituted for the other. He thought the suggestion of the hon. Baronet a good one. To a great extent it followed the suggestion which he himself had made in a previous debate, when he proposed that the words "eight hours" should be omitted, and that the title should read, "The Mines Act, 1901." There was a third suggestion, which he thought would be applicable to all collieries, whether new or old, shallow or deep. It was suggested to him by a deputation of miners who waited on him some years ago. He had always a friendly feeling towards his mining friends and neighbours, and supported the idea of an Eight Hours Bill, though not a Bill for a hard and fast eight hours from bank to bank. The leader of the deputation suggested that, if objection were taken to fixing the hours from bank to bank or at the face of the coal, eight hours should be fixed from station to station. That would put all pits on the same level, and the men would have no difficulty in getting from bank to station and back again.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not see how that arises on this Amendment. It may arise at a later stage, but at present the only Amendment is to substitute ten hours for eight hours.

MR. LEES KNOWLES said he was trying to show that his hon. and gallant friend, in moving to substitute ten for eight, had two ideas in his mind; one, eight hours at the face of the coal, and the other, ten hours from bank to bank. He was perfectly willing to adopt the suggestion proposed by the hon. Baronet, that the Bill should be described as "The Mines Limitation of Hours Act, 1901."

MR. BANBURY said he did not agree with his hon. and gallant friend in thinking that the alteration of eight to ten was the best Amendment that could be moved. His hon. and gallant friend had given very excellent reasons for making an alteration in the number eight, but his reasons for substituting ten were not as strong. There were, of course, seams of hard coal and seams of soft coal, and some pits were more easily worked than others. If the hours in all were limited to eight, then the owner of a pit having soft seams would be in a better position than the owner of a pit having hard seams. He should like to mention that they were now, on the title, practically discussing the whole merits of the Bill. It was quite a new thing in his Parliamentary experience that the whole of a Bill should be in the title, and it was extremely inconvenient. Reverting to hard and soft seams, in the majority of cases the collier was paid by the amount of coal he cut, and the consequence would be that a collier working on a hard

seam, if the hours were limited to eight, would not be able to earn as much as a more fortunate brother who was working on a soft seam. Therefore, not only the proprietor but the collier would be injured. That emphasised very strongly the difficulty of attempting to limit the hours of adult labour. Again, it seemed to him very important, in connection with the Bill, how long it took a man to get from the surface to his work.

MR. PICKARD submitted that the remarks of the hon. Member were not relevant to the question before the Committee.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think the hon. Gentleman has yet said anything irrelevant.

MR. BANBURY said his point was that if a hard-and-fast rule were fixed it would inflict an injury, and he was endeavouring to show how that injury would be brought about. He would say that he had never yet been called to order, and should be extremely sorry if that were to be his first occasion. He could assure hon. Members that it would be his endeavour not to break what he hoped he might consider an honourable record. He was discussing the question of the time occupied by a man in travelling from the bank to his work. In some places he believed that the distance was as much mile. [An HON. MEMBER: Three miles.] He also presumed that there were collieries where the distance was only half a mile, and therefore the provision in the Bill would be putting a great burden on the men who had to travel long distances. He thought he had shown that eight was perhaps not as good a figure as could be put in the Bill, but he was not at all sure that ten was the best figure that could be inserted. Ten hours would no doubt recompense the owner and the collier in a pit which it was difficult to work, because a longer time was necessary; but he thought it would be possible to put even something better in the Bill. The hon. Baronet opposite, who had very great experience in colliery matters, was very much against the word "ten," but he did not tell the Committee what he proposed to substitute for it.

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE said he suggested the withdrawal of the Amendment, in order that he might move to insert the words "limitation of hours."

MR. BANBURY said that the hon. Baronet did not tell the Committee whether he approved of any particular number of hours other than ten.

*SIR JOSEPH PEASE said he did not name any number of hours, owing to the variety of the work.

MR. BANBURY said that that was a very excellent sentiment. He would wish to know if it were allowable in discussing the omission to discuss whether any number should be inserted at all.

*THE CHAIRMAN assented.

MR. BANBURY said he was glad of that, because it would give the Committee an opportunity of considering again whether it was desirable to insert any number of hours at all. They had heard only a few weeks ago of the fate that was shortly to overtake the coal industry. They were told that the industry was going to be ruined, and in view of that he asked whether it was advisable to put in any hours at all. By limiting the number of hours the output would unquestionably be limited also. The Hon. Member for the Wansbeck Division, in a very eloquent speech on the Second Reading, said that the real reason for the

figure "eight" was because it was desired to limit the output.

MR. FENWICK said that he stated that the agitation for the limitation of hours began with that object.

MR. BANBURY said that was what he thought. When, however, it was found that that was unpopular in the country, a cover was thrown over it. He thought the position was very serious. Only a few hours ago he had read a long article in The Times, written by an hon. Gentleman in reply to the Secretary of State for India, showing that the limitation of working hours in England was tending to destroy industries and manufactures. The main thing required to make a successful industry or manufacture was cheap coal, but the Bill before the Committee would not cheapen coal, and if coal were not cheapened how was the country to resist the great competition from other parts of the world? That was a consideration which should induce every hon. Member to pause before he voted for the question which would be put from the Chair;" That 'eight' stand part of the clause." The question of cheap coal applied not only to manufactures, but also to individuals, and especially to the working classes of the country, and he doubted

very much whether if eight were retained they would be doing a service to the miners themselves. There seemed to be an idea that work was a hard thing: and ought to be avoided. He maintained that that was false in itself. No man was so happy as when he was really working hard.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is now approaching the point when I shall have to call him to order.

MR. BANBURY said he would continue his observations as to whether it was advisable to insert any particular number of hours at all in the Bill. He had endeavoured to show that competition by foreign countries where the hours of work were longer was very serious. The question now arose whether it would not be more advisable to leave out the number altogether. That would not prevent hon. Members from inserting in Clause 2 any number they liked; but, it would give the Committee an opportunity of considering whether any number of hours should be inserted at all. If his hon. and gallant friend would withdraw his Amendment another Amendment could then be moved to insert the words "hours of labour."

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the Committee? strike out from the clause the words; "eight hours" there will be a vacancy which can be filled up.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER said if the word "eight" remained he understood it would not be in order to move another number, but that it would be in order to move the addition of a half.

MR. BANBURY said he was afraid that if they went to a division on the question "That 'eight' stand part of the clause" they would probably be defeated. The matter ought to be further discussed before stereotyping that number. If he could induce his hon. and gallant friend to withdraw his Amendment, then there would be no question before the Committee, and it would be possible for him to move to omit the words "eight hours."

*THE CHAIRMAN: If the Committee agrees to allow the hon. Gentleman to withdraw his Amendment, then another Amendment can be moved to leave out the words "eight

hours" and insert some other words.

MR. BANBURY said he would appeal to his hon. and gallant friend to withdraw his Amendment. He did not suppose there would be any objection to inserting the words "hours of labour." He hoped his hon. and gallant friend would consider his appeal, but if there were reasons against it perhaps his hon. and gallant friend would state them.

SIR JAMES JOICEY said he would suggest that the better way would be to leave out the word "eight" and insert "limitation of."

*SIR ALFRED HICKMAN said he strongly objected to the insertion of the words "ten hours," because no man was now in a pit ten hours, and he should be very sorry if he were. He thought the suggestion of the hon. Baronet was a very good one. His hon. friend who had just spoken objected to eight hours from bank to bank because of the difference it would make between various classes of labour. He should like to give the Committee a concrete case. He had a pit employing 600 men, and they had to be taken down in cages, twelve in a cage, a depth of 400 yards, which, with fifty cages, occupied half an hour. He had another pit employing 100 men, but they went down in five minutes. The same applied when the men returned, and therefore the men in one pit were able to work fifty minutes longer than the men in the other. How could two collieries compete fairly when the men in one worked fifty minutes longer daily than the men in the other? At present men worked something less than seven hours, so that fifty minutes was a very large percentage indeed. But that was not all. When the men got down they had to get to the face of the coal. In one case the distance was one mile and three quarters, in the other only 100 yards. Although there was every possible mechanical contrivance to convey the men, the longer journey occupied forty minutes, whereas the 100 yards could be traversed under five minutes. That again meant a difference of seventy minutes per day. That was a very considerable time to be taken from the men's working hours. Would it be contended that a man who had worked for about five hours and was anxious to work longer should not be allowed to do so? That seemed to him to be preposterous. In the United States men worked eleven hours in the pits, and the price of coal was never more than half of the price of England. How was the manufacturing supremacy of England to be kept up if the article which enabled every manufacturer to carry on work was to be twice the price of the same article to his competitors? For his own part, he strongly deprecated long hours in the pits. He thought seven hours was quite sufficient, but he would not make a hard and fast rule. One of the first effects of the Act, if passed, would be that famine prices would rule, and that large sums would be paid into the pockets of the colliery proprietors, but ultimately the manufacturing supremacy of the country would be destroyed.

SIR THOMAS WRIGHTSON (St. Pancras, E.) said he desired to say a few words with reference to the effect of the limitation of hours in the county of Northumberland. In Northumberland they had the oldest coalfield not only in the kingdom, but perhaps in the world, and the conditions under which it was worked would be entirely upset if the hours were limited to eight from bank to bank. It would be impossible for the men to cut the amount of coal which would justify

them in receiving the wages they ought to receive if their hours were limited to that number. The great argument which had been used with reference to Northumberland and Durham was that boys, of which there was one shift to work with two shifts of hewers, were, some of them, obliged to work more than eight hours. As a matter of fact, although the boys were ten hours in the mine, those were not all working hours. They took half to three-quarters of an hour to get to their work, and during that time they were taking healthy gentle exercise in an atmosphere which was far more healthy than the atmosphere of the House of Commons. It did them no harm, and he would draw the attention of the House to the fact that for twenty generations the collieries of Northumberland had been worked on conditions similar to the conditions which now prevailed. If any hon. Member went down to Northumberland he would find a finer, healthier, and harder set of men than in any other mining district in the world.

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

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)

Field, William

Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe

Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Fison, Frederick William

Markham, Arthur Basil

Aird, Sir John

Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond

Mellor, Rt. Hon. John Wm.

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Flower, Ernest

Mildmay, Francis Bingham

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

Flynn, James Christopher

Milton, Viscount

Ambrose, Robert

Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)

Minch, Matthew

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry

Mooney, John J.

Atherley-Jones, L.

Fuller, J. M. F.

Morley, Chas. (Breconshire)

Austin, Sir John

Gilhooly, James

Moss, Samuel

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Herbt. J.

Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Murnaghan, George
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Bell, Richard
Green, Walford D (Wednesbury
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Black, Alexander William
Greene, W. Raymond-(Cambs.
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Blake, Edward
Gretton, John
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Boland, John
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Griffith, Ellis J.
Norman, Henry
Boyle, James
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Norton, Capt. Cecil Wm.
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Brigg, John
Hammond, John
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Broadhurst, Henry
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Hardie, J. K. (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Harwood, George
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, S T.)
Bryce, Rt. Hn. James
Hay, Hon. Claude George
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
Bull William James
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
.Burke, E. Haviland-

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Burns, John
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Burt, Thomas
Helder, Augustus
O'Dowd, John
Butcher, John George
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Henderson, Alexander
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Caldwell, James
Holland, William Henry
O'Malley, William
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hope, John Deans (Fife, W.)
O'Mara, James
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Carvill, Patrick George H.
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Causton, Richard Knight
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
O'Shee, James John
Cawley, Frederick
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Partington, Oswald
Clancy, John Joseph
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Jacoby, James Alfred
Pickard, Benjamin.
Cogan, Denis J.
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Pirie, Duncan V.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt. Hn Sir U
Power, Patrick Joseph
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Kearley, Hudson E.

Price, Robert John
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir J. H.
Priestley, Arthur
Colville, John
Kennedy, Patrick James
Randles, John S.
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Kinloch, Sir John George S.
Rea, Russell
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Labouchere, Henry
Reckitt, Harold James
Craig, Robert Hunter
Lambert, George
Reddy, M.
Crean, Eugene
Langley, Batty
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Cremer, William Randal
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Crombie, John William
Lawson, John Grant
Reid, Sir Edw. James (Cardiff)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Reid, Sir R. T. (Dumfries)
Cullinan, J.
Leamy, Edmund
Remnant, James Farquharson
Dalziel, James Henry
Leese, Sir Jos. F. (Accrington)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Delany, William
Levy, Maurice
Robson, William Snowdon
Denny, Col.
Lewis, John Herbert
Roe, Sir Thomas
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Lloyd-George, David
Russell, T. W.

Dillon, John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Donelan, Captain A.
Lough, Thomas
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Doogan, P. C.
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Duffy, William J.
Lundon, W.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Dunn, Sir William
MacDonnell, Br. Mark A.
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Elibank, Master of
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Ellis, John Edward
M'Crae, George
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Emmott, Alfred
M'Dermott, Patrick
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
M'Govern, T.
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Soares, Ernest J.
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Question put, "That the Question be now put."
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 232; Noes, 156. (Division List No. 249.)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Ure, Alexander
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Stevenson, Francis S.
Walker, Col. William Hall
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Strachey, Edward
Wallace, Robert
Wilson, Fred W. (Norfolk. Mid.
Sullivan, Donal
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Woodhouse, Sir J T (Huddersf'd
Tennant, Harold John
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.
Weir, James Galloway
Young, Samuel (Cavan. East)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Welby, Sir Charles G. E (Notts.)
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Thomas, J A (Gl'morgan, Gower
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Mr. Yoxall and Sir Fortescue Flannery.
Thomson, F. W. (York, W.R.)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Tomkinson, James
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Furness, Sir Christopher
Myers, William Henry
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Garfit, William
Nicholson, William Graham
Allsopp, Hon. George
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (Cy. of Lond.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Anstruther, H. T.
Godson, Sir Augustus Fredk.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Arrol, Sir William
Gore, Hn. G. R C Ormsby-(Salop
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Balcarres, Lord
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Parker, Gilbert
Baldwin, Alfred
Graham, Henry Robert

Paulton, James Mellor
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch
Greene. Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington
Banbury, Frederick George
Greene, H. D. (Shrewsbury)
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Hain, Edward
Penn, John
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Pierpoint, Robert
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'rd
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Bond, Edward
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Plummer, Walter R.
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Boulnois, Edmund
Heath, Arthur Howard (H'nley
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Brassey, Albert
Heath, Jas. (Staffords, N. W.)
Purvis, Robert
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Rankin, Sir James
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hill, Arthur
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Cameron, Robert
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampst'd)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward H.
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Richards, Henry Charles
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.
Hogg, Lindsay
Robinson, Brooke

Chapman, Edward
Hope, J. F. (Sheffi'ld, Brightside
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Coddington, Sir William
Houston, Robert Paterson
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter,-
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Joicey, Sir James
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Kitson, Sir James
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Cranborne, Viscount
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Law, Andrew Bonar
Smith, H C (N'rth'mb. Tyneside
Dalkeith, Earl of
Lecky, Rt.Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggar
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N S.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Thornton, Percy M.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Tollemache, Henry James
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lowther, Rt. Hn. James (Kent)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Doughty, George

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsm'th)
Vincent, Col Sir C E H (Sheffiel A
Doxford, Sir William T.
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Duncan, J. Hastings
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
M'Calmont, Col. H L B. (Cambs.
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Edwards, Frank
Manners, Lord Cecil
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)-
Fardell, Sir T. George
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Fenwick, Charles
Massey-Mainwaring. Hon. W F
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn Sir J. (Manc'r
Morgan, Hn Fred. (Monm'thsh.
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Morrell, George Herbert
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Fisher, William Hayes
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
FitzGerald, Sir Robt. Penrose-
Mount, William Arthur
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Muntz, Philip A.
Lieutenant-Colonel Pilkington and Mr. Knowles.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Murray, Chas. J. (Coventry)
Question put accordingly, "That the I word 'eight' stand part of the clause."
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Ashton, Thomas Gair.
Abraham, Wm. (Rhondda)
Ambrose, Robert
Atherley-Jones, L.
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Arrol, Sir William
Austin, Sir John.
The Committee divided::Ayes, 214; Noes, 153. (Division List No. 250.)
Bain, Col. James Robert
Hardie, J. Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Harwood, George
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon N.
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
O'Malley, William
Bell, Richard
Hay, Hon. Claude George
O'Mara, James
Black, Alexander William
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Blake, Edward
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Shee, James John
Boland, John
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Partington, Oswald
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Helder, Augustus
Pease, Alfred E. (Cleveland)
Boyle, James
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
Pickard, Benjamin
Brigg, John
Henderson, Alexander
Pirie, Duncan V.
Broadhurst, Henry
Holland, William Henry
Power, Patrick Joseph
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Price, Robert John
Bull, William James

Horniman, Frederick John
Priestley, Arthur
Burke, E. Haviland-
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Randles, John S.
Burns, John
Hughes, Colonel Edwin
Rea, Russell
Butcher, John George
Humphreys-Owen, Arthur C.
Reckitt, Harold James
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Reddy, M.
Caldwell, James
Jacoby, James Alfred
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Redmond, William (Clare)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U.
Reid. Sir R. Threshie Dumfries)
Carvill, Patrick Geo. Hamilton
Kearley, Hudson E.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Causton, Richard Knight
Kennedy, Patrick James
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Cawley, Frederick
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Robinson, Brooke
Clancy, John Joseph
Labouchere, Henry
Robson, William Snowdon
Cochrane, Hn. Thos. H. A. E.
Lambert, George
Roe, Sir Thomas
Cogan, Denis J.
Langley, Batty
Russell, T. W.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
Samuel, Harry S. (Limehouse)
Colville, John
Layland-Barratt, Francis

Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Leamy, Edmund
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington)
Seton-Karr, Henry
Crean, Eugene
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Shaw, Chas. Edw. (Stafford)
Cremer, William Randal
Levy, Maurice
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Crombie, John William
Lewis, John Herbert
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Crossley, Sir Savile
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cullinan, J.
Lloyd-George, David
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire)
Dalziel, James Henry
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Soares, Ernest J.
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan)
London, W.
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk)
Delany, William
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Denny, Colonel
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Dilke, Rt. Hn. Sir Charles
M'Crac, George
Strachey, Edward
Dillon, John
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sullivan, Donal
Donelan, Captain A.
M'Govern, T.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Doogan, P. C.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Tennant, Harold John

Duffy, William J.
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Dunn, Sir William
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Elibank, Master of
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings)
Ellis, John Edward Emmott, Alfred
Markham, Arthur Basil
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r
Evans, Sir Francis H. (Maidstone
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Minch, Matthew
Tomkinson, James
Ferguson, R. C Munro (Leith)
Mooney, John J.
Ure, Alexander
Field, William
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Wallace, Robert
Fison, Frederick William
Moss, Samuel
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Muntz, Philip A.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Flannery, Sir Forteseue
Murnaghan, George
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Flower, Ernest
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Flynn, James Christopher
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Weir, James Galloway
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton und. Lyne
Fuller, J. M. F.

Norman, Henry
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Gilhooly, James
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Gladstone, Rt Hn. Herbert John
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid.)
Green, Walford D. (Wednesbury
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Gretton, John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Woodhouse, Sir J T. (Huddersf'd
Greville, Hon. Ronald
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Haldane, Richard Burdon
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Mr. Yoxall and Viscount Milton.
Hammond, John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W)
O'Dowd, John
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Nicholson, William Graham
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Furness, Sir Christopher
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Aird, Sir John
Garfit, William
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Allsopp, Hon. George
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Anstruther, H. T.
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Balcarres, Lord
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby-(Salop)
Parker, Gilbert
Baldwin, Alfred
Gore. Hn. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc)
Paulton, James Mellor
Balfour, Maj K. R (Christchurch
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Pease, Herbert Pike (Darlington
Banbury, Frederick George
Graham, Henry Robert
Penn, John
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Greene, Sir E. W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Percy, Earl
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Pierpoint, Robert
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Hain, Edward
Plummer Walter R.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashfo'd
Pryce-Jones, Lt. Col. Edward
Boulnois, Edmund
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Purvis, Robert
Brassey, Albert
Heath, Arthur Howard) Hanley
Rankin, Sir James
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Remnant, James Farquharson
Bullard, Sir Harry
Higginbottom, S. W.
Renshaw, Charles Bine

Burt, Thomas
Hill, Arthur
Rentoul, James Alexander
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Cavendish, V. C. V. (Derbyshire
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hogg, Lindsay
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Chapman, Edward
Hope, J F (Sheffield, Brightside)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Coddington, Sir William
Houston, Robert Paterson
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H
Smith. H. C (North'mb Tynes'de
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Kenyon-Slaney. Col. W. (Salop.)
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Kitson, Sir James
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Thornton, Percy M.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Lawson, John Grant
Tollemache, Henry James
Cranborne, Viscount
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Dalkeith, Earl of
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Walker, Col. William Hall
Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)
Walrond, Rt. Hn. Sir William H.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Wanklyn, James Leslie
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Wharton, Rt. Hon. John Lloyd
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Ered Dixon
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Malcolm, Ian
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Manners, Lord Cecil
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn-W. F.
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Edwards, Frank
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Morrell, George Herbert
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Manc'r
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Mount, William Arthur
Fisher, William Hayes
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Lieut.-Col. Pilkington and

Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

Myers, William Henry

Mr. Knowles.

And it being half-past Five of the clock, the Chairman left the chair to make his Report to the House.

Committee report progress; to sit again upon Wednesday next.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BOARD (JOINT COMMITTEE).

Ordered, That a Select Committee of five Members be appointed to join with a Committee to be appointed by the Lords to consider the constitution of Queen Anne's Bounty Board, and to report whether economy and efficiency of administration would be promoted by any change in its constitution or by its amalgamation with any other body.

Sir William Anson, Mr. Hanbury, Mr. Humphreys-Owen, and Mr. Stevenson nominated members of the Committee.:(Sir William Walrond.)

Question proposed, "That Mr. Stuart Wortley be one other Member of the Committee."

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) objected.

It being six of the clock the Debate stood adjourned till to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER adjourned the House without Question put.

Adjourned at six of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 13th June, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

ARIZONA COPPER COMPANY (LTD.) ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL. (BY ORDER.)
[UNDER THE PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.]

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Mid) moved that this Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons.

He said the point he had to raise was a novel one, but of some general interest with regard to the working of the Private Legislation Procedure Act of Scotland. Under that Act several inquiries had been held in Scotland, and this was the first occasion on which opponents had asked to be heard in this House after having been unsuccessfully heard in Scotland. The question which the House had now to determine for the future was, What were the rights that opponents had to be heard here after they had been heard in Scotland? He contended that, according to the express provisions of the Act, any opponent whose opposition was not simply frivolous had a right to be heard here. It was not a question of asking the House to upset the decision of its Committee, but it was a question of the right of having a second hearing, which was given by the Act of 1899. The Scotch Committee of Members of both Houses was a strong one, and he would hesitate very much to ask the House to pronounce any final opinion upon the merits of a question that had been heard and decided by that Committee. All he wished to point out was that the duty of the House was not to decide on the merits, but to send the matter upstairs to a Joint Committee as provided for by the Act. The Arizona Company was a company of Scotch domicile. He knew nothing about it or its directors. It had had a very chequered career, but it was now getting into smooth waters, and was much more prosperous. It had found that it

had outgrown its original memorandum and articles, and, by general consent of the shareholders, it sought to put the matter straight by Parliamentary powers. Being a Scotch company, it had to present a petition to the Secretary for Scotland for a Provisional Order. Then, under the terms of the Act, an inquiry was held in Edinburgh. One provision which was strongly opposed by certain of the shareholders was a general indemnity for the directors for all their acts in the past, so as to make a clean slate for them. There was a certain transaction which took place many years ago, and which was challenged, by which 10,000 shares of £5 each were issued to certain gentlemen as fully paid up, when, in fact, no cash was paid. Petitioning shareholders said this was improperly done, and the case of the directors was that this issue was part of an elaborate compromise, and was in the interests of the company, and therefore a reasonable piece of business on the part of the directors. The Committee supported the view of the directors, and declined to make the alteration which the petitioning shareholders demanded, and which would have left the question of this issue of shares open to challenge in a court of law. Those petitioning shareholders had since this hearing commenced an action in the Court of Session, and he could not see who could go into this question except a court of law. It would be an extremely strong measure on the part of this House to interfere and pass an absolute indemnity without knowing anything about the merits, for that indemnity clause would make subsequent investigation by a court of law impossible. In asking for a second hearing he was merely asking the House to carry out the provisions which it laid down for the conduct of these matters in the Act of 1899. Objection was taken that the local hearing should be final, but in the discussion on the Bill the Lord Advocate had clearly pointed out that upon unopposed orders there was to be no second inquiry in London but that upon opposed orders there should always be the possibility of an opponent coming to this House. Of course the opponent had to run the risk of the costs if he were unsuccessful.

MR. RENSCHAW (Renfrewshire, W.) seconded.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be referred to a Joint Committee of Lords and Commons."; (Mr. Parker Smith.)

MR. THOMAS SHAW (Hawick Burghs) said that he desired to meet the motion with a direct negative. The House had substantially devolved its private Bill business to local committees of inquiry, and he read with dismay the statement made by the Lord Advocate the other night that he would heartily support the motion of his hon. friend that an appeal to a tribunal of this House should be allowed in these cases. That statement contained the minimum of comfort with the maximum of in

accuracy. He had read the speech of the Lord Advocate on Tuesday with dismay, and he ventured to say that it contained the minimum of comfort to the Scottish people and the maximum of inaccuracy. The Lord Advocate cited certain utterances of Members of the House, and he said that they expressed the views of Members of the House when the Act passed through Parliament. Nothing of the kind. There were no utterances in the House of Commons with regard to the law as it now stood. The law was the result of a compromise in the House of Lords. When the

compromise was arrived at in the House of Lords on the 27th July, 1899, Lord Balfour of Burleigh said;

"While I could not myself view with acceptance or favour the doing away with the second inquiry altogether, I am quite willing to consider proposals that may be made for the purpose of preventing such an absolute power being placed in the hands of those who, having had one inquiry, wish to repeat it over again before another tribunal."

He wished to ask why the Government had now taken up such a different line. He should like to say that up to the present the Act had been a conspicuous success in Scotland. The proceedings had worked well, and the public in Scotland were satisfied with it; but if the present proposal were carried all that would be substantially undone, and he felt bound to enter a prompt and emphatic protest against such a suicidal course. The Bill before the House had been affirmed by the two Chairmen of the Houses of Parliament to be a Bill of no great magnitude, of no great public importance, and a Bill which involved no question of public policy. It had been inquired into locally by a joint Committee of the two Houses, and the House knew perfectly well that, if the two Houses had again to select a powerful and influential Committee, that joint Committee would be exactly the Committee to be chosen. Why, therefore, should one little clause of one little Bill be again put to the hazard by the proposal of the hon.

Gentleman? There was no need to talk about the merits of the Bill; he wanted to destroy at once what would be a very bad system. He had read certain petitions presented against the Bill, but he positively declined to enter into the merits of the questions raised in them. He did not find that there was any suggestion that the matter was not argued to the full before the Committee of the two Houses in Scotland, and no new fact was now before the House. If the principle of the motion were affirmed, they would be in a worse position than they were before. Under the old system there was an appeal from a Committee of one House to the Committee of the other, but now it was proposed to have an appeal from the Committee of both Houses to another Committee of both Houses. He wanted to be loyal to the Act. Clause 9 of the Act did not give any absolute right of appeal. There was a clause in the original Bill to the effect that a Bill should, if notice were given, be again referred to a joint Committee. They protested against that on the ground that it was a senseless proposal, and on the 20th of June he himself moved its rejection. There was an interesting debate, and, of course, the Scottish Members were swamped by the English Members, nine out of every ten of whom had not heard the debate at all. Thirteen Scottish Members voted in favour of a re-hearing and thirty-one against. On the 4th July he again moved the exclusion of the clause on Report, and the result was that thirty-six Scottish Members voted in favour of the exclusion of the clause, and only nine were found to support it. Then the Bill went to the House of Lords. It was absolutely and unmistakeably clear that Scotland wished the local inquiry to be a final inquiry, and a compromise was arrived at in the House of Lords by which it was provided that good cause should be shown before there should be a rehearing. The meaning of this day's proceedings was that the Government were not loyal to the compromise arrived at in the House of Lords.

They were supporting the reaffirmation of a principle which was emphatically rejected by four votes to one of the Scottish Members. That was not fair to Scotland; it was not fair to the House, and was not loyal to the actual provision in the Act. Therefore he protested against it. The Act provided many precautions. The two Chairmen of the Houses of Parliament should decide whether a Bill was a big Bill or only an insignificant measure.

That was done, as he maintained, very drastically. Seven important Bills from Scotland had been cut out from the benefits of the Act, by the Chairmen.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! It appears to me undesirable, and indeed out of order, to criticise the action of the two Chairmen of Committees.

MR. THOMAS SHAW said it was not his intention to criticise their conduct. It was merely an argument as to why a new Committee should be appointed. He found in the list of excluded Bills three great Scottish Railway Bills. The difference between the two classes of Bills was that the large Bills had to go before two Committees, and if there was any principle of that kind the result would be to give a better procedure for the larger Bills, but the little Bills would be worse off. There would have to be two Committees sitting twice, and what would be the proceedings of Committee No. 1 if they had to be revised by Committee No. 2? Neither trouble, expense, nor harassment would be saved. The proposal as to costs was ridiculous. What was required was to protect the little litigant from the large, overbearing litigant, who did not care what cost he was put to if he got his desire; the proposal struck out all the benefits of the measure in those particular cases. He objected to the way in which the Government treated their own offspring. The Bill having once seen the light was going to receive its death blow at the hands of the Lord Advocate. He desired the House to make this new departure on different grounds; he asked them to say that there must be either some new facts exposed by the petitioner or some gross blunder committed by the Commissioners or some error proved, before such a thing was allowed. Unless some common-sense rule was laid down of that kind the Act passed two years ago would be of no use whatever.

*MR. J. E. GORDON (Elgin and Nairn) said he hoped the matter would be treated without any party prejudice. A right had been created under the Act, of an appeal by an opponent of a Provisional Order to this House, but in this case he submitted insufficient ground had been shown for such an appeal. The only reason for reconstituting a fresh Committee would be, firstly, that the Commissioners had committed a mistake of procedure; no such allegation had been made; secondly, that some new facts had come to light which were worthy of the consideration of this House; and that was not suggested. The hon. Member for Partick had not explained to the House how this small indemnity clause arose. That compromise happened in 1884. The sum under discussion was not £50,000, the £50,000 was only the nominal value of shares which in 1884 represented a cash sum of £6,000. An action for £220,000 had been entered recently with respect to this amount. In 1884 the shares were worth £6,000; at that time the company was in low water, and the shares worth about 12s., but could anybody say that a claim worth £6,000 in 1884 was worth £220,000 now? The claim had been before the courts, and already in 1898 it was in the hands of an agent who was no

stranger to the fortunes of the company, and who, in fact, was a director. When the indemnity clause was put into the Provisional Order it was only by the goodwill of the Commissioners that this gentleman was allowed to bring in his claim; he exhausted his case before the Commissioners, and ran dry in the sands of argument; he absolutely failed to substantiate his objection. The House was now asked to grant a rehearing. He appealed to the Lord Advocate under the circumstances to leave the decision to the House and allow them to use their common sense on this matter.

The LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire) said he could not disguise from himself the fact that this was a matter for the decision of the House alone, and all he sought to do was to impress upon the House, first of all, what it did when it passed this particular section of the Private Legislation Procedure Bill, and, secondly, what would be the consequences of its decision one way or the other. The point they had to deal with was a point of procedure, and the House should not be led away by the fact that this Bill was of a particular class. The reason of the Bill was that the company was domiciled in Scotland, and, like many other companies, it had entered into proceedings which were afterwards found to have been irregular; in the meantime there had been immense transfers of share interests, and the proprietary interests in the company had been largely altered. The company came to the conclusion that it could not surmount its difficulties without Parliamentary powers, and the reason it had to go to Scotland for its private Bill was that the company was registered in Scotland. He was absolutely at one with the promoters that the Bill should be passed, but he disagreed with them as to the merits of this particular clause; it was, however, inquired into by the Commissioners, who decided that the clause should stand, and the last thing that he should attempt to do was to go behind the decision of the Commissioners. But persons who were affected by the decision of a Committee were not always satisfied, and the question for the House to decide was what was the position of a gentleman whose case has been heard by a tribunal and who was not satisfied and who appealed to the House of Commons? He would remind the House that the original scheme of private Bill legislation procedure was by way of Provisional Order, and it was afterwards to be decided by the Chairman of Committees which Bills were to be proceeded with by way of private Bill, and which by Provisional Order; after that the Provisional Orders were to have local inquiries. It was at first intended that those inquiries should be made by extra-Parliamentary tribunals, but that was subsequently altered, and the tribunals were to be composed of Members of Parliament, the number if necessary to be augmented by extra-Parliamentary members. Anyone who was dissatisfied with the action of the Commissioners at a local inquiry was to be allowed to lodge a petition with the Secretary for Scotland and come up to this House. There was to be in every case a confirming Bill, just as there had been under the old system, and as soon as the machinery of a confirming Bill was introduced it became obvious that every step from the first inquiry leading to a possible second inquiry should be taken in this House, and it was necessary that a motion should be made in the House in order that the

matter should be taken before another tribunal. It was afterwards suggested that, having an extra-Parliamentary Commission, it would be as well to do away with appeals altogether. There were cross currents of feeling in all these matters, and an Amendment to that effect was defeated, and a provision was embodied in the Private Bill Procedure (Scotland) Act to the effect that a person who appeared before a local tribunal and was not satisfied should have a right to go to another tribunal. The words of the Act were these;

"If, before the expiration of seven days after the Second Reading of a Confirmation Bill, under the immediately preceding section, in the House in which it originates, a petitions be presented against any Order comprised in, the Bill, and if, upon motion made, either House do resolve that it is expedient to inquire into the propriety of assenting to the prayer of the said petition, the Bill shall, subject to the Standing Orders, be referred to a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament.

Therefore, they were in the same position as an unopposed Bill in that case. It must not be supposed that he was standing here arguing that the House had not perfect power to refuse this motion. He absolutely conceded that. The point for the House really to determine was on which side the onus should lie. Was the true meaning, looking to the history of the Bill, that a gentleman who wished to appeal to the Joint Committee must come here and must, through the mouth of some hon. Member, perhaps, show to the House that he had got what might be called a proper case upon the merits to be referred, or was it the other way? He could not help thinking that the true intention of the House was to alter the meaning, and he did not think that there was anything more emblematical of that than the course which the hon. Member for the Border Burghs had taken. If he had said that no man had a right to have a second inquiry opened, and if he had gone into the merits of that, that could have been understood. The hon. Member for the Border Burghs said that he pronounced no opinion upon this whatsoever; for aught he

knew it might be the most crucial case for an appeal.

MR. THOMAS SHAW: Perhaps my right hon. friend will allow me to say that I have read the petition through, and I did not see any new facts which were not fully considered by the Committee. Having done that, I decline to alter what the Committee of both Houses has decided upon.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY asked whether there could be any appeal when there were no fresh facts. According to the forms of the House, the only procedure was by motion. As the hon. Member knew very well, no stage could be got here without going through the forms of the House. Therefore he was doing the hon. Member for the Border Burghs no injustice, but was merely quoting his own speech in which he said he conspicuously declined to go into the merits of this question.

The first view the right hon. Gentleman sought to impress upon the House was that, inasmuch as the House had come to the conclusion, rightly or wrongly, that there should be an appeal from the tribunal below, that appeal ought to be given as an ordinary right, unless somebody was in the position of being able to say that it was a case which ought to have been debated on appeal. He hoped he had made himself clear upon this point. Then he asked the attention of the House to

another matter. What would the practical effect in this House be of taking either the one view or the other? As to the end they all had in view, he thought there was no disagreement. Their view was that the House should not be saddled with discussions upon these matters. The view taken by the hon. Member for the Border Burghs would, he thought, excite far more discussion. They had only got to deal with the man who was dissatisfied, and who had been beaten down below. The man who was dissatisfied would always feel that he had a prima facie case, and it was not too much to suppose that if he thought that, he would be able to find some hon. Member of the House to voice his case for him. The hon. Member says he had read this statement from cover to cover, and he did not see why there should be a second appeal into the merits of the case. In every case there must be a discussion upon the merits. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the Opposition said practically as regards this question, that if the procedure was to be to go to a tribunal below, and then to a tribunal above, it would have been far better to have had the old system. The right hon. Gentleman could not have said that if he had had the figures regarding our experience this very year. This year there were thirty-one Provisional Orders deposited at the Secretary for Scotland's office. Of these six and a portion of the seventh were by the decision of the Chancellor kept from Parliament. That left twenty-five and a portion of the twenty-sixth to come under the new procedures. Of these twenty-six no less than twenty-three were withdrawn. One had been refused by the Committee, and eleven, including that one, had been inquired into locally. Four of them had been read a third time in both Houses without further inquiry, and one-fifth of them had passed the stage in which an inquiry was impossible. A second inquiry was possible in five other cases, but there was no probability of any further action being taken. Therefore it practically came to this, that, out of the whole twenty-six cases disposed of, there had only been one appeal. That surely contrasted favourably with what would have happened under the old system, where in every case there would have been an appeal to the second House. They had not lost sight of the fact that appealing was a very grave matter, for they particularly put in, with the assent of the House, a clause as to costs, which was very much more stringent than anything which had so far obtained in Parliamentary practice. Hon. Members were perfectly well aware that, according to the rules of the House, costs could not be given against an opponent, unless he had been somewhat vexatious. The clause they had put in was one which would be a safeguard against appeals being taken upon frivolous pretexts. That was the whole matter. He agreed entirely that it was a matter for the House and not for the Government, and he hoped the House would pause before it decided in the way it had been asked to decide by the hon. Member for the Border Burghs. He believed that if the decision of the House was in accordance with what the hon. Member for the Border Burghs asked, the result would be what the House wished to avoid; namely, these discussions would come on at the time of private business in order to see whether a Bill had been sent upstairs or not. After all, a member of the public would only enjoy something analogous to the old right he had, which was the right to appeal to the second House when he was dissatisfied with the decision of the lower tribunal.

*MR. EUGENE WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross) said that as one of the Committee there was one point which had not been brought before the notice of the House, and that was that the petitioner who objected to the proceedings here now had no locus standi before the Committee, but the matter was considered fully by the Committee who gave him a locus standi. The case was fully and ably argued by counsel, so that the Committee had the whole circumstances of the case before them in dealing with it. He thought it was right to bring that fact to the notice of the House. He could well understand that if the petitioner had not been heard he would have had a right to come to Parliament and ask, in justice, that his case should be gone into. The hon. Member for Elgin and Nairn had so fully stated the facts that it was not necessary that he (Mr. Wason) should state more than that the Committee were absolutely unanimous, and, as had been well pointed out, no fresh facts had been brought forward which were not before the Committee that had already adjudicated on the matter. He thought also the House ought to be reminded of the sea of litigation in which the Arizona Copper Company had been concerned. The case in dispute went back to 1884. He did not suppose that many of the parties to the dispute were alive at the present time. It would be a case of going against the trustees and executors of deceased people, and the Committee thought it would be unfair and unjust, after this long lapse of time, that the proceedings should be gone into again.

There was a special point which had been mentioned by the hon. Member opposite that he would like to emphasise, and that was this; the petitioner told them that he was a shareholder from 1882, and had continued so without any break-down to the present time, and that he had attended all the meetings of the company. He was present at the meeting at which this very agreement was read, of which he now complained, and from that day down to the present time he had never lifted his finger in the matter. The company had got some advantage under the agreement then entered into in respect to the deferred shares, and it would be wrong that any person should have the right to approbate and reprobate the agreement entered into. A memorandum had been sent round the Members of this House which was an extraordinarily misleading document from first to last. There was no better-known principle of law than that it was the interest of the State to put an end to strife and litigation. This litigation had continued too long, and now that the company was in smooth water he hoped the House would not lightly reopen the matter. It had been thoroughly gone into by a special Committee, and unless good cause was shown the House should not grant the petition.

*SIR HENRY FOWLER (Wolverhampton, E.) said he thought a great reform was effected in connection with private Bill business when the Private Bill Procedure (Scotland) Act was passed, and he should like to see the same principle applied not only to Ireland but to England. But if the doctrine of the Lord Advocate was accepted he thought a fatal blow would be struck at the working of this system of devolution. The right hon. Gentleman's argument was that wherever a party who had appeared before a Committee was dissatisfied he was entitled as a matter of course to come to this House and get an appeal to another tribunal. The facts were simply these. A joint Committee of both Houses had unanimously decided upon the facts and merits of this case. Supposing that

were done in connection with an ordinary Bill, would the House entertain a proposal on the facts of this case for recommitting the Bill to another tribunal composed of Members of this and the other House? It was not an appeal from an inferior to a superior authority that was asked. It was an appeal to the same authority; to another Joint Committee composed of different men. What they did in 1899 was to maintain the practical supremacy of Parliament, and they provided that in a case where it could be shown that an injustice had been done Parliament should have power to direct recommital. It was not, however, to be a matter of right for a petitioner to have another Joint Committee of both Houses appointed to try the case again because the decision had not been satisfactory to him. He did not consider that was contemplated, but the practical effect of what was proposed would be to upset this most beneficial mode of procedure, which, as the Lord Advocate had shown, had worked most satisfactorily in all the Scotch cases which had come before the Committee. He was glad the right hon. Gentleman had stated in unmistakable terms that this was an open question to be decided by the House, and that it was not to have any element of party in it. In the interest of the successful working of this mode of procedure they should adhere to the decision the Committee had already come to.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): My right hon. friend the Lord Advocate has quite properly stated that this was a question for the House to determine, and what are the principles upon which the House ought to determine it? We are all agreed, as I understand, that in so far as it is possible there should be devolution of this private Bill legislation to the locality. We are also all agreed that in the last resort this House must keep its grip upon the private Bill legislation, whether it be for Scotland or for Ireland or other parts of the United Kingdom. I believe we are agreed upon a third point, namely, that the system ought to be worked so as to give as little trouble to this House as possible. One of the things we chiefly want to avoid is these debates at the time of private Bill business, which waste a great deal of very valuable time, and do not always show the House of Commons at its best. How is that end to be attained? I confess the question is not easy of solution. The right hon. Gentleman who has just sat down and others who have spoken seem to think that it is perfectly clear that the best way of avoiding debates in this House is to say that there should be a good *prima facie* case made out in favour of the appellant, and that there can only be an appeal when cause is shown. I am not sure that that is the way to avoid debates in this House. If we take the opposite view, and say that unless there is a very strong case against appeal the appellant should go forward, it would probably avoid debate, or, at all events, there is a good deal to be said for the view that it would avoid debate, because under the Act there is a heavy penalty imposed upon a person who makes a frivolous appeal. I do not believe that the number of those appeals would be great. I really think that unless there is a very strong *prima facie* case such an appellant would have every summary treatment from the Joint Committee, and if the Committee agreed, as they probably would, with the local Commission, the appellant would be mulcted in heavy costs. Although it

might throw a little more trouble upon the Joint Committee, it would probably relieve this House of a great many debates on the question whether or not sufficient cause had been shown for an appeal. I do not believe that it is possible, without further experience, to decide really which line of action would work best. I certainly do not think that the case is as clear as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Wolverhampton appears to think. We are all agreed as to what we want. We are all agreed as to the end to be achieved. We are largely agreed as to the machinery by which it should be attained, but the one point on which there is a difference of opinion must be decided by hon. Members, who have quite as much means at their disposal for coming to that decision as the Government can have. Personally, I shall vote with my right hon. friend the Lord Advocate, but I admit that the case is one of great difficulty, which should be left to the House itself to decide.

*MR. BLAKE (Longford, S.) said the main moving cause for the passing of the Private Bill Procedure (Scotland) Act was to procure cheapness and finality in dealing with these measures. The demand from Scotland was based on the ground of the expense and protraction of the proceedings under the former system. There was also another object which Parliament tried to meet, and that was devolution. The proposal of the Bill originally was that the trial should take place before an extra-Parliamentary panel, so that members of this House might be relieved from their labours as members of Private Bill Committees. That was embodied in the Bill when it went to the Committee to which it was referred, but the members of this House were disinclined to part with their power of adjudicating through Parliamentary Committees; and although, as the Lord Advocate had said, the Act contained the useful power of filling up the tribunal from an extra-Parliamentary panel, yet the wish of both Houses was that the tribunal should be a Parliamentary one. The result was that instead of relieving Members their burden was increased, for they had to go to Scotland instead of the parties coming to Westminster. The gains were the cheapness of one single trial before a Joint Committee sitting on the spot over two trials by two Committees sitting at Westminster. He had heard suggestions made with reference to appeals from the Committee outside and the Committee below to the Committee above, but he did not understand this language. The Committee in this case was a Committee such as they had had some experience of in late years in reference to peculiarly complicated and difficult Bills, in which the sense of both Houses of Parliament was that they were best disposed of by the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses. And in such a Committee, so constituted, he thought a higher degree of representation and efficiency was likely to be attained than would be in the ordinary Private Bill Committee. Not a lower but a higher degree of representation was attained, and knowing something of the principle of action and the care which was taken with reference to the formation of Private Bill Committees by the Committee of Selection, he would say that the Committee, anxious always to get the best Committee it could, exercised, and, he believed, rightly, peculiar care in the effort to make the panel up of the best possible material for the trial of those new Bills. He had no doubt the House of Lords did the

same thing, and, therefore, they had the best that could be done in the way of the formation of the tribunal. He wanted to know if, instead of this Joint Committee which had been formed under the operation of this Act, it had been formed by the resolution of both Houses of Parliament with reference to some special highly complicated question, they would have heard the suggestions, except for the gravest possible cause, not merely alleged, but established here, to set up a new Joint Committee? He held that the suggestions made from the Benches opposite were not merely opposed to the letter but also to the spirit of the Act of Parliament, and that they would be destructive in effect of what was the intention of the Act of Parliament. They had practically lost already in the course of the passage of the Bill so much of devolution as would have relieved the Members of this House from acting. They gained in recompense for that loss the fact that the Committee was of the same order and quality, chosen with the utmost care, to which they were accustomed to give reverential respect. There was no ground at all for the proposal which had been made. It would be destructive of the larger part of the advantages of this Act that, as a matter of course, there should be a new reference, because one of the parties to the trial simply was dissatisfied. The defeated party was always dissatisfied. Let him, to use the French proverb, have license to curse his judges, but no absolute right to appeal. Parliament decided to deal with this reform with especial regard to the question of economy. Large and important questions in which it might be supposed that the litigants on either side had a full purse, and in which great interests were to be determined, were left to the old and cumbersome machinery of Parliamentary Committees. This Act was a poor man's Act, in which economy was of great consequence; and he said deliberately that in those classes of cases there was great mischief done by appeals. Better occasionally have an erroneous decision than have an appeal in which lawyers get the oyster and litigants the shell. If there was indicated *prima facie* that so serious an injustice had been done as to justify that that evil of a new trial shall be admitted; for evil it was to have another trial; Parliament had power to interfere. He did not agree with the view of the Member for the Border Burghs that Parliament ought to interfere only in case of new facts. No. Occasion might arise; grave occasion; for interference in case of miscarriage of justice, or mistake of policy, on the facts before the Committee. He left Parliament as the Act left it, full power, but to be exercised only for grave cause shown. He was quite sure that ought to be the general impression, unless the House was seduced by the argument of the Leader of the House and of the Lord Advocate with reference to the saving of its time. It was suggested that they must do this thing in order to avoid debate. That contention was abandoned now. It was acknowledged there might be debate, and the question was upon what the issue was to be. Was it on a simple allegation that A or B was dissatisfied and wanted a new trial? Did they suppose it was only the disappointed litigant they could dissatisfy? They would dissatisfy the successful one by the course proposed. If they told him they were going to allow the case to be tried all over again, he would come here and say the unanimous verdict of the Committee was publicly attacked, and he would ask leave to defend

the verdict, and enquire whether they were going, because A or B said he was dissatisfied, to put him to the expense and trouble to come to London and have another trial before both Houses of Parliament. Of course, they would have debate in support and in opposition to the motion. Let not this House inflict by such a suggestion as was now made a great and permanent evil. Let it not destroy to a large extent the efficiency and usefulness of this Private Legislation Act, even if by adopting that course they would save a little time and trouble. They would not in faith save time or trouble.

But anyway their first duty was to be just. It was to relieve the people in a distant part of one of these islands from an intolerable injustice that they passed this Bill; and let them not now on a ground that was fallacious destroy that relief and renew and aggravate the injustice.

SIR WALTER THORBURN (Peebles and Selkirk) said there had been no attempt to show fault on the part of the Committee, and therefore it was a great misfortune that the motion had been proposed. He believed the Committee was one of the most competent that could have been appointed to deal with the Bill. He could state from personal knowledge that the decisions of the Committee had given the greatest satisfaction to all parties. He was very glad that the Government had intimated that this was not a Government question, and that the House was left to decide. He felt perfectly sure that the common sense of the House would decide that this appeal should not be granted. He was not a shareholder in the company, and he had no interest in the matter beyond the proper working of the new Act. He felt sure that if the appeal was allowed it would have a most disastrous effect on the working of the Act, and would give rise to most unmitigated complaint throughout Scotland. Something had been said about the waste of time in the House through discussions on private Bills. He believed that, if the House emphatically rejected this appeal, in future appellants would think twice before they did likewise. He thought no better means could be adopted for stopping vexatious appeals than to record the verdict of the House against this appeal.

MR. RENSCHAW said he regarded the right of appeal as one of the most important features of the Act. He believed that a greater blow would be struck at the new private Bill procedure for Scotland by the House refusing to admit the appeal than by admitting it. Very likely the rehearing would be adverse to the appellant, and he could not imagine anything more useful to the future progress of private Bill legislation in Scotland than that the first application for a re-hearing should be granted. He must support the proposal that the Bill should be referred to another Committee, but he regretted that such an important question as that of devolution should have been raised in connection with the matter now before the House.

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.) said he would ask the House to pause before committing itself to a motion which would have the effect of absolutely destroying the Private Bill Procedure (Scotland) Act which was passed with so much care two years ago. Nothing would be more adverse to the working of the Act than that the decision of the Committee, which was come to after careful inquiry, should be overturned in this House, perhaps on a snatch division. The

hon. Member for Partick had given no reason whatever for the faith that was in him, and the Lord Advocate had brought forward the most extraordinary plea he had ever heard in this House, that the proceedings of a Committee of both Houses of Parliament could be overturned at the instance of a cantankerous and wealthy litigant. He believed that the granting of the appeal, instead of lessening confusion, would make "confusion worse confounded." He was bound to say that the Act had worked a great deal better than he expected. They were very careful in this House not to interfere with the proceedings of Committees upstairs, and he believed it was quite as much their duty to respect the action and authority of this Committee in Scotland.

*MR. STUART WORTLEY (Sheffield, Hallam) said he had great difficulty in making up his mind how to vote on the very important question before the House. He, as chairman of the Committee which sat on the Private Bill Procedure (Scotland) Bill, took a very strong view that where a tribunal consisting of Members of the two Houses of Parliament had sat locally, the House should not, without an extremely strong reason, interfere with the decision which had been arrived at. To act otherwise would not be putting the Joint Committee in a proper position. He was bound to say, from the evidence given to the Select Committee that that Bill was not the class of Bill which that Committee expected would invariably be sent to Scotland at all. Although the company might be domiciled in Scotland, the shareholders might be resident in England or Wales, or even abroad, and even the property of the company was situated in another country. The only possible doubt in his mind was whether an injustice might not be done to, for instance, the shareholders of the company, who owing to the proceedings taking place in Edinburgh might not have received the necessary notices. He was, however, inclined to stop the proceeding on the Bill at that stage.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.) said that what had occurred to-day had fully justified his action in calling attention to this Bill. The subject before the House was of more importance than many matters which engaged the attention of Parliament. His chief object in rising at all, after such an exhaustive discussion, was to explain the ground why, while agreeing thoroughly with hon. Members for Scotland, he was unable to vote with them. He was of opinion that Bills such as that before the House ought not to be decided locally at all. Bills dealing with the reconstruction of companies and Bills containing an omnibus clause of indemnity for actions which might have been breaches of the Company laws should not be referred to local tribunals. If the practice were to arise of sending such Bills to local tribunals to enable company promoters and directors to evade and defy the Companies Acts, the door would be open to all kinds of abuses. It was on that ground, namely the nature of the Bill, that he could not vote on the present motion. He might say that the discussion fully justified those Members of the Irish party who viewed with considerable doubt the proposal to extend the Scottish system of private Bill legislation to Ireland. When he ventured to call attention to the matter the other day, he was jumped upon by the Lord Advocate, and was accused in one sentence of being in blank ignorance of the provisions of the Act, and in the next of having taken an unduly active part in its

discussion. These were inconsistent charges, but neither of them was true. The Irish Members, of necessity, took great interest in the working of the Scotch Private Bill Procedure Act, because they were promised or threatened with a similar system in their own country. The speech of the Lord Advocate, in which he expressed his bitter disappointment at the working of the Act, was a considerable justification for the action of the Irish Members in hesitating before going blindly for the extension of the system to Ireland. Whatever difficulties were experienced in working the system in Scotland, those difficulties would be increased tenfold in Ireland, and the discussion which had taken place had fully justified the attitude of the Irish Members.

MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY said that, while the debate had not altered his own opinion, still, the opinion of the House was so obviously on one side that he would ask his hon. friend to withdraw his motion.

MR. PARKER SMITH said that in view of the opinion of the House, he asked leave to withdraw his motion. ["No, No."]

Question put and negatived.

Bill to be considered to-morrow.

CROMER WATER BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

HUMBER COMMERCIAL RAILWAY AND DOCK BILL.

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

LONDON AND INDIA DOCKS (NEW WORKS) BILL.

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

SOUTHAMPTON AND WINCHESTER GREAT WESTERN JUNCTION RAILWAY BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC SUPPLY BILL.

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

LEEDS CORPORATION (GENERAL POWERS) BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

DERBY CORPORATION BILL.

Ordered, That the Minutes of Evidence taken on the Derby Corporation (Extension of Borough, etc.) Bill, 1877, be referred to the Committee on the Derby Corporation Bill of this session.;(Mr. Caldwell.)

ARDROSSAN GAS AND WATER ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

[UNDER THE PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.]

Read the third time, and passed.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

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

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

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

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

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

Table.

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

WINSFORD URBAN DISTRICT (GAS TRANSFER, ETC.) BILL.

GREAT WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

SWANSEA HARBOUR BILL.

STALYBRIDGE, HYDE, MOSSLEY, AND DUKINFIELD TRAMWAYS AND ELECTRICITY BOARD BILL.

ASPATRIA, SILLOTH, AND DISTRICT WATER BILL [Lords].

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

NITRATE RAILWAYS COMPANY BILL [Lords].

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

OTLEY GAS BILL [Lords].

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

Bill to be read the third time.

SHREWSBURY GAS BILL [Lords].

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

LONDON (CITY) SCHOOL FOR ORPHANS OF FREEMEN BILL [Lords].

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

Bill to be read the third time.

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD (CANADA DOCK WORKS, ETC) BILL [Lords]

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

Bill to be read the third time.

MERSEY DOCKS AND HARBOUR BOARD BILL [Lords].

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

MILFORD DOCKS BILL [Lords].

Reported, with an Amendment; Report to lie upon the Table.

COWES FERRY BILL [Lords].

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

SUTTON-IN-ASHFIELD URBAN DISTRICT (WATER) BILL [Lords].

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

NEW SWINDON GAS BILL [Lords].

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE AND GATES-HEAD GAS BILL [Lords].

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

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS, FINCHLEY AND HENDON TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].

The Lords request that this House will be pleased to give leave to Mr. James

Bigwood, a Member of this House, to

attend in order to his being examined as a witness before the Select Committee

appointed by their Lordships in the present session of Parliament on the

Finchley and Hendon Tramways Bill [Lords].

Lords' message considered.

And Mr. James Bigwood, in his place, having consented, leave given.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to, Colwyn Bay and Colwyn Urban District Gas Bill; Bury Corporation Tramways Bill; Midland Railway Bill, with Amendments.

That they have agreed to Amendments to Alfreton Gas Bill [Lords]; Omagh Gas Bill [Lords], without Amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to authorise the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the borough of Bolton to construct additional tramways and to make street improvements, and to confer upon them further powers with respect to streets, buildings, sewers and drains, and the health, local government, and improvement of the borough; to borrow additional moneys; and for other purposes." Bolton Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the limits of supply of the Wisbech Waterworks Company, and to confer further powers upon that company." Wisbech Water Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses of the city of Bristol to enlarge their Greenbank Cemetery; and for other purposes." Bristol Corporation Cemetery Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to dissolve the Harpenden Gas Light and Coke Company, Limited, and to incorporate and confer powers upon the Harpenden District Gas Company; and for other purposes." Harpenden District Gas Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Corporation of Barrow-in-Furness to make additional waterworks, to make certain street works, and to make better provision for the health, local government, and improvement of the borough; and for other purposes."

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act for incorporating and conferring powers upon the Manchester and Liverpool Electric Express Railway Company."

Manchester and Liverpool Electric Express Railway Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Corporation of Dover to make certain new streets; to lay down a tramway; and to confer further powers on the Corporation in regard to the health, local government, and improvement of the borough; and for other purposes."

Dover Corporation Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to empower the Heywood and Middleton Water Board to construct additional waterworks, to repeal and amend enactments relating to the water undertaking of the Board; and for other purposes."

Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [Lords].

BOLTON CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

WISBECH WATER BILL [Lords].

BRISTOL CORPORATION CEMETERY BILL [Lords].

HARPENDEN DISTRICT GAS BILL [Lords].

BARROW-IN-FURNESS CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

MANCHESTER AND LIVERPOOL ELECTRIC EXPRESS RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

DOVER CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

HEYWOOD AND MIDDLETON WATER BOARD BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

NAVAL WORKS PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL

Ordered, That the Admiralty be at liberty to attend by Counsel and Agent before the Committee on the Naval Works Provisional Order Bill.:(Mr. Pretymen.)

PETITIONS.

BEER BILL.

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

EDUCATION BILL

Petition from Coseley, against; to lie upon the Table.

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

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

HOSPITALS (EXEMPTION FROM RATES) BILL.

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

LANDS VALUATION (SCOTLAND) ACT. (1854) AMENDMENT BILL.

Petition from Scotland, against; to lie upon the Table.

LICENSING ACTS AMENDMENT (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

LIQUOR TRAFFIC LOCAL VETO (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kirkcaldy, against; to lie upon the Table.

POOR LAW OFFICERS' SUPERANNUATION (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petition from Kirkcaldy, against; to lie upon the Table.

ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

Petition from Montrose, against establishment; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Bradford; and Nuneaton; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL AND SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions against, from Stroud; Bradford (Yorks.); Crewe; and Manchester and Salford; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Arbroath; Weymouth (two); Sleaford; Wall Heath; Elham; Liverpool; Boro' Green; Blackheath (two); Attleborough; Jarrow-on-Tyne; Hebburn; East Islington; and Horslydown; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Kilninver and Kilmelford; and Killin; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

Petition from Braemar, in favour; to lie upon the Table

TIED HOUSES ABOLITION BILL.

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

TROUT FISHING ANNUAL CLOSE TIME (SCOTLAND) BILL.

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

WORKMEN'S HOUSES TENURE BILL

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

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EAST INDIA (PROGRESS AND CONDITION).

Paper [presented 12th June] to be printed. [No. 207.]

POLLING DISTRICTS (COUNTY OF WARWICK).

Copy presented, of Order made by the County Council of the County of Warwick on the 7th May, 1901, altering certain Polling Districts in the County [by Act]; to lie upon the Table.

UNIVERSITIES OF OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE ACT, 1877 (CAMBRIDGE).

Copy presented, of Statutes made by the Governing Body of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, on 31st January, 1901, and sealed on 21st February, 1901, amending Statutes IV., IX., X., XIII., and XVII. of the Statutes of the College [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 208.]

DOGS REGULATION (IRELAND) ACT, 1865.

Account presented, of the Receipts and Expenditure under the Act for the year 1900 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 209.]

FINES, ETC. (IRELAND).

Copy presented, of Abstract of Accounts of Fines accounted for by the Registrar of Petty Sessions Clerks for 1899 [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 210.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2626 and 2627 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

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

Medway Conservancy.; Copy of Statement of Receipts and Expenditure of the Conservators for the year ending 25th March, 1901 [by Act].

PUBLIC PETITIONS COMMITTEE.

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

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Ordered, That a Message be sent to the Lords to request that their Lordships will be pleased to give leave to the Clerk of the Parliaments to attend to be examined as a witness before the Committee of Public Accounts.; (Sir Arthur Hayter.)

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR; THE PRESENT POSITION.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether an early opportunity will be given to the House of obtaining full information as to the condition of affairs in South Africa.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I think the question of the right hon. Gentleman is a natural and proper one, but I am not aware that there is any information at our disposal which, in its general outline at all events, the public are not already acquainted with. Of course, all political reconstruction must wait until further progress has been made in military affairs, and as regards military affairs the House knows that the war is no longer a contest between organised military bodies. [Cries of "Oh!"] I do not want to give a controversial tone to my answer, and I will say between large organised bodies. The Boer forces are scattered over the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal Colony and in Cape Colony in small commandos, for the most part of about 100 or 200 men. The largest I have heard of amounts to about 600 men. The

majority are of the kind I have indicated. Their total forces are estimated at about 17,000. The operations on which Lord Kitchener is engaged, of course, cannot have any kind of unity such as is given to operations against large organised forces. I do not know that there is any further information with regard to the war which I have to give to the right hon. Gentleman. I ought, perhaps, to add that there is no foundation for the rumours which I see are appearing in the public press as to peace negotiations.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): May I ask whether, in view of the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that the total organised Boer force is 17,000, and having regard to the fact that there are a quarter of a million British troops in South Africa, he will ask Lord Kitchener to settle the war?

[No answer was given.]

BOER PRISONERS; CONDITIONS OF REPATRIATION.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, on the restoration of the Boer prisoners to the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, he will recognise all the rights of property of each prisoner as the same existed at the period of his capture so far as the same are capable of being ascertained; whether it is proposed to leave it open to each prisoner to choose the locality in which he is to settle, or whether any restriction is to be placed upon the areas open for re-population by the Boers on their return from captivity, and whether it is proposed to exact the oath of allegiance to His Majesty from each prisoner before repatriating him.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The question is premature. I am not prepared at present to make any statement regarding the conditions on which the Boer prisoners will be allowed to return.

MR. BLACK: Will the right hon. Gentleman submit his proposals in this respect to the House for discussion?

[No answer was returned.]

SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVES.

MR. ALFRED PEASE (Yorkshire, Cleveland): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he will inform the House as to the arrangements that have been made, if any, for the relief of natives in the Transvaal and Orange River districts whose cattle and grain have been seized or destroyed, or who have been otherwise rendered destitute, in connection with the military operations against the Boers in those districts, and whether he will institute such inquiries and give such directions as may serve to materially lessen the privations to which the natives are exposed through disturbances for which they are in no way responsible.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have not received any information pointing to the necessity of special arrangements at the present time for the relief of natives, but I called the attention of Lord Milner to the possibility of scarcity some months ago, and I will make further inquiry of Lord Kitchener. Meanwhile, I notice

that a large proportion of the population in the refugee camps are coloured persons.

BOER PRISONERS; INTERNMENT IN INDIA.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether his attention has been directed to the statements in the official gazetteers of India respecting the positions and sanitary conditions of the town and fort of Ahmednagar, now being used as a Boer prison; whether he is aware that Major Gambier, R.E., reported in 1873, after the drainage operations, that all who lived in the fort, both Europeans and natives, suffered from fever; and that, in consequence, all troops were withdrawn from inside the fort and quartered in barracks built outside it; and seeing that the mortality of Ahmednagar town was 79·75 in 1899, 55·04 in 1896, and 61·63 in 1897, and that the mortality of children under one year of age was 524·89 in 1899, against an average in that year of 196·97 for the whole Bombay Province, whether he will consider the advisability of the removal of the Boer prisoners to some other station.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Baling): There is no intention of removing the Boer prisoners from Ahmednagar cantonment, which is one of the healthiest and most popular garrison stations in India. Major Gambier's report is twenty-seven years old, and was made before the sanitary improvements were effected which have since made the fort salubrious. The mortality statistics quoted are misleading, and include urban areas outside the town. During the famine of 1899 there was a heavy mortality amongst the distressed people who flocked into the town from the drought-affected districts.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will the noble Lord be kind enough to say in what way the figures are misleading?

*LORD G. HAMILTON: The figures for the year 1898, which are the lowest in the four years in question, are omitted. Then the figures apply to exceptional famine conditions, and, as I have said, include urban areas outside the town.

FARM BURNING.

MR. DILLON (Mayo, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has any official information to the effect that General Rundle, during his recent march through the north-western portion of the Orange Free State, blew up all the mills in the district, destroyed ovens, ploughs, and other implements for the preparation of food stuffs; and if so, whether such proceedings have the sanction of the Government as being in accordance with the customs recognised by The Hague Convention of civilised war.

The following Questions also appeared on the Paper::

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether he has received any report from General Rundle on his expedition in the triangle between Ficksburg, Bethlehem, and Witjies Hoel, and as to the blowing up of the mills in the district, and the destruction of the ovens, ploughs, and other implements for the preparation of foodstuff's; and if not, whether he will inquire of Lord Kitchener concerning these matters.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.E.): To ask the Secretary of State for War whether a despatch or other communication respecting the operations of the troops under the command of General Rundle, General Campbell, and Colonel Harley during the past few weeks has been received; can he state what number of Boers were killed or

wounded, and what is the proportion of wounded to killed; and whether the mills in the district were blown up, and ovens, ploughs, and other implements broken; and, if so, is this destruction of fixed and movable property which is of no military value in accord with the usages of warfare recognised by The Hague Convention.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): In reply to this and similar questions put by the hon. Members for Northampton and North Cork, no

official Report has been received as to the facts alleged. They would involve no breach of The Hague Convention, which expressly allows the destruction and seizure of an enemy's property if imperatively demanded by the necessities of war.

MR. FLYNN: Does that regulation apply to fixed property, such as mills, and places of that kind?

*MR. BRODRICK: Anything which is likely to enable the enemy to obtain supplies in order to carry on the war comes under The Hague Convention.

MR. DILLON: Will the right hon. Gentleman hold that the poisoning of wells comes under the same rule?

MR. LABOUCHERE: What about the natives in the places which have been destroyed?

*MR. BRODRICK: I cannot say what the procedure is, but Lord Kitchener has done all he can to see that the natives are duly protected and kept from starvation. It is absolutely impossible in a war continuing in the way which this war is to avoid the destruction of supplies that would be useful to the enemy.

REFUGEE CAMPS;MORTALITY AT JOHANNESBURG.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that in the prison camp on the racecourse at Johannesburg the deaths during the three weeks ending 13th May, 1901, were 80 out of a total of 3,125 in the camp, and that 220 are reported sick in the camp, chiefly suffering from measles; can he state what medical provision there is for treatment of sick in this camp, and whether any arrangements are in force for the isolation of those suffering from infectious diseases.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): May I, at the same time, ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to the fact that for the three weeks ending the 13th May there were 80 deaths out of a total of 3,125 persons in the

refugee camp on the racecourse at Johannesburg, equal to a rate of 435 per thousand for a year, and whether instructions will be given to improve the sanitary condition of the camp.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask if there has been any epidemic in British camps, and whether there is any precedent in history for the housing and feeding of the women and children of an enemy.

MR. DILLON: These are not men. These are women and children.

*MR. BRODRICK: It is impossible, of course, to avoid epidemics of this character in camps where there are refugees, or, in some cases, where there are British soldiers. I had already telegraphed to Lord Kitchener to report as to the accuracy of the figures quoted in the question, and have not yet received any

reply. I have no recent information to hand as to the medical provisions for this camp, but the instructions general to all camps would appear to sufficiently secure proper medical treatment.

HORSE TRANSPORT; STATISTICS.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE (Camberwell, Dulwich): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state how many horses used for military purposes were shipped from South Africa between 1st January and 1st June this year, how many horses were landed in South Africa between the same dates, and what is the estimated cost per horse for conveyance each way between South Africa and England; and whether the Government would consider the possibility of chargers belonging to officers returning home being retained in South Africa for the use of officers proceeding from England to fill their places.

*MR. BRODRICK: 120 horses, which were officers' chargers, were brought back from South Africa during the five months referred to. These included the horses of deceased officers, whose relatives wished to retain them. 33,483 horses were landed in South Africa in the same period. The cost of conveyance from England of remounts by freight or in

horse transports averages from £;20 to £;25. Officers' chargers are generally sent in infantry transports, and no extra cost is incurred for their conveyance. Chargers which are the property of the Remount Department are retained in South Africa. With those which are the private property of officers it is, of course, impossible to interfere.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE: Is it not possible that the officers' chargers coming back from South Africa, some of which are not worth the cost of carriage, might be bought out there even as "cats' meat," and the cost of carriage saved?

*MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir. My hon. friend will, I think, understand that 120 horses coming back in the course of five months, at an average of from £;20 to £;25, including a number of chargers of deceased officers, is not an amount which will make a great difference either way. It is entirely a question for an officer, who has a charger on which he sets store, whether he leaves it in South Africa or brings it home.

SIR J. BLUNDELL MAPLE: Does 120 represent the total number of horses sent back?

*MR. BRODRICK: Yes; 120 only have been brought back altogether. Officers' chargers belonging to the Government are retained in South Africa.

SUPPRESSION OF NEWSPAPERS IN THE PAARL DISTRICT.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War will he explain on what grounds Major Commandant C. Wedgwood has issued a martial law notice in the Paarl district declaring contraband in that district the following publications (among others); namely, the South African News, Truth, Reynolds's Newspaper, the Review of Reviews, the Weekly Freeman, and the book entitled "With the Boer Forces," by Howard Hillegas, and that anyone found in possession of any of them will be punished under martial law.

*MR. BRODRICK: No report on the subject has reached the War Office. Martial law has been in force in the Paarl district since January, and the action taken is a matter for the discretion of the local military authorities, the exercise of which His Majesty's Government consider highly desirable.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Are they not all papers which object to the policy of the Government in South Africa?

[No answer was returned.]

RAIDING BY NATIVES UNDER BRITISH. MILITARY AUTHORITY.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been drawn to a statement of Mr. Brunner, Eshowe member of the Natal Legislative Assembly, that steps have been taken, with the cognisance of the highest military authorities in that country, to let loose the natives upon the enemy, and allowing them to loot and plunder; that the natives of Zululand had been instructed by the military officers to arm and invade the Vryheid district; that numbers of cattle had been brought in and handed over to a British military officer, and the Zulus were allowed 10 per cent. of all plunder; and that the Premier of Natal had protested to the military authorities that he believed that the military officer had greatly exceeded his instructions, and whether he has now received any reports on these matters.

MR. BRODRICK: Since the reply which I gave to the right hon. Member for South Aberdeen, and the debate in this House on the 23rd May, to which I must refer the hon. Member, I have received information that the civil authorities were now satisfied with the arrangements which had been made, and that the causes of disquiet on the Zulu frontier were removed.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: But were not protests made?

*MR. BRODRICK: I challenge some of the statements made in the question. They were all dealt with in my reply to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for South Aberdeen.

* See preceding Volume, pages 952, 1022, and 1032.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.): Has the correspondence which was promised to for brought home yet been received?

*MR. BRODRICK: Not yet. Any question as to that should be addressed to the Colonial Secretary.

TREATMENT OF MILITARY DESERTERS.

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that two men charged with desertion from the 18th Hussars were marched through the public streets handcuffed together on Tuesday morning, 11th of June, in charge of a corporal and a private, and that these alleged deserters had been handed over by the police authorities at Marlborough Street Police Court for the purpose of being tried by the military authorities at Canterbury; and, seeing that these two alleged deserters, assumed to be innocent in the eyes of the law, were followed through the streets by a mob, whether he will, in the public interest, take steps that in future men charged with desertion should not be so treated by the military authorities.

*MR. BRODRICK: The facts are as stated in the question, except that nothing is known at the War Office as to the mob. The procedure is contrary to the King's Regulations, and attention has been called to the error.

MR. GALLOWAY: Could not the War Office set apart a certain sum of money to enable the men to be conveyed in cabs?

*MR. BRODRICK: I have said that what was done was contrary to the King's

Regulations.

VOLUNTEER SERVICE COMPANIES.

MR. HAMMOND (Carlow): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, in view of the fact that, notwithstanding the War Office cable of 21st December last, a number of members of the original Volunteer service companies who have served for over a year in South Africa, and who have been doing duty as mounted infantry for the last six months, are still detained in the country, and seeing that these men are employed on precisely the same duties as members of the Imperial Yeomanry, can he explain why they do not receive the same rate of pay as the yeomen.

MR. BRODRICK: Lord Kitchener informs me that members of the Volunteer service companies employed as mounted infantry have been released. All men employed with the Line regiments must be paid as the Line.

VOLUNTEERS AND RIFLE PRACTICE.

COLONEL SADLER (Middlesbrough): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the desirability of supplying Volunteers with gratuitous ammunition to encourage private shooting practice.

MR. BRODRICK: Artillery and engineer corps are supplied with twenty rounds per man and are not required to fire a compulsory course of musketry. Infantry corps are supplied with ninety rounds, out of which a recruit is obliged to fire forty-nine rounds and a trained Volunteer forty-two, leaving the remainder for private practices, etc. An additional ten rounds may be purchased at £;4 per 1,000, and any further supply at £;5 per 1,000. The question of whether any further supply is necessary is being considered.

RANK OF RETIRED COLONELS.

MR. KIMBER (Wandsworth): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he would consider the advisability of granting to all colonels who have been employed in that rank, and who are compulsorily retired for age, a step of honorary rank.

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir. That system was abandoned some years ago, and it would be inadvisable to give the rank of general to officers who have not been so employed.

PEMBROKE BARRACKS.

MR. PHILIPPS (Pembrokeshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that it is proposed to convey the drainage from the new barracks at Pembroke Dock into Milford Haven at a point where there are valuable oyster fisheries; and whether he is aware that the Local Government Board prevented the Pembroke Urban authority from conveying their sewage to this point owing to the probable danger of typhoid; and whether he will cause inquiries to be made with a view to the drains being diverted to another point.

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member has been misinformed. The drainage system of the new barracks will be connected with the approved town drainage system now being carried out.

H.M.S. "CRESSY."

COLONEL LUCAS (Suffolk, Lowestoft): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he will lay upon the Table of the House, directly he receives it, the report

of the court of inquiry which is sitting to investigate the breakdown of the steering-gear of H.M.S. "Cressy," by which her departure to the China station will be delayed for some weeks.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): It is not the practice of the Admiralty to publish the proceedings of courts of inquiry, which are considered confidential. No satisfactory explanation of the accident to the steering gear of H.M.S. "Cressy" has yet been obtained. When the cause of the accident has been ascertained, I shall be happy to answer a further question on the subject.

CHINA-DISTURBANCE AT TIENTSIN BETWEEN INDIAN AND FRENCH TROOPS.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he can give the House any information relative to the disturbance between the French troops and native Indian soldiers, at Tientsin, on Wednesday, 5th June.

LORD G. HAMILTON: Sir Alfred Gaselee has informed me that the report of the disturbance referred to is without any foundation.

EUROPEAN GARRISON IN CHINA.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is in a position to state what will be the strength and the disposition of the German troops which will remain in China for the purpose of safeguarding German interests.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): We are informed that the military representatives of the allied Powers consider it necessary to maintain for the present in North China a total force of 6,000 men, exclusive of the Legation Guards at Peking, but we have no information as to the number of men to be furnished by each Power.

GERMAN GARRISON AT SHANGHAI.

MR. GRETTON (Derbyshire, S.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Shanghai is officially described by His Majesty's Government as within the area of the Tientsin Provinces, and if he can state the reasons which have been put forward by the German Government to justify the maintenance of a German military garrison in that city.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: We have received no statement from the German Government bearing upon the retention of a German garrison there. Shanghai is in the province of Kiang-su, one of the provinces bordering on the Yang-tsze.

MR. JOSEPH WALTON (Yorkshire, W.R., Barnsley): May I ask the noble Lord whether under the Anglo-German Agreement Germany is not acknowledged to possess the same rights and privileges in the Yang-tsze region as were claimed by Great Britain?

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I must ask for notice of the question.

KIAO CHAOW

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if the Government have sent, or intend to send, British troops to Kiao Chaow to assist in maintaining order there.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: No, Sir.

STATUS OF THE BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.

MR. H. D. GREENE (Shrewsbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether, in view of the answer given by him on the 3rd of August, 1899, he can now state whether, having regard to the importance of His Majesty's Indian Empire, and to the fact that certain bishops of the Church of England in the colonies have recently adopted and assumed the style of Archbishop, His Majesty's Government will take steps by amending the statutes affecting the Church of England in the East Indies, or otherwise legally, to confer on the Bishop of Calcutta as statutory Metropolitan Bishop in India the style and precedence of an Archbishop.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: I am well aware of the nature of the position of the Bishop of Calcutta as Metropolitan of India, and the suggestion contained in the hon. Member's question is not new to me. But there are so many important considerations involved that I cannot in advance give any definite pledge.

NEW INDIAN FRONTIER PROVINCE.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he will lay Papers upon the Table of the House relating to the formation and future administration and financial arrangements of the new Indian Frontier Province; whether he can arrange for these Papers to include a map showing the exact boundaries of the Province; and whether the Papers can be laid upon the Table before the discussion on the Indian Budget takes place this present session.

*LORD G. HAMILTON: I will present further Papers to Parliament, and I will also arrange to include a map showing as far as possible the boundaries. But I cannot fix the date for presentation, since I have not yet received a reply to my despatch dated

December 20, 1900, and when I do receive it the details will require careful consideration by myself in Council.

JUBALAND EXPEDITION.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state the total cost of the Jubaland Expedition, and how much, if any, of that cost was borne by India.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The accounts have not yet been made up, but a sum of £140,000 was voted in the Supplementary Estimates for the last financial year to meet the expenditure, which will be defrayed entirely from Imperial funds.

BRITISH INVESTMENTS ABROAD.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Kirkdale Division of Liverpool, I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether his attention has been called to a statement made by Sir Robert Giffen at the Institute of Bankers, in which he placed the value of our excess of imports over exports last year, less freight and other charges, at £90,000,000, as representing the interest which we were entitled to receive upon our capital invested abroad; whether this £90,000,000, derived from investments abroad, paid income tax to the extent of the £4,500,000 which would have been collected if the £90,000,000 had been derived from investments in this country.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): The amount of income derived from investments abroad that is charged with income tax cannot be precisely stated. There is, however, good ground for supposing that it is not

less than £90,000,000, and that it paid income tax to the extent stated in the question.

CONSTANTINOPLE RIOTS OF 1896; BRITISH MERCHANTS' CLAIMS.

MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that the claims of French subjects in Constantinople who suffered losses during the disturbances of August, 1896, have been paid in full by the Porte; and can he state the reasons for the delay in satisfying the British merchants who sustained losses on that occasion, and whose demands have been admitted by His Majesty's Ambassador to be fair and reasonable, a certificate to that effect having been given four years ago.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Government have received no confirmation of the statement, which has appeared in the press, that the French claims have been paid in full by the Porte. The Porte has always refused to admit any liability for the claims of any of the sufferers, of whatever nationality, and all arrangements for satisfying them have been of an unofficial nature. His Majesty's Government have reason to believe that British claimants will not receive less favourable treatment than those of other nationalities.

GOVERNMENT CARGOES FOR MOMBASA; CHARTER OF VESSELS.

COLONEL DENNY (Kilmarnock Burghs): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state how many vessels have been chartered by the Crown Agents for the Colonies during the last twelve months for shipment of Government cargo to Mombasa, with dates of fixtures and rates of freight thereon.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: There have been thirteen sailings since the beginning of 1900, and one more is contracted for. The rate of freight has varied from £;1 1s. 3d. to £;1 17s. 6d. The average has been £;1 8s.

WELSH COLONY IN PATAGONIA.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether a report of the Rev. D. Richards, chaplain of H.M.S. "Flora," on the condition of Welshmen in Patagonia, has been received in his Department; and, if so, whether he can state the nature of it, and if it will be laid before Parliament.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The report has been received through His Majesty's Minister at Buenos Aires, and is under consideration.

EXPLOSIVES IN COAL MINES.

CAPTAIN BAGOT (Westmoreland, Kendal): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department will he explain why certain explosives which passed the special test, after July, 1900, for admission to the permitted list have not yet been authorised for use in dangerous coal mines according to Section 6, Coal Mines Regulation Act of 1896; and when he proposes to issue the Order in Council authorising the use of such explosives under the said section; and whether he is aware that loss has been suffered by explosive manufacturers owing to the delay in issuing the Order in Council, such loss being due to the cost of explosive plant, the product of which cannot be put on the market.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I regret

very much that the issue of a new Explosives Order has been unavoidably delayed in settling the details of definition of the explosives which were to be added to the Special List. I have now signed a new order, and the explosives to which I understand my hon. and gallant friend to refer are included. I am causing all mine-owners to be informed by circular that these explosives may now be lawfully used in dangerous mines.

NORTH WALES MINES INSPECTORS.

MR. MOSS (Derbyshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if any person, and, if so, who has been appointed inspector under Section 15 of the Metalliferous Mines Act, 1872, and Section 2, Subsection (2), of the Quarries Act, 1894, for the North Wales district, lately in charge of Dr. Foster; and, in the event of an appointment having been made, whether the gentleman appointed has a knowledge of the Welsh language.

*MR. RITCHIE: In consequence of Dr. Foster's retirement, I have decided to rearrange the work and the districts of the Mines Inspectors. Dr. Foster's district will be distributed amongst other Inspectors, and I have assigned the general charge of the North Wales portion of it to Mr. Hall, one of the oldest and most experienced inspectors, who has for many years had under his charge the coal mines in North Wales. The ordinary work of inspection will be carried on by Dr. Foster's assistants, Mr. Williams and Mr. Jones, who both speak Welsh as their mother tongue. They will be relieved of work in the south eastern counties which has hitherto lain upon them, and will be able to give more time than formerly to inspection in North Wales.

WELSH-SPEAKING MINES INSPECTOR.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS (Glamorganshire, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he has in consideration or in contemplation a proposal for the division of the South Wales Coal Mines District (No. 13) into two parts for inspection by two of His Majesty's Inspectors of Mines; and, if so, whether he will appoint as the new inspector a gentleman who has a knowledge of the Welsh language, so that he may, if necessary, hold direct communication with Welsh-speaking miners.

*MR. RITCHIE: Yes, Sir. I propose to divide the South Wales District into two. As I said just now in answer to the hon. Member for East Denbighshire, I am making some re-arrangements of the Mines Inspectors' districts. I found that the work of the South Wales district has recently grown enormously, and is now too heavy a charge for any one chief inspector. One division of it will be retained by the existing inspector for South Wales. The other will be taken by another inspector set free by re-arrangements elsewhere. I do not propose to make any new appointment, but there will continue to be in South Wales, as at present, four Welsh-speaking assistant inspectors.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: Are the new appointments to be Welsh inspectors, or are they to be transferred from England?

*MR. RITCHIE: If the hon. Gentleman implies by that that we ought to appoint a Welsh-speaking chief inspector, I have to inform him that, unfortunately, there are none of the chief inspectors who can speak Welsh; but, as the hon. Gentleman knows, the assistant inspectors

are men who come in closer contact with the miners than the chief inspectors, and those all speak Welsh. I can only say that Welsh Members may take it from me that, whenever the opportunity arises, I shall be only too glad to take care that Welsh-speaking sub-inspectors are appointed when appointments are made in Welsh-speaking districts.

MR. SAMUEL EVANS: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he will take into consideration the possibility of appointing as chief inspector one of the assistant inspectors who does know Welsh?

*MR. RITCHIE: If there was any vacancy I should be glad to take the matter into consideration, but the hon. Gentleman will understand there is not really any vacancy for a chief inspector at all. I am sure the hon. Gentleman will not desire that a district should be taken charge of by an assistant inspector instead of a chief inspector. I shall be glad to take into consideration any recommendation of the hon. Gentleman, and I will take care when new appointments are made in Welsh-speaking districts, if it is at all possible to meet the desire of the hon. Gentleman, to have a Welsh-speaking inspector in Welsh-speaking districts.

AN HON. MEMBER asked whether in North Wales, where a vacancy had occurred, the right hon. Gentleman would appoint a Welsh chief inspector to take the place of Dr. Foster, who had resigned.

*MR. RITCHIE: No; a vacancy has not occurred, simply because, as I informed the hon. Gentleman, we are making re-arrangements in Wales. We are going to divide up Dr. Foster's district, and to allot it to two of the existing inspectors, and there are none of those inspectors who can speak Welsh. I cannot appoint an unnecessary inspector in order to get an inspector who can speak Welsh.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896;FREE ADVANCES.

LIEUT.-COLONEL PRYCE JONES (Montgomery Boroughs): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he can state how much of the £;250,000 voted by Parliament under the Light Railways Act, 1896, for free advances remains still available for that purpose, and also how much of the £;750,000 voted for loans under the same Act remains.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The Treasury have conditionally agreed to special advances under Section 5 of the Light Railways Act amounting to £;197,250, of which £;181,750 is by way of free grant and £;15,500 by way of loan. There remains therefore a sum of £;52,750 available for special advances under that section. No loans have been granted under Section 4 of the Act, and the whole of the sum of £;750,000 referred to by my hon. friend remains unappropriated.

LIGHT RAILWAYS AND CYCLE RATES.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will be prepared in the Committee stage of the Light Railways Bill to introduce clauses making it compulsory upon the promoters of light railway schemes to make provision for the conveyance of bicycles; and whether he will also propose a maximum schedule of charges.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: No, Sir, I am not prepared to introduce clauses placing upon the promoters of light railway schemes obligations not imposed upon railway

companies generally. Any alteration of the law on this subject should, in my opinion, be of general application. I may say that the Board have, with the consent of the promoters, inserted in some Light Railway Orders a maximum scale of charges for the carriage of bicycles.

MR. LOUGH: But if the Board of Trade thought it right to insert in some of the Light Railway Orders a provision with regard to the carrying of cycles, would the right hon. Gentleman not agree that that should be imposed on all companies?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That is a matter of opinion.

IMPORT OF IRON ORE INTO SOUTH WALES.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade if he can state the quantity of iron ore imported last year into South Wales ports; whether he is aware that the steel works of Glamorganshire and Monmouthshire are entirely dependent for their supplies upon ore imported from Spain and Algeria, and that the percentage of iron in the ore imported from Bilbao shows a continuous falling off owing to the best quality ore becoming exhausted; and whether the Government has received any notification from the Spanish Government that it intends placing a duty on exported ore beyond that required to meet shipping and dock expenses, with a view to conserve its mineral wealth, which is being rapidly worked out and cannot be replaced.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The quantity of iron ore imported last year into South Wales ports was 1,036,586 tons. There are no official statistics respecting the countries of origin of the iron ore used in steel works in Glamorgan and Monmouthshire, or the percentage of iron in the ore imported from Bilbao. No notification has been received from the Spanish Government of the nature referred to in the last paragraph of the question.

BOARD OF EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGICAL WORK.

MR. BOND (Nottingham, E.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the Board of Education have received the Report of the Committee appointed to consider the best means for co-ordinating the technological work of the Board with that at present carried on by other educational organisations, and whether and at what date such Report will be printed and published.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The Report has been received, but it is not proposed to publish it.

ESSENDINE ROAD BOARD SCHOOL.

*LORD HUGH CECIL (Greenwich): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether the attention of the Board of Education has been drawn to opposition by managers of local voluntary schools and by the Religious Education Union to the extension of the board school in Essendine Road; whether he can state how many children resident in Willesden there are in London board schools in the district bounded by the boundary of Willesden, by Maida Vale, the Grand Junction Canal and Kensal Green Cemetery (which is substantially identical with the School Board sub-divisions Y and Z, Marylebone; and AC 2, Chelsea); whether there is any prospect of the Willesden School Board making increased provision of school places, and whether the Board of Education will withhold its sanction to the proposed extension in Essendine

Road.

SIR J. GORST: The answer to the first paragraph is in the affirmative. To the second paragraph the answer is in the negative. Such information can only be obtained from the London School Board. The answer to the third paragraph is in the affirmative so far as the Willesden School Board is concerned, which is now building. The question as to whether the sanction of the Board of Education will be given or not is now under consideration.

RATE AID FOR VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.

MR. GEORGE WHITE (Norfolk, N.W.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether his attention has been called to a round table conference, held under the presidency of the Bishop of London, at which a resolution was moved in favour of rate aid to voluntary schools, when his Lordship, in reply, said they had been for some time elaborating their plans in regard to the education question, and were in communication with the Government; and whether such communications have been received by his Department; and, if so, whether he is prepared to lay them upon the Table of this House.

SIR J. GORST: I have not heard of any such communication having been received by the Board of Trade.

EVENING SCHOOL CODE.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he can state when the Evening School Code for 1901 will be issued.

SIR J. GORST: The regulations for giving grants to evening schools are now under consideration. It is hoped to issue them shortly.

BREAKING UP OF THE LONDON STREETS.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he has observed the inconvenience and loss of time and money to which the people of London are subjected by the way in which the numerous authorities in the same area resort to the consecutive taking up of the most frequented streets; can he state how many London authorities have this privilege for gas and electric lighting, telephonic and telegraphic communication, paving, drainage, water supply for domestic use and hydraulic power, and other purposes: and will he consider the possibility of bringing all these bodies and companies under one licensing head, which shall have control of the taking up of the streets.

MR. RITCHIE: I am unable to give figures in answer to my hon. and gallant friend, but the number of bodies, both local authorities and trading companies, who have obtained from Parliament powers of breaking up the streets is large, and I agree that very considerable inconvenience often results from the exercise of these powers. Recently, of course, the evil has been aggravated by the operations on behalf of the Post Office in connection with telephones, which are, I hope, drawing to a conclusion. I should be very glad if any remedy could be found; but so far I am afraid that I have not seen any proposal that would be practicable and meet the case.

ALIENS IN LONDON.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he can state when

he expects to be in a position to state the results of the recent Census as regards the alien population of London, and more particularly in Whitechapel, Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, Poplar, Stepney, and St. George's-in-the-East.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): As I stated in reply to a question by my hon. friend on the 10th May last, particulars as to the number of aliens will be published in the detailed abstract of the Census Returns, required by Section 8 of the Act. The detailed abstract for London will be issued before that for the rest of the country. The preparation of the abstract is being proceeded with as rapidly as possible, but I understand from the Registrar General that a considerable time must necessarily elapse before it will be ready.

RAILWAY COMPANIES AND THE TELEGRAPH SERVICE.

MR. LONSDALE (Armagh, Mid): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state, having regard to the estimated value of work done by the Postal Telegraph Department for the public service in the year ending 31st March, 1900, at £70,746 11s. 6d., as stated in Appendix (1), 46th Report of the Postmaster General, what was the corresponding value of the services rendered for the same year and for the year ending 31st March, 1901, in respect of the work done without charge for the railway companies of the United Kingdom by the Department; and as there is a loss of revenue on the working of this Department, if he will take steps to have the relations of this Department towards these companies brought before the House, with a view to their revision.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The value of the services rendered by the Post Office to railway companies during the years ended 31st March, 1900 and 1901, in respect of the transmission of telegrams on the business of the companies, either free or at reduced rates, is estimated at £59,676 and £52,063 respectively. These services are not, however, on the same footing as the work done by the Post Office for public Departments, seeing that the free message privilege was given to the companies as part of the consideration paid for the acquisition of their telegraph rights. Some time ago the matter was brought under very careful review, and the Postmaster General does not at present see any sufficient reason for altering the existing arrangements.

TELEPHONE DELAYS BETWEEN NORTHAMPTON AND LONDON.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware of the delays caused to those wishing to use the telephone between Northampton and London; whether the official reports show that these delays are due to there being only one wire, and whether the Post Office can and will obviate them by providing an additional wire, or by other means.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: There appear to have been a few cases of delay recently in telephonic communication between London and Northampton, but in several of these cases the circuit has been temporarily interrupted by unavoidable faults

or occupied by traffic diverted from other interrupted lines. There is at present only one direct circuit, but there are alternative routes for London traffic via Coventry and Leicester. A second direct circuit is about to be completed, and it is hoped that, when this has been brought into use, the delay will be entirely obviated.

POSTAL ORDER BRANCH;WOMEN CLERKS.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he has received a petition from the women clerks of the postal order branch praying for an increase in the initial salary of their class, which salary was reduced from £;65 to £;55 per annum in 1897, and whether he can see his way to granting their request.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has received and duly considered the memorial referred to, and he has answered the memorialists that the circumstances do not admit of his complying with their wishes.

UNDERGROUND CABLE TO BIRMINGHAM.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St George's): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state whether the new underground electric cable from London to Birmingham has realised official expectations; also, how it compares in swift and effective action, distance for distance, with overhead wires, both as regards telephones and telegraphs, and have the Post Office department any information showing the nature of the results of working the cable wires as part of telegraph circuits 300 or 400 miles long, such as those to Dublin and Edinburgh.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is of opinion that the underground cable between London and Birmingham has realised the expectations of the department. It was not intended to be used as a telephone cable, the idea being that it would benefit the telephone service by setting free overhead telegraph routes, which would then be available for telephonic purposes. For long-distance telephonic communication it is important that aerial wires should be available. For ordinary telegraphic communication there is no diminution in the speed of working through the cable as compared with an overhead line, but for high-speed news circuits the cable at present involves the use of two wires as compared with one overhead wire. Combined with overhead wires the cable is being used for circuits extending to Belfast, Glasgow, and Edinburgh, which are each over 400 miles long. The cable has proved of the greatest utility in giving steadiness to the service, and in enabling the department to maintain that service during interruptions of the overhead lines by storms.

SOUTH PETHERTON POST OFFICE.

*MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware of a strong feeling at South Petherton, Somerset, against the removal of the post office there to another part of the parish, and whether he will take the opinion of the parish council of South Petherton as to this change.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN The removal of the South Petherton Post Office to its present site, which is central and convenient, was authorised after full

consideration of the circumstances, and the Postmaster General sees no reason for departing from the decision arrived at. Within the last few days a memorial' from a considerable number of the inhabitants has been received in favour of the retention of the office in the new position.

MALLAIG MAIL SERVICE.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, in view of the fact that the present experimental service for the conveyance of the Stornoway mails via Mallaig has been in force since the 1st of April, will he say for how long a period he intends to continue the service as an experiment, and will he give some assurance that, so soon as a definite service is determined on, tenders will be invited for the mail steamer service to and from Stornoway.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General is unable to say for how long a period it may be found desirable to continue the service between Mallaig and Stornoway as an experiment; nor can he give any assurance that tenders will ultimately be invited for the mail steamer service to and from Stornoway, and he sees no reason at present to suppose that such a course would result in a more economical arrangement than the present.

MR. WEIR: And is the experiment to continue until the mails go down to the bottom of the sea?

AVOCH HARBOUR, ROSS-SHIRE.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, seeing that the proprietor of Avoch Harbour, Ross-shire, returned home from Ceylon some time since, will he state whether the Fishery Board for Scotland has yet approached him with a view to secure the repair of the present harbour or the construction of a new one, and, if not, will he state what steps it is proposed to take to provide suitable harbour accommodation at Avoch.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): As I told the hon. Member on 1st April last, I can give neither determination nor admission as to who is the proprietor of Avoch Harbour. But the initiative in the renewal of negotiations on behalf of those locally interested must rest with them and not with the Fishery Board.

SHADER COVE, ROSS-SHIRE.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether the Congested Districts Board have received a petition from the fishermen of Shader, in the Point District of Lewis, Ross-shire, urging the removal of an overhanging rock which threatens to fall and render the bight or cove at Shader dangerous as a landing place, and will he say whether the Board can see their way to grant assistance in the matter.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The petition was before the Congested Districts Board on the 4th instant, and they have intimated a grant to the county council.

BRECHIN LABOUR DISPUTE; CASE OF JAMES BEAN.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate whether his attention has been called to the sentence passed by Sheriff Lee, in the Forfar Sheriff Court, upon James Bean, tailor, Brechin, who was found technically guilty of a breach of Section 7 of the Conspiracy and Protection of Property Act

for having jeered at some blacklegs, and was sentenced to thirty days imprisonment without the alternative of a fine, and whether, considering the length of this imprisonment for the alleged offence, he will cause the accused to be at once set at liberty.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Secretary for Scotland has made inquiry into the case in question. The offence for which sentence was passed was not merely technical, and the Secretary for Scotland sees no reason for advising any remission.

MR. KEIR HARDIE: But did not the Sheriff himself describe the offence as technical, and does not strong indignation prevail in the district in regard to the sentence?

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Sheriff would hardly have described as technical an offence for which he sent a man to prison.

KILLILAN DEER FOREST.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether he is aware that the farms of Faddoch and Killilan, in the Parish of Kintail, Ross-shire, formerly in the occupation of crofters, and recently occupied by a farmer, are to be cleared of sheep and cattle and added to the deer forest of Killilan; in view of the fact that 7,000 acres of this forest were scheduled by the Highlands and Islands Commission in 1892 as suitable for crofters' holdings or small farms, will he say whether the Government will consider the expediency of taking such steps as may be necessary to check the extension of deer forests, especially in cases like the present where part of the existing forest has already been reported as suitable for occupation by the people; and is he aware that the farm of Lienassie, in the same parish, and lately in the occupation of a farmer, is also to be cleared, and reserved for deer.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I find, after consultation with the chairman and secretary of the late Deer Forest Commission, that they have no information as to the clearing and afforesting either of Faddoch and Killilan, or of Lienassie. I am informed by them that no part of the forest of Killilan was scheduled yellow as suitable for new holdings by the Deer Forest Commission, but certain parts were scheduled brown as suitable for moderately sized farms above the limit of £;30 rent. I may also mention that none of the lands referred to by the hon. Member fall within the area declared congested by the Congested Districts Board.

SCOTTISH MEDICAL OFFICERS OF HEALTH.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, having regard to the fact that a medical officer of health is required to be the holder of a public health diploma, will he explain how it happens that of the 278 medical officers of health for Scotland only sixty-one possess the required diploma.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The great proportion of local medical officers of health in the various districts of the counties in which they are employed do not possess the qualification referred to by the hon. Member because it was unnecessary in the case of appointments made prior to the coming into force of

the Public Health Act of 1897, namely, 1st January, 1898. As regards burghs, the qualification has been imperative only in the case of appointments made subsequent to 15th May, 1894.

IRISH INVENTORS AND AMERICAN SPECIFICATIONS.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Irish inventors are unable to consult American patent specifications anywhere in Ireland, but are put to the expense and inconvenience of visiting London if they desire to consult American specifications, and that a free gift of all American patent specifications was offered to the trustees of the National Library in Dublin, but had to be declined on account of want of space and of insufficient staff; and, in view of the hardship and unequal conditions to which Irish inventors are thereby subjected, will suitable space be provided by the completion of the east wing of the National Library or otherwise.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I have already replied to an inquiry on the subject of the first paragraph. The question of providing suitable space in the east wing of the library will not be overlooked.

KENMARE RIVER;LIGHTS.

MR. BOLAND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Kenmare River, county Kerry, which forms an inlet about thirty miles in length, is unprovided with lights, and that the absence of such lights is detrimental to the interests of Sneem, Kenmare, and other places at which steamers and fishing vessels call, and, seeing that the erection of a light on the western point of Sherky Island, which is situated about half way up the bay, is required, would the Congested Districts Board, in view of the increased facilities that would be thereby given to trading vessels, consider the advisability of erecting such a light.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Congested Districts Board could not undertake the erection of a light such as proposed. This could only be done by the general or local lighthouse authority within the meaning of the Merchant Shipping Acts.

DUBLIN INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government intend to establish the industrial schools in Dublin on the same plan as prevails in Glasgow and Liverpool, where they are open to the public.

MR. WYNDHAM: Legislation would be necessary for this purpose, and I am unable to give any undertaking on the subject this session. But it is one that deserves and shall receive attention in connection with the general question of industrial schools, upon which I spoke somewhat fully in the course of the discussion raised on the 7th May by the hon. Member for South Kilkenny. †
FERMANAGH ROYAL SCHOOL ENDOWMENTS.

MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the † See Debates [Fourth Series], Vol. xciii., page 1015.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether students attending St. Macarten's Seminary, Monaghan, from districts outside the counties of Fermanagh and Monaghan are

allowed to derive any benefit, either in the shape of reduced fees or prizes, from the Fermanagh Royal School Endowment; and whether he has any official information to the effect that a student named Keenan, from county Tyrone, has been admitted at £;12 10s., half the usual fee; if so, will he cause an inquiry to be made in this matter.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that the scheme of May, 1891, contains no restriction as to the selection of students attending a qualified school, within the meaning of the scheme, to whom the Fermanagh Roman Catholic Board may provide prizes out of the endowments in the shape of reduced fees or prizes. I am also informed that the student named in the second paragraph has never received any benefit from the endowment such as suggested.

PRICES OF IRISH BUTTER.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the prices of butter furnished in the Irish statistics for 1900 have been obtained solely, as in former years, by inquiry at the eight markets named in the Report; whether he is aware that in recent years a large proportion of Irish butter has been made and disposed of through creameries at much higher prices than in the markets; and whether he will undertake in future Reports also to furnish the prices obtained through these creameries.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that the average prices for butter quoted in the publication referred to are based on creamery butter prices as well as on the prices of butter otherwise produced. The prices of creamery butter have also been separately published in a recent issue of the Journal of the Department of Agriculture.

OGILBY ESTATE, CO. TYRONE.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he can explain the delay in the Land Judge's Court in regard to the sale of the Ogilby estate, in county Tyrone, to the tenants; and, seeing that final notice of sale was served on the tenants prior to 1882, that a similar notice was served in 1891, that an application was made by the tenants in 1899 to have the case listed under Section 40 of the Act of 1896, and that the turbary claims on the part of a section of the tenantry have been withdrawn, whether there are any reasons why the sale should not be carried through at once.

MR. WYNDHAM: No delay, so far as the Land Judge's Court is concerned, has occurred in reference to the sale of this estate. Prior to the passing of the Act of 1896 the parties having the carriage of the sale appear to have been undecided whether to proceed to a sale or not; on two occasions a final notice to tenants was issued, but no further steps were taken to bring the estate to a sale. The estate first appeared in the Land Judge's list in March, 1899. No sale can take place under the 40th Section till the rental is settled. The estate consists of a large number of holdings, and the rental cannot be settled until all the disputes between the tenants in respect of boundaries, turbary, and other rights are disposed of. It is expected that the last batch of objections will come on for argument next week. After the decision has been given in these cases the estate will probably be in a position to be sold.

KILLCLOONY PROPERTY.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland if he is aware that the Treasury, or some other department of the Government, is now in practical possession of the Killcloony property, which at one time belonged to a philanthropic company, who acquired it with the object of dividing up some grass farms it contained and selling them to the tenants so as to increase their holdings; and if the Government will, when selling this property, strive to fulfil the original object.

MR. WYNDHAM: There is not, as I have already informed the hon. and gallant Member, any power under the existing law to act in the manner which he suggests.

JUDGE CURRAN AND THE TULLA-MORE JURYMAN.

MR. REDDY (King's County, Birr): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will recommend the remission of the fine of £;10 imposed by Judge Curran at the last Tullamore Quarter Sessions upon the foreman of a jury in a case of alleged larceny, seeing that the county court judge upon the occasion referred to discharged the jury without allowing them to bring in a verdict.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have already stated that no fine was imposed on any juror on the occasion referred to. Consequently, the question of a remission of a fine does not arise.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): Will the right hon. Gentleman produce the official record of the case? I was in court at the time.

[No answer was given.]

R.I.C.; ACTION OF SERGEANT O'REILLY.

MR. REDDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state by whose authority Sergeant O'Reilly, of Shannon Harbour, King's County, went to the house of Michael Dolan, Lisclooney, no person being there but his wife and son, a boy under fourteen years of age, and took the boy, against the protests of his mother, into the stable to extract information from him, threatening at the same time to give him the prison unless his answers were satisfactory; although his mother stated that the boy was under age to take an oath.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): At the request of my right hon. friend I will reply to this question. The boy referred to in the question was a necessary witness in a case of arson, and his statement was taken in the usual way by Sergeant Reilly, on his own authority, in the ordinary discharge of

his duty. It is untrue that the sergeant made use of any threats, and equally untrue that the boy's mother protested, as alleged.

MR. REDDY: The boy came to my house with the summons, and;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MOYSTOWN ARSON CASE.

MR. REDDY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that a man named Peter Kerans, of Lisclooney, King's County, was arrested on a charge of alleged arson, and was subsequently admitted to bail

to appear before a special court held at Moystown on Thursday, 6th instant; whether he can state the reasons for holding this special court when the ordinary petty sessions were coming on in a few days; and whether informations were refused by the bench in this case.

MR. ATKINSON: Peter Kerans was arrested on the 30th May on a charge of arson; he was remanded for eight days, and subsequently admitted to bail to appear at Moystown House before a magistrate, in order that depositions might be taken. No special court was or could be held, and the charge being an indictable one, there is nothing to require that depositions should be taken at petty sessions. The next petty sessions will be held on the 25th inst. The informations were refused.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY AND THE UNITED IRISH LEAGUE.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland by whose authority did a member of the Royal Irish Constabulary at Camp, county Kerry, on Sunday, 19th May, while members were being enrolled in the local branch of the United Irish League, take the names of those who joined, and is he aware that this constable on being asked to desist refused to do so.

MR. WYNDHAM: The constable acted without authority. His sergeant ordered him to desist, and he did so.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say what the constable did with the names?

MR. WYNDHAM: No, Sir.

BRACKLINN NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHER'S PAY.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can explain why the teacher of Bracklinn national school, county Kerry, who taught Irish as an extra subject during the year ended 31st January, 1901, has not been paid for it; and whether the Commissioners will take into account, in fixing this teacher's salary, his classification, length and efficiency of service, size and importance of school, and previous teacher's income.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that this teacher has now been paid an equivalent results fee for the teaching of Irish during the period mentioned. In fixing his future income he will get the full benefit of the new rules. If it should be found that it would be inequitable to fix his future income on the average of his receipts from State sources for the past three years, the Commissioners will give the case special consideration.

IRISH GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS AND THE FAIR WAGES RESOLUTION.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received complaints from the Dublin Bookbinders Society as to the manner in which Messrs. Blackie and Company evade the terms of the Fair Wages Resolution in the carrying out of their contract for the Government; whether similar complaints have been received from the same society by the Commissioners of Education regarding this firm; and, if so, what steps have been taken by the Government; and will he, should these complaints be substantiated, insist on the Messrs. Blackie carrying out the conditions of the

Fair Wages Resolution in their contracts for the binding of the books for the Government.

MR. WYNDHAM: The question of the application of the Fair Wages Resolution to the dealings of the Commissioners with the firm mentioned is still the subject of correspondence with the Commissioners. I would ask the hon. Member to postpone the question for a fortnight.

PAUPER CHILDREN;SICK REGULATIONS.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that medical officers of Irish workhouses classify as sick not only those under treatment, but also children under two years of age and all assistants engaged in the work of the infirmary; is such method of classification permitted by the Local Government Board, and will inquiry be made as to the extent of the practice and orders given to classify as sick only those under medical treatment.

MR. WYNDHAM: Children under two years of age are not classed as sick unless they are under medical treatment. But, even if they were, I do not think the arrangement would be open to objection, as infants of this tender age in workhouses generally require much care. The employment of pauper assistants for nursing duties is illegal, and no healthy pauper engaged in menial duties is allowed to be classed otherwise than as healthy under the Board's regulations.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY;DISMISSAL OF MULLOUCH POLICE OFFICERS.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that Sergeant William Sheridan and Constable Mahony were discharged from the Royal Irish Constabulary on the 9th of February last without any reason being given for their discharge, and that Sergeant Sheridan applied for a statement of the charge against him, and for a sworn public inquiry into his case, and whether both these requests were refused; and will he state what were the grounds on which Sergeant Sheridan and Constable Mahony were discharged, and why was an inquiry refused.

MR. WYNDHAM: On the 14th March, in answer to a question by the hon. Member for West Clare,* I stated very fully the reasons which led to the discharge of these men from the constabulary. The discharge was ordered by the Lord Lieutenant in pursuance of the statutory power conferred upon him, and it is not proposed to reopen the case.

MR. DILLON: The answer of the 14th March does not answer the question I have put.

MR. WYNDHAM: The answer of the 14th March states that the men were discharged for having supported a charge with unsatisfactory and conflicting evidence, and their detention in the force was not considered further desirable. On that ground the Lord Lieutenant exercised the statutory power vested in him.

MR. DILLON: The right hon. Gentleman does not answer the question I have put. I have carefully read the answer for the 14th March. I will further ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he is aware that the opinion prevails in the country that these constables were dismissed for placing threatening notices in the pocket of a man under arrest, and whether, in view of the interest which has been aroused, he will grant a sworn inquiry into the matter.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is it not true that these policemen have been charged with having placed a threatening notice in the pocket of the man they arrested?

[No answer was returned.]

MR. DILLON: As I cannot get an answer, I shall repeat the question next week.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Yes, the refusal of the right hon. Gentleman to answer only makes it necessary for us to trouble him again. We mean to ascertain the facts.

J. C. JONES'S ESTATE, CO. CAVAN.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord

* See Debates, Fourth Series, Vol. xc, page 1578.

Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the estate of the late John C. Jones, in the county of Cavan, has been in the Landed Estates Court for sale during the past twelve years and has not been offered for sale during that time; and can he state what reasons, if any, exist why it has not been offered for purchase to the tenants in occupation under the provisions of the 40th section of the Land Act of 1896.

MR. WYNDHAM: The case of this estate came before the Land Judge on the 9th ultimo, when the solicitors having carriage of the sale represented that all parties were desirous of withdrawing the estate from sale. The case stands adjourned to enable the necessary formalities in this respect to be completed.

NAVAN MAIL DELAYS.

MR. PATRICK WHITE (Meath, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he will take steps to improve the postal regulations affecting the town of Navan, as under existing arrangements the mails do not arrive there till 10.40 a.m., and are not delivered in some parts of the town till after twelve o'clock, thus causing inconvenience to all classes of the community.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has directed that inquiry be made on the question of improving the postal service to Navan, and the result will be communicated to the hon. Member.

ARTERIAL DRAINAGE OF IRELAND.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government intend to provide funds to enable the arterial drainage of Ireland being effectively carried out at an early date.

MR. WYNDHAM: The question of arterial drainage is of importance, and a number of schemes for carrying it out have been brought to my notice. They will receive careful consideration, but I am not in a position to make any announcement on the subject.

IRISH EMIGRATION.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the total number of emigrants who left Irish ports last month was 8,565, as against 8,105 for the corresponding month of the previous year, and that 8,241 of these, or over 96 per cent., were bound for America; and, seeing that for the four months of the year now passed the total emigration from Ireland was 13,802, being an increase of 2,209 over the number for the same period in 1900, whether the Government intend to propose legislation calculated to keep the people in Ireland by making the occupiers the owners of the land,

and whether the Government will consider the necessity of reducing taxation in Ireland in ratio with the reduction of population.

MR. WYNDHAM: The percentage of emigrants from Irish ports to the United States in April was 90୵. The total number of emigrants in April and in the first four months of the present year was less for each period than in the corresponding periods of 1900. The decreases in May and the first five months of the present year are still more striking. I cannot discuss future legislation and taxation in reply to a question.

LAND PURCHASE IN COUNTY CORK.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that in May, 1900, a request was issued to the Irish Land Commission for the sale of the estate of F. C. Hawkes and others under the 40th section of the Land Act of 1896; that the Commission sent their valuer, who assessed 18½ years as the fair purchase value of the farms of John Cronin, Scart, Lower Aherla, county Cork, which the tenants were willing to give; that, when the case again came before the Land Commission for further consideration, it was represented that the purchase money, owing to the fall in the price of Government stock, was insufficient to redeem the superior interests, and that the head landlord would not accept less than twenty-seven years purchase of the

head rent; and, seeing that the Land Commission rejected the application for purchase, whether it is intended to introduce legislation under which, in circumstances such as these, the sale of the landlord's interests will be compulsorily ordered.

MR. WYNDHAM: It was shown to the satisfaction of the Land Judge that the sale of the holding at the price reported to him by the Land Commission would be insufficient to redeem the superior interests to which the holding was liable. The Land Judge cannot compulsorily redeem a superior interest without paying for it the full redemption price, which at the option of the owner of the superior interest may be fixed by arbitration. The reply to the last query is therefore in the negative.

MR. SHEEHAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman compensate the tenants for the time lost and money expended in connection with these abortive proceedings?

[No answer was given.]

IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

MR. DILLON: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he can now state the terms of reference to the Royal Commission on University Education in Ireland.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am afraid I cannot answer this question, but I am in great hopes that no long period will elapse before I make a full statement on the subject.

ROYAL DECLARATION AGAINST ROMAN CATHOLICISM.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if a copy of the Return of 23rd May, touching the declarations of the heads of the States of Germany, United States, France, and Austro-Hungary has been forwarded to Lord Salisbury and to our various embassies, and if some effort in

legislation will be made this session in order to assimilate the treatment of Roman Catholics under the Declaration to be made by the sovereign of this country

to that accorded to Roman Catholics by the Declaration made on the accession of new chiefs in the Protestant German Empire, and to that given to Protestants in Roman Catholic France and Austro-Hungary, even if it is impossible to adopt the equality of the United States.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It will not be possible, as legislation is arranged this session, to comply with the wish of the hon. Gentleman. The Committee, to which I have more than once referred, has now been appointed in another place.

COLONEL NOLAN: Will it have a chance of sitting and reporting in the next few months?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot imagine that the investigation of the Committee will be of a very long character.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): Can the right hon. Gentleman give the House the names of the Committee?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have been told them, but I have no note of them here. No doubt the information will be published to-morrow.

MILITARY LOANS BILL.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce a Military Loans Bill this session; and, if so, what will be the nature of its proposals, and will it be brought forward at a period sufficiently in advance of the close of the session to ensure it receiving adequate consideration and discussion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is our intention to bring in a Bill such as that to which the hon. Gentleman refers, but I cannot give any undertaking as to the date on which it is to be brought in.

WAR OFFICE REPORT.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can state when the War Office Vote will be taken, and whether an opportunity will be afforded for full discussion of this Vote, seeing the important changes recommended in the Report of the recent Committee.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot give any pledge such as the hon. Gentleman requires. I may remind him and the House that the Committee to which he refers was not a Committee appointed by this House, but a Committee appointed by my right hon. friend; and I venture to think that, until my right hon. friend has had an opportunity of considering the Report and how far it seems to him that its recommendations should be carried into effect, we ought not to have a discussion in this House.

COST OF ENGLISH AND SCOTCH POLICE.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he will give the Return respecting the cost of police in England and Scotland, notice for which stands on to-day's Paper.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I think the hon. Member will find the information he desires in the annual Report of Police, England and Wales (Parliamentary Paper

181, of 1900), Tables VI.B and VII., and in the Annual Report of H.M. Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland (C. 548 of 1901), Tables I. and II.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: May I ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can inform the House as to the course of business for next week.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The general business of next week will be the consideration of the Finance Bill in Committee. But it is extremely important in the interests of the Factory Bill that without any unnecessary delay it should be referred to a Grand Committee, and I hope the House will consent to give me that Bill at a relatively early period. I will put it down as the first Order on Monday, and I hope I may be allowed to get it by 7 o'clock.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.): When does the right hon. Gentleman propose to take Irish Supply? Will he put down the Vote for the Land Judges Court early?

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon): When is it intended to take the Loan Bill of the Chancellor of the Exchequer?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot say when the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Loan Bill will be taken, but it will not be taken during the discussion in Committee on the Budget. Neither can I say what days will be allocated to Irish Supply, but I have always been anxious to meet the convenience of hon. Members on both sides in determining what Estimates shall be put down, and I shall not depart from that rule.

Dr. FARQUHARSON (Aberdeenshire, W.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can say when he proposes to allocate another Friday evening to Scotch Supply.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: There must be another day for the discussion of the Scottish Estimates, but I cannot give an assurance when that day may most conveniently be fixed.

NAVAL WORKS AT GIBRALTAR.

[MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.]

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES (Lynn Regis): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether, in view of the dangers to which works on the western side of the Rock of Gibraltar are exposed, His Majesty's Government have, since 30th March last, suspended the prosecution of any of the works on that side of the rock sanctioned by the Naval Works Act, 1896; and, if so, will he state what are the works the prosecution whereof has been so suspended.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: In answer to my hon. friend, I have to say that, as regards the works which are in process of construction, I understand that neither he nor anybody else has desired that they should be suspended.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES dissented.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is what I understood. As regards the works which have not been commenced in situ, the First Lord of the Admiralty has done all that is possible, short of breaking contracts, to prevent progress with the works pending the final decision of the Government. I may say that the final Report of the Committee, of which at one time my hon. friend was a Member, was only received on 15th May, and that since 15th May the Commander-in-Chief and the Senior Admiral on the Mediterranean Station have had to be consulted. So that

there has been no long delay. The Government have nothing whatever to conceal from the House in this matter, and I hope that at an early date a full statement may be made on the subject to the House.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: But can my right hon. friend not give me an assurance that these works will be stopped?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Not as to the works in process of completion; but I have told my hon. friend that everything short of breaking contracts has been done with regard to the other works. I only ask my hon. friend to wait a few days until the Government are in a position to state to the House exactly how matters stand and the reasons which have induced them to adopt their policy.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Then I shall be obliged to ask leave to move the adjournment of the House. Perhaps I may ask my right hon. friend a question, the answer to which, I trust, will make it unnecessary for me to move the adjournment of the House. I think my right hon. friend has misapprehended me. The works referred to in my question were the works recommended for abandonment by the unanimous Report of the Committee on March 30th, whether they have been begun or not. No restriction was made at all in that Report. That being so, what I wish to ask is, Can my right hon. friend give me the assurance that all such works will be abandoned? That will content me for the moment. If not, can he say when the statement he has said he hopes to make will be made, and whether it will be made in such circumstances as would give me an opportunity of raising the whole question in this House? If so, I will not move the adjournment of the House.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): Cannot the whole matter be discussed on the Naval Works Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I am not sure whether it can.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: It cannot.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is a question of order on which I am not an authority, and I have not had an opportunity of making inquiries which would enable me to make even an unauthoritative statement upon the subject. As regards what has fallen from my hon. friend, I understand that as far as the works to which he refers go, they have been stopped as far as it is possible to stop them without breaking contracts. More than that cannot be done until the Government have given a decision upon the whole question. That decision will be come to, I believe, in a very few days, and then it will be the business of the Government to acquaint the House generally with the decision arrived at. My hon. friend goes on to ask when that statement will be made, and whether there will be an opportunity of discussing it. At all events, there will be the same opportunity which my hon. friend has to-night, but under much better circumstances.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: There may be a blocking motion.

MR. DILLON: You blocked the farm-burning in South Africa motion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not think that is a contingency that is very likely to arise, but I think probably I shall be able to give the House an opportunity. At any rate, my hon. friend will benefit, because no discussion this evening can be operative. The House must wait for the final decision of the Government, and until we have come to a decision the question must be left very much

where it is. Therefore I hope my hon. friend will take the answer I have given him, at all events provisionally. I understand the question can be discussed on the Naval Works Bill.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: My right hon. friend has given me no assurance whatever as to when he will make this statement, or as to whether I shall have an opportunity of discussing the whole matter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Does my hon. friend wish me to name the day and the hour? I have said it is under the consideration of the Government, and their decision will be given very shortly. Surely, that ought to satisfy my hon. friend.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will my right hon. friend undertake that I shall have an opportunity of discussing the matter? If I cannot get that undertaking I shall move the adjournment.

*MR. SPEAKER: I understand from what has been said that money for the works which the hon. Member wishes to be abandoned will have to be voted in the Naval Works Bill. In that case, of course, the hon. Member will have an opportunity of discussing it I only intervene because this point was referred to as raising a question of order.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I think that will not meet the case. I should have a right to discuss the application of that money, but I wish to have an opportunity of discussing the method in which this Committee and its Report have been handled. If my right hon. friend would give me an assurance that I shall have an opportunity of discussing the whole matter, I will abstain from moving the adjournment. [Opposition cries of "Move."] If not, I will ask the permission of the House.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): I beg to ask my right hon. friend whether I understood him correctly that, in the event of this matter being precluded by one of these motions known as "blocking notices," he would take care that a full and legitimate opportunity was afforded to the hon. Member as soon as possible.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is perfectly plain to the House, after what I have said, that the Government have no desire to conceal anything from the House in this matter. We mean to make a clean breast of it, and the House will, of course, have an opportunity of discussing it.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I have only one question to ask my right hon. friend. Will he undertake meantime to stop the works recommended for abandonment by the Committee on March 30th?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I cannot undertake to break contracts. I think my hon. friend must feel that in making any such demand upon me he is making a most unreasonable demand.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES then asked leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the conduct of His Majesty's Government in refusing to give any undertaking to suspend the prosecution of certain works on the western side of the Rock of Gibraltar which are exposed to serious dangers "; but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. SPEAKER called on those Members who supported the motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having

accordingly risen;

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Sir, I move that this House do now adjourn. I do so with great reluctance, and only because I have been refused anything like an assurance that an opportunity would be given for the discussion of this matter.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not so.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: That is my understanding of the statement the right hon. Gentleman has made. As I understand him, he has not given me any assurance that I shall have, on a definite occasion, some opportunity of discussing this subject. I may be mis-

taken, but that is my belief. I regret very much to have to discuss the subject of Gibraltar at all in this House, and I only do it because of the danger involved and the delay imported into it. I regret especially to have to discuss it on a motion like this, and only do it on account of the great urgency of the matter. No doubt it is inconvenient in every way to ask the House to adjourn. It is a false issue, and does not represent the real question at issue. But it is an occasion which, in the wisdom of the House, has been provided for precisely such cases as this, where matters are being prosecuted, which there is no other way of putting an end to. When I have finished; I shall be short, and shall only make those remarks which will enable the House to understand the position of the subject; I think the House will see that this is a legitimate occasion on which to raise this matter.

In two words, my case is this. His Majesty's Government are prosecuting, contrary to the unanimous Report of a Committee appointed by themselves, works which that Committee recommended on 30th March should be abandoned. There was no question in that Report whether the works were begun or not begun. They were all begun. There is no question of the breaking of contracts, because I shall show the House that the contracts contain a provision enabling the Government to abandon any part of the work. My belief is that the Government are not conscious of the danger involved in these works, or of the urgency of stopping them, not for want of information of the most serious and disquieting character, not from want of the Report of the Committee, but I fear for the want, which has distinguished them more than once, of understanding the full importance of the information they had in their possession. I must go over a short history to make the House understand the matter. The House will remember that in 1895 under the late Government, a proposal was made to build at Gibraltar certain moles for torpedo defence, and one dock, at a cost of a million and a half. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for North Galway and a late Member of the House, Captain Bethell, did at the time object, on the ground that since guns had obtained a range of 10,000 yards, such works would be exposed to fire from the land. I supported the scheme, but if I had known then, as I know now, that Sir Andrew Clarke had reported against any such scheme, and that Major-General Crease and Colonel Buckle had also reported against it, I should have hesitated. But I did not hesitate because I did not then know what I have learned since. All the import and the meaning of the thing was at the time hidden. In 1896–97 the great mistake was made. Mr. Goschen came down to the House and proposed a much more ambitious scheme than that proposed by his

predecessor. He proposed to increase the moles, and also to increase the number of docks from one to three, and to increase the expenditure from one and a half millions to four millions. I maintained then that was a misapplication of public money, and had I then known what I know now I should have exhausted every means at my disposal to defeat that scheme. But I did not know, and none of us knew what we know now. What we did not know was that such heavy guns could be used without forts, embrasures, or emplacements, and moved about, and that if they were fired with smokeless powder they could not be located. We have since learnt that in 1889 from the Boers.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE: Every fortress in the Mediterranean is so supplied.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Everybody did not know in 1896 that heavy guns, six-inch guns, could be moved about; had become mobile and invisible; but I think it is only reasonable to say that when this knowledge was acquired in 1899 that the Government should in 1900 have reconsidered the situation at Gibraltar by the light of these new facts, should have suspended these works, and not have waited for me to bring this matter to their attention. At that time only £1,000,000 had been spent upon these works; now £2,000,000 have been spent, and for the most part have been ill spent. In that remark I do not intend to include the moles, which I think are defensible. I am dealing now only with certain works which were recommended by the Com-

mittee of which I was a member to be abandoned, which were not abandoned, and which are being continued to this day. I became anxious about this matter last autumn. In November I wrote a letter to The Times. On 10th December I put a question in this House. At the same time I wrote privately to the First Lord of the Treasury. I also wrote to and saw the First Lord of the Admiralty, and appealed to him to inquire as to the dangers of the works on the western side, and as to the possibility of making a harbour on the eastern side, and to suspend the works then being carried on on the western side until those inquiries were made. That was the burden of my appeal then, and that is the burden of my appeal now, but the reply was always the same. My appeals for inquiry and suspension were rejected, and the works were continued. So impressed was I that I went out to Gibraltar in January last, and what I heard in Gibraltar and Spain impressed me still more, and I came back more than ever convinced of the danger of the works on the western side. Then once again I appealed to the Government to stop the works, and once again did they refuse, and then, and only then, did I come to this House and to the public. I wrote the pamphlet "Gibraltar a National Danger," in which I pointed out the danger involved on the western side; I alleged that the harbour and works on that side would be untenable against fire from the Spanish land, and that in order to secure them it would be necessary to occupy Spanish territory with a separate army. I pointed out that the alleged impossibility of making a harbour on the eastern side did not exist, and that it was possible and desirable to make it; but all I contended for was inquiry and suspension of the work on the western side. My motion upon the subject came on on the 25th of February, and the First Lord of the Treasury, with complimentary allusions to myself, to which I am little accustomed from that bench, accepted my motion, and asked me to join the

inquiry. The right hon. Gentleman accepted it to my great relief, because then as now I did not desire to discuss that subject in this House. I have throughout sought to avoid discussion in this House, and I withdrew my motion with the greatest possible pleasure. I doubted indeed whether I ought to join the Committee, but after the support which I had received from the House I thought it was my duty to return to Gibraltar and do what I could to assist in solving the problem, and the next day, therefore, I accepted the offer of the Government to serve on the Committee.

After I had joined that Committee something strange happened which made me fear that the Committee might prove abortive, and I might have to come back to this country after the inquiry was over with nothing done and no result to show, and under those circumstances I thought it proper to reserve my right to make, in such an event, the statement which I owed to this House. Now we have been told continually that this was no Committee. But it has always been called a Committee; it was called a Committee by the First Lord of the Admiralty when I was asked to join it; then it was said there was to be no reference, but there has been a reference. The First Lord of the Admiralty explained that he gave the Committee six questions to reply to; that amounted to a reference, and the reply to those six questions is in fact the Report of the Committee. I again went to Gibraltar, and the men with whom I was associated there were most distinguished men; they were Admiral Sir Harry Rawson, the Commander of the Channel Fleet, General Sir William Nicholson, and Mr. Mathews, of the firm of Coode and Mathews, a man most eminent in his profession, and whose firm has long had relations with the Government. It is not my decision which I am now going to present to the House, but the decision of those three experts based upon the information which we received at Gibraltar. For ten days we did most strenuous work. Although I felt the want of certain necessary documents for which I had applied, but which I have never received, yet what we heard out there and ascertained was enough. We found that, in the opinion of the highest military authorities, occupying most important positions which gave them a most direct right to speak with authority

beyond all other men on those points, every danger which I alleged was admitted, nay, asserted to exist. The only difference between the statements in my pamphlet and the views of these military experts was that they went a great deal further than I had ventured to go. They admitted that the western side was untenable from fire to which no reply could be made, and also that the only way of protecting these works on the western side of Gibraltar was by occupying Spanish territory by a large separate army of, as I judged, at least 30,000 or 40,000 men; the only difference between us was that they put the territory to be occupied at a larger area than I. What these authorities said was, indeed not new. It was already published by myself in my pamphlet. But they confirmed it with greater emphasis and more authority.

Strong things had been said of me by the Ministerial press. It was said I was a vain alarmist. It has been proved that I am nothing of the kind. It was said that I quarrelled with the Committee, but the evidence of one of that Committee was that he had seen few Committees where there was so little disagreement. We

came to a unanimous conclusion on the 30th of March; we replied to the six questions in unequivocal terms, and, in addition, Admiral Rawson sent home a personal private Report to the Admiralty, which was exactly the same in effect, but which was more amplified and contained more details. It would be obviously quite impossible to lay Sir Harry Rawson's Report upon the Table, but it is possible to lay the Report of the whole Committee embodied in the answers to the six questions asked of the Committee, and they ought to be, and sooner or later must be laid before the House. There is nothing in them which, in my opinion, could injure the public service. I shall not state what the exact character of the Report is; I have said that it was unanimous, and the House knows my views about Gibraltar, and they know the strenuous way in which I have held to that opinion, and they may judge what the character of that Report was when I say that I agreed not only to the recommendations, but to every word of that Report, and that

I adhere to that Report. I will give the answer to one question of that Report. We unanimously recommended that dock No. 2 on the western side should be abandoned, that one-third of the workshops on the same side should be abandoned, and that all the store houses there should be abandoned. I tell the House that because it is on that article of the Report that I found my motion. It is because that recommendation has not been carried out, in spite of all my representations, because, after a long official correspondence, I have been unable to get it carried out, and because I have come to the conclusion that the Government do not mean to abandon the works which were recommended to be abandoned, but are still continuing them, and are thus adding to the dangers already existing at Gibraltar, that I have felt forced to make my motion to-day. The House may be told that if these works are discontinued, as recommended by the Committee, only a small sum will be saved. Well, the sum that could be saved by abandoning the works has according to the official view persistently decreased ever since the first time I went away from England. At first it was estimated that £;900,000 would be saved; when I left Gibraltar it was put at £;500,000; and now it is said to be £;300,000. But £;300,000 is not a small sum, and, even if it were, it is not so much the sum that I wish to save as the extra risk that is incurred by continuing the works. Every stone that is added to those works, every sovereign paid for them, adds to the dangers which are being built up around Gibraltar. It may also be said, as has indeed been suggested already, that to stop these works would be to break the contract. The right hon. Gentleman cannot have read the contract. Clause 78 of the contract states that "the work will be carried out and paid for by measurement," and Article 50 declares that "if the Lords of the Admiralty shall at any time think fit to make any alterations in addition to, or to omit or abandon any part of the works, they shall be at liberty to do so"; and Article 83 provides that "should the work or any part of it be altered, extended, or diminished, or should any item of the work described and provided for in the schedule of prices be omitted, so that a greater or less quantity of any particular class of work, material, or labour be executed as required, the same rates shall apply, and such quantity or such work or class of work only as is actually executed or

supplied will be paid for at the rates of the schedule of prices, and the contractor shall not be entitled to any additional compensation on account of such alteration, extension, omission or diminution." It is perfectly plain that the Government felt, as prudent men would feel under such circumstances, that they might at some time require to abandon some part of the work, and that they retained the power to do so, and the contractor has expressly agreed that he should not be therefore entitled to compensation. Consequently the answer to the recommendations of the Committee that they would involve breach of contract falls completely to the ground. The Report of the Committee answered five out of the six questions. The sixth dealt only with figures which one of the Committee alone, the engineer, could answer, and since the Committee returned to London that question also has been answered by the engineer.

As I have said, on the 30th of March we arrived at a unanimous conclusion. Each one of the answers sent home from Gibraltar as our Report was complete, absolute, exhaustive, definite, and final, and, having reached that point, I was perfectly satisfied, and I returned convinced that the Government, with the absolutely unanimous report of such a Committee before it, would not hesitate to act immediately upon it. I understood that the whole matter dealt with by the Committee must necessarily come before the whole Cabinet, and I felt that the decision upon it must necessarily be the decision of the Government as a whole, and that to arrive at that decision would no doubt take time. The House can have no idea of the extreme gravity of the dangers involved. The Government have an idea, but the House has not; but I assure the House they are very grave indeed. I felt that the final decision of the Government must take time. But surely the essential thing was to act forthwith on the recommendation of the Committee by at once suspending the works they had recommended to be abandoned. To continue them is positively to anticipate, forestall, and coerce the Cabinet in their decision. It places upon the Cabinet the weight of a decided fact, and renders it more difficult; impossible, perhaps; for them to come to an unfettered decision. That is where the urgency arises. If I could have obtained an assurance that these particular works would be abandoned or were suspended, I would not have come before the House with this motion to-day. That is my case. But I ought to add a word. No question ever arose as to the adequacy or finality of the Report of 30th March until some time after the Committee had returned to London. On the return of the Committee to London the official members of the Committee communicated with their official friends and superiors, and came possibly under official influence. [Cries of "Oh, oh."] Well, perhaps it was not so, but at any rate the Committee returned to London, where they held two or three meetings to consider matters not immediately referred to in the questions put to them. What was my surprise, when, after some of their meetings had been held, I received a proposal to vary and rewrite the Report. It was proposed to me to withdraw some of the recommendations made in the unanimous Report of the 30th of March, to introduce other recommendations in their place, and, finally; most irrelevantly in my opinion; to justify the extension of the work made in 1896 and 1897, and the author of that extension, to which, as I believe, the major part of the dangers

at Gibraltar are to be attributed. That seemed to me to be a proposal which amounted to trifling with an important matter. It was an invitation to the Committee and to myself to stultify ourselves. It seemed to me a humiliating proposal, and I not only would not agree to it, but I would not entertain it for a moment, and I at once resigned my position on the Committee. I do not know what remains of the Committee now. [Laughter.] I left three. I trust the House will not make this a laughing matter. It may be that one or possibly two other members have left it. I do not know. That is why I made that remark. Now I heard the term "final Report" used. What is the final Report? If the final Report be some document drawn up by the three gentlemen; or a lesser number; no doubt much more distinguished and more capable than I am; who have remained on the Committee; ["No, no."]; I do not for a moment pretend to compete with them in the qualities required for the consideration of this matter, but they are not more competent than I am to decide whether a man ought to alter a Report after he has made it; I say that if it be that those gentlemen who remained on the Committee have made a Report which agrees with the Report they agreed with me in making at Gibraltar, well and good; there is nothing to be said. But if they have made a Report such as was suggested to me, varying and altering the previous Report, and thus making an entirely new Report of it, then it seems to me that such a document is of no value and can have no effect, being, as it is, a contradiction of the Report made by those very three gentlemen; if they be three; plus the fourth at Gibraltar. I do not know if I require any justification for the urgency and persistency with which I have brought this matter forward. I hope not. I may have mistaken the right hon. Gentleman the First Lord of the Treasury. He thinks he did give me a definite promise of an opportunity for discussion. I thought he did not. I can assure him and the House that if he gives me in the course of this discussion a promise that the Report will be carried out, I will at once withdraw my motion. I do not know whether the House understood the right hon. Gentleman to definitely promise a discussion. ["No."] I certainly did not, and I can assure the House that I have brought forward this proposal with great regret. It has pleased the Ministerial press to insinuate that my representations were exaggerated, but they have been more than confirmed by the Committee itself, and by important Reports of the highest possible authorities. Those Reports are in the possession of His Majesty's Government. It has been insinuated that I could not agree with the Members of the Committee but the House knows that up to the time the Report was made I agreed with them as well as any man could agree with his colleagues on a Committee. We were unanimous, and it is only since the proposal to vary the Report that I have come to a breach. It has pleased His Majesty's Government to treat this matter sometimes with pleasantry, and me with attempts at ridicule. I have been called a corsair, and I am proud of the name. A corsair is a privateer, and a privateer is a man who fights the public battles at his own cost and charges, and very often to his own great loss.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): A corsair is a pirate.

MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The Civil Lord of the Admiralty says that a corsair is a

pirate; he therein shows his competency to be anything but a Civil Lord of the Admiralty. Let me tell the hon. Gentleman that the difference between a corsair and a pirate is the same as that between a special policeman and a burglar; and if he does not understand that, let me commend him to the works on international law. I am not displeased at being called a corsair, or with the other allusions of a more or less humorous and disagreeable character which have been made to myself. What I do complain of is that this matter should be treated as trivial, and of no importance or urgency; that the one recommendation of the Committee which, if acted upon at all, required to be acted upon at once, has not been acted upon; and that up to this moment I have not been able to get any assurance that it will be. I ask for the communication to the House of the Report of the Committee. Again I say it could be perfectly well communicated; every word of it; without any public inconvenience whatever. If His Majesty's Government refuse to communicate that Report, they will compel the House, through lack of information, to acquiesce in the continuance of works in regard to which I am sure the House would not so acquiesce if they had the Report before them. That is the situation. If the Report were produced we should see whether the House would agree to continue the works. I am certain they would not. In the meantime it is not right, it is not respectful to the Committee, it is not fair to the Cabinet, which will have to decide this question, to continue works which are of so dangerous and serious a nature. I have other strange matters which. I might bring before the House in, connection with the conduct of this Committee, but I would rather not. This matter arose in Parliament; a motion was made in this House, and withdrawn on condition of this Committee being appointed. Parliament therefore has a right to information, and it seemed to me that it was my duty to give some account of my conduct, and of the progress of the work I had undertaken. I have given that account to-night so far as I have been forced, but I have not told all. I have told only what was absolutely necessary. I have given some part of the story to-night, not because I was indisposed to keep the whole of it locked in my own breast, but only because I have been more and more impressed with the urgency of the necessity of the Government stopping these works. I am not prepared to keep Gibraltar at the pleasure of any Power or Powers. I cannot acquiesce in a policy which involves that; I am not prepared to hold it under conditions which cause it to be not strong enough to protect itself without the aid of a separate army sent out from England. I am not prepared, therefore, to acquiesce in the continuance of works every brick of which helps the creation of that situation and increases the danger. Observe how the plot is thickening. Strange things are going on in Morocco, in regard to which Gibraltar is a most potent element, and may become the most important factor. Strange deficiencies and omissions, if we may believe the Pall Mall Gazette, that most subservient of Government organs; are occurring in connection with the Mediterranean Fleet, which also is a factor that cannot be left out of sight, nor Gibraltar in connection with it. Finally, strange things are happening on the Continent of Europe which, if this unhappy war should not soon come to an end, may give us cause to think of other things even than sending reinforcements to Lord Kitchener. A situation is

arising, or has arisen, which makes it very necessary to deal with this matter I am perfectly certain the Government mean well. But many a Government has meant well which has ruined an Empire. I am confident that the Government do not even now appreciate the great urgency of this matter or the imminence of the dangers to which Gibraltar is exposed. We are silently drifting into a position which may make it impossible to diminish these dangers and to afford an adequate remedy for them. The Government refuse information to the House;

MR. A. J. BALFOUR dissented.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Well, if the right hon. Gentleman will promise to communicate the Report of the Committee to the House, I will at once sit down. I know perfectly well the decision the House and the country would come to if they had that Report. I make this appeal to His Majesty's Government. I know a certain amount of anger has been aroused over this matter, but I repeat that it is only because, rightly or wrongly, I think I am left without any other opportunity, that I have taken this course. I beg the right hon. Gentleman to believe that. I appeal to His Majesty's Government to stop these particular specified works recommended for abandonment. It is not a question of those which are begun and those which are not begun. The Committee definitely recommended their; abandonment whether begun or not. In reality they are all begun, and were when the final contracts were made, I believe, in 1898, and the Committee drew no distinction. If my appeal to His Majesty's Government fails, I shall appeal to this House. If my appeal here fails, I shall appeal, so far as my humble capacities allow me, to the public at large. Of course, I shall be beaten to-night; I may fail here, I may fail outside; but at any rate I shall feel that I have done my duty, that I have done my best to stop the works, and to procure such remedy as could still be found for the danger which now may be ignored, but which I am perfectly certain in the future will be only too bitterly recognised.

I have thought it my duty to persevere with this matter up to now. I have never come to this House without previously exhausting every means in my power in the endeavour to procure the doing of that which I consider necessary. I did so before I made my motion in February. I have done so now. Now, as then, it is only because His Majesty's Government leave me without any hope of their doing the thing that I hold to be most urgently necessary that I appeal to the House. Whatever happens, I cannot leave this question. I shall feel it my duty to exhaust every means to stop these works which perpetuate and increase the vulnerability of Gibraltar, make it a temptation and a bait to the enemies of England, and transform it from a defence and a strength into a snare and a danger to the Empire. I beg to move. Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."; (Mr. Gibson Bowles.)

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The hon. Gentleman had told us, not once but many times, in the course of the speech which he has just delivered, that he rises with the greatest reluctance, that he speaks very much against the grain, and that nothing but the coercing sense of public duty has induced him to break silence at the present moment. Never did anyone do violence to his own inclination in a

worse cause than my hon. friend. ["Oh!"] I do not know whether most to regret the occasion on which he has thought fit to make the speech to which we have listened, or the substance of a great part of that speech. As regards the occasion, what has my hon. friend done? He knows that he has forced on this debate at a time when the Government have not, and could not have, had time to come to a final decision on this most important question. ["Why?"] He knows that there has been no undue delay in coming to that decision, and I have explained to the House the dates which amply prove that proposition. The final Report of this Committee was only given to the Admiralty on the 15th of last month. It had to be considered not only by the First Lord of the Admiralty, but by the Board of Admiralty, and by the military and naval heads of the services at Gibraltar and in the Mediter-

anean. I told my hon. friend and the House, in the plainest language, that that decision had not been come to, but that it was ripe, and that a very few hours or days would elapse before we should be in a position to tell the House exactly where we stood in this matter. But my hon. friend was bursting with his speech. He could not restrain himself even for the few days for which I asked him to wait. He must needs force this debate on us at a time most inconvenient to the House;["No."];for the discussion of this great problem;not inconvenient with regard to the business which we have to deal with this evening, important as that business is, but it is most inconvenient for the House to be asked to discuss a question of Imperial policy like this before the Government have or could have come to the decision which it will be their business to communicate to the House and on which the House will have to pronounce.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.): There have been five years.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not five years, or even weeks, since the Committee reported. I will not say that this is a misuse of the forms of the House; but it is a deplorable exercise of those forms for my hon. friend to have taken this step. Before leaving this part of the subject, let me point out that this question is not merely one of great military and naval importance. It is one which involves diplomatic considerations of the gravest delicacy. And when my hon. friend volunteers statements about invasions of friendly territory, and of what might happen in this or that event, I think it deplorable;nothing less than deplorable;that an hon. Member who is so well acquainted with the difficulties of the position should allow himself to start topics and to raise controversies of the kind which I have briefly indicated, and on which I shall not say another word. Of what does my hon. friend complain? He complains that in regard to certain works which he does not desire to see completed;[Opposition cries of "The Committee"];at all events, works which

he does not desire to see completed;that is not an inaccurate statement;the Government have not given a pledge that they shall be abandoned. That is perfectly true. We have not given any such pledge, and I do not mean to give any such pledge, or hint at any such pledge this afternoon. But what we have done is this. The works to which the Interim Report referred to by my hon. friend;

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: (Dundee): Interim Report?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will deal with that later. What we have done is that the

expenditure upon the works which the Interim Report said should be abandoned has been stopped, so far as it could possibly be stopped. An arrangement has been come to with the contractor by which he shall not spend a single further shilling upon them unless he is out of pocket by abstaining from doing so. More than that could not possibly be done without breaking the contract. "Why do not you break the contract?" is the answer of my hon. friend, and he quotes certain clauses from the contract indicating in his opinion that under them the works could be abandoned.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES was understood to say that the contract would still subsist as regarded the remainder of the works, which would be paid for at the same price, but the Government would have power to omit any portion.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not contest that statement at all, but what my hon. friend has not realised thoroughly is that to abandon those works; to break the contract so far as those works are concerned; before we have finally decided upon that policy, would be absolutely suicidal, because a great deal of money has already been spent upon them. It is perfectly true that the money has not been largely spent in situ, but immense sums have been spent in making the necessary preliminary arrangements, purchasing quarries, collecting plant, and so on, before the works could be undertaken. To break the contract as regards those works would simply mean that in order to save the £;300,000 which my hon. friend speaks of, a very much larger sum would have to be thrown into the sea; for a very much larger sum than £;300,000 has already been spent indirectly upon them. To sacrifice this sum in order to save £;300,000 may be perfectly right if the policy of abandoning these works is finally decided upon; but to do so before we have decided on abandonment is a course which no sane Government could possibly pursue. And what position would the Board of Admiralty be in if it broke the contract before the decision of the Government had been come to upon this great military and strategic question; or if the Government decided, as very likely they may, that the works should be proceeded with? Surely as much has been done as can be done in the circumstances when we have come to an arrangement with the contractor by which not a shilling is to be spent upon these works except so far as may be necessary to prevent the contractor's being out of pocket. As I am on the subject of the contract, I may incidentally remark that I believe my hon. friend is entirely wrong when he says that only one million had been spent on these works in 1900. Only a million had been paid, but a great deal more had been spent by the contractor, who would finally have to be reimbursed in the ordinary course for the expenditure he had incurred.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I relied upon the Return presented to the House.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Did that Return say how much had been spent?

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: The Return gives the amount of money spent up to the 31st March, 1900, and the amount is £;1,194,453.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: That is perfectly true. That is the amount of money spent by the Government in paying the contractor. It does not represent the amount which at the termination of the contract, or at a later stage of it, would have to be spent and will be spent by the Government with respect to

work carried out before 31st March, 1900. My hon. friend had not sufficiently considered the character of those contracts when he hazarded that statement to the House.

Now, Sir, I leave the question of suspending further work upon docks, shops, and sheds, and I come to a point which my hon. friend has raised about the Report. I used the phrase "Interim Report," which the hon. gentleman opposite seemed surprised to hear. He may well have been surprised, for never once did the words "Interim Report" fall from my hon. friend in the whole course of his speech.

What is the view which any hon. Gentleman must have carried away from this debate if he had only listened to the version given of this Report by my hon. friend? I believe the impression which he would have carried away would have been this; that the four gentlemen, the distinguished engineer, the distinguished sailor, the distinguished soldier, and the no less distinguished Member of Parliament who went out to investigate matters at Gibraltair had come to a unanimous and final decision upon this question; that, having come to that unanimous and final decision, they returned borne, and the soldier, sailor, and engineer were got at; to put it mildly; by the Admiralty; but the impeccable honesty, the sterling, solid, self-controlled Member of Parliament ["Oh"] resisted all those official blandishments and declined to submit to a revision of the Report, which up to that point had been considered as final. That would be the view taken away by any gentleman of this transaction. But that view is entirely inaccurate. The original Report was an Interim Report. I think the word "Interim" occurs in it.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: Will the right hon. Gentleman look at the Report and see if he can find that word?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: The Report is an Interim Report. [Opposition cries of "No, no," and "Read it."] There are two, or certainly there was one, of the questions which the Committee did not attempt to answer, which they could not answer on the spot, which they had to come home in order to have the information to answer, and which had necessarily an important bearing upon all the other questions that had been answered. What were those questions which were not answered in the Interim Report? They were two questions of great importance. One, the least important, was as to the cost of the works on the eastern side of Gibraltar; and the other, which was a much more important question, was as to the time it would take to complete these works. My hon. friend has told us in the course of his speech that he thinks undefended docks better than no docks, and he dwelt in forcible language on the immediate necessity of having at Gibraltar a place where our ships may refit, and which may serve all the purposes in time of peace, as in time of war, which are served by a great naval base like Malta. Supposing that the works on the eastern side of Gibraltar would take ten years; no human being would put them at less than ten years; I do not know whether my hon. friend has any information on that point, as he left the Committee before they entered upon that part of the investigation;

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I beg your pardon. The question of estimated cost and estimated time had been dealt with. The estimated period was previously put at

twenty-five years, but the engineer member of the Committee put it at eight years, plus two years preparations at the Admiralty.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I do not believe that anyone would seriously put the period below ten years. Therefore, the policy of the Interim Report was to keep us with an incomplete base at Gibraltar for the purpose of saving £300,000. I daresay the question of Morocco may be settled in ten years. A good deal happens in ten years, and all the mysterious rumours to which my hon. friend refers may have given place to other rumours, and to other rumours again, and there may be a succession of rumours which may fall the history or the next ten years. Yet we are to wait ten years for the dock which my hon. friend desires to have. That is his policy, the precious policy which he presses upon the House. That is his mode of meeting pressing national needs and looking after national interests. This necessity is so great that he must needs move the adjournment of the House a week before the Government can come forward and make their statement on this question. I cannot congratulate my hon. friend upon the substance of the policy which he would press upon our attention. But there was something worse in my hon. friend's speech than a mistake in policy. There was an attack upon the honour of those colleagues with whom he tells us he worked so well. [Cries of "Oh" and Ministerial cheers.] I call it an attack upon their honour. I do not know what views on that delicate subject are held by hon. Gentlemen who interrupt me, but I emphatically call it an attack upon their honour to say that they came to a decision at Gibraltar, and that when they came home, and official influence was brought to bear on them, they modified that decision.

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I never said that.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: If my hon. friend did not mean that by his insinuation, what did he mean?

*MR. GIBSON BOWLES: I neither said it nor insinuated it. I do not know what decision those three gentlemen may have come to, but I know what decision was proposed to me.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Anybody who heard that part of my hon. friend's speech in which he described the reasons which induced him to leave the Committee; anybody who heard that part of his speech in which he said he would be humiliated and insulted if he remained on the Committee; anybody who remembers that part of his speech in which he suggested that the other members of the Committee must have felt themselves humiliated had they stayed on the Committee; anybody who heard the cheers with which those assertions were met on the other side of the House, can have no doubt, at all events, that there was an attack upon the honour of these gentlemen and an insinuation which I regret my hon. friend should ever have made against those with whom he tells us he lived in the closest amity and agreement through all their investigation at Gibraltar. I think it a deplorable suggestion on my hon. friend's part. I trust that, if this matter comes up again, he will not repeat it. I have nothing more to say upon the subject except to tell the House that the very last thing the Government desire to do is to have any secrets from them in this matter. We are perfectly conscious that the whole subject is surrounded not merely with military and naval difficulties, but

with other difficulties, which make it very unfit in some respects for public discussion within these walls; and it is a fact that in the Reports which have been made there are matters which I think ought not to be brought before public attention at all. I think my hon. friend would agree to that. But as regards the substance of those Reports, as regards the main line of consideration which should govern the decision of the Government

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)

Clancy, John Joseph

Hayden, John Patrick

Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Cogan, Denis J.

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Helme, Norval Watson

Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud

Craig, Robert Hunter

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

Ambrose, Robert

Crean, Eugene

Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Crombie, John William

Horniman, Frederick John

Asquith, Rt Hon Herbert Henry

Cullinan, J.

Jacoby, James Alfred

Atherley-Jones, L.

Dalziel, James Henry

Kennedy, Patrick James

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Delany, William

Labouchere, Henry

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Dillon, John

Lambert, George

Bell, Richard

Donelan, Captain A.

Langley, Batty

Black, Alexander William

Doogan, P. C.

Layland-Barratt, Francis

Blake, Edward

Duffy, William J.

Leamy, Edmund

Boland, John
Duncan, J. Hastings
Lewis, John Herbert
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Dunn, Sir William
Lloyd-George, David
Boyle, James
Elibank, Master of
Lough, Thomas
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Emmott, Alfred
Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent
Brigg, John
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Lundon, W.
Broadhurst, Henry
Fenwick, Charles
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Brown, Geo. M. (Edinburgh)
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Field, William
M'Crae, George
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Flynn, James Christopher
M'Dermott, Patrick
Burke, E. Haviland-
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.
M'Govern, T.
Burns, John
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Burt, Thomas
Gilhooly, James
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Caine, William Sproston
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Caldwell, James
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Minch, Matthew
Cameron, Robert
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Mooney, John J.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)

Haldane, Richard Burdon
Moulton, John Fletcher
Cawley, Frederick
Hammond, John
Murnaghan, George
Channing, Francis Allston
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Nannetti, Joseph P.

and of this House in dealing with this question, there is not the slightest desire, and there never has been, to have secrets or concealment from the House of Commons at all. I am sorry that this premature and necessarily incomplete debate has been forced on by the rash action of my hon. friend; but as it has been forced on, I hope I have indicated to the House with sufficient clearness that there is not the slightest basis for the charge against the Government that they are endeavouring to conceal anything; that there is no foundation for the suggestion that in continuing these works we have been either committing the House or the country to a costly and unnecessary policy; and, above all, there is not the slightest foundation for the suggestion that the three distinguished men, once colleagues of my hon. friend, have done anything unworthy of their great reputation or which should make the opinion they give to the House and the whole country less worthy of respect.

Question put

The House divided:;Ayes, 157; Noes, 216. (Division List No, 251.)

Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Pirie, Duncan V.

Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)

Power, Patrick Joseph

Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r

Norman, Henry

Price, Robert John

Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)

Norton, Capt. Cecil William

Priestley, Arthur

Trevelyan, Charles Phillips

Nussey, Thomas Willans

Rea, Russell

Wallace, Robert

O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)

Reddy, M.

Walton, John L. (Leeds, S.)

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid

Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)

Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)

Redmond, William (Clare)

Weir, James Galloway
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Reid, Sir R. T. (Dumfries)
White, George (Norfolk)
O'Connor, Jamos (Wicklow, W
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Shaw, Charles Edw. (Stafford)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
O'Dowd, John
Shaw, Thomas (Hawick B.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R)
O'Malley, William
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.).
O'Mara, James
Soares, Ernest J.
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Palmer, Sir Charles M (Durham
Sullivan, Donal
Mr. Gibson Bowles and Mr. M'Kenna.
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Partington, Oswald
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Thomas, David A. (Merthyr)
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Hay, Hon. Claude George

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Cranborne, Viscount
Heath, Arthur H. (Hanley)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Helder, Augustus
Aird, Sir John
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Henderson, Alexander
Allsopp, Hon. George
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hoare, E. Brodie (Hampstead)
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Cust, Henry John C.
Hogg, Lindsay
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Dalkeith, Earl of
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Arrol, Sir William
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Jessel, Captain Herbert M.
Austen, Sir John
Doughty, George
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Kenyon, Hn. G. T. (Denbigh)
Bain, Col. James Robert
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury).
Baird, John George Alexander
Duke, Henry Edward
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Balcarres, Lord
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Keswick, William
Baldwin, Alfred
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Kimber, Henry
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r

Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J. (Manc.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Fielden, Edw. Brocklehurst
Knowles, Lees
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christch.)
Finch, George H.
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Banbury, Frederick George
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Law, Andrew Bonar
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Fisher, William Hayes
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Fison, Frederick William
Lawson, John Grant
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants.
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Lecky, Rt. Hn. Wm. Edw. H.
Bigwood, James
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Leveson-Gower, Fred. N. S)
Bousfield, William Robert
Forster, Henry William
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H (Cityo'Lond.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Gordon, Hn J E. (Elgin'&Nairn)
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.).
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby- (Salop
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum. Penr
Brymer, William Ernest
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir J. Eldon
Macdona, John Cumming
Butcher, John George
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Maconochie, A. W.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Goulding, Edward Alfred

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanc.)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
M'Calmont, Col. H. L. B. (Cambs
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
M'lver, Sir L. (Edinburgh, W.)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Greene, W. Raymond (Cambs.)
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Gretton, John
Majendie, James A. H.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Groves, James Grimble
Malcolm, Ian
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Maple, Sir John Blundell
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'
Hain, Edward
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Chapman, Edward
Hall, Edward Marshall
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Middlemore, J. Throgmorton
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Hambro, Charles Eric
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (Midd'x
Milton, Viscount
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'ry
Mitchell, William
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hanbury, Rt. Hn. Robert W.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Morgan, David J. (Walthams'w
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh

Morrell, George Herbert
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Thornton, Percy M.
Morrison, James Archibald
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Round, James
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Mount, William Arthur
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Muntz, Philip A.
Russell, T. W.
Valentia, Viscount
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Walker, Col. William Hall
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Samuel, Harry S (Limehouse)
Wason, JohnCathcart (Orkney
Nicholson, William Graham
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw J.
Webb, Colonel William Geo.
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.).
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Seton-Karr, Henry
Whiteley, H. (Ashtonund. Lyne
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Parkes, Ebenezer
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Peel, Hn Wm. Robert Wellesley
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Penn, John
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Percy, Earl
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Pierpoint, Robert

Smith, H C (North'mb, Tyneside
Wilson-Todd, Wm H. (Yorks.)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Spear, John Ward
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R (Bath)
Plummer, Walter R.
Stanley, Hn. Arthur (Ormskirk
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Pretymann, Ernest George
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Wylie, Alexander
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Purvis, Robert
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Quilter, Sir Curhbert
Stone, Sir Benjamin
TELLERS FOF THE NOES.;
Reid, James (Greenock)
Stroyan, John
Sir William Walrond and
Rensbaw, Charles Bine
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Mr. Anstruther.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Talbot, Rt Hn J G (Oxf'rd Univ.)
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
NEW BILLS.

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (MR. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R. Thirsk): I wish to ask the leave of the House to introduce a very short Bill to remove certain inequalities with respect to districts for registration purposes, and the appointment of superintendent registrars of births and deaths in certain unions. The Government are of opinion, and I think the House will also be of opinion, that the time has now arrived for reconsidering the temporary arrangement established many years ago with regard to superintendent registrars. I think it is a Bill which will provoke no opposition in any part of the House. Bill to amend the Law with respect to districts for registration purposes, and the appointment of Superintendent Registrars of Births and Deaths in certain unions, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Grant Lawson and Mr. Walter Long.
REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS BILL.

"To amend the Law with respect to districts for registration purposes, and the appointment of Superintendent Registrars of Births and Deaths in certain unions," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 208.]
COLONIAL ACTS CONFIRMATION.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir ROBERT FINLAY, Inverness Burghs): I ask the leave of the House to introduce a Bill to confirm certain Acts of the Colonial Legislatures of New South Wales, Queensland, and Western Australia. Grave doubts have arisen as to whether these Acts ought not to have been preserved, and it is now desired that they should be confirmed by the Imperial Legislature.

Bill to confirm certain Acts of Colonial Legislatures, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Secretary Chamberlain, Mr. Attorney General, and Mr. Solicitor General.
COLONIAL ACTS CONFIRMATION BILL.

"To confirm certain Acts of Colonial Legislatures," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed [Bill 209.]

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY BOARD (JOINT COMMITTEE).

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on question (12th June), "That Mr. Stuart Wortley be one other Member of the Select Committee appointed to join with a Committee of the Lords on Queen Anne's Bounty Board."

Question put, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, "That three be the quorum.";(Sir William Walrond.)

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Ordered, That Sir Edgar Vincent be added to the Committee.;(Sir William Walrond.)

SUPPLY [10TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

CLASS II.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £132,328, be granted to His Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Office of the Committee of Privy Council for Trade and Subordinate Departments, including a Grant-in-Aid."

*DR. MACNAMARA(Camberwell, N.) said he desired to move the reduction which stood in his name in order to stimulate the Department over which the right hon.

Gentleman presided into a little greater activity in respect to the important matter of workmen's trains. This was a thrice told tale in the House, and his apology for repeating it must be the extreme urgency and importance of the matter. Under the Cheap Trains Act of 1883, it became incumbent upon railway companies to make suitable and adequate provision for supplying workmen's tickets at reasonable fares, and in consideration of that they were to receive the remission of the whole passenger duty on fares up to a penny a mile,

and a substantial portion of the passenger duty at a lower rate. The Act made it obligatory that all companies should provide sufficient workmen's trains for working men going to and from their work at such fares and such times after six o'clock in the evening and before eight o'clock in the morning as appeared to be reasonable. He did not suggest that the Cheap Trains Act of 1883 had failed, because the contrary was the fact. He found that there arrived at the London termini of the various railway companies in the year before the passing of the Cheap Trains Act about 8,000,000 working people using workmen's tickets. In the year 1896 that total had increased to 31,000,000. Therefore the Act has been a substantial boon to the working classes. There had, however, been no uniformity in the practice of the great railway companies in issuing workmen's tickets. The Great Eastern Railway Company in the year 1882 issued 2,500,000 workmen's tickets or their equivalent. In 1896 that total had increased by 100 per cent., for in that year they issued no less than 5,000,000 workmen's tickets. The London, Chatham, and Dover Railway, about which the House heard something on Tuesday last, issued 1,200,000 workmen's tickets in 1882, but in 1896 that total had only increased to 1,700,000. The companies themselves appeared to have made a very good thing out of the Cheap Trains Act. He gathered from The Times report of 28th January, 1891, that the then chairman of the Great Eastern Railway Company frankly admitted that the workmen's trains were a source of considerable profit to the company if they could run them at all full. He said that if they could carry 500 workmen in a train they could do very well by the process, and in consideration of these cheap tickets they also got a remission of the passenger duty. Since the year 1883 that remission of passenger duty had meant to the railway companies a new income of not less than £10,000,000, and so far as the railways which had their termini in London were concerned they had actually received £8,000,000 in remission of passenger duty. He had two complaints to make upon this Vote, and he would confine himself absolutely to this question of cheap trains. His first complaint was that the Board of Trade was not active enough in keeping the companies up to the mark in their supply of cheap trains, and the Royal Commission upon the Housing of the Working Classes which sat in 1885 was strongly of that opinion. They urged that the Board of Trade should take the initiative, and not wait for complaints. That was two years after the passing of the Act, and a great many things had happened since. He thought hon. Members would agree with him that the housing question was very closely connected with the subject of cheap trains in great industrial centres like London. At the present time, eighteen years after the passing of the Cheap Trains Act, the Midland Railway Company only gave the people five workmen's trains per day, the London and North Western eleven, and the Great Northern eleven; but the Great Eastern provided no fewer than 104 workmen's trains. The immediate result of this differentiation of policy on the part of the Great Eastern Company was to create a new overcrowding problem in the districts on its lines. The eleven workmen's trains per day given by the London and North Western and the Great Northern Railway Companies, when contrasted with the 104 trains per day given by the Great Eastern Company, did not suggest to him that the Board of Trade was doing all that it ought to do to stimulate

railway companies to carry out their obligations. The Royal Commission to which he had alluded found that it was the duty of the Board of Trade to see that the fullest benefits were secured to the working classes under the Cheap Trains Act. Another important feature of this question was the fares which were exacted from the working classes, more particularly in London. For a return journey of 10 miles each way, the Great Eastern Company charged a fare of 2d. the North London Company 2d. for a return journey of eight miles, and the Metropolitan and Central Electric Railway seven miles each way for 2d. But the London and North Western, the Midland, the Great Northern, the London and South Western, and the Great Western charged workmen from two to four times the fares levied by the other companies. He would give them a specific instance. A man could travel 10 miles out from London on the Great Eastern Railway and it would cost him 1s. per week, or 2d. per day. If that man wanted to go the same distance on the London and South Western Railway it would cost him 4s. per week for the same journey. That difference meant a great deal to a man earning a small wage. Another point was with regard to the time of running workmen's trains. The Board of Trade should be more active in causing the railway companies to carry out their obligations. He knew the difficulties on account of the smallness of the number of London termini. The Great Eastern Company had done much to meet their obligations, but if the Board of Trade would put pressure on the other companies relief would be given. Surely the Midland could do more than run five or ten, and surely the others could do more than run eleven trains per day. In the case of the Midland Company the latest workmen's train to arrive at their terminus was twelve minutes past seven in the morning. There were many young men and young women engaged in business places in the city who did not want to be at their places of employment until half-past eight or nine o'clock. Why should they be compelled to get to London at 7.12, to hang about for a couple of hours? At Liverpool Street Station of the Great Eastern Railway they were obliged to come by trains arriving an hour or two before it was necessary to reach their places of employment. The churches of All Hallows, London Wall, and St. Katherine Coleman, Fenchurch Street, were thrown open from 6.30 until 8.30 a.m. to provide warmth and shelter for these young people. All honour to the clergy of those churches for what they did. Meanwhile the present Cheap Trains Act was eighteen years old. Since then the hours and other conditions of many employments had altered, more young women and girls went out to work than formerly, and a new Act was wanted. In any event, he suggested that there should be an inquiry by a Committee of Members of both sides of the House as to how far it might be practicable and expedient to do more in the administration of the Cheap Trains Act of 1883 to meet the wants of the working classes. Let them have cheap trains which would bring them to their work at a reasonable hour instead of their being landed in London an hour or two before it was necessary and having to wait about railway stations on cold winter mornings before they could begin work. He moved the reduction of the Vote by £100.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Item A (Salaries) be reduced by £100,

in respect of the Salary of the President of the Board of Trade.";(Dr. Macnamara.)

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.) supported the hon. Member for North Camberwell in the appeal he had made to the President of the Board of Trade. The right hon. Gentleman could solve this problem with the greatest ease by adopting a Bill which he himself had before the House. A society had, in the interests of the workpeople, attempted to bring pressure to bear on the railway companies to provide more suitable cheap trains. But the railway companies had the right of appeal to the Railway Commission. The procedure of that Commission was most expensive, and this fact had debarred the society from taking one course which might be open to them. The railway companies complained of the difficulty of distinguishing those who were working people from those who were not. In Belgium, on the State railways, workingmen could travel to and fro for distances up to twenty-five miles for 1s. 8d. per week. This privilege was open to all who were engaged in manual labour and under the orders of others. That was a proviso which the railway companies might be prepared to accept in making a certain diminution of their fares. It would be said that in Belgium the majority of the railways were State railways, but he found that the private railways gave practically the same concessions. The light railways and the tramways also gave facilities at certain hours. In France the difficulty as to who were workingmen and who were not had been overcome by limiting the reduced fares to persons who came under a certain taxation of, say, 2,000 fr., or £;80 per year. Owing to an Act passed in 1883 certain remissions of Government taxation were given to the railway companies. During the past twenty years taxation had been remitted to the amount of £;10,000,000, and in return for this the railway companies were to provide a certain number of trains up to 8 a.m. daily for carrying the working-classes. A large number of those powerful companies had failed to carry out their portion of the contract. There would be no difficulty, even without further legislation, in getting something done if the President of the Board of Trade would place a certain amount of pressure on the railway companies to do what was being done in other countries. If the right hon. Gentleman would bring pressure to bear on the companies he could, under the powers of the Act of 1883, do much to solve the great problem of housing in London. He had no desire to press unduly or unfairly on the railway companies. They were entitled to as much consideration as the public whom they conveyed; but his contention was that, while the public had held to their part of the bargain, the companies had not held to theirs.

MR. BRIGG (Yorkshire, W.R., Keighley) supported the claim put forward by the hon. Members for West Newington and North Camberwell for more travelling facilities for workpeople, and reminded the President of the Board of Trade that in all our larger towns there was the same difficulty as was found in London. People crowded to the large factories. In the northern counties there were outlying villages now almost deserted in which formerly work was carried on by hand; and it would be a great advantage to them if workpeople could travel night and morning a few miles to and from their work on such a system as that by which, in Belgium, weekly tickets for an eight-miles journey were issued for a

franc. There were also special facilities given in Belgium to working-men who used bicycles. He thought that in some parts of the country a formal inquiry should be held in order to ascertain the facilities that should be given.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said he was probably the only Member now in the House who was on the Royal Commission which had been referred to. The Commission attached very great importance to its recommendations, as calculated to solve the great and growing problem of overcrowding in towns. Many people who at present used the trains provided for the working class came to London at seven o'clock in the morning, though their work did not commence till half-past eight or nine. The spectacle of these young men and women hanging about for hours was one to be deplored. To take the people a few miles out of town by cheap and convenient trains was the means of solving the overcrowding problem. The Great Eastern Company had almost reached the limit of accommodation, and that company had much difficulty to contend with in the access to its London terminus. Other companies must take their share of the burden, and he felt sure the President of the Board of Trade would give a sympathetic reply to this appeal. He felt certain that they were going to have a sympathetic reply, if not a pledge from the President of the Board of Trade that he would stir up his Department and see whether something more could not be done to meet those complaints. He knew that the Royal Commission depended largely upon the increased activity of the Board of Trade to assist them out of the difficulty. Might he make the suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman that the Government should consider seriously the question of the purchase of the railways surrounding this great metropolis for the purpose of the transport of workmen from their employment to healthy homes. He knew that there were railway systems that could be attached without any great risk, and that the Government would be putting their hands on almost the only means of settling the housing problem. There was another point to which he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give his attention during the autumn. Why did not the inspectors under the Weights and Measures Acts enter breweries for the purpose of ascertaining the accuracy of the weights and measures of the goods sent out to their customers, in the same way as they entered the shop of every little village dealer? He had raised this question both in the House and the country before, and had never been able clearly to ascertain whether the inspectors were legally entitled to enter breweries. He believed in some parts of the country it was done, in great doubt and under considerable difficulty, but in other parts of the country it was not done.

*MR. DAVID MORGAN (Essex, Walthamstow) said he wished to join with the hon. Member for West Newington and the hon. Member for North Camberwell in their appeal to the President of the Board of Trade to grant an inquiry as to whether or not the railway companies were doing all that was required of them in the matter of cheap trains. A great deal had been said regarding the Great Eastern Railway, and as one who had lived on the Great Eastern Railway all his life, and had held a season ticket for forty years, he might be allowed to speak as to what that railway had done. They had done, it was true, an enormous deal, but still an enormous deal remained to be done, knowing as he did what took place in

the early hours of the morning at Walthamstow. He believed that the Great Eastern Railway would do more if they could, but he thought he was right in saying that they could not run any more trains between 6 a.m. and 8 a.m. than they did at present. Something had been said in the debate about working girls and women congregating in very large numbers at Liverpool Street station at an early hour, because they had to travel before 8 o'clock in order to have the advantage of a cheap ticket, whereas their work oftentimes did not commence before 9.30 or 10.

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

*MR. DAVID MORGAN (continuing) said that the question of working girls and women, in the position to which he had referred, was one which certainly demanded the attention of the Board of Trade, although the directors of the company had opened all their waiting rooms except one for their accommodation. He had asked the company for certain facilities for working women and girls. He had asked that cheap tickets should be issued to them after eight o'clock, but he was met with the reply that such special facilities could not be given to women and girls over and above men. No doubt the right hon. Gentleman would be able to state if that were the case. If such special facilities could be given it would relieve working women and girls from a great deal of trouble and difficulty. It might be all very well in the summer, but he asked the Committee to consider what it meant in the depth of winter, when girls had to wait at Liverpool Street Station from perhaps 7.30 to 9.30. If the Board of Trade would grant an inquiry as to the extent to which the railway companies had met their obligations regarding cheap trains, he was sure that good would result. There was also another class which deserved consideration. He referred to lawyers' clerks, and others, in receipt of small salaries, who had to keep up a different appearance from that of the ordinary working man, although they often received less wages than a skilled artisan. Their case was excessively hard. He was quite sure that if the Board of Trade would only grant an inquiry, something might be done to help the working women and children, and also the other class to which he had referred, and that a great boon would be conferred on a very humble but very deserving class of workers.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead) said that while agreeing with his hon. friends in their demand for better railway facilities he desired to direct the attention of the Committee to one matter which had not yet been mentioned. The Board of Trade was the most important Department in the Government of the country. All the knowledge of the trade of the world was practically centred in it. He called attention to the fact that the President of the Board of Trade was the lowest paid head of any Department of the Government. The main point to which he wished to call attention was the salary of the senior Director of Railways, which was put down at £;1,400 per annum, but there was a footnote with regard to that item, from which he noted that this gentleman, in addition, received £;450 a year for retired Army pay.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The reduction has been moved on the salary of the

President of the Board of Trade, and the hon. Member must confine his remarks to that.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN said he was under the impression he was dealing with Vote A, but having regard to the remarks of the Chairman, he would not proceed with his remarks in that direction, but deal with that matter later on. In conclusion, he would only say that, in his opinion, the miserable pittance which the President of the Board of Trade received was not sufficient, and if he had been in order he would have been inclined to move an increase, but, unfortunately, he was not.

MR. HALSEY (Hertfordshire, Watford) said that he could not but agree as to the desirability of promoting in every possible way cheaper trains for the benefit of the working classes, and further legislation, as had been suggested, might be necessary. He thought the mover of the reduction had been a little hard on the President of the Board of Trade, and he testified to the assistance he had received, not only from that gentleman, but also from his predecessor, when he was engaged in obtaining cheaper trains for working classes in his constituency. He had met with every consideration. No impediment was put in his way, and the success with which his efforts had been met was entirely due to the assistance he had received from the right hon. Gentleman and his predecessor. The hon. Member for West Newington was perfectly right when he said the real difficulty was the appeal to the Railway Commissioners. He thought it was right that there should be an impartial tribunal, but he thought the cost of that appeal should be somewhat cheapened. The parties who went before the Railway Commissioners were not

equally matched. On the one hand, there was a rich railway company, and on the other a party of workmen with little money to spare. The hon. Member for West Newington quoted the practice in Belgium, but he did not think it would be wise to adopt any such definition of workpeople in this country, as it would cut out from all benefit those most deserving women and girls who were employed at restaurants.

CAPTAIN NORTON said he only pointed out that if any difficulty arose it could be dealt with in the same manner as in France, where the rate of wages was the basis.

MR. HALSEY said he was glad to hear the explanation of the hon Member, as it would save much misapprehension. It had been said that the congestion on the Great Eastern Railway would be met if the other railways were to increase their workmen's trains, but one must be just, and people could hardly expect railway companies to issue cheap tickets to desolate places in the country in the hopes of a workmen's colony growing up there; but when such a demand arose, he had no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman would do his best to get that demand granted.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): I have no reason to complain of the tone which the debate has taken on this occasion. It has been suggested by the hon. Member for Gateshead, not that my salary should be reduced by £100, but that it was a miserable pittance. My hon. friend the Secretary to the Treasury is not present. I wish he had been, and also the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when the hon. Member for Gateshead made those

generous remarks. He will, perhaps, take some opportunity, public or private, of pressing his views upon those gentlemen, who have the power to increase my salary, as I must admit it is not a subject which I could argue in my own favour at the present time. I now turn to the question of cheap trains. The hon. Member for North Camberwell has made two more or less definite suggestions. He proposes that the Board of Trade shall take the initiative of inquiring whether there is or not on any given railway sufficient accommodation.

Dr. MACNAMARA: That is not my proposal. That is a recommendation of the Royal Commission of 1885, which I merely reiterated to-night.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Well, I do not think it would be a convenient procedure, nor the procedure contemplated by the Act. The wording of the Act clearly shows that it was never contemplated that the Board of Trade should, independently of any suggestions from outside, inquire into the accommodation provided. Nor would such procedure be desirable. What has happened ever since the Cheap Trains Act came into force is that representations have been made either by persons immediately interested or by bodies of persons representing such people. Those representations have been taken into full consideration by the Board of Trade, and I can assure the hon. Member if any definite representations are made to us from any quarter we shall be only too happy to thoroughly investigate the facts and if necessary make representations to the railway company. The hon. Member for Watford has spoken of a particular case with which he was intimately connected. Representations were made to the Board of Trade, which investigated them and then negotiated with the railway company and succeeded in obtaining a substantial concession. It is by far the most convenient procedure, that before the Board of Trade makes any inquiries it should be set in motion.

The second point which the hon. Member for North Camberwell pressed upon me was the desirability of making the fares and accommodation on different railways more uniform than they are at present. I think the remark made by the hon.

Member for Watford, that railway companies could not be expected to run trains for the purpose, not of serving but of creating a traffic, answers that point.

Every case must be treated on its merits, and as conditions differ, so they require different consideration. In some districts there are large colonies of workmen, and a large traffic can be made to pay at very low rates. Reference has been made to the Great Eastern Railway, and the idea seems to be that the very low fares charged by that railway should be charged by other companies; but I may say that the low fares on the Great Eastern Railway are the result of a Parliamentary bargain made upon a private Bill, and it would not be fair to the other companies to suggest that the fares on the Great Eastern Railway should be made the standard by which their fares should be measured. It is inevitable that in a discussion of this sort arguments should be used pointing not so much to the administration of the Act by the Board of Trade as to questions of policy, and the desirability of introducing fresh legislation; but I venture to think that it is neither right nor convenient to enter into such matters upon this Vote. The point in my mind is this, that while railways can and, I think, do contribute considerably to the solution of the problem of the housing of the working classes, the solution of that problem is not so much a system of cheap

train fares as cheap tramways, and until we see how far that problem is dealt with in other directions it would be undesirable to enter further into legislation for the extension of the Cheap Trains Act which the hon. Member proposes. That Act has worked admirably for the object desired, and I think that the hon. Member will find that if certain facilities have not been given, it is because they have not been asked for. The Railway Commission is undoubtedly an expensive tribunal, and where a grievance as to a particular company has been brought to the attention of the Board of Trade, it has frequently settled it in a cheaper manner. At the same time, I think we could not leave the railway companies altogether without the right of appeal. I have now dealt with most of the points raised in discussion. The hon. Member for Walthamstow referred to the case of women and girls. I did not quite follow what his suggestion was.

*MR. DAVID MORGAN said that his point was that he understood, when he pressed the Great Eastern Railway to give better facilities for women and girls employed in London, that they could not do so, as it would be against the law.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: It is not for me to give an opinion, but I am ready to consider that point if the hon. Gentleman will put his views fully before me. Another suggestion has been made that the time of these cheap trains shall be extended to nine o'clock and ten o'clock. The first reply to be made to that is that it would require legislation, but the hon. Member who makes a suggestion of that kind hardly sufficiently remembers, perhaps, that the working classes are not the only classes for whose benefit railways exist. And if the time were extended, I do not think the companies would be able to cope with the traffic. To come back to what I have already said, I do not think that a full and final solution of the problem of the housing of the working classes can be expected from the railway companies.

CAPTAIN NORTON pointed out that the granting of preferential rates to women and girls, or special facilities as to time, would not be contrary to the law in any way.

MR. SOARES (Devonshire, Barnstaple) said he desired to call attention to the lack of communication between the Board of Trade and the Admiralty when inquiries took place with regard to wrecks, in consequence of which considerable amounts of public money were wasted in inquiries which served little or no purpose. When one desired to ascertain the truth with regard to a wreck, one was referred from the Board of Trade to the Admiralty and back again in a most bewildering manner. In the case of a particular wreck off the coast of Devon four lives were lost. It was plain from the appearance of one of the bodies when found that the unfortunate man had made a desperate attempt to climb the cliffs and had died of exhaustion; he was found fifty yards above high-water-mark, he was still warm, and blood was oozing from his wounds. Another fine young seaman had actually climbed the cliff, and had died also from exhaustion on land; one was found below high-water-mark and one just above high-water-mark. The first question that arose on those facts was, Did the coastguards do their duty, and was the number on that part of the coast adequate? Inquests were held on the bodies, and the jury expressed a hope that an inquiry would be held in the matter in order to ascertain whether the coastguard service on that part of the

coast was adequate. He put a question to the President of the Board of Trade on the subject on the 15th of February, and the right hon. Gentleman replied that he would put the matter before the Admiralty. Thereupon he put a question to the Secretary to the Admiralty, and elicited the reply that, when the report of the inquiry had been received, the matter would be inquired into. But when the inquiry was held, this question was excluded from the scope of the inquiry. If matters were allowed to remain as they were the consequences would be most serious. It had been said that these lives might have been saved had assistance been at hand. He had been told that the coastguard kept good watch, but not one of the bodies was found by the coastguard, nor did they observe any signals of distress, and it was admitted that no patrol was kept along this dangerous coast during the night. That would seem to show that the adequacy of the coastguard on that coast was a doubtful question. He hoped something would be done before the winter set in, otherwise many lives would be lost. The Elder Brethren of Trinity House were also involved in this matter, on the subject of the bar buoy. He had been told that that matter should be considered when the Report of the inquiry was received, but that matter had been also excluded from the inquiry.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) called attention to the question of manning in the merchant service. He said deliberately that owing to the bad arrangements of the Board of Trade numbers of valuable lives were from time to time lost at sea through ships being allowed to leave this country on long voyages without properly qualified sailors on board. At present the Board of Trade had the power of inquiring, before they were shipped, whether the men were qualified to be rated as able seamen, but they apparently had not the power of preventing the ships being manned by men who were not able to prove that they were able seamen. That was an outrageous state of affairs. A man was not allowed to drive an engine

or a 'bus or a cab unless he satisfied the authorities that he was qualified to do so. In every walk of life, save this one, men had to prove their qualifications; but merchant ships and sometimes emigrant ships were allowed to leave British and Irish ports without a single member of the crew being properly qualified. That was an alarming state of affairs, to which every Member of this House, whether English, Scotch, Welsh, or Irish, ought to have his attention directed. The single example of the "Primrose Hill" would prove his case. The "Primrose Hill," a large ship of over 2,000 tons register, sailed from Liverpool for Vancouver. She was wrecked off Anglesey, and out of a crew of thirty-four thirty-three were drowned. Naturally there, was an exhaustive Board of Trade inquiry, in which the following was one of the conclusions arrived at;

"The court has found that the 'Primrose Hill' was not adequately manned. The court, before arriving at this conclusion, carefully considered the matter, but bearing in mind that on the present occasion she carried five apprentices and one ordinary seaman who had never been to sea before, that the other ordinary seaman had only been three voyages in a steamer, and that four of the remaining apprentices had not served more than fourteen months at sea;" and so on; and it also stated that there was only one certificated officer besides the captain. But the most important part of the whole inquiry, and the

conclusion upon which he based his contention that the Board of Trade ought to take fresh powers in order to secure that properly qualified men went to sea, was the following;

"It should further be noted that none of the A.B.'s had proved their claim to be so rated on account of service."

The court were informed, moreover, that this was a very frequent circumstance. That was not a state of things which should be permitted to continue. He did not ask that every man on a ship should be able to prove that he had been long years at sea, but could not some inquiry be made with a view to the Board of Trade taking power to secure in some way that at least a proportion of the men who staffed a ship for a long voyage should be properly qualified sea men? Until that was done vessels would be wrecked and property and lives lost, simply because the Board of

Trade did not exercise a power which ought to be one of its very first functions. The Report in the "Primrose Hill" case further stated;

"Having regard to the number and qualifications of the crew, the court is of opinion that the crew of the 'Primrose Hill' was not adequate for the purposes of her safe navigation."

Thirty-three lives were lost, and that was the opinion of the court. Surely that was an appalling Report. The Merchant Service Guild of Liverpool, representing 6,000 or 7,000 merchant captains and merchant officers, had written to the Board of Trade asking whether, as a result of this Report, the Board of Trade would make some fresh inquiries for the purpose of arriving at some rule or regulation whereby it should be insisted upon that properly qualified men should be sent to sea upon merchant ships. That association, no doubt through no fault of the President of the Board of Trade, was treated with very scant courtesy by the Department, being simply informed that the Board did not propose to make the Report the basis of further instructions to their officers with reference to the manning of vessels. That was rather an unsatisfactory reply for a public Department to send to the representatives of a great mercantile association such as this. In view of the appalling state of affairs, the President of the Board of Trade might at least have held out some hope that, if not by a Committee, by some departmental inquiry, it should be seen whether arrangements might not be made whereby officers of the Board of Trade, besides asking the men to produce their certificates of service and the proof of their qualifications to be rated as A.B., should have the power to say before a ship sailed, "No, we will not allow that ship, with valuable lives and valuable property on board, to sail from the ports of this country until we are satisfied that at least a certain proportion of the crew are thoroughly and satisfactorily qualified seamen, well able to take charge of the vessel." That was the demand put forward by the Merchant Service Guild of Liverpool, because, beyond yea or nay, it was proved up to the hilt that the "Primrose Hill" was lost, and, with one exception, the whole of the crew drowned, simply because the men were not qualified seamen.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR was understood to dissent.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said the Report stated in so many words that the loss of the

ship was due largely to the fact that she was not manned by qualified sailors. MR. GERALD BALFOUR: Might I just read a paragraph out of the Report which shows that the hon. Member is not quite accurate? It is perfectly true, as the hon. Member has said, that the court considered that the manning of the ship was not adequate, but they went on expressly to say;

"There is, however, no evidence to satisfy the court that the loss of the vessel was due to such inadequacy."

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND was quite aware of that paragraph in the Report, but he contended that, when the court decided that the crew were inadequate, that not one single man of the A.B.'s was a qualified able seaman, that there was only one officer on board besides the captain with a certificate, that some of those on board had never been to sea before, and the ship was lost, it could not be denied that it was a very fair conclusion that the disaster occurred in consequence. The words of the Report were;

"In answer to the questions, the court has found that the 'Primrose Hill' was not adequately manned. It should further be noted that none of the A.B.'s had proved their claim to be so rated on account of service."

That proved perfectly clearly that the ship was not properly manned. This was not an isolated case, for the court was informed that there were other cases in which men were allowed to navigate vessels and take charge of life and property without being able seamen. Another point was the fact that there was only one other officer beside the captain on this vessel who had a certificate. That was a disgraceful state of affairs. It was disgraceful that a ship of that magnitude, going on a long voyage, should be allowed to leave port without at least three certificated officers on board. If a vessel had only two officers with certificates on board, and the captain or the mate fell sick, one man had day and night to conduct the whole navigation of the ship. It was impossible for him to do it. There certainly ought to be at least three men with certificates on every vessel of this tonnage. It was quite true that a man might sign articles to go on board and not be able to prove at the moment that he was a qualified A.B., but who still had the qualification. There might be such cases, but his argument was that there were a large number of cases the other way; of men who were unable under any circumstances to prove that they were qualified A.B.'s, but who were allowed to go on, with the result that lives were lost, ships wrecked, and property destroyed, as in the case of the "Primrose Hill."

Many of these men were long-shore loafers; many were absolutely unfit, and, if the captain knew anything about them, would not be allowed to set foot on the vessel at all. Such men should not be allowed to be smuggled on board to the detriment of properly qualified seamen, many of whom were looking for, but were unable to obtain, employment. He therefore asked the President of the Board of Trade to see if it were not possible for the officials of the Board of Trade to make arrangements by which it should be ensured that every ship leaving this country had at least a fair proportion of qualified men in the crew; men who had proved their qualification. He did not believe there was a single Member of the House who would deny that that was a reasonable and fair demand, and one which ought to receive at least the attention and consideration of the Board of Trade.

It was not necessary to go a single step beyond the "Primrose Hill," in regard to which it was found that not a single man of the crew was a proved or qualified seaman.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I do not think that is quite correct. There were 32 A.B.'s shipped as such, but with N.P. marked against their names. It does not follow from that that they were not qualified seamen. ["Oh, oh," and a laugh.] Hon. Gentlemen laugh, but they really do not know what the facts are. In order to prove that an A.B. seaman is entitled to the rating A.B., he has to show that he has served for four years. He cannot do that unless he has all his discharges for that period. As a matter of fact a large number of A.B.'s do not preserve their discharges. In this particular case it was really proved that one man's service exceeded nine years.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND admitted that probably there were a few such cases on the "Primrose Hill," and he had already referred to the point. But, on the other hand, there was a tremendous number of cases of men who undoubtedly were shipped and who under any circumstances would not be in a position to prove that they were able seamen. They were allowed to take charge of these vessels, and the result was disaster. This question was somewhat akin to the great question raised years ago by the late Mr. Plimsoll. It was a question referring to the safety of British ships, to the safety of property, and to the safety of life, and he appealed to Members of every shade of opinion to forget for the moment that he was one of the much abused Irish Members, and to consider that in this matter at least he was voicing the strong opinion of large masses of English and Scotch, as well as Irish people, and that his object was not to disrupt the British Empire, but to try and save the lives of unfortunate men who were allowed to go to sea and take charge of ships when they were not properly qualified for the duty. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade had said that if the Board of Trade put the letters "N.P." after a man's name it did not prove that he was not a properly qualified sailor. That was true. But was it not a perfectly absurd arrangement? The Board of Trade solemnly sent an official down to inquire whether a man was a properly qualified seaman. If the man cannot produce his discharge to prove his service, the agent simply puts "N.P."; not proven; after his name, and allows him to walk on board ship, to become one of the crew, just as if he had proved himself to be an A. B. Where was the sense of that? Besides asking for a man's qualifications, and having the power to put N.P. after his name, the Board of Trade should take to itself power to make such rules and regulations as should prevent a ship leaving port without a certain number of men on board who practically had proved that they were properly qualified to look after the navigation of the vessel.

*COLONEL ROPNER (Stockton) as a shipowner of many years standing, and President of the Chamber of Shipping, was surprised to hear the hon. Member say that a number of valuable lives were being lost in consequence of the Board of Trade not having sufficient power to see that vessels did not proceed to sea undermanned. This question of manning had occupied the attention of shipowners

and the Board of Trade for a good many years. In the year 1894 there was appointed by the Board of Trade a Committee to inquire into the question, and the conclusions of that Committee, arrived at after a long inquiry, resulted in the passing of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1897. Under that Act the Board of Trade had all the powers necessary to stop undermanned ships as unseaworthy. Consequently, he for one could not see what further power the hon. Gentleman wished to confer upon the Board of Trade. Every right thinking man would agree that all should be done to secure the safety of our sailors, but he claimed that, at any rate, in the direction of manning ships, everything had been done, and that nothing more could possibly be done under the circumstances. As to the accident to the "Primrose Hill," at the Board of Trade inquiry there was no proof adduced that the vessel was lost because she had not able seamen on board, or, for that matter, because she was not sufficiently and properly manned. No such allegation was made he believed; at any rate, the Court of Inquiry did not find that that was the case.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Does the hon. Gentleman refer to the "Primrose Hill" inquiry?

*COLONEL ROPNER: I do, yes.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND thought he had better read two or three lines in the Report; "In answer to that question the court has found that the 'Primrose Hill' was not adequately manned. The court, before arriving at this conclusion, carefully considered the matter, bearing in mind that on the present occasion she carried five apprentices and one ordinary seaman who had never been to sea before; another ordinary seaman had only been three voyages on a steamer, four of the remaining apprentices had not served more than fourteen months at sea, and there was no certificated second officer; and it should further be noted that none of the A.B.'s had proved their claim to be so rated on account of service."

It further stated;

"Having regard to the number and the qualification of the crew, the court is of opinion that the crew of the 'Primrose Hill' was not adequate for the purpose of her safe navigation, either on a winter voyage or the voyage in question having regard to the weather encountered. There is, however, no evidence to satisfy the court that the loss of the vessel was due to such inadequacy."

But when a vessel manned and described in that way got wrecked and the crew drowned, surely there was some evidence in that.

*COLONEL ROPNER said the hon. Gentleman confirmed what he had said. He stated that the court did not find that the vessel was lost in consequence of being undermanned. [AN HON. MEMBER: Yes; because dead men tell no tales.] The hon. Member seemed to imagine that the vessels of to-day were all sailing vessels, as they used to be, and that consequently a sailor must be a fully-qualified and a highly-trained man in order to be able to fulfil his duties as a seaman on board a vessel. That might be perfectly true as far as sailing vessels were concerned, but sailing vessels were fast becoming things of the past, and he believed that, in a very short time, they would have only steamers at sea. On board a steamer there was, practically, little qualification required for a sailor. Any ordinary

man, if he had his wits about him, could fulfil all the duties required from a sailor on board a steamer after a short training. A knowledge of the working of the sails of a ship and the masts was not now an essential qualification for a sailor, because steamers had few sails, if any. All that was required was a man with common sense, and such a man could in a few voyages; say to Australia and home again, or for that matter in a single voyage; learn to steer a vessel, and as soon as he had acquired that knowledge, then he was practically qualified to act as sailor on board a steamer. Consequently the House would understand that to-day there was absolutely no necessity to have men on board for many years to teach

them the use of ropes and management of sails as used to be the case upon sailing vessels. There were no such qualifications required at present, except in the case of the few sailing vessels which were still in existence. He should like to say that he was very much in favour of doing all that could be done in the direction of making sailors more comfortable on board, and by so doing getting the best and the steadiest men. The system of continuous discharge which was instituted last year would, he thought, to a large extent assist shipowners and captains in getting good sailors, and that measure had rendered further legislation unnecessary at the present moment. This continuous discharge system would go a very long way in the direction of providing reliable and steady men such as were required for the mercantile marine service, and until this system had been properly tried and found wanting, there was absolutely no necessity for any further legislation with regard to this matter. Speaking as a shipowner, he thought that it was the desire of shipowners generally to have sober, steady, and reliable crews, who were able to navigate their steamers satisfactorily. Shipowners were doing a good deal in that direction, and were trying to induce sailors to remain in their employ by providing for them better accommodation, better food, and also by paying them a part of their wages when laid up on shore owing to an accident. He believed that in this direction very much more good could still be done. It was a mistake to suppose that the shipowning community were a set of men who did not care for the comfort and the lives of their crews.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I did not say that.

*COLONEL ROPNER assured the hon. Gentleman opposite and every other hon. Member of the House that the gentlemen who owned the ships of this country were quite as honourable men as could be found anywhere, and they had no desire to do anything but that which was right and proper. But to ask the Board of Trade, on account of a single accident, to introduce fresh legislation, was to his mind a thing

which should not for one moment be entertained by this House.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. and gallant Gentleman, but I am certain that he does not wish to misrepresent me. I made no attack whatever upon the shipowners. Naturally, it is to their interest, if not more than to the interest of any other class of the community, that these horrible things, which are lamented by everybody, should cease. I said nothing at all to the effect that the shipowners were not honourable men, because I am sure that these things are regretted not only by the shipowners, but also by the Government and by

everybody concerned.

*COLONEL ROPNER said he was very sorry if he had misunderstood the hon. Member. He believed the hon. Member for East Clare instanced the wreck of the "Primrose Hill" as one of a number of similar accidents. The hon. Member, however, failed to give them any other instances.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I can give the hon. and gallant Member plenty of instances, and I did not give more because I was under the impression that I had spoken too long already. I commenced my speech by pointing to the answer given by the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Board of Trade in answer to a question which I put to him, and in which he informed me that there were more or less connected with this question some fifty-one instances.

*COLONEL ROPNER said he did not know anything about those fifty-one cases. He only knew what the hon. Gentleman opposite stated in this House. He said that the "Primrose Hill" was one of a number of instances, and he failed entirely to give any other example of the number of such cases which he evidently had in his own mind, and of which he had no knowledge. He was sorry to have taken up the time of the House so long upon this matter, but he felt that it was necessary that a word or two should be said on behalf of the shipowners. He did not think that it was the desire of anybody in this House to unduly interfere with the shipping trade of this country.

Hon. Members were aware that at the present moment we were being driven out of markets by foreign competition, and why? Simply because the shipping industry had been interfered with to a far greater extent than had been the case in foreign countries. Regulations had been made which had already been the cause of the sale of a very large number of British steamboats to foreign countries, and this had taken away the employment of a large number of British sailors. That was the consequence of legislative interference with the British shipping industry. Some years ago a load-line on British ships was enforced, and this load-line legislation interfered to a very large extent with the vessels on the north-east coast; and the consequence was that many British steamers had to be sold to the Swedes, Norwegians, and the Danes, and those very vessels were to-day being navigated by these foreigners, and were safely carrying to the extent of from 100 tons to 150 tons more than would have been allowed under British regulations. If such legislation had not taken place those vessels would to-day not only have been earning good money for the men who invested their capital in them, but they would also have been employing British sailors. He hoped the time was gone by for the continual interference which had taken place in the past, for such interference, instead of doing any good, had frequently done a great deal of harm, and instead of making navigation safer, it had in many instances made it more unsafe. He could refer to several instances of this kind, but he would conclude by again urging the House to refrain from any further interference with a class of the community which was anxious to do all that was possible to maintain the pre-eminent position of the British mercantile navy in spite of the competition of the subsidised and bounty-fed foreign vessels.

*MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea) said that with characteristic courage the hon. Member for East Clare had taken up the cause of the British sailor in a very

able and moderate speech, and he had very ably filled the breach caused by the absence from the House of the late Member for Middlesbrough. He sincerely deplored the absence of his friend Mr. Havelock Wilson from the House. He did not always agree with him, but he occasionally showed that excess of zeal on behalf of the sailors which, from a mistaken point of view, the hon. Member who had just spoken in support of a wrong cause and a bad case had shown on behalf of the shipowners. Before he came to close quarters upon this subject he wished to deal with one or two of the statements made by the hon. Member who had just sat down. He did not intend to make any insinuations against shipowners, captains, or any other persons, and he was going to deal strictly with the facts. What was the picture which the hon. Gentleman the Member for Stockton had drawn? To listen to him anyone would imagine that the Board of Trade had interfered so vexatiously with the shipping industry that their ships were being driven off every sea, and that the British mercantile marine was a "baseless fabric of a vision, leaving not a wrack behind." Let him go to "Mulhall's Dictionary," let him take up Fairplay, the Shipping Gazette, or the Shipping World, and he would find that to-day Britain built 82 per cent. of the ships and owned 62 per cent. of the shipping of the world. He would also find that their command over the making and owning of ships, both in regard to sailing ships and steamers, was absolutely and relatively as great, and even greater, than it had ever been before at any period of their mercantile history. So much for the hon. Member's exaggerated argument in regard to vexatious interference. He would content himself with giving that fact, which was worth a ton of the hon. Member's theory. The hon. Member also said that he hoped that the Shipping Federation would, by a system of bonuses, be able to induce men to stay in their ships and so secure a more experienced class of men than they got in the past. In this argument the hon. Member proved his case against himself. The object of this bonus was to make ship life so attractive that men would stick to their ships more permanently and regularly than they now did, and that was the object of giving bonuses. In his opinion bonuses alone were useless to induce men to stay in their ships. Other causes were responsible for the unpopularity of sea life. Their object was to assist in removing these causes by legislation which would cause shipowners to improve the conditions of sea life by not overworking and otherwise ill-treating the men. Under-manning meant over-working sailors, and these bogus bonuses would not induce them to stay in their ships at all. He found from the official organs that shipmasters at their monthly or quarterly meetings, and shipowners in their discussions, were confronted with this tremendous fact that, putting agitators and what was said by interested shipowners on one side, foreign sailors were increasing while British sailors were diminishing and deteriorating. It was admitted that the food of the sailors was bad, that they were overworked, that under-manning still prevailed, and, most significant of all, desertions from British ships were disproportionately increasing. What the hon. Member for East Clare, and what they all wanted, to do was to make sea life so attractive that they would get British sailors in British ships, and to accomplish that over-working, under-feeding, and under-

manning should cease. The conditions of sea life ought to be so much improved as to enable it to assume its old-time attractiveness, and then the English sailor would be attracted to that class of work. How could that be done? It could not be done by bonuses. Had the hon. Member opposite made any suggestions by which this could be accomplished? No. He said that everything had been done to prevent under-manning, and he declared that the law was sufficiently strong already to deal with it. He said that sailing vessels were disappearing, and that in a short time most of these difficulties would disappear. He ought to know that sailing vessels had been built to such an extent that generations would elapse before such vessels disappeared. It was a mistake for shipowners to so easily predict the disappearance of the sailing vessel. The sailing vessel was not going to disappear so quickly as many hon. Members seemed to think, and in the meantime the lot of its crew should be improved. He was staggered when he heard the hon.

Member say that there was no necessity to have sailors of many years standing at all, and here the hon. Member contradicted himself. What he had stated was directly contrary to the experience of the Shipping Federation, Fairplay, the Shipping Gazette, and the Shipping World. He would not quote the opinion of a shipowner, or the opinion of the former Member for Middlesbrough, but he had in his hand a Report of a Committee appointed by the Board of Trade to inquire into the manning of British merchant ships. This was a document which was not the product of an agitator or a shipowner, but it was the deliberate conclusions of a Committee on which the shipping interest, in my opinion, had a disproportionate amount of representation. And what does this document say? Recommendation 27 says;

"That at least three fourths of the crew of a sailing ship should be individually effective, i.e., of ratings not lower than that of A.B."

That was one recommendation. Recommendation 21 says;

"That it should be made illegal to withdraw men from the prescribed minimum staff of the stokehold for service in engine room or for other purposes."

Why did the Committee make that recommendation? Because, as the hon. Member knew, it was stated before the Committee and proved that in many instances men were withdrawn from the stokehold for service in the engine-room and to do work on deck. Recommendation 24 says;

"That sailing ships should be manned with some regard to sudden emergencies."

Recommendation 30 provides;

"That a ship is in an unseaworthy state when she leaves port without sufficient officers, or with her responsible officers unfitted for their duty by reason of prolonged overwork, and that no ship of large size or power should be permitted to go to sea without provision having been made that the deck shall always be in charge of some person who has given proof of his qualification, by service or examination, for such a position."

Recommendation 31 reads;

"That not less than two mates should be carried in any sailing ship of 1,000 or more tons under deck, clearing from a port in the United Kingdom. That steamers of 500 tons gross and over should have two mates, and of 2,000 tons gross and

over, three mates."

Recommendation 32 provides;

"That the absence of any requirement with regard to certificated masters, officers or engineers in the home trade, except in passenger ships, urgently demands legislation."

Recommendation 33 says;

"That the bridge of a steamer should never be left without an officer when the vessel is under weigh, and that the practice of taking away the look-out man at night to raise ashes, trim lights, etc., or the officer of the watch from the bridge to clear up for cargo, etc., is most reprehensible, as fraught with danger to navigation, and should be prohibited by law."

In these recommendations they had the calm, deliberate report of a Committee appointed to consider under manning, and these were some of their recommendations. Now, how did they start their Report? Be asked the hon.

Member's attention to this. Paragraph No. 7 reads;

"On the other hand, the Committee have found that in certain classes of ships there is a tendency to reduce the number of men out of proportion to the adoption of improvements in the rig or labour-saving appliances of the vessels, and that many vessels which have been referred to in evidence, or reported on by courts of inquiry, have not been so manned as to conduce either to the safety or well-being of the crews."

There was evidence clear and unmistakable, on the authority of the Manning Committee, supported by the appendices of that Report, that the statements made by the hon. Member for East Clare, and repeated many times in this House by the Member for Middlesbrough, were absolutely true. Hon. Members always wanted them to cite special instances and then qualify the details. He would only give another case. Take paragraph 13, which reads;

"The 'Deeside' (569 tons gross) is a typical case. That vessel had only two men in a watch, and whilst one of those men was absent from the look-out, trimming a side-light which had become dim, the vessel was run into and sunk, with several of the crew, by the 'Ludgate Hill' (4,063 tons gross). Notwithstanding the strong condemnation pronounced by the Judge of the Admiralty Division of the High Court against the practice of undermanning which led to this fatal collision, the Board of Trade were advised that a prosecution would not be successful, because, whilst there were sufficient men on board who might have been called and stationed on the look-out, it could not be said that the vessel was undermanned.

"In the case of the 'Cromartyshire,' which the "Wreck Commissioner declared to have been undermanned, the Board of Trade were advised that a prosecution would not be

successful, and that the law gave no power of detention for undermanning."

Why did the Board of Trade take that view? Because it was a moot point in the mind of the Board of Trade as to whether undermanning was unseaworthiness, and this Committee especially appointed to consider it decided that undermanning should be made a standard of unseaworthiness, and they asked the Board of Trade not only to adopt that view, but to enforce the law dealing with this condition

of things. He had defended the hon. Member for East Clare from the charge of exaggeration, and he had also proved that the hon. Member for Middlesbrough had been more than justified in the statements he had made on behalf of the sailors. He ventured to say that if they were to ask the owners of the Cunard Line or the owners of any of the best lines of steamers, whatever their politics, or whatever their views in regard to agitators might be, he believed they would be found ready to agree that the recommendations of this Manning Committee, whose document he had quoted, could without injury to the shipping trade be adopted, and should be adopted in the interests of attracting to the merchant service a more experienced and a steadier class of men who would serve shipowners much better than they did at the present time.

There was another point which he wished to deal with, and it related to a subject which was being discussed in the nautical papers. He referred to the scandalous instances of crimping that had taken place in American and other ports. Two years ago the former Member for Middlesbrough aroused quite a storm of indignation in the House of Commons because he suggested that in this matter some of the British consuls had not done their duty as they should have done in the direction of protecting the British sailor. What has happened since then? They had a Report dated 1899 presented to the House by the Board of Trade upon merchant shipping. It dealt with the engagement of seamen, desertions, and kindred subjects. The Shipping World, which is edited by an ex-Member of this House, who was a man of great ability and studious moderation, published several articles upon this subject, and this was what it said about the lack of discouragement on the part of the consular agents in reference to crimping. The article is headed "Seamen, Crimps, and Consuls";

"We print to-day the last of Mr. Stephen's articles on crimping and desertion in American ports. It has been shown that blame for the present condition of things is attributed to a variety of causes, apart from want of laws and treaties, namely: (1) Collusion between crimps and subordinates of H.M.'s consulates; (2) agreements between British shipowners and (or) captains on the one hand and so-called shipping masters on the other, whereby the crimp or shipping master pays for the privileges of inducing desertion and shipping fresh crews; (3) insufficient and badly cooked food on British ships; and (4) the nefarious work of crimps. We respectfully invite the serious attention of the Foreign Office and the Board of Trade to the fact that a taint rests upon more than one of our Consulates abroad; it is criminal to ignore this fact. There is really no doubt of the essential truth of some of the allegations of Mr. Havelock Wilson, made when he represented Middlesbrough in Parliament, and attributable to subordinate consular officers and clerks; that they are in league with crimps and shipping masters. This is a matter which should be carefully inquired into by the departments; and where guilt is discovered then the responsible consul should be dismissed or discharged."

He would add no single comment of his own to that statement. He said if the Shipping World be true, and it was backed up by the evidence of the reports of our own consular officers in this particular Parliamentary document, these facts

warranted that the Board of Trade, in deference to the wish of good shipowners and good sailors, should at once appoint a small committee of responsible men who would consider the questions of desertion, under-manning, crimping, bad food, and the unattractiveness of mercantile marine life for our sailors, and see if they could not suggest to Parliament some remedy for this deplorable condition of things. On this head he would conclude by quoting one of our own consuls, and he would direct the attention of the President of the Board of Trade to this document. It was issued in 1899 at the right hon. Gentleman's own instigation, he presumed. At page 43 Mr. Alan Williams made a number of suggestions, and he asked the House respectfully to listen to him, and when they did so to remember that similar charges and suggestions were made by the late Member for Middlesbrough. Mr. Williams said;

"Briefly, the causes and remedies I should suggest are as follows::

- (1) Desire to obtain work on shore; make ships' forecastles more comfortable; cabins for two and four men; abolish open ones with the windlass in the centre.
- (2) Ill-treatment and poor food; allow a magistrate or consul to grant a discharge if he saw fit to men who have a just reason for complaint; improve the sale of provisions; owners should themselves inspect food.
- (3) Boarding-house masters and crimps; compel shipmasters to take a certain proportion of their men out of the sailors' homes. (In Capetown the Sailor's Home receives an annual grant of £;250 from the Colonial Government); local authorities to give licences to sailors' boarding houses, and withdraw them when not properly conducted. In Cape Town this month a boarding-house master has been convicted for 'illicit drink traffic' on his premises.
- (4) Driving men out of ships; all forfeited wages to Seamen's Pension Fund. Men sign for slops; this most important, as otherwise there might be no wages to hand over to such a fund.
- (5) Abolition of present system of discharges, and adoption of German or Scandinavian plan."

Any man who knew what sailors had to do in the middle passage between Madeira and the West Coast of Africa would understand the reasonableness of the recommendation that forecastles should be made more comfortable. If they wanted to attract sailors to their ships they must not have forecastles as he had seen them; narrow, confined, dirty, insanitary, and ill-ventilated places. The consul might have said something also about; the blinding snow and wind and rain coming in at the windlass opening. [AN HON. MEMBER: Snow in tropical climates?] There were passages which included the tropics which could be very uncomfortable in the winter time. If the hon. Member were a seafaring man he would know that it was possible to be uncomfortable during a voyage three-quarters of which was in tropical or semitropical climates, but the hon. Member was not a seafaring person. He would make an excellent pair with that hon. Member who once said that he was not an agricultural labourer. These recommendations which he had quoted were some of the thirty or forty excellent proposals made by consular officers for the improvement of the sailor's condition.

Now he would deal briefly with food. He asked a question in 1894, it is true, but it held good to-day. He asked Mr. Mundella; whose death they all deplored; how

many instances he had had of food being rejected because it was bad, and he replied that out of 1,015 inspections of food and provisions there were 391, or 33 per cent., rejected as unfit for use. He believed that the same percentage would obtain to-day. Now, he would give to the Board of Trade a suggestion. Some day we should be at the end of this war, and probably before it was at an end there would be an immense amount, ranging from thousands of tons, of rejected tinned foods, preserved foods and other things. What the Board of Trade, in conjunction with the War Office and the Admiralty, ought to do was, immediately the war was over, to see that all that stuff was put into a dust destructor, or that it was chemically destroyed. If it was not treated in that way, for years after the war was over our mercantile marine would be living on that stuff, which ought to have been condemned at the end of the war. [AN HON. MEMBER: No.] The hon. Member might say it was not so, but he knew something about this, and he asked them, in the face of this percentage of rejection of bad foods, to see that the sailor got better food than he did now. Had not the hon. Member for West Clare been justified? Had not the late hon. Member for Middlesbrough been vindicated? He thought they had, in the two Reports he had quoted from this Parliamentary document. He would conclude by asking the President of the Board of Trade to defer to the request that had been made. He made no attack on shipowners. He had quoted facts. He appealed in this matter to the shipowners, and especially the best shipowners, who inevitably drifted into this House. The worst ones did not come here. When criticism was made against shipowners, many good ones fitted on the cap as though it were intended for them. He appealed to the best shipowners in this House to re-read their mercantile papers *Fairplay* and the *Shipping World*, to go through the master seamen's discussions, and to read the pamphlets on crimping, bad food, and the undesirable environments of the

sailor's life when in port and also on board ship, and to co-operate with the best friends of the seamen and the mercantile marine in the labour world to bring sufficient pressure to bear on the President of the Board of Trade to at once introduce a short Bill carrying out the recommendations of the Committee of 1896. If these recommendations were embodied in a Bill he considered that they could get it through the House next year. If they were not disposed to embody these recommendations in a Bill next year, let the President of the Board of Trade, in the face of these facts, appoint another Committee with a view to legislate next year, so that the sailor's life might be made more attractive than it was, and that the number of foreigners who were rapidly coming into our ships might be diminished.

One of these days we would deplore this foreign element in our ships; perhaps at a moment when it was too late. Then the much defended lascar would fail us. Next to a crew of British seamen; Scotch firemen, Irish deck hands, an English mate, always with a Scotch skipper, and always Scotch engineers; next to the Anglo-Saxon, he believed the best seamen were those to be found on the West Coast of Africa. But in the hour of emergency, when the rudder was gone, when the engines were done for, when they were face to face with a critical occasion, when they wanted, guts in their men and moral courage in their officers, would the lascar

serve them in the face of such emergency in the same manner as the British seaman? When, perhaps, through spread-eagle Imperialism we were at close quarters, and perhaps in death grips, in three or four quarters of the world we wanted men like Nelson's boys to hold the seas, it was not the lascar who would perform that service. It was the Irish or Scotch stoker and the British captain who would best on these occasions stand between us and danger. In that crisis we would want men who had had good food, to give them that strength wherewith to face the elements and withstand climatic difficulties. We had not got these men to-day because we did not pay our men enough. We allowed them to be badly fed, our forecastles were dirty and unsatisfactory, our vessels were too often over-worked and under-manned, and the time had arrived when, if we wished to maintain the maritime supremacy we had now, it must be done by the predominance of Anglo-Saxon sailors. The time had arrived when the President of the Board of Trade should lick these recommendations into the shape of a little Bill, so that these long-standing grievances might be remedied and something done to improve the miserable lot of the sailor.

MR. CHARLES MCARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said he quite endorsed what the hon. Member had said in regard to the conditions under which the shipping trade was carried on. The British shipowner's business was heavily handicapped, for, by reason of the way he had to meet foreigners, he was placed at a great disadvantage. But if some of the suggestions which had been made were carried out in the British mercantile fleet it would be bad not only for shipowners but also for sailors. It was desirable to increase the sailors' comforts, but he deprecated altogether looking at the matter from only one side. This was not at all the question of shipowner versus sailor, or sailor versus shipowner. He was sorry that the hon. Member for Battersea had imported rather a bitter tone into the debate, and had rather pointed the discussion as against the shipowner. He preferred the tone in which the hon. Member for East Clare addressed himself to the subject. He did not see that it was at all a question between shipowner and sailor, and he would try to look at the matter fairly. It had been said with justice that the sailors had grievances, and, while he regretted their existence, he believed they could not be remedied without casting fresh burdens on the shipowners. There was a sailor's side and a shipowner's side to the question. When we found that foreigners were gradually superseding British seamen and pushing them out of employment, and when we saw by the figures which had been recently given what was going on, he agreed that something should be done. In 1859 there were only eight foreigners to every hundred British persons employed on board our ships. In 1889 there were twenty-one foreigners to every hundred persons, so that we must feel that we were face to face with an alarming state of things. There was another thing to be considered, and it was equally important, namely, the deterioration of the character of our seamen. He did not dwell upon that, because it might be to some extent outside the point. He would deal only with the questions brought before the Committee that night, and he would try to indicate a few of the points which required to be remedied.

In the first place, what we required was a larger supply of qualified seamen.

The Board of Trade had done something in that direction, but the boy-sailor scheme had worked badly, because it was complicated with the question of light dues. It would have been better if they had granted a certain payment to every shipowner who carried a certain number of boys with a view to their being enrolled in the Royal Naval Reserve. He was glad to be able to confirm what was said by the hon. and gallant Member behind him that shipowners were moving in this way. The shipowners felt that they wanted to be independent. They did not want to be restricted by Government, nor did they want assistance. The Chamber of Shipping had appealed to every shipowner to carry at least two apprentices on board ship, and that, if carried out, no doubt would be a step in the right direction, for what we wanted was a better supply of ordinary and able seamen on board our vessels. The question of manning had been referred to, He thought a Bill framed to include the recommendations of the Committee would be not a little Bill, but a very big Bill. It would be a long time in passing this House, and that would be a very bad thing. But there was one thing he recommended, and that was that training ships should be established throughout the coasts for the purpose of training respectable lads for service at sea. The hon. Member for East Clare had directed attention to the desirability of every ship carrying a certain proportion of properly trained seamen whose competency had been proved. He had a great deal of sympathy with him in the views he had expressed. He had himself drawn attention to the rather remarkable practice that had sprung up (though he did not say it was a culpable practice) that when a man presented himself at a shipping office and could not prove that he was an A.B., he was taken on the rating of an A.B. That was very remarkable. It might be inevitable in the existing circumstances, but it was very undesirable, and he looked forward to the day when it would be possible to require that our seamen should be compelled to prove their qualifications, because, until we did that, and distinguished between properly trained seamen and the rag-tag and bobtail who came on board our ships on the same terms, we would never raise the profession of the seaman to a proper standing. As long as our trained British seamen had to compete on equal terms with the scum of the cities, almost the scum of the world, the tramps and loafers, we could never elevate that trade to a proper standing. He looked forward, in the future at all events, for some such distinction as he had indicated. It was impossible at present, for the reasons he had already given. How could we expect a sailor to show discharges for four years? It was not to be expected that he would keep them, and the result of such a requirement would be to increase the difficulty which captains and shipowners had in getting crews. Reference had been made to the case of the "Primrose Hill." The captain of that vessel, Captain Wilson, before he sailed, wrote a letter to the Liverpool Journal of Commerce in which he said that he had gone to the Board of Trade to supply a crew, and that he had been going about trying to find a crew. At last he had to go out into the river and anchor there, and to take the crew on board. It was due to that that the ship sailed late and encountered the hurricane in which she was lost. The captain did not complain of the crew, or the ship, or the owners, but of the system which compelled him to employ other persons to get

a crew for him. The Board of Trade had instituted that very valuable system which dealt with discharges. He believed it had been fully brought before the public. He believed that under that system, if continued, we would be able to work some plan by which the sailor might be required to prove his qualification before he shipped.

One word more as to another remedy, and one which he thought was most important, and that was that we ought to make the service more attractive to our sailors, and the only point which he wished to touch upon in that connection was a pension scheme. He thought we ought to have a pension scheme for our sailors, and one initial way of doing that would be if the sailors were given more encouragement to enter the Royal Naval Reserve, and if a better and more satisfactory pension was attached to the Royal Naval Reserve, It would be a great inducement to respectable men to follow the calling of sailors if some provision was made for them in old age. He could only say that he thought we needed to face this problem. We must deal with it in three ways. We must endeavour to increase the supply of trained seamen, we must endeavour to give a preference to trained men over untrained men, and we must endeavour to make the service more attractive to our sailors.

MR. BRYCE (Aberdeen, S.) said this was really a question of great importance. There was no doubt at all, he thought, that the Member for East Clare was quite right in saying that many of our vessels were under-manned, and that in consequence of that under-manning many British lives were lost. There was certainly the impression left upon his mind in perusing a great number of the reports of courts of inquiry, that a large number of vessels did go to sea undermanned, and that it frequently happened when the vessel was lost and the circumstances of the loss were unknown we had every reason to conclude that under-manning was the cause of the loss. There was good reason, he thought, to believe that this dreadful loss of British life, which anyone could establish for himself by reading the Report on Under-manning, was one considerable cause of loss of life at sea. The hon. Member for Battersea called attention to the Report of the Committee which was appointed when Mr. Bryce was at the Board of Trade in 1894, and reported in 1896. He would not say that everything reported by that Committee could be carried out, but he thought some of the recommendations made furnished the basis of legislation. But he was struck with the fact that all

our departmental legislation in this House was getting into arrears. It had become a very serious evil. He thought that in all the principal departments there were Bills pigeon-holed from year to year which collectively, if carried, would improve the condition of this country, and especially of the working classes, and the industries of the country, and for which, under the present arrangements, the time could not be found. He would recommend to the Government the desirability of endeavouring to consider whether a greater quantity of this much-needed departmental legislation could not be passed. It was for the most part unconnected with party, and non-controversial, and he thought a great deal more required to be done in that way.

With regard to under-manning, he did not think legislation was needed. As far as

he understood, the present state of the law on the subject of under-manning gave quite sufficient power to the Board of Trade to deal with it, and if the Board of Trade were to put in force the power which it had in that matter it would be able to meet the case. He believed that the difficulty was that the Board of Trade officers found themselves scarcely able to work up to the law, and in point of fact their practice did not quite come up to what the law required. He believed the difficulty lay very much in the fact that there was not a sufficient supply of British sailors. That, indeed, was admitted by the hon. Member for the Exchange Division of Liverpool. Then came the enormous difficulty, how we were to increase the number of sailors. Too large a number of sailors came in from foreign countries. It was true that some of these were among the best in the world, such as the Swedes and Norwegians, but a large number were not the best, such as lascars, who were very well in the tropics, but not in cold climates. He thought it was very much to be desired, not only for the safety of our sea-going ships, but also for political considerations, that we should have a larger proportion of British sailors in our ships. The Board of Trade brought forward the boy-sailor scheme a few years ago. He was afraid that scheme had not satisfied the expectations of its promoters. He earnestly hoped that the Board of Trade would be able to bring in some practical measure

which would make the profession of seamanship more attractive to good British men. It would be necessary for shipowners in one way or another, by providing more comforts or by paying higher wages, to make the profession of seamanship more attractive to good British men. He did not think, at any rate, it would be possible to go on with the present plan, for it was the case that a captain was frequently obliged to go to sea with a crew which he knew to be unfit. It was not altogether the fault of the shipowner.

Then, he should be glad to hear what was being done to carry out the Act of last year in regard to automatic couplings, and to make the railway companies provide these couplings more speedily. He hoped that prompt and effective action had been taken. Although the Board of Trade had no power over the companies in regard to the accommodation and the heavy rates charged for cycles, they had the power to advise them, and no doubt they could exercise a great deal of influence in that way. Unless the companies bestirred themselves in that matter, they would incur a great deal of unpopularity inside and outside the House. He wished also to ask what was being done under the Act intended to enable the Board of Trade to procure the shortening of the hours of labour of railway servants where the Board of Trade were convinced that the hours of labour were too long for the health of the men and the safety of the public. Something was being done, but he thought less was being done than might be expected, and he wished the Board would do a little more to induce the railway companies to reduce the hours. He did not think it would be right, on the first occasion the House discussed the Board of Trade Vote since the death of Sir Courtenay Boyle, for him to sit down without paying a tribute to that distinguished public servant. Sir Courtenay Boyle was accomplished in many ways. No man could have been more zealous in the discharge of his public duties. He regarded it a high privilege

and honour to serve the best interests of the commerce and industry of the country. No man could have been more perfectly loyal and devoted to the Minister under whom he was placed. He rendered great service as a conciliator and arbitrator in

labour disputes. He selected his subordinates in that duty with great care, and when he himself had to deal with difficult questions, his tact and judgment achieved success. He was one of the best Government servants of our generation. MR. GERALD BALFOUR said he joined most heartily in every word which had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman as to the great loss which the Board of Trade and the nation had suffered by the death of Sir Courtenay Boyle. That gentleman's power of work, his vigour, and his ability and judgment could not possibly have been excelled. He need hardly say that having come so recently to the Board of Trade he himself felt a great personal loss in being deprived of the services of so valuable an ally in his Department. With respect to the Act passed last year as to accidents to railway servants, the Board of Trade had issued draft rules, carefully prepared under the powers of the statute, and the proper announcements required by the Act had been made in the London and Dublin Gazettes. A period of six weeks was given within which the companies could make objection. That period had expired, and a very considerable number of objections had been laid; but he did not think they would cause very much difficulty in the administration of the Act. With regard to cycles, the Board of Trade had really no power in the matter. Of course it was possible for the Board of Trade to lend its friendly offices to endeavour to persuade the companies to adopt a different attitude towards the public, and they were always ready to do so, but they had no statutory power to compel the railway companies to do anything.

MR. BRYCE said that the Board of Trade was at the same time the controller and defender of the railway companies. It had the right not only to give advice to the companies but to put them under terms. The Board of Trade had a good deal of moral influence in that way, and it should warn the companies that if they did not make some concessions in regard to the accommodation and the rates charged for cycles they would not find themselves advantaged in this House.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said that was true, but it was a power which they ought to exercise with great discretion. As to complaints which had been lodged against railway companies about long hours, these had been diminishing year by year, which he regarded as satisfactory. The hon. Member for Barn-staple had raised the question of the insufficiency of the coast guards on the west coast of England. The Board of Trade had been in communication with the Admiralty on the subject, and he had since heard that it was proposed to increase the coastguard service at Westward-Ho. As to the question raised by the hon. Member for East Clare, he had no desire to question the hon. Member's motive, but he might have taken a little more trouble to be accurate. There was not evidence to satisfy the court that the loss of the "Primrose Hill" was due to under manning.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he had quoted from the Report to show that the vessel was not adequately manned, and that only two officers on board held certificates. Where was the inaccuracy in that?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said that the master and the mate both held British certificates, and the boatswain, who acted as second mate, held a Norwegian certificate. The hon. Member desired legislation to secure that on all ships a proportion of the crew should be able to prove that they were entitled to the rating of able seamen; but the hon. Member perhaps was not aware that the whole question of under-manning had been investigated by a Committee of the Board of Trade.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said that if the right hon. the President of the Board of Trade referred to Hansard, and to the debates raised by Mr. Havelock Wilson, he would find that he had taken a deep interest in this matter long before the right hon. Gentleman went to the Board of Trade.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR said that the Manning Committee of 1896 recommended two manning scales; one by the majority and the other by the minority of the Committee; and judged by either of these scales the manning of the "Primrose Hill" could not be declared insufficient. So far as could be judged from the facts, the "Primrose Hill" seemed to have been lost through deficiency in navigation.

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)

Hammond, John

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Harmsworth, R. Leicester

O'Malley, William

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

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Mara, James

Ambrose, Robert

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-

O'Shaughnessey, P. J.

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Helme, Norval Watson

O'Shee, James John

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.

Partington, Oswald

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

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

Pirie, Duncan, V.

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.

Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)

Power, Patrick Joseph

Bell, Richard

Horniman, Frederick John

Priestley, Arthur

Black, Alexander William

Joicey, Sir James
Reddy, M.
Boland, John
Jones, William (Carnarvons.)
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Boyle, James
Kennedy, Patrick James
Redmond. William (Clare)
Brigg, John
Lambert, George
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Broadhurst, Henry
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Leamy, Edmund
Roe, Sir Thomas
Burns, John
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Caine, William Sproston
Lewis, John Herbert
Shaw, Charles E. (Stafford)
Caldwell, James
Lundon, W.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cawley, Frederick
M'Crae, George
Soares, Ernest J.
Channing, Francis Allston
M'Dermott, Patrick
Strachey, Edward
Clancy, John Joseph
M'Govern, T.
Sullivan, Donal
Cogan, Denis J.
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Mansfield, Horace Rendell
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, Gow'r
Crean, Eugene
Minch, Matthew

Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Cullinan, J.
Mooney, John J.
Tomkinson, James
Delany, William
Morgan, David J (Walth'mst'w
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Dewar, John A (Inverness-shire
Moss, Samuel
Weir, James Galloway
Donelan, Captain A.
Mursaghan, George
White, George (Norfolk)
Doogan, P. C.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
White, Luke, York, E. R.)
Duffy, William J.
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Elibank, Master of
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Field, William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Fuller, J. M. F.
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.
Dr. Macnamara and Captain Norton.
Gilhooly, James
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Dowd, John
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir A. F.
Carlile, William Walter
Dorington, Sir John Edward

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Doughty, George
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Doxford, Sir William T.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Duke, Henry Edward
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Arrol, Sir William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edw.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Bain, Col. James Robert
Chapman, Edward
Finch, George H.
Balcarres, Lord
Churchill, Winston Spencer
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fisher, William Hayes
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Balfour, Rt. Hon. G. W. (Leeds)
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Balfour, Maj K. R. (Christch'ch)
Corbett, A. C. (Glasgow)
Flower, Ernest
Banbury, Frederick George
Cox, Irwin Edward B.
Foster, Henry William
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Cranborne, Viscount
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Blundell, Col. Henry

Crossley, Sir Savile
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin&Nairn
Bond, Edward
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormsby (Salop
Bousfield, William Robert
Dalkeith, Earl of
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir JohnEldon
Brassey, Albert
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlts, S. Geo.
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Digby, J. K D. Wingfield-
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Bull, William James
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph C.
Green, Walford D. (Wednesb'y
Question put.
The Committee divided:;Ayes, 114; Noes, 195. (Division List No. 252.)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Maconochie, A. W.
Round, James
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Greville, Hon. Ronald
M'Calinont, Col. H L B. (Cambs.
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Groves, James Grimble
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Majendie, James A. H.
Seton-Karr, Henry
Hain, Edward
Malcolm, Ian
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Hall, Edward Marshall
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Smith, H C (North'mb., T'neside

Hambro, Charles Eric
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld G (Midd'x.
Milton, Viscount
Spear, John Ward
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Stanley, Hon Arthur (Ormskirk
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Morgan, Hn Fred (Monm'thsh.)
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset
Hardy, Laurence (Kent Ashford
Morrell, George Herbert
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Morrison, James Archibald
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford)
Stroyan, John
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.
Mount, William Arthur
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Heaton, John Henniker
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Talbot, Rt Hn. J. G. (Oxf'd Univ.
Helder, Augustus
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Thomas David A. (Merthyr)
Henderson, Alexander
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Thomas, F. Freeman (Hastings
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Thornton, Percy M.
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Parkes, Ebenezer
Ure, Alexander
Johnston, William (Belfast)

Pease, Herb. Pike (Darlington)
Valentia, Viscount
Johnston, Heywood (Sussex)
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Walker, Col. William Hall
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Penn, John
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney)
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Percy, Earl
Webb, Col. Wm. George
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Pierpoint, Robert
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Knowles, Lees
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Plummer, Walter R.
Whiteley, H (Ashton und. Lyne)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
Pretymann, Ernest George
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Lawson, John Grant
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham)
Purvis, Robert
Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Rentoul, James Alexander
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Richards, Henry Charles
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)

Wylie, Alexander
Long, Rt Hn. Walter (Bristol S.)
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Sir William Walrond and
Macdona, John Cumming
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter
Mr. Anstruther.

Original Question again proposed.

It being after midnight, and objection being taken to further proceeding, the Chairman left the Chair, to make his Report to the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again to-morrow.

PURCHASE OF LAND (IRELAND) BILL.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

[Mr. GRANT LAWSON, (Yorkshire, N.R., Thirsk), in the Chair].

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said he understood that the Bill was not confined to any particular county, but that it would apply to all counties in which the limit had been exceeded.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): Yes, Sir, on the recommendation of the Lord Lieutenant.

Bill reported without amendment; read the third time, and passed.

OUTDOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) BILL.

Considered in Committee, and reported; as amended, to be considered Monday next.

Adjourned at twenty-five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 14th June, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

WALLASEY IMPROVEMENT BILL. (BY ORDER.)

As amended, considered.

MR. STRAGHEY (Somersetshire, S.) said he wished briefly to explain why he had placed a new clause on the Paper with reference to this Bill. When the Bill was read a second time, he carried an Instruction by a majority of over seventy making certain provisions regarding workmen's superannuation come under the control of the Registrar of Friendly Societies. Although the Instruction had been carried out, the clause inserted by the promoters was not one which he could assent to, but he need not go into details, as the promoters were now quite ready to accept his new clause, which was drawn up as a model clause, and which would be put in various other Bills if necessary.

New Clause;

"Any scheme for the establishment of a superannuation or provident fund under

this part of this Act shall not come into operation until the council shall in respect of that fund have been registered under the Friendly Societies Act, 1896, and the provisions of that Act (except section forty-one) so far as they are applicable and are not inconsistent with the provisions of this part of this Act shall apply as if (a) the council were a society to which that Act applies and were the Trustees of such society; (b) as if the scheme were the rules of such society; (c) as if the superannuation or provident funds were the funds of such society; and (d) as if the contributors to the fund were the members of such society."

;brought up and read the first and second time.]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be added to the Bill.";(Mr. Strachey.)

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange) said he would like to explain the position of the promoters in regard to this new clause. They regarded it as substantially the same as the one they had inserted. He explained to the House, when the matter was before it on the last occasion, that Clause 41 would have limited any lump sum payable to £;200, or an annuity to £;50, and that would have made any superannuation scheme brought out tinder the Bill inapplicable to the case of the higher officials. However, as the new clause substantially agreed with the views of the promoters, the difference being only one of form, he was glad to say he was enabled to accept it.

Question put, and agreed to.

Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time.

CHRIST'S HOSPITAL (LONDON) BILL [Lords]. (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley) said it was his intention to have moved that this Bill be read a second time this day three months, but the promoters and himself had agreed that it would be more satisfactory to discuss the question at issue upon an Instruction to the Committee, and under those circumstances he begged to withdraw his motion, and to intimate that the motion would be discussed this day week.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time.";(Lord Balcarres.)

MR. RICHARDS (Finsbury, E.) said he represented those whose original intention it was to oppose the Bill altogether unless a compromise could be effected between them and the Christ's Hospital authorities with regard to the real points at issue. It had been stated that those who were seeking to prevent the authorities from building upon a burial ground and destroying a most valuable open space were endeavouring in that way to prevent the authorities from securing the necessary funds to support the institution in its new home at Horsham. Many of them would have liked to oppose the scheme from the beginning, but, as the Charity Commissioners had forced the hands of Christ's Hospital, and the authorities had built a school at Horsham, it would be absurd to ask the House to refuse to give the necessary permission to the Foundation to sell what was required for the re-endowment and for the payment of the expenses to which

they had been put. Far from attempting in any way to hamper the hospital, their only object was to secure the preservation of the cloisters and the two open spaces now existing.

SIR JOSEPH DIMSDALE (London) expressed a hope that the assertions of the hon. Member who had last spoken would not be regarded by the outside public as accurate. When the matter came up for discussion he thought he would be able to show the House that the statements were absolutely unfounded.

MR. MELLOR (Yorkshire, W.R., Sowerby) agreed with the action taken, and pointed out that it would have been impossible for him to support a motion for the rejection of the Bill.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.), as one greatly interested in the matter through his constituents, entirely concurred in the statements made by the noble Lord and the hon. Member for East Finsbury. Any remarks he wished to make he would reserve, he added, until the Instruction was under discussion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

BOURNEMOUTH CORPORATION BILL [LORDS] (BY ORDER).

*MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.), who had on the Paper the following instruction;"That it be an Instruction to the Committee on the Bill to leave out Improvement No. 5 from Part III. of the Bill," said he would not take up the time of the House by moving the Instruction which stood in his name. He understood that the Chairman of Committees was going to move that Standing Orders be suspended, and that the Bill be allowed to go to a Select Committee upstairs. He ought to say with regard to the motion on the Paper that the Bill was not opposed in the House of Lords, and neither had it been opposed in this House hitherto, because the vicar and churchwardens had no knowledge that part of the churchyard was going to be taken by the tramway scheme. Unfortunately, in this matter one gentleman was acting in two interests;for the corporation and for the churchwardens, and owing to a misunderstanding no petition was laid against the Bill. It was found, therefore, that unless he moved an instruction in the House the Bill would have passed through unopposed, and the tramway would have carried away part of the churchyard. As he had before said, he understood the Chairman of Committees was now going to propose that Standing Order No. 83 be put in force, so as to enable the Bill to be sent to a Select Committee upstairs. Under those circumstances he would not move his instruction.

*THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith) said the hon. Member had quite accurately described the compromise which had been arranged. He intended to report the Bill as an opposed Bill, and at the same time he would put down a motion enabling his hon. friend to present a petition. That petition would be referred to a Committee upstairs, who would hear the case.

TITLES OF PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS.

On the motion for the consideration of the Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders No. 1 Bill;

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said he thought it would be a matter of great convenience to hon. Members if some means were afforded them of

identifying the work proposed to be undertaken under Bills bearing these titles. He had been put to considerable inconvenience in trying to get the information for himself.

*MR. SPEAKER: The difficulty was pointed out some time ago, and as a result it was decided to give the information in the fortnightly lists of private Bills with which hon. Members are supplied. I will, however, consider whether it is possible to do anything further.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) (NO. 2) BILL (BY ORDER).

Order for Second Reading read.

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

MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.) said that when he saw the title of this Bill and ascertained the objects with which it was being promoted he had some doubt as to what the effects of the measure would be, having regard to the fact that in several well known towns in England, and notably in Liverpool, where a very large district of working class buildings had been swept away, years had been allowed to elapse before suitable houses were provided for the persons thus displaced. He had provided himself with a copy of the Bill, and he found that even the promoters of the Bill themselves granted a large part of the case he stated against it, inasmuch as they proposed a statute to provide for a certain number of those they dispossessed. Of the 10,000 people whose dwellings they were going to pull down 3,000 would be left without provision being made for them, and would have to go outside the district in which they were employed to find accommodation. It was only fair that the House should ask the promoters of the Bill to take it back and amend the section so as to remove that grievance. He had great sympathy with the Bill, and would like to see the dwellings of the working classes improved, and more comfort provided in all large towns. There was not the slightest objection to the avowed intention of the Bill being carried out, but the Corporation of Leeds should not be allowed to carry out the work until they had provided ample accommodation for the persons whom they proposed to dispossess. It would, no doubt, be urged that the commissioner who held the local inquiry had reported in favour of the scheme, but he suggested that that gentleman, who, it might be taken for granted, was highly respectable and intelligent, of a necessity would only be brought into contact with those who favoured the scheme. Such gentlemen had seldom or never had an opportunity of meeting the people whose interests were affected, and whose homes were to be destroyed. If, for instance, the working classes of the Scotland Division of Liverpool, who had been affected by the clearance now being effected, had known what the result would be, that they were going to be driven out and no provision was to be made for them, and that they would have had to go out of the district altogether to find a home as best they could, it would have taken more than the united force of the Liverpool police to have evicted them. The working classes really did not know the meaning of these Bills or the effect of them until it was too late, and consequently they did not enter their protest at the right time. The Bill before the House was one which should be opposed by all

the representatives of labour in the House, and he ventured to raise a humble protest against it, because if the scheme was carried out in its present form it would involve a very serious loss and damage upon a large section of the community. The area was declared to be unsanitary, and for all he knew it might, or it might not, be unsanitary, but against that statement he would urge upon the House the fact that the average school attendance in that district was higher than in any other part of Leeds, and everyone knew very well that in unsanitary districts epidemics broke out and raged with great virulence, causing all the schools to be closed, which must of a necessity reduce the average school attendance. He, however, did not profess to be able to deal with that aspect of the case. He rested his case upon the fact, which was clearly stated in the Bill by the promoters themselves, that they did not intend to provide accommodation for thousands of the people whom it was proposed under the Bill to deprive of their homes. He begged that the Bill be read a second time this day three months.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green), in seconding the Amendment, complained that for some time past schemes for the clearance of unsanitary areas had been put forward by local authorities and various corporations in which insufficient provision was made for the rehousing of the persons dispossessed. The result was that people were removed from the dangers of overcrowding in one place only to create veritable plague spots in another. The House of Commons ought to be very chary indeed of giving its sanction to any scheme unless adequate provision was made for the accommodation of the people to be dispossessed before they were dispossessed.

Amendment proposed;

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

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

MR. GALLOWAY (Manchester, S.W.) said the objections which had been raised by the mover and seconder of the Amendment were very natural objections in the minds of anybody who had had experience of clearing unsanitary areas, but they referred rather to defects in the various Acts for the housing of the working classes than to any action of the particular corporation concerned in the scheme under consideration. His object in rising, however, was to ask the President of the Local Government Board to consider a hardship which had arisen in this case. Rightly or wrongly, a large number of the property owners concerned, when the Local Government Board inquiry was held, were under the impression that it was the preliminary inquiry, and, indeed, when they applied to the inspector to be heard their application was refused. As a result of this decision there were scheduled for the purposes of this improvement scheme certain properties which it was contended could be proved to be in themselves perfectly sanitary, and the owners felt that it was rather hard that such properties should be taken from them by the Leeds Corporation at an "unsanitary" price, and that they should be penalised because of unsanitary property over which they had no control. He had placed on the Paper an Instruction, the effect of which would be to give these property owners a right to be heard before the Committee as to whether this

scheme was a scheme within the meaning of the Act. By giving his favourable consideration to the matter when it came before him, the President of the Local Government Board would be doing an act of justice to these property owners, who, after all, were not responsible for the scheme of the Leeds Corporation. The scheme itself was a good one, and the corporation deserved the highest credit for taking in hand so large an undertaking. That, however, was no reason why injustice should be inflicted upon anyone, and therefore he hoped the property owners would be heard in their own defence before the Committee.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said that five years ago the Leeds Corporation obtained power to set aside the almost universal law in this country against the erection of back to back houses.

MR. SPEAKER ruled that the byelaws of the city of Leeds could not now be debated.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER said that in that case he would move an Instruction at a later stage to the Committee that they should amend the Act so as to forbid the building of back to back houses in, the future.

*MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydfil) said that the real objection to this Bill was that it proposed to dishouse 9,000 and to rehouse only 6,000 people. He did not suggest that the right hon. Gentleman should insist upon an equal number of people being housed on the site being cleared, as that would at once do away with the benefits to be derived from the scheme. He suggested to the President of the Local Government Board that he should insist upon a sufficient number of houses being erected within the boundary of the city of Leeds equal to the number of those who had been displaced. It was a very serious matter to turn 3,000 people adrift without making provision for their requirements, and it simply meant an increase of rent and the transforming of some other district into a slum area.

MR. CAUTLEY (Leeds, E.) contended that the Bill should be sent to a Select Committee for consideration. One of the main objections was that this was not a scheme within the meaning of the Act, but the property owners would have an opportunity of appearing before the Committee in opposition to the scheme. The Local Government Board were of opinion that all the necessary requirements had been complied with, and they were of opinion that it was a scheme worthy of the consideration of the House of Commons. He thought that the House would no more think of going behind the decision of this Local Government Board inquiry than it would think of going behind the Standing Orders. He hoped the House would consent to a Select Committee, before

which any property owner could appear and oppose the scheme on its merits if he thought he could satisfy the Committee that the Bill ought to be rejected. Any private Bill could be opposed before the Committee in the regular form. He sincerely sympathised with the property owners, and he did not agree that their property should be taken for the good of the community without adequate compensation, any more than the property of other classes of the community. This was a great scheme which had been undertaken by the Leeds Corporation, and it was the largest scheme of this sort that had ever come before Parliament. The justification for it was to be found in the very heavy death rate.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The hon. Member for South Louth, who moved the rejection of this Bill, did so on the ground that the Corporation of Leeds, in taking power to clear an insanitary area in that city, did not make sufficient provision for housing the working classes displaced by the scheme. I do not think that that contention will be found to be correct when the statistics are examined. In this case the number of persons of the working classes who will be displaced under the scheme is 9,234. The order now under consideration provides for rehousing on the sites of existing buildings 6,000 persons, leaving a balance to be provided for in other ways of 3,234. There is suitable house room vacant within half a mile of the area to accommodate 1,070, and beyond the half mile but within a mile sufficient for a further 1,500, leaving 664 unaccounted for. Of this total 616 are provided for in model lodging houses, and therefore the actual number which can be said to be unprovided for is only 48. I do not think that the House can possibly regard that as unsatisfactory provision for the working classes. The hon. Gentleman also stated that the Local Government Board inspector during his inquiry came only into contact with the officials of the Corporation and not with the working classes. I doubt whether that could ever be an accurate description of an inquiry held by an inspector of the Local Government Board, but it is most certainly an inaccurate description in this case. A long inquiry was held by the inspector at Leeds, and witnesses of every sort and condition were heard. The inspector himself spent considerable time personally inspecting every portion of the land and every court, alley, and street within the area affected, and the recommendation he makes to me is based not alone upon the evidence received from the medical officer of health and other experts, but also upon his own personal experience after close investigation conducted by himself and after a careful examination of all the property. Therefore, I do not think it can fairly be alleged that the inspector only came into contact with the Corporation officials. My hon. friend the Member for South West Manchester alleges that some property owners in Leeds have not been heard, and that they will suffer an injustice through the operation of the penal clauses of the Act of 1890. When my hon. friend states that some of the property owners were not heard at the inquiry, I do not think he has been correctly informed. The point was raised before the inspector whether or not this was a scheme within the meaning of the Act. The inspector decided that that was a question for the Local Government Board or Parliament to decide, and with that point he declined to deal, but he did not decline to hear the owners in regard to the scheme as it affected their property. I think the point raised was one for the Local Government Board to decide, and Parliament could reverse their decision if hon. Members disagreed with it. I do, however, hope that this House will pause before it consents to check in any way the work of large corporations in their efforts to deal with insanitary areas. There is an additional danger in rejecting such schemes as this, and it is that if Parliament in all cases insists upon the full number of those displaced being provided for before the areas are allowed to be dealt with, I venture to say that you will make the work of clearing insanitary areas practically impossible. There is, fortunately,

accommodation within easy reach of the affected area, and nobody could suggest that it would be a hardship for working men to go half a mile or so further. I admit that the

scheme is important as a precedent; as my hon. friend has said, it is the largest scheme which has ever been brought forward under the Housing of the Working Classes Act, but I know of no word or line in that Act which limits the size of a scheme. It has been said that the scheme does not comply with the Act: because it does not definitely lay down what the Corporation propose to do, but the Corporation have made a full and complete plan as to what they propose to do with this insanitary area when it is cleared. I do not hesitate to say that from the point of view of getting rid of many insanitary houses the scheme is a right and sensible one, and I hope the House will see its way to adopt it.

*MR. HERBERT GLADSTONE (Leeds, W.) said the Bill had been attacked from different points of view. But he could assure his hon. friend the Member for Northwich that it was not intended to erect, back to back, houses on the area in question. He quite agreed that the clearing of such a large area was a matter of very serious consideration; but it was obvious that the House could not at that stage give a ripe judgment on all the details of the Bill. The scheme was promoted by the city council of Leeds, the members of which were practically unanimous in favour of it, and was supported by the Trades Council. A full local inquiry, lasting eight days, had been made into the scheme, and the Local Government Board had been satisfied on the technical points that the provisions of the various Housing Acts had been fulfilled. The Bill had the support of the Government. There was nothing in the Acts requiring full details of the scheme to be embodied in the Provisional Order, for that would be impossible. In these circumstances, he hoped the House, having regard to the great necessity that existed for this Bill, and to the fact that the mortality in the area was 40 per cent. higher than in the remainder of the city, would read the measure a second time and send it upstairs for the consideration of the Committee.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said that in his own constituency he had had some experience of the corporation pulling down houses of poor people and neglecting to provide accommodation for those dispossessed. The result had been that, instead of reducing the insanitary condition of the poor people in Dublin, they had removed these poor people from comparatively good houses to worse houses in other parts of the city. A colleague of his had received a letter from a working man who lived in Leeds, who said that before any corporation was allowed to pull down an enormous number of low-rented houses they ought to undertake to build other houses, and have them completed before commencing demolishing the old houses. A deputation of working men had laid these views before the Sanitary Committee of the Leeds Corporation, but he had not yet heard whether that Committee had reported on the matter. He did not intend to oppose the Second Reading of the Bill, but, having an interest in the working classes everywhere, he thought they were entitled to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether the representatives of the working classes had been consulted in this matter as well as the proprietors of property. He understood from the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local

Government Board that the proposal of the Corporation of Leeds was to erect immense flats, and that the rent to be charged for houses in these flats for working men would be 4s. to 6s. per week. That was a good deal higher rent than they were paying at present; namely, from 1s. 10d. to 3s. He thought the corporation ought to provide accommodation for poor people at the same rate they paid at present. He did not wish to occupy the time of the House much longer, because he knew that these private Bill discussions were always looked upon as a waste of time. He did not take that view, but thousands of poor people were affected by these schemes, and very frequently the time of the House was devoted to much less important subjects. He merely wanted the right hon. the President of the Local Government Board to assure the House that these poor room-holders would be heard before the Committee, those who, when evicted, would have no place to go to. The right hon. Gentleman must know that in Paris and other continental cities, before houses

inhabited by working people were pulled down in order to make grand boulevards, houses were erected for the accommodation of the people dispossessed.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) said he had had some experience on this subject, and therefore he intervened in the discussion to oppose the Bill. One of the great defects of the scheme was that the houses were to be pulled down without other houses being provided; and he had known the hardships to which poor people were exposed by that process. Two questions ought to be answered before the Bill was read a second time. First, where were they going to put the unfortunate people dispossessed by the demolition of the existing houses; and second, what class of houses were to be provided for them? As a general rule, corporations did away with what they considered houses which were an injury to public health, but they took no consideration of the unfortunate people whom they displaced. They only built

AYES.

Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Brookfield, Colonel Montagu

Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.

Denny, Colonel

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson

Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Bryce, Rt. Hon. James

Dickson, Charles Scott

Aird, Sir John

Brymer, William Ernest

Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Bull, William James

Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud
Bullard, Sir Harry
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Burns, John
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Anstruther, H. T.
Butcher, John George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Caine, William Sproston
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Caldwell, James
Duke, Henry Edward
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Cameron, Robert
Dunn, Sir William
Arrol, Sir William
Carlile, William Walter
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir William Hart
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Edwards, Frank
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbert H.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Atherley-Jones, L.
Cavendish, V.C.W. (Derbyshire
Elibank, Master of
Austin, Sir John
Cawley, Frederick
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Baird, John George Alexander
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Emmott, Alfred
Balcarres, Lord
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Evans, Sir Francis H (Maidstone
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Balfour, Maj K. R. (Christchurch
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worcr'
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Banbury, Frederick George

Channing, Francis Allston
Fergusson, Rt. Hn. Sir J (Mane'r
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Chapman, Edward
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Coddington, Sir William
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Fisher, William Hayes
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
FitzGerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon
Bill, Charles
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Black, Alexander William
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Flower, Ernest
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Forster, Henry William
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Craig, Robert Hunter
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Crombie, John Williams
Galloway, William Johnson
Brand, Hon. Arthur G.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Garfit, William.
Brassey, Albert
Crossley, Sir Saville
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Brigg, John
Dalkeith, Earl of
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
houses which attracted a better class of people into the district, and drove the people dispossessed into other districts. They should see that the rents of the better class of houses to be erected would be such that they could be paid by the poor people dispossessed. His experience was that the rents were generally doubled. In fixing the rents of these houses the corporation generally took into consideration both the sinking fund and the interest on the first outlay, and so they made the incoming tenant pay for both, although when the cost was paid off by the sinking fund they retained the property. That was not justice; it was iniquitous, and should be stopped. He hoped the scheme would be inquired into in its entirety, including the question of the rent of the outgoing tenant and the rent of the incoming tenant.

Question put.

The House divided:;Ayes, 307; Noes, 52. (Division List No. 253.)

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

Lowther, Rt. Hon. James (Kent)

Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter

Gore, Hon. GRCOrmsby-(Salop

Lowther, Rt. Hn J W (Cum. Penr.

Royds, Clement Molyneux

Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc)

Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft

Russell, T. W.

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth

Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander

Goschen, Hon. George Joachim

Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.

Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)

Goulding, Edward Alfred

Maconochie, A. W.

Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)

Graham, Henry Robert

M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)

Sharpe, William Edward T.

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

M'Crae, George

Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew)

Gretton, John

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

Shipman, Dr. John G.

Greville, Hon. Ronald

M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire

Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire

Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton

Majendie, James A. H.

Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Hamilton, Rt. Hon Lord G (Midd'x
Malcolm, Ian
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Manners, Lord Cecil
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Spear, John Ward
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Mellor, Rt. Hon. John William
Stanley, Edward Jas. (Somerset)
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Stanley, Lord (Lord)
Heath, James (Staffords, N.W.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Stevenson, Francis S.
Heaton, John Henniker
Morgan, J. Lloyd (Carmarthen
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M Taggart
Helder, Augustus
Morrell, George Herbert
Strachey, Edward
Helme, Norval Watson
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Stroyan, John
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampstead
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Tennant, Harold John
Holland, William Henry
Moss, Samuel
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Mount, William Arthur
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Thomas, J A (Glamorg'n, Gower

Hornby, Sir William Henry
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.),
Horner, Frederick William
Myers, William Henry
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Horniman, Frederick John
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Thornton, Percy M.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Norman, Henry
Tollemache, Henry James
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Hutton, John (Yorks. N. R.)
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Jacoby, James Alfred
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Palmer, Sir Chas. M. (Durham
Valentia, Viscount
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading
Vincent, Col. Sir C. E H (Sheffield)
Joicey, Sir James
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Wallace, Robert
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Partington, Oswald
Walrond, Rt. Hon. Sir William H
Jones, William (Carnarvonshire
Paulton, James Mellor
Walton, John (Barnsley)
Kay-Shuttle worth, Rt. Hn Sir U.
Pease, Herbert P. (Darlington)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Kearley, Hudson E.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Peel, Hon. Wm. Robert W.
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth

Percy, Earl
Weir, James Galloway
Kitson, Sir James
Pierpoint, Robert
Welby, Lt.-Col. A. C. E. (Taunton
Knowles, Lees
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Labouchere, Henry
Pirie, Duncan V.
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Lambert, George
Plummer, Walter R.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Law, Andrew Bonar
Pretymann, Ernest George
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Lawson, John Grant
Purvis, Robert
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Pym, C. Guy
Wilson, Chas. Henry (Hull, W.)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Rankin, Sir James
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W.R.)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Rea, Russell
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.)
Leng, Sir John
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon. E. R. (Bath)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Levy, Maurice
Rentoul, James Alexander

Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Lewis, John Herbert
Ridley, S. F. (Bethnal Green)
Wylie, Alexander
Long, Col Charles W. (Evesham
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.)
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Roe, Sir Thomas
TELLERS FOR THE AYES; Mr. Herbert Gladstone and Mr. Cautley.
Lough, Thomas
Rollit, Sir Albert Kaye
Lowe, Francis William
Ropner, Colonel Robert
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cullinan, J.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Carew, James Laurence
Delany, William
Blake, Edward
Clancy, John Joseph
Donelan, Captain A.
Boland, John
Cogan, Denis J.
Doogan, P. C.
Boyle, James
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Duffy, William J.
Burke, E. Haviland
Crean, Eugene
Field, William
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid
Reddy, M.
Hammond, John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)

Redmond, William (Clare)
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Leamy, Edmund
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Sullivan, Donal
Lundon, W.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
O'Dowd, John
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
M'Govern, T.
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Minch, Matthew
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Mr. Nolan and Mr. Nannetti.
Mooney, John J.
O'Malley, William
Murnaghan, George
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
O'Shee, James John
Main Question put, and agreed to.
Bill read a second time, and committed.
PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).
MR. BILL reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills, That the parties opposing the Derby Corporation Bill had stated that the evidence of Mr. William Feast 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 Mr. William Feast do attend the said Committee to-day.
Ordered, That Mr. William Feast do attend the Committee on Group L of Private Bills to-day.
LONDON BRIDGE WIDENING BILL.
Lords' Amendments considered, and agreed to.
NOTTING HILL ELECTRIC LIGHTING BILL.
Read the third time, and passed.
OAKHAM WATER BILL [Lords].
Read the third time, and passed, with Amendments.
BLACKBURN CORPORATION BILL.
As amended, considered; to be read the third time.
BIRMINGHAM (CITY) TRAMWAYS BILL [Lords].
SOUTH WESTERN AND ISLE OF WIGHT JUNCTION RAILWAY BILL [Lords].
WIGAN CORPORATION TRAMWAYS, ETC. BILL [Lords].

Read a second time, and committed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

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

ARIZONA COPPER COMPANY, LIMITED, ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

[UNDER THE PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.]

Considered; to be read the third time upon Tuesday next.

BOURNEMOUTH CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

The CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS, in pursuance of Standing Order No. 83, relating to Private Bills, informed the House that, in his opinion, the Bournemouth Corporation Bill [Lords], though unopposed, ought to be treated as an opposed Private Bill.

Report to lie upon the Table.

RHYL IMPROVEMENT BILL.

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

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP K).

MR. HEYWOOD JOHNSTONE reported from the Committee on Group K of Private Bills:

That, there being no business ready for their consideration, the Committee had adjourned till Thursday next, at half-past eleven of the clock.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to Great Northern Railway Bill, with Amendments.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Blackrock, Dungannon, Kildare, and Waterford." Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 10) Bill [Lords].

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the authority of the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Bexhill Water and Gas, High Wycombe Gas, Portsea Gas, Slough Gas, and Woking District Gas." Gas and Water Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to extend the powers of the Elland-cum-Greetland Gas Company; to amend the Acts relating to that Company; and for other purposes." Elland Gas Bill [Lords].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 210.]

GAS AND WATER ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; Referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 211.]

ELLAND GAS BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; and referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills.

PRIVATE BILLS (GROUP L).

MR. BILL reported from the Committee on Group L of Private Bills, That the

parties opposing the Derby Corporation Bill had stated that the evidence of Dr. William Henry Wright 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 Dr. William Henry Wright do attend the said Committee upon Monday next, at half-past eleven of the clock.

Ordered, That Dr. William Henry Wright do attend the Committee on Group L of Private Bills upon Monday next, at half-past eleven of the clock.

PETITIONS.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Petitions for Alteration of Law; from Burton-on-Trent; and, Stapenhill; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION BILL.

Petition from Ystradyfodwg, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions against, from Rochdale; Taunton; Burton-on-Trent; and, South Bristol; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from Hove; Hackney; Colwyn Bay; Street; Crewe (three); Gloucester (two); Stoke Newington (two); Stepney; Erith; South Hackney; South Hornsey; Upton Park; Belvedere (two); Kettering; Blacko; Westbury; Limehouse; Uttoxeter; Onslow Square; Edgbaston; South Kensington; Bethnal Green; and Southwold; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Strath-kinness; Eday; Nenthorn; Greenlaw; Persie; and Helensburgh; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

Petitions against, from Kirkintilloch; and Lairg; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

EDUCATION (SCOTLAND) (GENERAL REPORTS).

Copy presented, of General Reports by the Chief Inspector of the Northern and Southern Divisions of Scotland for the year 1900 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LOCAL TAXATION ACCOUNT (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1898.

Copy presented, of Minute, dated 14th June, 1901, providing for the distribution of the sum available for Secondary or Technical (including Agricultural) Education under the Act [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.

Copy presented of Forty-fourth Annual Report of the Trustees of the National Portrait Gallery, 1900–1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING ACTS, 1882 AND 1888.

Copy presented, of Special Report by the Board of Trade under Section 1 of the Electric Lighting Act, 1888.

Penge Electric Lighting Order; [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

LIGHT RAILWAYS ACT, 1896.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Mid-Suffolk Light Railway Order, 1900 (Mid-Suffolk Light Railway (Amendment) Order, 1901) [by Command]; to

lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the Rural district of Pateley Bridge, in the West Riding of the county of York, from Pateley Bridge to Loft-house (Nidd Valley Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways from Ravensthorpe to Cleck-heaton, in the West Riding of the county of York (Spen Valley Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the borough of Dewsbury, the urban districts of Cleckheaton, Liversedge, Heckmondwike, Gomersal, Birkenshaw, Hunsworth, and Thornhill and (under certain conditions) in the city of Bradford and the borough of Batley, in the West Riding of the county of York (Spen Valley Light Railway (Extensions) Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, amending the Isle of Thanet Light Railways Order, 1898 (Isle of Thanet Light Railways (Amendment) Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of a Light Railway in the county of Warwick, in the urban district of Nuneaton and Chilvers Coton and the rural district of Atherstone (Nuneaton and District Light Railway Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made by the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the county of Nottingham, in the borough of Mansfield, and the urban districts of Mansfield, Woodhouse, Sutton-in-Ashfield, and Hucknall-under-Huthwaite (Mansfield and District Light Railways Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

Copy presented, of Order made By the Light Railway Commissioners, and modified and confirmed by the Board of Trade, authorising the construction of Light Railways in the West Riding of the county of York from Rothwell to Hunslet, and the working of the East and West Yorkshire Union Railways as Light Railways (East and West Union Light Railways Order, 1901) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

CENSUS OF SCOTLAND, 1901.

Copy presented, of Preliminary Report of the Census of Scotland, 1901 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

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

Intermediate Education (Ireland).;Accounts of Receipts and Expenditure for 1900, with Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon [by Act], to be printed. [No. 211.]

COAL TABLES.

Copy ordered, "of Statement showing the Production, Consumption, and Export of Coal, and the number of Persons employed in Coal Production, in the principal Countries of the World, in each

year from 1883 to 1899, as far as the particulars can be stated; together with a Statement showing the Production of, and Trade in, Petroleum in the United States and in the Russian Empire for a series of years (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 134, of Session 1900).";(Mr. Gerald Balfour.)

PUBLIC INCOME AND EXPENDITURE.

Return ordered, "of Net Public Income and Net Public Expenditure under certain specified Heads, as represented by Receipts into and Issues out of the Exchequer from 1880–81 to 1900–1901 inclusive (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 357, of Session 1900).";(Sir Henry Fowler.)

SELECTION (STANDING COMMITTEES)

Mr. HALSEY reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures;Mr. Harrington and Major Jameson.; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Dillon and Mr. T. P. O'Connor. 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 Larceny Bill.;Sir William Anson, Mr. Attorney General, Mr. Black, Mr. Boland, Mr. T. D. Bolton, Mr. Caldwell, Mr. Cohen, Sir Brampton Gurdon, Mr. Charles Hobhouse, Mr. Leigh-Bennett, Mr. Martin, Mr. Mather, Mr. Morris, Mr. Nicol, and Mr. Stock.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

STANDING COMMITTEES (CHAIRMEN'S PANEL).

SIR JAMES FERGUSSON reported from the Chairmen's Panel, That they had appointed Mr. Laurence Hardy to act as Chairman of the Standing Committee for the consideration of Bills relating to Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures.

Report to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

Queen Anne's Bounty Board.;That they have appointed a Committee consisting of Five Lords to join with a Committee of the Commons, pursuant to Message of this House, "to consider the constitution of Queen Anne's Bounty Board, and to report whether economy and efficiency of administration would be promoted by any change in its constitution or by its amalgamation with any other body."

Public Accounts.;That they give leave to the Clerk of the Parliaments to attend in order to his being examined as a Witness before the Select Committee appointed by this House on Public Accounts.

PRESENCE OF THE SOVEREIGN IN PARLIAMENT [JOINT COMMITTEE].

Report, with Minutes of Evidence and an Appendix, from the Joint Committee brought up, and read.

Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 212.]

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;SHOOTING OF BOER PRISONERS AT PRETORIA.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that two burghers were shot in Pretoria on Tuesday, and can he say what was the offence, and whether any British subjects were shot by the Boers in cold blood since the war began.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): Three Boers who were on parole attempted to leave Pretoria during the night of 9th June to join commandoes; two were armed and opened fire on the party sent to capture them, wounding one man. They were condemned to death by court-martial, and the two armed men were shot. All prisoners attempting to escape are liable to be shot. There are undoubted cases of shooting of British subjects by the Boers. I do not think it is desirable to deal with them, as there is no connection between these judicial sentences and excesses which have been, in certain instances, committed by the Boers.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman cite a single instance where British prisoner have been shot in this way by the Boers when captured by them?

MR. BRODRICK: No, Sir.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Of course not.

MR. BRODRICK: But I do not know of any cases in which British prisoners, having escaped, have fired on a patrol sent to capture them and wounded them, though I do know cases in which British subjects, for no valid offence, have been shot in cold blood by the Boers. [Cries of "Name" from Nationalist Members.] I might mention the cases of Boyd and another who were shot at Wolmaranstad about four months ago, and also the case of Esau, who was shot in cold blood.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: Is it not the fact that a large number of British prisoners imprisoned on the racecourse at Pretoria, while the capital was in the hands of the Transvaal Government, escaped; were any of them captured and shot, and was any attempt made to shoot the hon. Member for Oldham when he ran away?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! These incidents cannot be discussed.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then, is it not the fact that the circumstances surrounding the cases mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman have been greatly in dispute, and particularly that the case of Esau was strenuously denied?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! This matter cannot be investigated now. The right hon. Gentleman was asked to name cases, and he did so, but these cannot be discussed.

PROTECTION OF SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVES.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in the course of operations for clearing the country in the Transvaal and Orange River Colony, the natives are deprived of their cattle, sheep, grain, and agricultural implements; if so, whether any compensation is made to the owners for the loss, and what measures are taken to prevent a famine among the native population in the denuded districts.

MR. BRODRICK: Every effort is made to secure natives from any avoidable loss. Payments to natives for their cattle have been reported in various instances.

Lord Kitchener is fully alive to the difficulty of the situation in regard to supplies.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Are the natives taken into refugee camps?

MR. BRODRICK: I cannot say what is done in each case; but they are safeguarded as far as possible from the rigours of the war.

VLAKFONTEIN ENGAGEMENT.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state how many troops General Dixon had under his command in the recent engagement at Vlakfontein, and whether the Boer forces opposed to him exceeded 600; and, if so, what was his estimate of the strength of the Boers engaged in the action.

MR. BRODRICK: The figures have been already published. General Dixon had about 1,450 men, and the Boers had about 1,200 men.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Will the right hon. Gentleman kindly inform the First Lord of the Treasury of that fact?

TRANSVAAL CONCESSIONS COMMISSION; MINING CONCESSIONS.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, having regard to the fact that the Report of the Transvaal Concessions Commission shows that mining concessions have not yet been inquired into, will he state when the Commissioners propose to make inquiry in regard to these concessions.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Mr. J. CHAMBERLAIN, Birmingham, W.): The Commissioners have concluded their inquiry, and I am not aware that there are any further concessions demanding inquiry.

LONDON SCOTTISH VOLUNTEERS ACTIVE SERVICE COMPANY.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will explain the conditions under which London Scottish Volunteers were enrolled for active service shortly after the outbreak of war in South Africa; and is he aware that the members of this force who have now returned to this country have recently been informed that the thirty days pay, which was paid to them as a gratuity, will now be deducted from war gratuities payable by the paymaster; and will he state why the deduction is to be made.

MR. BRODRICK: The conditions of enlistment are clearly laid down in Army Order 29 of February, 1900. Under these they were entitled to a gratuity of £5 on discharge, in addition to the war gratuity. In some cases, by a mistake as to the regulations, a furlough of thirty days was granted to these service companies on discharge, involving a further payment. Considering the long and excellent service given by these men, and that their engagement was at Army rates, I have arranged that in all cases a furlough of thirty days with pay shall be given in addition to the gratuities earned.

SPION KOP; SURVEY.

MR. HENNIKER HEATON (Canterbury): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, in view of the discussion on the question of the events in connection therewith, whether there is any objection to correct plans of Spion Kop and the neighbourhood of Spion Kop being issued and laid before Parliament; and whether maps were made by a thoroughly equipped party, including Royal Engineers, under

Lieutenant Skip-with; if so, are these or copies of them in the War Office.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton): Surveys are being made of the neighbourhood, and I think we must wait for them before issuing detailed plans of any particular district.

TRANSPORT;THE "MONGOLIAN."

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state the registered accommodation of the "Mongolian" for troops, and how many men she brought home from South Africa on her last voyage, whether there were seven deaths on board, and what was the number of cases of enteric fever and other diseases which occurred during the passage to Southampton.

LORD STANLEY: The registered, accommodation of the "Mongolian" is 1,000 for troops. On her last voyage she brought home 778 Imperial Yeomanry. There were thirty-one cases of enteric, forty-two cases of miscellaneous diseases and other trivial cases during the voyage; seven deaths occurred, all from enteric.

MR. SEELY (Lincoln): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether the s.s. "Mongolian" is still in the transport service; and, if so, on what date she will sail.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The "Mongolian" was discharged from the transport service on the 11th instant.

ARMY RATIONS;POISONOUS TINNED MEATS.

MR. PARKER SMITH (Lanarkshire, Partick): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that a number of men of the York and Lancaster Regiment in Fermoy Barracks were poisoned on Saturday last by eating tinned meat; can he state whether any deaths have occurred; from what source the meat was obtained, and whether a full inquiry will be made into the circumstances.

LORD STANLEY: Some men of the York and Lancaster Regiment were poisoned by partaking of a tin of beef. This tin was purchased by the men from the canteen, and was not part of, the Government ration. The men are all practically well now. The commanding officer has full discretion in regard to canteen supplies, and no inquiry is necessary.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Will an inquiry be made as to where the canteen authorities purchased this meat?

LORD STANLEY: If the general officer commanding thinks it necessary to make further inquiry, it lies in his power to do so.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): Will a prosecution be ordered against those who have thus endeavoured to poison His Majesty's troops?

[No answer was returned.]

PENRHYN QUARRY DISPUTE;MILITARY AID TO THE CIVIL POWER.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether any application has been made for the military, in anticipation of disturbance at the Penrhyn quarries; whether, in the event of application being made, will he notify by circular or otherwise to magistrates and tradesmen in the locality that neither the War Office or the County Council of Carnarvonshire is bound by any agreement for catering the troops that may be entered into by the local magistrates; and whether the War Office proposes to make any further

payment to the Aberdare tradesmen who catered for the troops in that town in 1898 upon the order of the late stipendiary magistrate for Merthyr, at rates agreed upon between him and them, and before the decision of the High Court was given that the cost of catering was an Imperial and not a local charge.

LORD STANLEY: I understand that application for military aid has been made, but this matter entirely rests with the general officer commanding the district. I do not propose to issue any circular of the nature suggested. In regard to the third paragraph, all the payments that are considered due from Army funds have been made, and it is not proposed to make any further payments.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: Is the noble Lord aware that the payment was not in accordance with the terms agreed upon?

LORD STANLEY: I am not.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Where did the application for military aid come from?

LORD STANLEY: I cannot answer that question. I do not know.

VOLUNTEERS AT DUBLIN BARRACKS.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether the individuals who are alleged to be drilled at Portobello Barracks, Dublin, with regular soldiers are volunteers; and, if so, to what volunteer regiments do they belong; whether, if they do not prove themselves efficient, they are subject to any penalty, and, seeing that they are receiving instruction from a non-commissioned officer on the strength of the Rifle Brigade, will he state what remuneration this officer receives for his services; whether these individuals have applied for and received licences to carry arms from the Chief Commissioner of Police; for what purpose are they being drilled and instructed in the handling of firearms; and whether part of the instruction comprises a week at camp at Rhyl; and, if so, can he state who pays the expense of such a journey.

LORD STANLEY: The individuals named are volunteers from the Volunteer Battalions of the Royal Welsh Fusiliers and the Royal Highlanders. Their drills are for the purpose of improving their military knowledge, but do not count towards efficiency. If they are returned non-efficient they do not receive the efficiency grant, and they are liable for certain penalties according to the rules of their corps. The non-commissioned officer who drills them receives no extra remuneration from Army funds. I have no information as to any application for licences. If the battalion to which they belong goes into camp they would be permitted to go into camp with it, but the cost of the journey would not fall upon Army funds.

IRISH RIFLE CLUBS.

MR. O'SHEE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state the general regulations for the formation of rifle clubs in Ireland with respect to the right of such clubs to be supplied with Government rifles and ammunition, and will any such club duly affiliated to the National Rifle Association be supplied with same at cost price.

LORD STANLEY: The conditions under which rifle clubs in Ireland are supplied with Government rifles and ammunition are precisely the same as those which obtain in England and Scotland. In cases where such clubs have been affiliated to the National Rifle Association, rifles and ammunition have been supplied at

vocabulary rates.

RECRUITING IN IRELAND.

MR. O'SHEE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can state how many recruits for the Regular and Militia forces, respectively, have enlisted in Ireland during the first four months of the present year, and how many during the same four months of the years 1899 and 1900.

LORD STANLEY: The figures are as follows::

Army.

Militia.

1899

1,465

3,063.

1900

1,880

1,867.

1901

1,367

1,344.

NAVAL WORKS BILL.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if he can name an early day for the introduction of the Naval Works Bill.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): In the present state of public business it is impossible for me to fix a date for the introduction of the Naval Works Bill, but I am specially anxious to meet the convenience of the House upon it, because I understand that on this Bill the hon. Gentleman desires to make some observations on the subject of Gibraltar. I think that would be a proper occasion, and I quite recognise that there are special reasons connected with the events of this year which make it important, if possible, to take an early opportunity for discussing this matter.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: There will at any rate be a Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: Yes.

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, E.): Can the right hon. Gentleman say when he will make his promised statement on the subject of Gibraltar?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I said "very shortly," which I suppose may be interpreted, without any violent exegesis, to mean next week or the week after.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION.

MR. MACARTNEY (Antrim, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he will state what was the amount spent on new construction during the financial year ending 31st March, 1901.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The amount spent on new construction during the financial year ending 31st March, 1901, was £8,911,849.

QUEENSLAND ASIATIC BILL.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether it is intended to continue to refuse the Royal Assent to the Queensland Asiatic Bill in case that or a similar measure should be presented for assent by the Parliament of the Australian Commonwealth.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The question is purely hypothetical, and the hon. Member is aware that I cannot answer such questions.

CHINA;GERMAN TROOPS AT SHANGHAI.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Mayo, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether the occupation of Shanghai by German troops is in accordance with the terms of the Anglo-German Agreement, and, if not, whether His Majesty's Government will invite the German Government to withdraw at an early day all German troops from the British sphere of influence in China.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): The Anglo-German Agreement is directed to securing freedom of trade for all

nations in the rivers and littoral of China, and to maintaining the territorial integrity of China, and has no relation to the subject of the hon. Gentleman's question.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Is it not the fact that the operation of the Anglo-German Agreement is having the effect of elbowing England out of China?

[No answer was returned.]

FRUIT AND SUGAR DUTIES;PRESERVED FRUITS.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is aware that the Customs have recently issued an order imposing a duty of 7s. per cwt upon apricot pulp which contains no added sugar, that this article contains over 80 per cent. of water, and that fresh apricots when dried yield one-fifth of their weight, and consequently that the pulp will now pay relatively five times as much duty as dried apricots, and this notwithstanding that neither of these articles contain any added sugar whatever; under what authority has this order been issued, and whether all fruit pulp free from added sugar imported or produced in this country will be subject to similar conditions.

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): This is a question of the Fruit Duty, not of the Sugar Duty. Dried and otherwise preserved apricots and apricot pulp are chargeable with duty at 7s. a cwt. under the Customs Tariff Act, 1876, because apricots are a kind of plum. Duty has long been levied on dried apricots, but apricot pulp has hitherto escaped duty under the idea that it contained sugar, plums preserved in sugar being exempt from duty under the above-mentioned Act. This exemption clearly could not continue after the reimposition of the sugar duty, and it was therefore repealed by the resolution agreed to by the House and embodied in the Finance Bill. From recent analyses in the Customs laboratory, apricot pulp appears to contain no added sugar and very little (at most 10 or 11 per cent.), if any, added water. No doubt a pound of pulp contains much less fruit than a pound of dried apricots, but the fact that a particular method of preservation retains the natural juices in the fruit does not afford any legal ground of exemption from duty. I am, however, considering whether a lower rate of duty might not properly be charged on preserved than on dried apricots.

MR. KEARLEY: Are we to regard this as a strictly new duty which has never been before the House at all?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No, I have said it is embodied in the Finance Bill.

MR. KEARLEY: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he can explain the differentiation of the sugar duty on canned peaches and other fruits preserved in syrup, which are assessed on the basis of 1s. per cwt. of the nett weight of the contents of the tins, while canned apricots, also preserved in syrup containing a like amount of sugar, are now being charged a duty of 7s. per cwt.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Canned apricots, as I have already explained, are subject to the Fruit Duty. Canned peaches and the other fruit assessed at 1s. the cwt. by General Order 45 of 1901 are not subject to it; therefore the Sugar Duty only is charged on the sugar in each can.

MR. KEARLEY: Can the right hon. Gentleman say what is the difference between an apricot and a peach, that one is subject to one treatment and the other to another treatment?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: According to the very best authorities I have consulted, it was decided many years ago that an apricot was a plum and a peach was not.
CUSTOMS REBATES IN IRELAND AND THE ISLE OF MAN.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, having regard to the fact that a rebate on the duty on tea, sugar, whiskey, and tobacco is allowed in the Isle of Man, and in

view of the Financial Relations Commission's Report, a similar rebate could be allowed in Ireland to reduce the over-taxation of that country.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The Isle of Man has its own customs tariff, originating with the Tynwald. The duties on tea and tobacco are the same in the Isle of Man as in Great Britain and Ireland, and no rebate on them is allowed. The duty on whiskey is lower in the Isle of Man than in Great Britain and Ireland, and a rebate is consequently allowed on whiskey which has paid duty in Great Britain and is subsequently shipped to Man. As regards sugar, no duty has yet been imposed in the Isle of Man, and sugar removed to that island would receive a rebate under similar circumstances. So long as the customs tariff in Ireland is the same as in Great Britain no question of rebate can arise.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.E.): How long will that be?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I hope as long as I live.

THE "PRIMROSE HILL" INQUIRY.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can state why the relatives of certain apprentices who lost their lives in the "Primrose Hill" disaster were not allowed to be represented at the inquiry held upon the subject, and whether the next-of-kin of men who lose their lives in cases of this kind are entitled to be represented at such inquiries.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): I am informed that the relatives were allowed to be represented at the inquiry to the extent of their solicitor being permitted to cross-examine witnesses. But the judge declined to allow them to be made formal parties to the proceedings, and therefore refused to permit their solicitor to address the court at the conclusion of the evidence. By the rules made under the Merchant Shipping Act governing these inquiries, any person who can show that he has an

interest in the investigation has a right to appear and be made a party to the proceedings, but the question whether any person succeeds in showing that interest is for the discretion of the judge.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: May I ask whether the right hon. Gentleman will make some new arrangement whereby in similar cases the relatives of all persons who are drowned in ships that are wrecked may have the fullest opportunity in every way of appearing before the court of inquiry? In this case the relatives of twelve unfortunate boys were refused it.

*MR. RITCHIE: I have already stated what the requirements of the law are, and I have no power to vary the law. The judge, acting on his own discretion, refused to hear the representatives, and I am not prepared to say whether, in my opinion, it was aright or wrong discretion.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I will call attention to this case at an early date.
WELSH INSPECTORS OF MINES.

MR. MOSS (Denbighshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he is aware that Mr. Hall, the inspector for North Wales under the Coal Mines Regulation Acts, and Dr. Foster, the late inspector for North Wales under the Metalliferous Mines Acts, were appointed prior to the passing of the Coal Mines Regulation Act, 1887, and the Quarries Act, 1894, respectively; and, seeing that Dr. Foster having now resigned, the appointment of Mr. Hall as his successor (he, prior to this appointment, not having been inspector for North Wales under the Metalliferous Mines Acts, but only under the Coal Mines Regulation Acts) now comes under the provisions of the Metalliferous Mines Act, 1872, Section 15, as amended by the Quarries Act, 1894, Section 2, Sub-section 2, and in view of the fact that Mr. Hall is not able to speak the Welsh language, and that there are thousands of monoglot miners in North Wales, whether he will, in accordance with the statutory requirements, appoint an inspector in succession to Dr. Foster acquainted with the Welsh language.

*MR. RITCHIE: The answer to the first paragraph of the question is in the affirmative. As regards the second paragraph, it is true that Mr. Hall has not hitherto been inspector for North Wales under the Metalliferous Mines Acts, but he has been the inspector under the Coal Mines Acts, and in accordance with the express provisions of Section 15 of the Metalliferous Mines Act of 1872, I am directing him to act as Metalliferous Mines Inspector in North Wales, and in pursuance of Section 2, Subsection (2), of the Quarries Act of 1894, he will also be inspector of quarries in that district. I am not, therefore, making a new appointment, to which contingency alone, in my opinion, the section of the Quarries Act to which the hon. Member refers applies. Even if it were otherwise, that section requires merely that "among candidates equally qualified, persons having a knowledge of the Welsh language shall be preferred." In this case there was no candidate whose qualifications, could compare with those of Mr. Hall, upon whose ability and good service I need hardly enlarge. With reference to the consideration due to the Welsh-speaking miners, I would repeat that, in accordance with a general scheme of rearrangement in the mines inspection districts, of which this particular question is only part, Mr. Williams and Mr. Jones, the two Welsh-speaking assistant inspectors in North Wales, who have

hitherto acted not only for that district but also for four English counties and the Isle of Man, will now devote themselves entirely to inspection in Wales. The new arrangement will, therefore, secure a considerable increase of inspection there by Welsh-speaking inspectors.

MR. MOSS was understood to inquire if candidates were advertised, seeing that this was a new appointment.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): The question is whether the appointment of an inspector to duties different from those he had hitherto performed, and in a different district, did not constitute a new appointment.

*MR. SPEAKER: That is a matter of argument.

EXPORTS OF WELSH COAL.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he will state what variation there has been in the exports of coal from Cardiff and Newport respectively in May, 1901, as compared with the quantity exported in the corresponding month of last year, and if he will give the percentage increase or decrease.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): The quantity of coal exported from Cardiff in May, 1900, was 1,168,722 tons, and in May, 1901, 1,352,279 tons, an increase of 15·71 per cent. The exports of coal from Newport in the same months were 209,077 tons and 210,289 tons, an increase of 58 per cent.

MILK STANDARDS.

MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he intends to adopt the standard for milk recommended by the Departmental Committee (Majority Report); and, if so, when such standard will come into force.

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

SIR MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE (Bethnal Green, N.E.): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture if he has had under consideration the Reports, both of the majority and minority, of the Departmental Committee as regards the percentage of solid matter and fat in milk; and if he has come to any decision on the recommendations contained in those Reports.

MR. LAMBERT (Devonshire, South Molton): To ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he has fixed the standard for milk under the provisions of the Food and Drugs Act; if so, can he state what are the standards fixed.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): After carefully considering the evidence submitted to the Departmental Committee and their Reports, I propose to fix a standard under which, for the purposes of the Sale of Food and Drugs Act, a presumption will be raised that milk is not genuine unless it contains 3 per cent. of milk fat and 8.5 per cent. of non-fatty milk solids. Regulations to this effect are being prepared, and I propose that they shall come into force on 1st August.

PUBLIC DRINKING PLACES FOR ANIMALS.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR (Essex, Romford): I beg to ask the President of the Board of

Agriculture whether, seeing how easily under present conditions, horses are infected with dangerous diseases, he will consider the advisability of issuing a regulation to the effect that every public drinking place for animals must be provided with a standpipe and tap, which will enable carmen to fill their own buckets and water their horses without fear of infection.

*MR. HANBURY: I have no power to issue such a regulation as the hon. Member suggests.

DISEASES OF ANIMALS;COMPULSORY SLAUGHTER.

MR. LOUIS SINCLAIR: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether he will consider the advisability of granting a higher compensation to the owners of diseased animals slaughtered by order of the Board's inspectors; and whether he is aware that £;2 as compensation in cases of glanders is insufficient to prevent the owner endeavouring to temporarily cure his horse, and send it for sale to a public place in which it is almost certain to affect surrounding animals.

*MR. HANBURY: The diseased animals are slaughtered by the local authority at their own discretion, and without any special order of the Board or their inspectors. The sum of £;2 mentioned in the question is the minimum amount of compensation sanctioned by the Board, and one-fourth of the value of the animal immediately before it became diseased is the maximum. Between these two points the decision rests with

the local authority, out of whose funds the compensation is paid. A very large proportion of cases of glanders occur in the area of the London County Council, who, I understand, now have the whole subject under their consideration.

POST OFFICE;EXTRANEIOUS ASSISTANCE.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he can state why certain officials from Somerset House and other public offices have for the past six to eight months been employed at from 6d. to 8d. per hour in assisting in the primary sorting at different postal centres in London for as long as three or four hours in the evening, although in receipt of salaries some as high as £;160 per annum; and whether he will consider the advisability of having this work performed by members of the permanent postal staff instead of having to resort to dual employment.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The reason is that the assistance is required at a period of the day when all the permanent postal staff whose attendances can possibly be arranged to cover the period in question are already on duty.

EX-SUBMARINE TELEGRAPH COMPANY'S CLERKS PENSION QUESTION.

CAPTAIN NORTON: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether those clerks in the employ of the late Submarine Telegraph Company, who were in 1890 taken over by the Post Office, are allowed to count the whole of their service, including that not rendered to the Crown, towards superannuation.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It is provided by Clause 3 of the Post Office and Telegraph Act of 1897 that officers, of the late Submarine Telegraph Company,

who, on the 1st of April, 1889, entered the permanent Civil Service of the State in an established capacity shall, for the purposes of the Superannuation Acts, be entitled to count their past years of continuous service with the company since the 28th of January, 1870, as years passed in the Civil Service of the State.

ELECTRIC TRAM ACCIDENTS IN GLASGOW.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, if he will state how many tramcar accidents occurred in Glasgow and Edinburgh respectively during the first four months of the present year, and also the number of electric car accidents in each city during the same period; and, in view of the increase in the number of accidents of this description, will he state the maximum speed at which electric cars are allowed to travel in these cities, and will he say how many cases of excessive speed have been reported by the police.

*THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The Secretary for Scotland has no information on the matters referred to, which do not fall within his departmental jurisdiction.

MR. WEIR: Then to whom must I apply for the information?

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: I should say to the Glasgow City Council.

APPLECROSS (ROSS-SHIRE) FISHERY.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether the Congested Districts Board have yet considered the expediency of providing a grant towards the erection of a small pier or boatslip at Annat, in the parish of Applecross, Ross-shire.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The Congested Districts Board received an application from the county council on the 6th instant, and are making inquiry into the case.

OFFICERS OF HEALTH IN THE HIGHLANDS.

MR. CATHCART WASON (Clackmannan and Kinross): I beg to ask the Lord Advocate if in the case of sparsely populated districts, especially in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland, the Government will provide that medical men may be appointed officers of health without holding diplomas in sanitary science, public health, and State medicine.

*MR. A. GRAHAM MURRAY: The matter is entirely regulated by statute, and the Government have no power in the matter.

NEW GOVERNMENT OFFICES; ARCHITECTS.

MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he can state what arrangements, are being made to ensure the satisfactory execution of the designs of Mr. Young and Mr. Brydon for the new Government Offices.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): To my great regret both Mr. Young and Mr. Brydon, the architects originally selected to carry out the building of the new War Office and the Government Offices in Parliament Streets have recently died. My hon. friend will remember that Sir John Taylor was specially appointed to act with them as consulting architect. In the case of the War Office, Mr. Clyde Young, the son and partner of the original architect, is now carrying out the work in conjunction with Sir

John Taylor. No definite decision has been come to with regard, to the Government Offices in Parliament. Street, the question being now under the consideration of the Treasury and of my Department. The completed plans and drawings are in the hands of the Office of Works, and can easily be carried, out, either by that Department or by an architect specially selected for the purpose.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY; RETIREMENTS ON PENSIONS.

MR. REDDY (King's Co., Birr): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the number of head constables, sergeants, acting sergeants, and constables of good character compulsorily retired from the Royal Irish Constabulary on pension during the past twelvemonths; and the number ordered to apply to be retired, and the counties in which they were stationed in each case.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I can not conveniently give this information within the limits of a reply to a question, and I have communicated a Return on the subject to the hon. Member.

LABOURERS' COTTAGES AT AHINAH.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork Co., Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will explain upon what grounds the application of John Desmond for a labourer's cottage in the Ahinah division of the Macroom Rural District Council was rejected by the Local Government Board after it had been passed at the recent Local Government Board inquiry held in Macroom; and whether he is aware that the site for the said cottage was selected so as to fulfil all the requirements of the Labourers Acts, being adjoining the public road and in close proximity to a sufficient supply of water.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board has not rejected this application. The inspector's report on the inquiry has not yet been received by the Board.

FORESTRY IN IRELAND.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the Government will consider the necessity of taking measures to form a forestry department in Ireland, with the object of utilising suitable waste lands for tree planting, and of preventing the country from being entirely denuded of timber.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction is fully alive to the importance of the matter, which it hopes to take up in due time in conjunction with the county councils. It does not appear to be necessary at present to form a special forestry department in Ireland.

MR. FIELD: Are there any funds at the disposal of the Department to take up a question of this magnitude, or will the Government have to vote more money?

MR. WYNDHAM: There are funds at the disposal of the Government.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY GRIEVANCES.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the inquiry into the claims and alleged grievances of the Royal Irish Constabulary has yet been brought to a conclusion; if not, can he state when it will be concluded, and will the evidence be made public and available to Members of this House before any decision is arrived at.

MR. WYNDHAM: The taking of evidence has been completed by the Committee, who will submit their Report to the Lord Lieutenant in due course. The Report and evidence, as I have already stated, will be presented to Parliament.

MR. FLYNN: Of course, if the Irish Government, as a result of the Report, decide to make application to the Treasury for additional money, an opportunity will be afforded of discussing the matter?

MR. WYNDHAM: That will depend on circumstances.

PUBLIC WORKS IN IRELAND.

MR. M'GOVERN (Cavan, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the Council of Agriculture and Technical Instruction at its meeting in Dublin on the 31st ultimo passed a resolution calling on the Government to amend the Local Government Act so as to enable county councils in Ireland to execute arterial drainage and other works of a reproductive character, such as reafforesting, and to simplify the procedure for the compulsory acquisition of land and other property necessary for the carrying out of these and other public works; and will he state what steps, if any, the Government intend to take to give effect to this resolution.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have already replied to questions on the various points referred to in this resolution in answer to questions put to-day and yesterday by the hon. Member for the St. Patrick Division.

ROAD MAKING IN IRELAND.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether, with a view of preventing public roads in several parts of Ireland from falling into a bad condition in the coming winter owing to the uncertainty of contract labour and the direct labour system in prospective, the Government can see their way to have the new order of things, outlined in the improvement of the Local Government (Ireland) Act, come into operation by the 1st day of October next, a proceeding that would give employment to the labourers when it cannot otherwise be had.

MR. WYNDHAM: I presume the hon. Member refers to the Local Government Provisional Order (No. 3) Bill. There is a provision in the Order fixing the date on which it is to come into operation as the 1st of April next. This date was fixed having regard to the administrative arrangements of county and district councils, and I do not think it could be altered with advantage.

IRISH CENSUS.

MR. O'SHEE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say when the completed census returns for Ireland will be ready, and whether any statistics compiled by the census authorities in addition to the figures already published will be issued before the completed returns are made out.

MR. WYNDHAM: Complete statistics for each county will be published from time to time, and the first of these county books will, it is expected, be issued in September next. The county books, when completed, will be followed by the general report, but no date can be fixed, even approximately, for the publication of the latter.

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

MR. LAMBERT: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will propose to make permanent such temporary law, as the Ballot Act, 1872, and other Acts which are renewed annually, but have become part of the settled legal enactments of the realm.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I quite agree that the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill is rather an anomalous measure, and contains Acts which are practically now part of the permanent statutory system of the realm; but I am very unwilling to touch that Bill without giving a great deal of time to its thorough revision, because, of course, if the Bill be amended at all, it naturally is open to the discussion of the whole House, and it would be a very long affair. For that reason the Government have been very careful that the renewal of the Rating Act should not be carried out by means of that kind, as of course it might have been, but that it should be a separate measure.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport): May I ask what the business will be next week, and especially what Supply will be taken on Friday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It is not usual until the beginning of the week to state what Supply will be proceeded with on the Friday, but I shall be happy to make a statement not later than next week. I have received information this morning which makes me think that it may be necessary, or at any rate desirable, to pass the Third Reading of the Civil List Bill at an early date. I will probably put it down as the first Order on Tuesday.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON: Does the right hon. Gentleman contemplate taking any other Bills next week than the Factory Bill, the Civil List Bill, and the Finance Bill?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No.

DISTURBANCES IN BELFAST.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the character of a handbill which was circulated in Belfast prior to Sunday, the 9th instant, and which openly incited to attacks on a Roman Catholic procession; whether the police had possession of this circular before the riots in Belfast on Sunday last; was any effort made by the police prior to or since the riots to discover the authors and circulators; and, if so, whether any prosecution has been instituted or is intended by the authorities against the authors or circulators of this handbill.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, Sir; this discreditable handbill was brought to my notice, together with written reports for which I had called, to supplement telegraphic reports on these riots. The police seized and destroyed the handbill wherever they found it. The question of instituting proceedings against the person or persons responsible for its publication and the question of what further steps may be necessary to prevent a renewal of disorder are now under consideration. No effort will be spared to protect individuals and property and to bring to justice any persons who can be made amenable for having exposed either to risk.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the statement which appeared in last evening's Evening Standard of the proceedings

in Belfast on Wednesday is correct;

"A shocking onslaught by Queen's Island men;"

*MR. SPEAKER: It will not be in order to read a paragraph from a newspaper and ask if it is correct. If the hon. Member can vouch for the fact he can then put the question.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I cannot vouch for the facts. I am asking for information. I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether it is a fact that on Wednesday last 100 Catholic navvies engaged in making the Musgrave Dock were attacked by Queen's Island men, and were obliged to take refuge in boats in the harbour; that a large number of them were seriously injured by showers of iron nuts thrown by these men; that one of these men had to take refuge in the water and was nearly killed; whether a similar occurrence took place when the Alexandra Dock was being made; whether on that occasion one young man was not actually drowned; whether the recent disturbance which commenced on Sunday and apparently extended up to Wednesday has been effectually put down; and what steps will be taken to make the ringleaders and inciters of these proceedings amenable to the law.

MR. WYNDHAM: The very regrettable and discreditable incident to which the hon. Member refers took place on Tuesday.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I was asking as to the proceedings on Wednesday.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am giving the hon. Gentleman all the information I have. A large number of Queen's Island men made an attack on Roman Catholics on Wednesday. Some 250 took refuge in boats, and one man was struck by a missile, but he was a Protestant. [Laughter.]

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: It is no laughing matter.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: In consequence of the character of some portions of the answers I have received, and in consequence of the serious state of these occurrences, owing to which, I understand on good authority, many hundreds of Catholic workmen are at this moment out of employment, I will deem it my duty to ask the indulgence of the House to raise the question in a motion for the adjournment of the House after questions.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord; Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say how many persons were injured and how much damage done to property by the riots which took place in Belfast on Sunday the 9th instant and since, and how many arrests and prosecutions have resulted.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that fourteen persons are known to have received injuries, none, happily, save in one case, of a dangerous character. The amount of the damage done to property is estimated at £;100. Twenty-eight persons have already been arrested, prosecuted, and convicted for participation in the rioting. One man who was badly injured, named Macalister, is a Protestant and was mistaken for a Roman Catholic. The police do not control the harbour works, nor could, they do so without the aid of the military. The place where this regrettable incident

occurred is private ground. Reports from Belfast state that all is quiet now, and all steps are being taken to preserve the peace.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN asked if the right hon. Gentleman had taken any steps to stop the publication of the handbill, as he did in the case of the Irish People.

MR. WYNDHAM: The hon. Member can hardly have caught the purport of my answer. I have already stated that the police seized the handbill wherever they found it, and that proceedings were pending against the persons said to be responsible. Under these circumstances he deprecated any discussion on the matter while legal proceedings were pending.

MR. JOHN REDMOND asked who were the persons against whom proceedings were pending.

MR. WYNDHAM said he deprecated that too. When summonses were about to be issued the best way to defeat the action of the Executive would be to give names.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I do not see that.

DISTURBANCES AT BELFAST.

[MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT].

MR. JOHN REDMOND then rose in his place and asked leave to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, viz., "the riots which have been taking place in Belfast during this week, and the failure of the Executive to take proper measures for the protection of the lives and properties of the Catholic working men of Belfast;" but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. Speaker called on those Members who supported the motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen;

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The question which I feel it my duty to bring before the House is one of very great

importance. I can assure the House that the bringing up of questions of this kind in which Catholics and Protestants are in conflict is to me an absolutely hateful task. During all the years I have been in public life in Ireland I have carefully guarded myself against ever saying one word of an offensive character with reference to my fellow-countrymen in the North of Ireland of a different creed from my own, and I have always looked forward to the day when these wretched religious differences would disappear from Ireland altogether. As an Irishman I am ashamed of the fact that, in any part of our country, circumstances such as I have to allude to to-day could take place. If these unfortunate incidents had taken place, not in Protestant Belfast, but in Catholic Cork or Dublin, and the Protestant minority had been treated as the Catholic minority has been treated in Belfast, I would have been the first to raise my voice against them, and just as strongly as I do on this occasion.

People in this country follow events in Ireland so slightly that probably an overwhelming majority of the Members of this House are not even aware that since last Sunday the city of Belfast has been almost in a state of siege, that day and night since then there has been a state of rioting, necessitating the strongest measures on the part of the police, and even upon one occasion the calling out of the military, in order to restore order. Let me briefly state what occurred. On Sunday last a Catholic religious ceremony was announced to take place in the enclosed private grounds of St. Malachy's College in Belfast, and the Catholic people from different quarters of Belfast, not accompanied by banners, religious emblems, or bands, marched in processional order to the grounds. There was nothing to mark their particular religious creed. No attempt

was made to have any religious ceremony or service in the public streets. On the way to the college the processionists were insulted and attacked all along the route, but nothing in the nature of very serious violence occurred. It was after the ceremony was over, and the people returned to their homes, that the really serious violence occurred. From the very start of the procession no adequate police arrangements were made. If there had been, the attacks and insults might have been prevented in the first instance, and certainly after the ceremony it would have been possible to prevent the disgraceful and barbarous scenes of violence which took place. That night serious rioting occurred; the people were pursued to their homes; their property was in many cases destroyed; the windows of houses supposed to be inhabited by Catholics were smashed; the processionists were scattered, and they fled for their lives. One would have thought the disturbance would have ended with that, and probably if a riot of this kind had occurred in any other city in the world, the whole thing would have been over that Sunday night. But no. What occurred on Sunday was only the commencement of the real mischief. On Monday it had been arranged that some yeomen, back from the war, were to be received in Belfast, and;for what reason I know not;the return of these yeomen, coupled with the occurrences of Sunday, was taken as a reason by the Orangemen of Belfast to make a deliberate and carefully planned and most murderous attack upon the Catholic population of the city. Large bodies of workmen employed on Queen's Island at a great shipbuilding yard marched out from their workshops, invaded the Catholic quarters of Belfast, attacked Catholic houses, smashed windows, beat and ill-treated Catholics wherever they could find them in the streets, and finally the rioting became so serious that the police were unable to cope with it, and the Lancers had to be called out to clear the streets. All this time, as far as I have been able to discover, there was not a single act or word of provocation on the part of the Catholics;unless it be held that the procession of the day before was a provocation. So far from there being any retaliatory violence on the part of Catholics;although, God knows, I hate the whole idea of these so-called religious fights and disputes;while reading the accounts of these riots I could not help feeling my blood boil almost at the fact that the Catholics did not resist this violence. They fled and escaped where ever they could, and there was never anything in the nature of a fight between Protestants and Catholics. It was violence upon one side, and a scattering and running away on the part of the Catholics attacked. That was Monday. On Tuesday the reign of terror was narrowed down. Instead of sallying forth into the streets and attacking the houses and people, the whole force of the attack was concentrated upon the unfortunates in the shipyards at Queen's Island. We know something of these shipyards. We have always been proud in the knowledge that the greatest shipbuilding yard in the world is in Belfast. Some little while ago I visited this yard, and was astonished at its magnitude. I found that 10,000 hands were employed, that they were building the greatest ships in the world for every country in the world, and that amongst those 10,000 hands there were about 1,500 or 1,600 Catholics. I asked how the Catholics and Protestants got on together Mr. Pirrie, who personally I believe is a liberal-

mindful man, told me quite candidly that, while they got on all right during the greater part of the year, from time to time it became impossible to protect the Catholic minority, and that Messrs. Harland and Wolff had actually at times to close their works in consequence for a fortnight at a time.

If one read of all this happening in some foreign country, in a semi-civilised community, one would not be astonished. But to think that here, in a great and civilised city, by your own very shores, these things can happen, seems absolutely incredible. I am convinced that the Commission of 1886 or 1887, presided over by Mr. Justice Day, were correct when they stated in their Report that the riots and the maltreatment of the Catholic minority could not take place were it not that, unfortunately, the rioters have at their backs the sympathy of the well-to-do classes of the community. I allude to that statement of the Commission to show the horror, the barbarous, semi-savage state of things which exists in a community where this kind of conduct is tolerated by those who call themselves the upholders of law and order, and who are very fond of urging upon the Government the necessity of protecting life and property and liberty in other parts of Ireland. Let me read shortly a description of what took place on Tuesday. I hope the right hon. Gentleman, if he does me the honour to reply to what I am saying, will carefully distinguish between the different dates, because I attach great importance to them. The original cause of the riot was this procession and religious ceremony on Sunday. The riot was not so bad on Sunday; it got worse on Monday, and the military had to be called out. On Tuesday the disturbance got into the shipyards, and, as I shall show, it culminated on Wednesday, there thus being nearly a week of the savage work, increasing in intensity from day to day. Here is what occurred on Tuesday. I am reading from the Irish News, of Belfast. That, no doubt, is a Catholic organ; I want to be perfectly frank; but that is no reason why this statement should be unduly exaggerated, and I think it will be found that it is substantially true; "Scenes of violence, in which the sufferers were as usual Catholics, took place in the Belfast shipyards yesterday. The bigotry was strongly in evidence when the shipyards opened for the resuming time of business at the usual hour yesterday morning, but matters did not come to a head until the approach of the breakfast hour, when the Catholic workers in many instances were set upon and brutally beaten. As nine o'clock drew near the Catholic workers in the yard of Messrs. Workman and Clark were informed by some persons in authority there that they had better be on the alert, as a crowd was waiting for them at the gate by which they were to leave. When some of the workers had departed several hundreds, who had been outside, rushed through the gate, and proceeded in the direction of the boiler shop, where they attacked an old man named Ruddy, who is a Catholic, and resides at Sheriff Street. He was kicked in a savage manner about the head and body, and no doubt his life would have been in danger had he not managed to get on his feet and dash to the cook-house, where some fellow-workers were just then having the morning meal, and who intervened on his behalf. He was bleeding profusely, and at the first opportunity the ambulance was sent for, and in it he was driven to the Royal Hospital, where he was detained.

"Shortly after seven o'clock a.m. a young rivetter was attacked in a manner as savage as it was uncalled for. He was engaged in his work in the north yard, when he was surrounded by a crowd numbering about thirty, who threatened to 'tear the Fenian heart out of him,' and, in addition, they used further language of a most menacing character. A rivetter who endeavoured to protect the man from the violence of the mob was menaced, and to the credit of the foreman it must be said he did all he could in the interests of peace, but his efforts were unsuccessful. The youth referred to; who, needless to add, was a Catholic; did not leave the yard at the time, as the foreman feared he would be again attacked by the mob.

"Towards dinner hour the mob had not vacated its position outside the gate, and, acting, on the advice of the foreman and others of the establishment, the Catholic workers gradually left the place as best they could, and were compelled through fear to remain out all day."

But the more serious occurrences took place at Messrs. Harland and Wolff's. Here is what occurred there;

"The number of workmen employed usually on the Queen's Island amounts almost to 10,000, and of this number about 1,500 are Catholics. Whenever any disturbances take place in the city this small percentage are practically hunted, from the works. This is what took place yesterday morning. Fresh from the exploits on the Shankhill Road, hundreds of the majority assembled yesterday morning and began what was nothing short of a reign of terror for the Catholics. They succeeded so far in their efforts that just now there are very few of the hated religion left. Let us give some instances of their conduct. There is an apprentice on the island who is the son of a man who occupies a responsible position in the works. The unfortunate youth, who is in his teens, was going along Queen's Road on Monday morning, when he saw a mob of Queen's Island employes coming towards him. Very naturally, he anticipated that he would come in for rough usage, and, seeing a harbour policeman adjacent, he sought his protection. The constable endeavoured to save the boy, but without avail; and the cowardly crew set upon the poor apprentice, and beat him in a most savage manner. Indeed, as an eye-witness remarked, he thought no set of human beings could be so cruel. They left the apprentice with his face covered with blood. The wonder is that they did not finish him outright. After a period of semi-consciousness the poor fellow was conveyed to the dining-room close at hand, where the attendants removed the blood by washing. From this temporary resting-place he managed to get to his home.

"The details of the above give an illustration of what was occurring generally in the Queen's Island. The R.I.C. were not present, and perhaps they have no jurisdiction in the district, but there is a force of harbour police, and they were also painfully absent."

I will have a word to say presently about the Royal Irish Constabulary being apparently exempt from duty on Queen's Island, because it is private property. The report then goes on to explain that these men went from shop to shop, singling out those who were known to be Catholics, beating them, and finally driving them out of the works. This reign of terror was thus going on in the

streets and

workshops of Belfast for three days, but on Wednesday things got even worse. The Evening Standard of last night published this paragraph describing what they call;

"a shocking onslaught by the Queen's Island shipyard men yesterday;(that would be Wednesday);afternoon on the Roman Catholic navvies employed on the new Musgrave Channel. About 100 of the latter, chased for their lives, had to take refuge in a tug-boat, which safely landed them on the other side of the harbour.

Many of them were seriously injured by showers of iron bolts, nuts, and rivets.

One young fellow was inhumanly beaten and thrown into the river. It was with great difficulty that he was rescued in a half-drowned condition. The new canal boats are to day idle, the navvies, numbering about 200, resolutely refusing to return. The harbour police were utterly powerless to cope with the disturbances.

In 1886 a similar attack was made on the navvies at Alexandra Dock works, many being driven into the harbour, and one young fellow named Curran was drowned."

Another description, taken from the Freeman's Journal of yesterday, says::

"To-day the Queen's Island workers again signalled their joy at the return of the Yeomanry. A formidable attack was made by a large and organised body of them upon hard-working, inoffensive Catholic labourers employed by the Belfast Harbour Commissioners at the new Musgrave Channel works. The attacking party numbered from 300 to 400 mechanics. About one o'clock they swept down upon 100 Catholic labourers. The Catholics were taken completely by surprise, when the Orange and Protestant mob started hailing upon them bolts, bars, nuts, and stones. They took to a boat alongside, and escaped. The boat was towed rapidly off by a tug to the Co. Antrim side of the harbour. So complete was the surprise of the Catholics that numbers of the poor fellows hurried off leaving their coats behind on the slob-lands at which they were working. The derelict coats were burned by the magnanimous island rowdies, and then the windows in the huts were shattered to round off the expedition. Bitter complaint is made at the absence of the Royal Irish Constabulary from the neighbourhood of the shipbuilding yards, where serious occurrences took place during previous periods of excitement."

I do not want to detain the House unnecessarily by reading extracts, but, after all, I am basing my case upon the information supplied to me from the ordinary sources of public information. Of course, personally I have no knowledge of these transactions, and I think it right to give the authority on which I make these statements. Here is another description of the transactions of Wednesday;

"The nature of yesterday's work was so serious that over a hundred Catholics (employed by a public board) have been turned out of work in a body, and forced to subsist as best they can, as no remuneration will be given them during their enforced idleness…. At the dinner hour a Catholic labourer, in the employment of the Harbour Board at the Channel, was proceeding down Queen's Road, when a crowd of over 300, who had provided themselves liberally with bolts, angle-irons, stones, and bars, made a rush at him, the attack being apparently part of a thought-out plan. The unfortunate man ran for his life, remembering only too well that it was at this exact spot, in 1886, the poor boy

Curran was drowned by the inhuman monsters then in force on the island. After an exciting chase, during which he was subjected to a fusillade of missiles, he managed to reach the Musgrave Works and sought to protect himself within the enclosure. The mob were determined, however, to achieve their object, and rushed into the works, taking by surprise the other workers who were scattered about, and therefore not in a position to return the attack. Taken by surprise, and alarmed by the large numbers of their assailants, they were unable to protect themselves, and only thought of how to escape the shower of bolts and nuts, etc., which was now raining down upon them. A tug was near, and towards this a rush was made, and just in time, for the mob had now advanced, seemingly with the intention of driving the Catholics into the water. Many were struck, some very severely, and one particular instance might be mentioned of one man who, whilst frantically endeavouring to drag an old man into the boat, came in for a number of blows from bolts and nuts, which caused bad injuries. Another young lad was seriously injured, and subsequently had to be removed to the Royal Hospital, where he was treated and detained, so badly was he injured. There were no police about; there never are on the island; and then the paper repeats the statement I have already read with regard to the Royal Irish Constabulary;

"The Royal Irish Constabulary have no jurisdiction, we believe, upon the island, the latter being harbour property."

These are the occurrences which have been taking place during the last few days in Belfast. As to their serious character nobody can have any doubt. If ever there was a case when it was essential to move the adjournment of the House to call public attention to the action of the Executive this is such a case. This is no party question. It is not a question of politics at all, and certainly it is not a question of religion. This is nothing new. If this was the first time such a circumstance had happened in Belfast there would be some excuse for the Executive Government. But what argument can there be in defence of any Government which has been for twenty or thirty years trying to cope with this mischief, and which to-day has to admit it is unable to do it? I may use against the Government one of their own favourite maxims; that a Government which is not able to protect the lives and the property of the minority in Belfast is not able to justify its existence. I may be asked what exactly I complain of on the part of the Executive, and what do I suggest. The Chief Secretary just now said something about the probability of some prosecutions.

MR. WYNDHAM: The certainty.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I allege; and I am anxious to know whether the right hon. Gentleman will admit it; that these riots in Belfast were carefully and deliberately planned, that they were openly discussed, and that the Orange crowd were at public meetings in public speeches told to do exactly what they did. There is a man in Belfast named Trew. I am glad to think for the sake of Christian churches that he is not a minister of any religion; he is one of those itinerant preachers who sometimes arrogate to themselves the functions of properly appointed ministers of religion. He holds street services in different parts of the country, especially in Belfast. According to my information, this

man has been in the habit of holding public meetings on the steps of the Custom House in Belfast, and at one of these meetings, on the Sunday before the riots, this Mr. Trew made a speech in which he told the people all about the Catholic ceremony which was coming on, and urged them in unmistakable language not to permit it or to allow the Catholics to walk through the streets. I ask is Mr.

Trew to be prosecuted? I cannot understand the Chief Secretary saying it would defeat the ends of justice if he told us who were to be prosecuted. That may be true if these prosecutions are going to be confined to some two or three rowdies, picked up at street corners; but if the right hon. Gentleman is going to the fountain head of the mischief, and to prosecute the men who really are the ringleaders and instigators of this mischief, he need not be afraid of giving

the names, because they can scarcely run away from the country, and even if they did, possibly the right hon. Gentleman's object would be achieved.

So much for the open incitement by speech. Let me now read a poster which was put on the walls of Belfast, and also circulated as a handbill; issued, I am informed, on the authority of this Mr. Trew, but I do not know as to that. The poster says;

"Protestants! be on the alert. The Pope's brigade is preparing for an illegal procession through the streets of this Protestant city, carrying crucifixes, wafer gods, and other pagan emblems, on Sunday, June 9th. Will you permit God and Christianity to be insulted publicly by these pagans? Remember the glorious deeds of your forefathers at Derry, Aughrim, Enniskillen, and the Boyne, for our deliverance from papal tyranny. Rouse yourselves, Protestants, and see to it that Popery does not again gain the upper hand. God save the King."

Well indeed might the Sovereign's friends say "God save the King" from a man who could put his name at the bottom of such a document. I put it to English Members; Can they wonder that "God save the King" is not such a popular cry in Ireland as they would wish, when they find these words dragged through the dirt and mire by a wretched section of anti-Christian men who are conducting a campaign which is a disgrace to any civilised human being? I am glad the police have seized these placards where-ever they could, but it is manifest that they did not do it in time. What steps are being taken to make the man responsible for that placard amenable to the law? Let me take an illustration of what I mean. We are continually hearing of prosecutions for intimidation in the south and west of Ireland. Some of the most respectable men in the county of Waterford were recently prosecuted for intimidation because they passed in a meeting a resolution which was held to be likely to hurt unfairly the sensitive feelings of a land-grabber. The mere publication of that resolution was held to be a criminal offence. I know numbers of cases of prosecutions for placards infinitely less criminal and objectionable than this. If in the south and west of Ireland it is possible for the Government to trace and make amenable to the law for intimidation and public incitement to violence the authors of documents not half as bad as this one, how is it that they are unable to fulfil this duty which they owe to the State in the city of Belfast? We shall await with curiosity to see who will be prosecuted, but we know by

bitter experience what happens. Three or four, or perhaps a dozen or two dozen rowdies will be arrested; ignorant men, who have been incited by such documents as I have referred to, and the ribald and wild talk of men like Mr. Trew, and possibly sentenced to terms of imprisonment. That kind of prosecution is no good. You must go to the fountain head and make the men who are really responsible amenable to the law and punish them. It is said that the police were not present at Queen's Island, and the newspapers state that the Royal Irish Constabulary have no jurisdiction in Queen's Island, and that the keeping of the peace is entirely in the hands of the harbour police. The Chief Secretary also seemed rather to take that view. I do not understand that view at all. If crime and violence are taking place in Messrs. Harland and Wolff's yard it is not only the right, it is the duty, of the police to stop it. The right hon. Gentleman is on the horns of a dilemma. If he takes the attitude that they have no jurisdiction, then it is a monstrous, illegal, and unconstitutional doctrine. If he admits they have jurisdiction and they were not there to protect the lives of the people, why were they not present? It is not as if this was a mere ebullition of temper, over in half an hour. It has gone on for four days, every day getting worse, and yet on not one of the occasions was there apparently a single member of the Royal Irish Constabulary inside the works to protect the lives and property of the Catholic workmen. I am told that this question of the police on Queen's Island was discussed before Mr. Justice Day's Commission, and that strong representations were made as to the necessity of putting a police barracks upon the island. Certainly that has not been done, and I would urge upon the Government the necessity of taking that course, so that when these disturbances take place ;if they ever take place again; the police may be upon the spot in order to deal with them. I may here say that I made the assertion with regard to Mr. Trew making that speech on the Sunday before the riots on what I thought to be very good authority, but I did not like to use names without permission. One of the gentlemen who gave me this information has been telegraphed to, and he has given permission for his name to be mentioned. It is the Rev. Dr. Murphy, of St. George's, Belfast; a Protestant clergyman.

What do I expect the Government to do? I expect them to prosecute the ringleaders, like Trew, to find out the ringleaders in the workshops who organised these attacks, and not to confine their prosecutions to the ignorant men who may have been taken red-handed throwing stones in the streets. In the second place, I ask the Government to put a police barrack on the island, so that they may not be in that ridiculous position of having to admit that although the rioting went on increasing in violence for four days there was not a single member of the Royal Irish Constabulary in the place. If we were dealing with any city or government other than the city of Belfast and the English Government in Ireland, I would have some hope that the mere statement of these facts would prevent the possibility of their recurrence. But I have no such hope in this case. This disgraceful state of things has gone on regularly year by year, Government after Government. It is ridiculous to tell me that the Government cannot put it down. If it were necessary to send an army of 250,000

men to Belfast for the purpose, you would have them better employed than they are in South Africa. If you are not able to put it down, I repeat that you cannot justify your existence. What would happen if these things took place in Cork or Dublin;[A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Mitchelstown again.];if a peaceable Protestant procession was attacked in this manner on its way to a religious service in a private ground, and riotous proceedings similar to those in Belfast were kept up for four days, and then the Government came to the House of Commons and said, "We have done our best; our predecessors have done their best for generations. They failed, and we have failed. We are hopeless of putting this thing down, but we will institute prosecutions here and there"? If the condemnation of the English Government in Ireland rested upon this one fact alone, it would be condemned in the eyes of the whole civilised world. You are able to imprison men in the south and west of Ireland for things which are not comparable with the occurrences in Belfast, but with all the police and the military at your back you are unable to fulfil in Belfast the first duty of a Government; namely, to protect the lives and property of the citizens. I am heartily ashamed of having to deal with this matter at all. I take no pleasure in alluding to the bigotry, intolerance, and cruelty of the Protestants of Belfast. If these things were done by the Catholics in the south I would be in the first rank in condemning them. I take no pleasure in attacking Belfast; it is a great city, and for its greatness I am proud of it. Of the Protestants of Ireland I do not desire to say a single disrespectful word. They have given to the national cause of Ireland some of its greatest heroes. The Protestants of Ireland are not responsible for what has occurred in Belfast. They are, in the main, and growing more so every day, a broadminded set of men. The responsibility rests upon a little intolerant ring; just the same ring which, when Lord Fitzwilliam was Lord Lieutenant in Ireland, succeeded in defeating Catholic emancipation. It is against that little narrow section of bigots, an intolerant and unchristian set of people, that the Government should direct themselves instead of prosecuting two or three miserable tools. If they fail, as their predecessors have failed, then, I repeat, it is impossible to justify their existence at all. I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

MR. CLANCY (Dublin County, N.): In seconding the motion for the adjournment of the House I desire to say a very few words; but I hope they will be very plain.

My hon. friend who has just sat down said that the responsibility for these outrages in Belfast rested with a small knot of Irishmen whom he sufficiently described. I do not entirely agree with my hon. friend, because my view is that the responsibility is clearly shared by the Government sitting opposite. The reason why these things have been going on from generation to generation is perfectly plain to every Irishman; the law is not for the people of Ireland as a whole, but the law protects one section, and the people are out of it altogether. I was reading the other day the autobiography of Dean Swift, in which a story was told that, because he was supposed to be in sympathy with the last ministry of Queen Anne, a small ring of the ultra-Protestants of the city of Dublin made a point of attacking him from day to day in the streets; and on one occasion when he went out to a place about seven miles from Dublin,

accompanied by two servants, Lord Blake hired a chaise with two horses with the deliberate purpose of riding the Dean down, and when he failed to do that he turned round and struck the Dean's horse. The petition which Dean Swift presented to the Lord Lieutenant was a remarkable forecast of the present crisis. May I read a sentence from that petition.

"Your petitioner is informed that there is no law which can justify a certain noble Lord under cover of his peerage for assaulting any of His Majesty's subjects on the public highway and placing them in fear of their lives."

The complaint of Dean Swift;himself a Protestant of the Protestants;Catholics had reason to echo from generation to generation, and it has re-echoed from generation to generation, no matter what the Government of England is, because the Government in Ireland remains the same;an Orange Tory Government;a Government not for the people but for a section;a Government which violates with impunity the rights of the majority of the people. What happened only last year in Portadown? I brought this question before the House a few months ago, and I warned the right hon. Gentleman that his conduct on that occasion would lead to a renewal of these disturbances from time to time. The Catholics of Portadown;a miserable minority in point of numbers;proposed to exercise their constitutional right to go on an excursion

sion to a neighbouring town, and they gave the Executive warning that police would be required to protect them on their route. They gave them this warning by letter and by telegram, but that warning was disregarded. After many questions, I succeeded in finding out from the right hon. Gentleman that he made no effort to give protection; and the result was that these Catholics were assaulted, battered, and beaten, and a state of riot existed in that town for several days.

Then, of course, when that took place, what did the Orangemen in other parts of Ulster say? They said, "When the Orangemen of Portadown are able to do this with impunity, we can do the same, for the law exists for only one section of the community." The right hon. Gentleman said that these rioters could be prosecuted, but I told the right hon. Gentleman that those prosecutions were a sham, and would continue to be a sham. Take, for instance, those who have been brought up before the magistrates in Belfast. What chance was there of their being convicted, or, if they were convicted, what chance was there of any adequate sentence being passed upon them? Their "pals" were on the bench;the real fomenters and inciters of the disturbance, encouraged by the Government, and many of them were appointed by the present Attorney General. These encouragers and outrage-mongers are placed on the bench and refuse to listen to any evidence against their friends; and then they rise in the height of their virtue and declare that their friends are not guilty, or, if found guilty, they sentence them as street-brawlers to a few weeks' imprisonment. The right hon. Gentleman will have to do a great deal more than prosecute; he will have to reform the machinery of the Government of Belfast. If he has the courage of what, I believe, are the right hon. Gentleman's own convictions;for I do him the justice to believe that the right hon. Gentleman despises these people, and does not sympathise with them;he will take much stronger steps, and, if he has not the courage of his convictions, I am ready to suggest the course he ought to

take. The first step should be to report the names of every single magistrate in Belfast

belonging to the Orange persuasion to the Lord Chancellor, with a recommendation to remove them instantly. I say deliberately that unless the right hon.

Gentleman does that he might as well do nothing at all, because all these prosecutions will be a sham, and all these other steps will be equally shams.

One great argument in the Home Rule debates;as I understood it;against Home Rule was that the minority of Protestants outside Ulster would be oppressed by the Home Rule Government. As a matter of fact, they never have been oppressed, and never will be oppressed; but what becomes of the Catholic minority in the North;in Belfast, in Portadown, and one or two other places? They have no more real liberty, no more real protection for their lives and property than if they lived in some savage part of China, where Christian missionaries have been murdered with impunity. When I recollect that in the Home Rule debates the charge made against Irish Members was that they sympathised with crime, because they did not denounce it; when I remember that they were charged before a tribunal, specially selected and constituted for that purpose, with having connived at crime, and not having denounced it, I begin to wonder why it is that the hon. Member for West Belfast sits silent to-day on the Treasury bench in face of the outrages detailed by the hon. Member for Waterford. I say, if I and my colleagues are henceforth to be accused of sympathy with crime because we do not denounce it, why should I not publicly accuse him of sympathy with these outrages in Belfast? If the hon. Gentleman does not avail himself of the position which he occupies in this House, and say that, in his opinion, the outrages that have been perpetrated in Belfast deserve no sympathy, then he sympathises with these crimes. ["Oh, oh!"] I hear some cries on the other side of the House, and I am surprised. I do not understand them. Do hon. Gentlemen mean that when crimes are being committed by persons of their own political persuasion their action is not to be challenged, and that they sympathise with those crimes? I observe that hon. Gentlemen now cease to laugh. But the matter is a little more serious. I say it most deliberately, that the failure of hon.

Gentlemen opposite who sit silent while these things are being enacted, and fail to protest against these disturbances and crimes, incite their continuance. And if the Government continue to pursue their policy of inaction;and fail on every future occasion, as they have failed in the past, to anticipate these Orange disturbances;[AN HON. MEMBER on the Ministerial benches: They are not Orange disturbances];if they institute prosecutions which, I maintain, are sham prosecutions, the disturbances will continue, and the only thing that remains for the Catholics of Belfast to do;and I hope they will do it;is to procure arms and defend themselves against those murderous assaults upon them by the Orangemen.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn.";(Mr. John Redmond.)

MR. WYNDHAM: In replying to a question this afternoon as to the disturbances in Belfast, I ventured to deprecate any discussion of the subject at the present moment; and I think that many members on both sides of the House who have

listened to the speech just delivered will agree with me that it was not an opportune pronouncement on the eve of the legal proceedings;[An HON. MEMBER on the Irish benches: A legal sham];which are to be taken against the persons who are held to be responsible for these disturbances. Now, does it assist matters to make an unjustifiable attack upon the magistrates of Belfast, to make an appeal, as the hon. Member has done, to all those party and religious passions which have created the very evil which all men of common sense and of common charity deplore, and to challenge my hon. friend the Member for West Belfast to make some statement in the debate? I feel it due to my hon. friend to say that he asked whether he could intervene in this debate to denounce, with the hon. Member for Waterford, the objectionable and detestable placard that had been scattered broadcast. It has been suggested that the Catholics of Belfast should procure

arms and wreak vengeance. I say I was amply justified, not in order to shield the Government but in order that the ends of justice might not be defeated, and that Members' passions might not be excited, in submitting, as I did, that this was not the best occasion for raising a debate upon the riots of Belfast. I come now to the speech of the hon. Member for Waterford, and I am glad to say I cannot urge against that that which I have urged against the speech to which we have just listened. The hon. Member for Waterford based his motion for adjournment upon the failure on the part of the Executive to take proper precautions, and in dealing with that charge the hon. Member asked me to reply, stating what action was taken day by day, commencing with Sunday, the 9th. I say that every step that could have been taken was taken. The Irish Government kept itself in close telegraphic communication with Belfast during that period, and had there been such a failure as the hon. Member has attributed to the Government and the police many lives would have been lost, whereas no lives have been lost, and many people would have been seriously injured, whereas only one case of serious injury occurred.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I did not speak of the failure of the Government to take any particular course. I spoke of the failure which was proved by their inability to prevent this affair happening.

MR. WYNDHAM: I will come to that later. I think it is due to the House that I should tell them what occurred, beginning with Sunday. The Lord Mayor of Belfast, the Commissioner of Police, and the magistrates held a conference prior to this procession, and in consequence of the steps that were taken by them, although the procession passed several points at which attacks upon it were attempted by the rabble;for that is what it is; it is not the Orange party;it was able to proceed. The hon. Member himself preferred the charge against the leaders of that party that they did not take proper steps to keep down this disreputable fringe, this riotous element, in the town of Belfast.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I must interrupt the right hon. Gentleman, The disreputable fringe of the Protestants of Ireland, as he now calls it, is synonymous in my mind with the Orange party.

MR. WYNDHAM: Again I regret that this subject has been raised this afternoon, because I find myself being led away into making statements which, though I know

and believe them to be true, cannot with advantage be made this afternoon. I know that the hon. Member has no justification for stating that the action of the irresponsible rabble in the riots of Belfast is in any way typical of a great, important, and public-spirited party. The arrangements that were made by us for this procession were adequate and successful. The procession proceeded without interruption or serious interference, and although there was a good deal of excitement and some stone-throwing and disorder, these were immediately suppressed by the police, and the city of Belfast remained quiet on Sunday night last. On Monday there was an outbreak of rioting, but owing to the elaborate police arrangements and the calling out of the military the rioting in the Shankhill Road was suppressed by midnight without serious injury to life and property. I do not suppose that the hon. Member for Waterford, who has read a number of partisan accounts of these riots; although I admit that one of his authorities was a newspaper which takes an opposite view upon this religious question;

MR. JOHN REDMOND: What religious question?

MR. WYNDHAM: I agree it is an unfortunate expression. I am sorry so sacred a word as religion should be used in these miserable faction fights, but my meaning was perfectly plain, and I really do not think my expression invited the hon. Gentleman's interruption. The hon. Gentleman asks why was not our force sufficient to prevent the riot alto

gether; but he knows perfectly well that two hostile mobs live in Belfast in close proximity to each other, and are so organised that they can be called out at a moment's notice, and he also knows perfectly well that if provision had not been made there would have been loss of life that night.

I pass on to the Tuesday and Wednesday. On those days disgraceful attacks were made on certain workmen in Harland and Wolff's yard. I gave all the information upon that subject that I could obtain in reply to the question asked me, and I do not propose to add anything more to what I said then. I say now that my conviction is that no step would have been a more mistaken one than to have arranged for a body of policemen to patrol the yard where during eleven months and three weeks of the year the men in that yard work in perfect peace and amity. Anything more unhappy than these collisions it is impossible to conceive, but when they occur the law must be enforced. On the question as to what further steps are to be taken, I assure the hon. Member and the House that the Government intend to take every step in their power. We are determined to put this sort of thing down, and it shall be put down; but is this an opportune moment to discuss those steps? Is it wise, when feeling runs high in Belfast, for us here to talk of the number of police that we have available, or of the necessity of keeping the military there for the next few days or the next few weeks, and to arraign a Government which declares that, in the first place, it is instituting, legal proceedings, and, in the second, it is in consultation with the authorities of Belfast as to what further steps will be necessary to maintain perfect order there? Such a thing does not assist the Government or the object which I am sure the hon. Member for Waterford has at heart. I have already stated in reply to the question put to me by the hon. Member that I do

not propose to name any persons against whom it is proposed to proceed, but the hon. Member has himself named Mr. Trew. Now, I will not let it go forth that justice is to be affected by this discussion. Before this discussion I refused to give any names. I now say that Mr. Trew is to be proceeded against. I do not say whether he is guilty or not guilty. I merely say his action during the last few days has rendered it a reasonable thing for the Government to call him to account for what he has done. If he can prove that his action had nothing to do with this matter, and was perfectly right, so much the better for Mr. Trew; but this House is not to constitute itself a revolutionary tribunal. Passing from prosecutions and legal proceedings to military and police steps to be taken for the preservation of order, I must say that in my opinion steps must be taken occasionally in Belfast of a military character, but I regard them only as a palliative of the evil and regrettable necessity. These troops ought now to be free to pursue their own profession.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Yes, to pursue De Wet.

MR. WYNDHAM: I mention that aspect of the matter because it was some time ago urged that the police were unpopular and the military were popular, and that we should, therefore, police the north of Ireland by the military. I decline to accept that view; you cannot take away a battalion during two months of its training season from its proper work without involving great loss upon the taxpayers of this country, who are entitled to receive full value for their money. Therefore I hold it is necessary to take such other steps as may lead one to hope, though it does not do to be too sanguine, that those persons who were responsible for working up these unfortunate men to a state of maddened excitement would become sensible of the gravity of their action, would realise that they were not good citizens, and that their conduct was reprehensible, and would realise that those who agree with them in politics and many other questions dissent entirely from them when they misuse their convictions and madden the mob until they commit these deplorable excesses. The hon. Member for Waterford endeavoured to draw a distinction between the action of the Government in Belfast and their action in the south of Ireland. No such distinction can, in my opinion, be drawn.

The people of all parties and of all faiths have, in my opinion, the right to express their views, and to observe, if they please, political and ecclesiastical anniversaries, provided they do so in such a way as not to cause a breach of the peace, and that is the rule which governs the action of the Executive in the south of Ireland as in the north of Ireland. The Government do not take into account the political or ecclesiastical views or the motives of those who endanger the public peace. They regard only the probable consequences of their action. This is a police matter, not a political or a religious matter, and it is one question, whether in the north or in the south of Ireland. And, both in the north and in the south of Ireland, I am able to say to the House that, in my opinion, the Government do not favour one party or the other by a hairbreadth. All they are careful of is the maintenance of law and order.

MR. HAVILAND-BURKE (King's Co., Tullamore) said that in his plausible explanation, the Chief Secretary for Ireland had entirely evaded the main point

of the indictment brought against the Executive by the hon. Member for Waterford, which was, not that the police failed to be on the spot to suppress an outbreak of riot, but that, having had ample warning of the riot, they neglected to take the precautions it was incumbent upon them to take, and when the riot had broken out in its full and savage brutality they failed to appear, not for an hour, but for days, while the riot grew fiercer and the maltreatment of the Catholics grew more violent and more brutal. He accepted the disclaimer of the right hon. Gentleman and his declaration of disgust at the leaflet of which the Catholics of Belfast had so much reason to complain. It would have been more to the point if the printers of that leaflet had, instead of "God save the King," printed at the bottom "God save Protestantism from such Protestants as these." Every police station in Ireland had a stock of proclamations of public meetings with spaces left blank for the dates, and the statement that such a meeting was likely to cause boycotting or intimidation. What meeting was more calculated to

cause intimidation than this scandalous leaflet, which was scattered broadcast over Belfast on the night before the riot? He accepted the statement that the placard was torn down by the police, but why did not the police take precautionary measures to protect the Catholics on the very day when this act of ruffianism broke out?

MR. WYNDHAM: They did, and they were successful.

MR. HAVILAND-BURKE said that in that case they did not maintain their vigilance.

The right hon. Gentleman's first statement was very remarkable. He said the police could not control the harbour without the assistance of the military. That gave the House a picture of the unbridled lawlessness and ruffianism which generations of Irish Secretaries had allowed to exist in Belfast. The right hon. Gentleman had said that it was impossible for the police to show themselves in the harbour without the assistance of the military. What a confession of impotence! When thousands of the lives of His Majesty's Catholic subjects are menaced, to say that the police could not patrol a particular district without the aid of the military! The right hon. Gentleman said that too much police patrol would cause needless irritation. If the right hon. Gentleman desired to be needlessly irritated he had only to become a Nationalist Member and attempt to address his constituents in certain portions of Ireland. He had been to places where hundreds of armed men had been on the spot because it was said that such a meeting might create intimidation. The same sauce which was served out to the Nationalist goose should be served to the Orange gander. What the Nationalists wanted was the ruffianism at Belfast to cease, and they looked to the Chief Secretary and the Executive to take measures which were infinitely more prompt and effective than those which, on the right hon. Gentleman's own showing, they had taken when this outrage on the religious susceptibilities of the Catholics of Belfast was perpetrated in the leaflet to which allusion had been made. There was a sturdy little Protestant colony in the constituency which he represented, but no riots ever occurred at Tullamore, because there the community was not brought up year after year in the belief that it was safer to break a Catholic head than a Protestant window! There was

some attempt at impartiality in the administration of the law. In conclusion he might say he had not stood up to direct a malicious attack upon any Minister, but only to remind the right hon. Gentleman that the terrible riot of 1886 began in exactly the same way as the riots now under discussion, and to say that something more than the prosecution of a few poor corner-boys was needed to establish anything like the semblance of law in Belfast. It was useless to prosecute a few stone-throwers and not strike at the men who publicly initiated the attack against Catholics simply because they were Catholics.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAMS (Cork, N.E.): I desire to acknowledge the considerate terms in which the Leader of the Irish party has spoken of the services which the Protestants of Ireland have rendered in the struggles of the Irish people to recover their lost rights. I heartily believe that the respectable Protestants of Ireland, whether in Belfast or in any other province, condemn the proceedings which have recently disgraced Belfast as strongly as any person can possibly do. It is rather remarkable that so far not a single Member for the northern provinces of Ireland has yet seen fit to take part in this debate, to repudiate the disgraceful state of things which produced this riot. While there may be some allowance made for some members of the Government not taking part in this debate, I should have thought that some of those unofficial members of the House who are closely and intimately connected with Belfast would have felt it to be their duty to rise in this House and denounce in the strongest possible terms the conduct of men who I, as a Protestant, am ashamed to think are classed as my coreligionists. I say that it is a disgrace to Protestants that these riots should be carried out by Protestants. If there is anything at all in Protestantism it is a

desire to secure perfect freedom for every man to exercise his own religious belief. The Catholics of Belfast felt it to be their duty to take part in a religious ceremony inside the walls of a college, and their procession was attacked by men who call themselves Protestants. Therefore I think it is the duty of every right-minded Protestant who glories in the freedom which is the real foundation of Protestantism to rise in this House and dissociate himself from those wretched men who have brought disgrace upon Protestantism. I have just heard the Chief Secretary state that he intends to put down these proceedings in Belfast. We shall look with much curiosity to see what means are taken to accomplish this end. We shall watch with interest the prosecutions which the Government will initiate, not against those few misguided individuals who have disgraced that city, but against those persons who are behind those unfortunate men, and who have incited them to commit these acts which have disgraced the city of Belfast. As an Irish Protestant, I have risen to take part in the debate in order to thank the Member for Waterford for his kind expressions towards Protestants, and I feel that I should be false to my convictions if I did not express my opinion from my place in the House of Commons.

SIR ROBERT REID (Dumfries Burghs): I only wish to occupy a few moments in order to say why I intend to vote for the motion of the hon. Member for Waterford. I intend to do so as a protest against the constant troubles in Belfast, which I

have heard of from time to time, ever since I have had a seat in this House, and which I think are a disgrace to our system of government. On this occasion complaints have been made that there have not been adequate prosecutions in past times. It is also complained that the magistrates are biased or partial in their administration of the law. Of course, all those things are denied, and no doubt the Chief Secretary for Ireland thinks he has taken proper precautions, and he believes in the impartiality of the magistrates. There must, however, be a screw loose somewhere. What seems to me to be absolutely unintelligible is that people engage

in a discreditable riot, which is denounced by the Chief Secretary and everybody else, which it ought to be within the power of the law to put down, and yet it does not seem to be put down. What would the Attorney General do in England if he found a local authority did not put down rioting? He would take care that a large number of those persons who were the ringleaders in getting up religious riots were prosecuted. Of course, it is not necessary to prosecute everybody, but the law should direct its shafts towards the ringleaders and towards those who are most highly placed. The Chief Secretary has stated in language which I listened to with satisfaction that these riots shall be put down, and that this state of things shall not be permitted to continue. If he will direct his weapons against the ringleaders and the persons who instigated these disgraceful scenes, that will be the most effective method to adopt. Everybody will watch with considerable interest the steps the Chief Secretary takes to put down these riots, and I hope he will take care to punish those who are really guilty.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR (Liverpool, Scotland): My hon. and learned friend who has just sat down has made the statement that these riots are condemned by every reasonable man in this House and in Ireland. That statement compels me to call attention to a fact which I think is very remarkable in the course of this debate. We have had a repudiation of these riots from the Chief Secretary and from hon. Members on the Irish benches, both Catholic and Protestant. But although this debate has gone on for some time, and there are Members in the House associated with Belfast and with the organisation which was the root and origin of these riots, the debate is apparently about to close without a word of repudiation, and without a syllable of condemnation from them, of these disgraceful proceedings. I waited for the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh to rise;

COLONEL SAUNDERSON (Armagh, N.): I will follow you.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I was very unwilling to join in this debate, because the case had been so ably stated by my hon. and learned friend the Member for Waterford and other hon. Members who have spoken, but I think my rising will have been more than justified if it elicits some words from the right hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite. Now that he is going to rise after me, may I suggest some subjects to which he may direct his remarks? The Chief Secretary says that the Protestants of Ireland are to be held free from responsibility for these riots. That statement was also made by the hon. Member for Waterford. Perhaps I may be permitted to say that in my opinion the Protestants of Ireland in future will play as great and honourable a part in the self government of Ireland as

any other religious section of the community. Religious discussions in Ireland are not raised from the point of view of making wider and deeper the gulf which lies between Catholics and Protestants in Ireland. The Chief Secretary went on to say that he was able to relieve not merely the Protestant body of responsibility for these riots, but also that section known as the Orange Society. Here I am sorry to say I could not agree with him, and if I wanted a contradiction and repudiation of this statement I could find it in his own speech. He says that for eleven months in the year Catholics and Protestants are able to get on well together, and that even in the Belfast Dockyards, where one-eighth of the men are Catholics, they are able to work in peace side by side for eleven months in the year. Everybody acquainted with the north of Ireland knows that that is perfectly true. There is one month of the year, however, which seems to bring out all those ancient feuds and unchristian passions. That month would pass away like other months if religious feuds were not resurrected from their graves by men of repute and position, who make it their business to make speeches, call meetings, and use all the old weapons by which those religious feuds can be revived and religious passions excited. Even the hon. Member for South Belfast excuses his absence from this House on the ground that he has to be in Ireland on the 12th of July. On that date probably the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh will be addressing Orange Lodges in Ireland and arousing religious passions.

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member must keep to the specific point before the House. He is now entering into a discussion about what happens on the 12th of July. That is out of order, and it is undesirable to discuss it now.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: We say that every precaution has been taken by us to prevent these riots, and may I not make an appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite not to make speeches which arouse religious passion in Ireland and which we hold are the origin of the riots? It is a little too bad that we should have to come here year after year and make the same complaint in regard to these riots and always get the same answer. I remember these riots when a boy at college in 1886, and every five years since that time we have had the same riots and the same promises to put them down. The Chief Secretary says the law is administered in the same way in the north as in the south of Ireland. I dare say that is his intention, but as far as the facts are concerned it is not so. These riots would never take place in Belfast at all if the rioters did not feel that the strong arm of the law would not be raised against them.

MR. WYNDHAM: No, no!

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: The Chief Secretary denies this, but I have seen Protestant magistrates in the north of Ireland leading mobs, and the very next day those gentlemen were not ashamed to take their places upon the magisterial bench to administer what they called impartial justice to Catholics. The only occasion in my life when I was seriously assailed by a mob was in the north of Ireland, and the gentlemen who took part in it were pointed out to me as members of the magisterial bench.

MR. WYNDHAM dissented.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: The Chief Secretary shakes his head and gives me that solemn

negative which Chief Secretaries always give to unpleasant facts. In this country people know that they have to face the law, and that it will be enforced if they do not obey it, but in the north of Ireland the Protestant feels that the law is his friend and protector in riotous proceedings. Ireland must be in a very bad way if the Government cannot rule without resorting to such methods. There is something to be admired in a Government which is determined at any cost to preserve the rights of every individual and the maintenance of law and order. Let the Chief Secretary adopt that principle in the north of Ireland. I hope this debate will have three useful results: (1) the repudiation by the right hon. and gallant Member for North Armagh of the men who are guilty of these gross and brutal acts of cowardice; (2) a greater vigilance on the part of the Government than they have hitherto shown; and (3) most important of all, I hope this discussion will bring home to the minds of hon. Gentlemen opposite and the people of this country that, if there is any danger of religious servitude and bigotry in Ireland, it would come not from the Catholics, but from those who persecute them.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I can assure the hon. Member who has just sat down that it is not the habit of the party to which I belong to make any allusion to the faith of those who are opposed to us, and I challenge the hon. Gentleman to go through the speeches which I have made during the last twenty years and produce one single instance where I have ever uttered one syllable which is insulting to the faith to which the majority of Irishmen belong. It is not the habit of myself, or the organisation to which I belong, to do that. I am perfectly well aware that hon. Gentlemen look upon it almost as an insult if we take a strong Protestant line. We are Protestants, and we are not ashamed of it. We proclaim it, and we intend to stand by it in Ireland and in this country. As for insulting or inciting the Irish

people to attack their fellow-countrymen, that is not our habit. If hon.

Gentlemen opposite desire that this ill-feeling shall permanently cease, a good deal rests with them. Let them abandon their insane policy of Home Rule, which nobody believes in either in Ireland or in this country. It is merely a political cry which fills the Irish benches. But there is really nothing in Home Rule, and why not abandon it?

*MR. SPEAKER: I hope the right hon. Gentleman will not extend this limited debate to Home Rule.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON: I will not pursue that question or my speech in that direction. As one of the Orange leaders, I utterly repudiate, as I know they also repudiate and abhor, any such proceedings as have been described. Protestants claim a perfect freedom and right which, I believe, all the King's subjects claim to hold their faith, and, if they choose, to proclaim it. We agree that our fellow-countrymen have a right to celebrate any religious ceremony which they believe they ought to perform. These riots in Belfast, unfortunately, occasionally recur. I deplore this, but these riots are invariably got up by boys and girls under eighteen. They are never got up by the leaders of any party, and amongst those who are now being tried or have been tried in Belfast you will not find one single member of the Orange organisation.

[Nationalist cheers, and AN HON. MEMBER; No; they will not touch them.] I challenge contradiction of the statement I have made. No doubt hon. Gentlemen opposite will say that an Orangeman is seldom brought before the magistrates, and if he is he is generally acquitted. There is not one syllable of truth in such a statement. As one of the leaders of the Orange organisation, I say that Orangemen themselves and those who are under our discipline take no part whatever in riots of this kind, and we deplore them as heartily as hon. Members opposite. Therefore I hope that I have satisfied my hon. friend opposite that the leaders of the party to which I belong and myself deplore and condemn as strongly as he does

these unfortunate proceedings. I only hope that good sense will prevail in Belfast, and that these people will see that those who are really injured by such proceedings are not the co-religionists of the hon. Gentlemen opposite, but it is their own faith which is covered with obloquy and disgrace.

MR. FIELD: If the right hon. Gentleman when he goes to Belfast would repeat the statements he has made in this House I am quite certain that they would have a much greater effect than any debate here, because there can be no question whatever that it is only when Orange festivals come about that these riots take place. It is always about the 12th of July.

COLONEL SAUNDERSON dissented from that statement.

MR. FIELD: The right hon. Gentleman's recollection and my own do not agree. I think it is generally about the 12th of July that the Orangemen decide to have a night in Belfast. It seems to me most intolerable that in this age of free thought and civilisation the occurrence of a procession within Catholic grounds should be made a reason for such proceedings as those which happened in Belfast during the past few days. I have always preached toleration. I do not care what a man's religion is, he has a right to the free exercise of his

AYES.

Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.)

Cogan, Denis J.

Helme, Norval Watson

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Condon, Thomas Joseph

Hope, John Deans (Fife, West)

Allen, Charles P. (Glouc., Stroud)

Craig, Robert Hunter

Jacoby, James Alfred

Ambrose, Robert

Crean, Eugene

Jones, Wm. (Carnarnonshire)

Austin, Sir John

Cullinan, J.

Kearley, Hudson E.

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Dalziel, James Henry

Kennedy, Patrick James

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Delany, William
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Black, Alexander William
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Leamy, Edmund
Blake, Edward
Doogan, P. C.
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Boland, John
Duffy, William J.
Levy, Maurice
Boyle, James
Duncan, J. Hastings
Lewis, John Herbert
Brigg, John
Dunn, Sir William
Lundon, W.
Brown, George M. (Edinburgh)
Elibank, Master of
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Field, William
M'Crae, George
Burns, John
Flynn, James Christopher
M'Dermott, Patrick
Caldwell, James
Gilhooly, James
M'Govern, T.
Campbell John (Armagh, S.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Minch, Matthew
Carew, James Laurence
Hammond, John
Mooney, John J.
Causton, Richard Knight
Hayden, John Patrick
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Clancy, John Joseph
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Chas. Seale-
Moss, Samuel

religion irrespective of his political party, and it appears to me that the Orangemen of Belfast ought to allow Catholics the liberty to exercise their religion, which is almost the only liberty left to them in Ireland. I trust that the result of this debate will be that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief

Secretary for Ireland will be in earnest in what he has proclaimed this evening. Those who have studied the question for years past know very well that the administration of the law is not evenhanded in Ireland. Those of us who have taken part in Nationalist demonstrations know very well that in various parts of Ireland the same liberty is not accorded in the south and west that is freely given to the Orangemen in Belfast. I have no desire to quarrel with Orangemen. I cannot understand why such proceedings as occurred at Belfast should take place. I could understand if they took place in Africa. If meetings are to be put down in Nationalist quarters in Ireland the same law should be carried out in Belfast. I trust that the result of this discussion will be that the Chief Secretary will carry out the law in all parts of Ireland in an evenhanded manner, and that he will bring to an end those unfortunate riots between Catholics and Protestants in Belfast, which are a disgrace to the community. Question put.

The House divided: Ayes, 105; Noes, 182. (Division List No. 254.)

Murnaghan, George

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R (Northants

Nannetti, Joseph P.

O'Shee, James John

Stevenson, Francis S.

Nolan, Cl. John. P. (Galway, N.

Pearson, Sir Weetman D.

Sullivan, Donal

Nolan, Joseph (Louth South)

Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)

Thomas, J. A (Glamorgan, G'wer

Norman, Henry

Power, Patrick Joseph

Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.).

O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)

Reckitt, Harold James

Wallace, Robert

O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary Mid

Reddy, M.

Weir, James Galloway

O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

White, Patrick (Meath, North)

O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)

Redmond, William (Clare)

Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)

O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)

Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries

Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)

O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)

Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East),
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
O'Dowd, John
Robson, William Snowdon
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Captain Donelan and Mr. Patrick O'Brien.
O'Malley, William
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire
O'Mara, James
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S)
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Duke, Henry Edward
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Lowe, Francis William
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Arrol, Sir William
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Finch, George H.
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. Ellison
Baird, John George Alexander
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Macdona, John Cumming
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Fisher, William Hayes
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Fitzroy, Hon. Edward Algernon

M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. Gerald W. (Leeds
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Majendie, James A. H.
Balfour, Maj K. R. (Christchurch
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Malcolm, Ian
Banbury, Frederick George
Forster, Henry William
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Galloway, William Johnson
Maxwell, W J H. (Dumfriesshire
Bigwood, James
Garfit, William
Mitchell, William
Bill, Charles
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Morgan, David J (Walthamstow
Bullard, Sir Harry
Gorst, Rt. Hn. Sir John Eldon
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh.
Butcher, John George
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford)
Carson, Rt. Hon, Sir Edw. H.
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Cautley, Henry Strother
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lanes.)
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Midd'x
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay

Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Peel, Hn. Wm. Rbt. Wellesley
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Pierpoint, Robert
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Chapman, Edward
Heaton, John Henniker
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Helder, Augustus
Plummer, Walter R.
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Henderson, Alexander
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Higginbottom, S. W.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Hogg, Lindsay
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield, Brightside
Purvis, Robert
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Hornby, Sir William Henry
Pym, C. Guy
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Rankin, Sir James
Cranborne, Viscount
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Rasch, Maj. Frederick Carne
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Hutton, John (Yorks., N. R.)
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Reid, James (Greenock)
Crossley, Sir Savile

Johnston, William (Belfast)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Cust, Henry John C.
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. C. Thomson
Dalkeith, Earl of
Kimber, Henry
Robertson, Herb. (Hackney)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Knowles, Lees
Ropner, Col. Robert
Davies, Sir Horatio D. (Chatham
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Round, James
Dickson, Charles Scott
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Law, Andrew Bonar
Russell, T. W.
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Lawson, John Grant
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Disraeli, Coningsby Ralph
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants, Fareham
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Dixon-Hartland, Sir Fred Dixon
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sassoon, Sir Edw. Albert
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw. J
Seton-Karr, Henry
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Shaw-Stewart, M. H. (Renfrew
Thornton, Percy M.
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Tollemache, Henry James
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray

Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Tuke, Sir John Batty
Wylie, Alexander
Spear, John Ward
Valentia, Viscount
Wyndham, Rt. Hn. George
Stanley, Lord (Lanes.)
Walker, Col. Wm. Hall
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Welby, Sir Chas. G. E. (Notts.)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES; Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Stroyan, John
Whitmore, Chas. (Algernon)
Strutt, Hn. Chas. Hedley
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell (Birm.)
NEW BILL.

SMALL HOLDINGS (IRELAND).

Bill to increase the area of Small Holdings in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Colonel Nolan, Mr. William Redmond, Mr. James O'Kelly, and Mr. Conor O'Kelly.
SMALL HOLDINGS (IRELAND) BILL.

"To increase the area of Small Holdings in Ireland," presented accordingly, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday, 24th June, and to be printed. [Bill 212.]

SUPPLY [11TH ALLOTTED DAY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

NAVY ESTIMATES, 1901–2.

1. £2,684,000, Shipbuilding, Repairs, Maintenance, Etc.; Personnel.

*THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): I ask leave to rise at this stage of the proceedings as I have a statement to make on the Vote, which may shorten discussion. There are several points in which hon. Members are interested with regard to the personnel of the dockyards. One matter which has on many previous occasions led to considerable discussion in this House has reference to the rate of wages paid to the dockyard labourers. The history of the existing rate of wages is well known to Members of the House. The difficulty arose owing to a change in the wages of the War Office labourers at Woolwich Arsenal. At Woolwich there were labourers in the employment of the Admiralty working side by side with those employed by the War Office and receiving 1s. a week less. As that anomaly could not continue, the labourers of the Admiralty at Woolwich were paid the same wages as those of the War Office. But that led to another anomaly. The workmen at Deptford, which is nearer to London, were then receiving a lower rate of wages than the men at Woolwich. At first, in view of what was the current rate of wages, the Admiralty did not see their way to make the alteration

desired by many hon. Members, and to give an extra shilling to the Deptford labourers. There were two grounds. In the first place, they were not clear that the concession was demanded by the state of the labour market, and, further, they were not at that time, in view of the rate of wages prevailing, prepared to accept the natural consequence of any alteration in the Deptford wages, and of adding to the wages of the labourers in all the Government dockyards. But the matter has now been carefully considered, the rates of wages prevailing in other parts of the country and in London have been examined, and it has been decided to concede an extra shilling a week to the labourers at Deptford. As a necessary corollary, a similar rise will be given to the labourers in all the Admiralty dockyards. I speak of this as a necessary corollary, because as hon. Members are aware, the principle has already been admitted that there is a distinction between the rate of wages in London and the rate in the provinces. That distinction in respect to labourers is held to be represented by the sum of a shilling. Therefore it would be impossible, in the face of the recommendation; which was the recommendation of a strong Committee; to give the increase at Deptford and not give it to the labourers in the other dockyards. The next point I wish to say a word about, with the view of shortening debate, is the matter of dockyard petitions. There are hon. Members who represent dockyard workers and others who have often brought before this House questions which have been pressed upon them with regard to shipwrights. The shipwrights are a most important body of men in the dockyards, and there can be no doubt that in some respects they have not hitherto been on all fours, as regards wages, with other skilled labourers who may be called approximately of the same class in the dockyards. There has existed among the shipwrights a system of classification, according to their actual or supposed professional merit, which has been recognised by a larger or smaller wage. The wage itself has not always been held to compare favourably with that of workmen of a similar class, and this has given rise to a good deal of dissatisfaction. It has now been decided to remove, as far as we can remove, that source of dissatisfaction, and we propose to abolish the classification of shipwrights and to raise the rate of pay in the following degrees:; The established shipwrights, at present receiving 32s., will receive 33s.; the hired shipwrights, at present receiving 33s. 6d., will receive 34s. 6d.; and the probationers, now receiving 31s. 6d., will receive 32s. 6d. By granting these concessions we shall give a substantial increase to by far the larger number of shipwrights. There will be a very small number who will not gain the full shilling owing to the fact that they are now receiving somewhat more than the bulk of the men with whom they work. There have been two other sources of petitions affecting another class. One has been with reference to the recorders of work. They are an important body of men, because they are entrusted with responsible functions. It is their duty to investigate the work done by their colleagues in the same or a kindred trade, and to report, for the purpose of estimating the amount of piecework earnings for the work performed. In view of the recent increase granted to charge men this responsibility was no longer adequately compensated by the wages they received, which was by an allowance of 6d. a day duty pay. Now we have raised

that remuneration from 6d. to 1s. The last class to which I wish to refer are the machinists and spinners; the women engaged in the rope-works at Chatham and Deptford. A considerable class of women engaged in dockyards are those known as color-women, and they have been hitherto receiving a wage in excess of that paid to the other women engaged as machinists and spinners. Machinists and spinners have hitherto received a wage varying from 11s. to 15s. a week. It is now proposed to raise the wage to a sum varying from 13s. 6d. to 18s. a week, thus placing them on the same terms as colorwomen. These are substantial concessions, which have been desired by Members of this House, and which we are now convinced the present state of the labour market makes it reasonable for us to concede.

There has been of course an enormous number of individual petitions. I have thought it my duty to peruse all of them. I am sure the Committee will not desire that I should give a reply now to individual petitions. Answers will be sent in due course to petitioners whose petitions have been acceded to.

In the matter of boilers in the ships, there has been a further readjustment since my hon. friend made his statement on the subject. I hope it is not out of order to refer to this, but I have not given to the House on other occasions lists of the ships which were to be boilered. I may say that it has been found impracticable under the rule laid down by ourselves to put new, boilers into the "Donegal," the "Cumberland," and the "Prince of Wales"; but on the other hand it has been decided to take out the existing boilers of the "Hermes."

*THE CHAIRMAN: It will not be convenient to discuss boilers on this Vote.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE (Gloucestershire, Forest of Dean): We generally have on first reaching the Vote for the shipbuilding yards some general discussion. I understand from you, Sir, that is not to be the case to-day.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think that has generally been the case when Section 2 or 3 has been taken first. Possibly it will be convenient to discuss Sections 2 and 3 together, because they deal with shipbuilding and boilers. I think it would be inconvenient to discuss shipbuilding on the Vote before us.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I do not think I need say any more now, having drawn attention to the changes we propose to make with regard to the wages of labourers.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said it was perhaps unfortunate that the Government had not followed the usual course of taking first either Section 2 or 3, on which the programme of the year could be discussed. He sincerely trusted that they might not occupy the whole evening discussing the personnel, the more so because the first matter with which his hon. friend the Secretary to the Admiralty dealt at greatest length had generally been discussed on another Vote. He had heard with pleasure of the small advance granted to the labourers at Deptford, for that had been the worst case in the whole range of labour employment by the Government. The present increase ought to have been given three or four years ago. Having no personal interest in the matter, having a constituency interested the other way, and having inquired into the circumstances, he considered that the case of Deptford and Woolwich was an extraordinarily strong case of where the pay was terribly too low. The only doubt he had in his mind in connection with the gratifying announcement which had been made was whether the men at Devonport, in

view of the peculiar circumstances attendant upon living there, ought not to be put on the London scale. He believed it was as dear a place as, London for the men. He rather doubted whether the other concession would be sufficient to remove the difficulties which had stood in the way of the Admiralty obtaining the services of first class shipwrights.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said he wished to express his satisfaction that, after the long and weary campaign which had been waged on behalf of the underpaid men in the dockyards, the Admiralty had seen their way to take a step in the right direction, and to make these concessions. The Devonport case had been well known in the House. The condition of the men there was altogether different from that in any other Government yard, and he submitted that there was a case for further inquiry with the view of ascertaining whether they were entitled to the same consideration as was given to the men in the London yards. He thanked his hon. friend for what he had done, but was he to understand that the shilling concession would apply to hired hands and to skilled labourers?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No; the skilled labourers are on a totally different footing.

MR. KEARLEY said that the skilled labourers as a whole starved on a very low wage, while the ordinary labourers had the benefit of this concession.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that the skilled labourers on regular wages were paid on an average 24s. per week, and a large number on piece work earned from 24s. to 32s. a week.

MR. KEARLEY admitted that the average wage was about 24s. per week, but he maintained that the Government would not get the most desirable men so long as they were paid an unequal wage for doing the same work. He believed the Government were right in abolishing classification amongst the shipwrights, but why limit it to that one trade only? Were the joiners less concerned in this principle of classification than the shipwrights? The logical conclusion was to carry the abolition of classification to all trades. The Government could not get skilled labour in these other trades unless they paid proper wages. Lord Goschen, then

Mr. Goschen, promised in this House in March, 1890, that the whole conditions in regard to pay of the labourers in the Government dockyards would be revised. That promise had not been carried out, and he thought that there should be a general inquiry. Of course the conditions of labour had changed during the last ten years, and if the Government wanted to get the best skill it would be necessary to adopt the scale of wages paid to similar trades in private yards. As to the question of arrears of construction, could he raise it under the present Vote?

*THE CHAIRMAN thought it would be more convenient to take the point of arrears of construction on the Shipbuilding Vote.

MR. KEARLEY asked whether he would be in order in calling attention to some matters referred to in the Report of the Committee of Public Accounts as to the lack of expenditure of money which had been voted for shipbuilding by the House.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member would not be in order in raising that question on this Vote.

MR. ARTHUR MORTON (Deptford) said he wished to express his acknowledgment and thanks to the Government for the concessions which the Secretary to the Admiralty had announced, and he was quite sure these would be received with great gratitude by the workmen in the dockyards.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON (Devonport) desired to add his acknowledgment to the Secretary to the Admiralty for the concession he had made; a larger one than had been made since Lord Spencer was First Lord of the Admiralty. But while the hired men received a slightly higher rate of pay, they received a smaller advantage than the establishment men in the way of pension. In fact they did not receive a pension at all; they received only a bonus. The hired men constituted 75 per cent. of the whole employees of the Government, whereas thirty or forty years ago they were half. Again, in the old days the hired men were practically only taken on for the job, and when the job was finished they expected to be dismissed. It was not out of consideration for the men that the Government now gave them practically continuous employment, but from the necessities of the Government, although the rate of wages for hired men was distinctly lower than was paid to a similar class of workmen in private yards. The real question was what was the service of these men worth. He would suggest that the Government labourers were worth sixpence an hour, as much as the labourers in private yards. It was rather an ungracious thing to look a gift horse in the mouth, but he would like the Secretary to the Admiralty to extend the same concessions which he had made to the shipwrights to other trades, particularly to the joiners, ship-riggers, store-house labourers, and others, which were very markedly paid at a lower rate than in private yards. The hon. Gentleman had got a petition from these trades before him, in which they fairly and accurately set out the rate of pay in private yards as compared with that paid in Government yards, and he would like the hon. Member to make a statement as to what he was prepared to do in regard to the other trades besides the shipwrights.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB (Great Yarmouth) said there was a matter of principle connected with this particular Vote on which he wished to ask a question, and to make a few observations. He referred to the naval staffs employed at the different naval stations abroad. It was almost impossible to recognise that any principle of policy was pursued as to personnel ashore on stations abroad. For example, in the days of wooden ships, and when the main colonial trade of this country was with the West Indies, Jamaica was an important station. There they now had a commodore and a commander, and altogether £4,000 a year was spent on the personnel of the naval establishment at Port Royal. But in these days of iron; steel, and steam, Jamaica could only be regarded as a very small and insignificant station. Now, at Halifax, the headquarters of this North American and West Indian fleet, there was only a civil store keeper in charge. That seemed a somewhat ridiculous position. Both at Halifax and at Esquimaux they should have a naval officer of superior rank in charge of the station, who could be getting all the information possible to be obtained, so as to prepare for the coming time of colonial co-operation. Again, he noticed that they were spending as much on the personnel at Jamaica as at Gibraltar. He asked the Secretary to the Admiralty to

throw some light on what was the principle of general policy in regard to the distribution of the naval staffs on shore on the different stations abroad.

MR. DUKE (Plymouth) said that formerly the men in the dockyards had the privilege of approaching the Lords of the Admiralty, and bringing to their notice what they regarded as their grievances as to pay and position. In recent years they had lost that privilege, but there was left to them the right of petition, and that right they had exercised. Hon. Members who came into contact with the employees in the dockyards knew that they did not exercise that right of petition without cause, as had been witnessed that night by the concessions made. But sometimes for two years together the men who had forwarded petitions to the Admiralty, setting out clearly the terms of their grievances, had got no sort of reply. He knew that that was a source of much irritation, and he thought it would be a great satisfaction to large bodies of men employed in the dockyards if, within a reasonable time after they had addressed their petitions to the Admiralty, they were informed whether anything was to be done in the matter of redressing their grievances.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that the practice was to communicate with the men in all cases where their petitions could be acceded to. But when the large number of petitions frequently forwarded to the Admiralty, and the small points often brought up, was considered, it would be seen that it was very difficult to answer every one of them personally. The object of the concession of extra pay to the shipwrights was not to achieve the abolition of classification but to give them a

just pay. That had levelled up the whole of the shipwrights in a particular way, and it had practically the effect of abolishing classification; but that was not the object of the change. His hon. and gallant friend the Member for Great Yarmouth had suggested a readjustment of the personnel on shore at the different stations abroad. During the short time he had had experience at the Admiralty he observed that the tendency was that the naval stations which were really becoming important had received additions to their personnel, and the contrary was the case with those stations which had ceased to be important. It was a matter of opinion whether this particular survival of maintaining, superior officers at Jamaica should be continued. He acknowledged that Jamaica was now of nothing like the importance it once occupied as a naval station; but it was isolated, and was still of considerable importance in relation not only to the West Indian islands, but to our colonies on the mainland of South America. He would also point out that Port Royal, Jamaica, was much further off from any foreign country than Halifax. He believed there was justice in the case of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, and if his hon. and gallant, friend would assist him in the matter he would be much obliged.

*SIR JOHN COLOMB said he had not argued so much for the reduction of the staff at Port Royal, but for increasing the naval staffs at Halifax, Simon's Bay, and Esquimaux, and putting a senior officer in charge there, thereby giving them better opportunities of keeping in touch with what was going on.

MR. E. J. C. MORTON said that the distinction between the hired men and the establishment men having practically ceased to exist, he wanted to know whether

the Government could not give the hired men some sort of a pension after, as some of them had given, thirty years service.

Resolution agreed to.

Motion made, and Question proposed "That a sum, not exceeding £5,306,500, be granted to His Majesty, to defray the Expense of the Material for Shipbuilding Repairs, Maintenance, &c., including, the cost of Establishments of Dockyard, and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March, 1902."

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Perhaps with the acquiescence of the House, and for the satisfaction of the hon. Member for Gateshead, I might, in continuance of the brief statement which I made in an earlier stage of the debate, say that a slight alteration will have to be made. In the statement I made to the hon.

Gentleman with regard to the change of boilers in His Majesty's ships I included three ships, the "Donegal," "Cumberland," and "Prince of Wales," in which the Admiralty hoped to substitute some other type of water-tube boiler without great expense; but, having investigated the matter and approached the firms that are contracting for the propelling machinery and boilers for these ships, the Admiralty find they cannot satisfy the conditions they have imposed on themselves in making the change, and so these vessels, in order to avoid the postponement of the completion of them, which would be a most disastrous thing, have been withdrawn from the list previously given. But I am glad to say we are able to eliminate from the other list the "Hermes." As the Committee knows, the "Hermes" is a ship belonging to a class of four fitted with Belleville boilers.

She is a ship with an unfortunate career, which has been animadverted upon more than once in the House. She has returned to this country in a condition which necessitated serious repairs to her boilers, and the Admiralty has now decided that instead of replacing her boilers with a reinstallation of Belleville boilers the boilers in her shall be removed and another type of boiler put in.

Their policy is, I believe, to adopt the Niclausse. There will then be the opportunity for a useful and scientifically accurate experiment, the "Hyacinth" and the "Hermes" being built on the same lines, having similar engines, with the same calculated horse power. It is pro

posed further to alter the boilers of the "Medea" and the "Medusa."

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said he had been desired by the hon. Member for Gateshead, who was in possession when the House adjourned, to proceed with some observations which he (Mr. Robertson) desired to make upon this Vote. He proposed to take the somewhat unusual course of moving a reduction of the Shipbuilding Vote in reference to the building of the royal yacht. This vessel had a most unfortunate history. In the year 1897 the First Lord of the Admiralty came down to the House with a proposal for the construction of a new royal yacht. Exception was taken that if the yacht was to be built it should be built in such a way as to constitute an addition to the naval force of the country.

The suggestion was that the example of Germany should be followed, and that she should be built on the lines of a first-class cruiser. Had that course been followed there would not have been so miserable a tale to unfold as he would unfold to-night. Had the royal yacht been built as a man-of-war, the officials

with whom the building of her was entrusted would have been dealing with a subject in which they had had long experience, but that suggestion was never regarded by the Admiralty; it was received with something like derision. It really appeared as if the new Imperialism, then just coming to the front, had decreed that this new addition to the Navy List should deliberately be made useless for naval purposes. The money voted for the Navy should be expended in perfecting the efficiency of the Navy.

In the Estimates for 1897–8 there were no particulars as to the total cost of the proposed new royal yacht. A sum was taken, but Mr. Goschen was unable to give an approximate estimate of the total cost. In the following year there was an Estimate, according to which this vessel was to cost £;237,000; in the next year a final Estimate was produced of £;353,000; in 1900–1 the Estimate had bounded up to £;434,582, and this year the total asked for by the Admiralty for this ship was over half a million. It reminded one, in a small way, of the leaps and bounds by which the

Estimates for the war rose. Whether this was a full and final Estimate he did not know, but he had some impression that even this £;512,000 was likely to be exceeded. The increase of the Estimate for the building of this ship was a reflex of the career through which she had passed before she was fit for any service. He was unable to go into the details of the history of the royal yacht, and his motion was made for the purpose of obtaining some information. The vessel was, he believed, laid down in December, 1897, in the Pembroke Dockyard, and he believed her engines and boilers were put on board while she was in dry dock in Pembroke Dockyard, but, at all events, directly they were put on board and the vessel launched, the vessel capsized in dock, and she had been in the hands of the dockyard ever since. How nearly she might now be fit for service was not within his knowledge. One minor detail to which he would draw attention because it deserved consideration was that the wood employed in her construction was what was called non-inflammable; what device was used to make it so he did not know, but it was a total failure, and moisture was continually oozing from the wood, and some process had to be adopted to take out the moisture which had been pressed into it to render it non-inflammable. He drew attention to that point because it was a new experiment that was made upon a vessel to be constructed for the use of the Sovereign, and which the Government had refused to make useful for the Navy, and apparently had made useless for the purpose for which it was designed to serve, and no experiments ought, in his opinion, to be made upon such a vessel. So far as he had been able to mention the facts they were not such as to reflect credit upon the Dockyard authorities responsible.

The two gentlemen responsible for the Vote were, of course, perfectly free from all responsibility, and he had not the least intention of fixing upon them any responsibility for what had taken place in the past, not did he, in making the request he was about to make, intend to blame anybody, because he did not know enough about the history of the vessel, or who was to blame for the blunders; who was responsible for the thing going wrong

he could not say, except the Admiralty as a whole. The blame that attached to the Admiralty attached to it on the ground that the vessel ought to have been

built on the lines of a man-of-war, and that, if not, she should have been constructed by persons who had had some experience of that class of work. What he wanted the hon. Gentleman to do was to give some explanation of the present position of the yacht, and say what more required to be done, if anything, and generally to fill in the sketch which he had made, and tell the House something more about it than any hon. Member could pretend to know.

His second request was of a more serious and novel character, and it was because of its novelty that he took the responsibility of moving the reduction. He desired to ask the hon. Gentlemen representing the Admiralty if he would promise on behalf of the Admiralty an independent inquiry into the position of the vessel, such as would satisfy the conscience of the House and the country. They were in the presence of a new problem in the control of the Admiralty; the House of Commons had voted freely and readily vast sums of money for the construction of a vessel of a particular type, for a particular purpose. That vessel had been a complete failure, but never before had the House considered the question of what they were to do when they found that the purposes for which they had voted money had not been fulfilled; that a work which they had authorised had not been done, or, if it had, had been done in such a manner as to show no result. There had been a good deal of talk about the application of business principles to these matters, and he suggested that, in addition to the Committee on Public Accounts, there ought to be another Committee to sit upon the Estimates from an administrative point of view. The House authorised beforehand certain money to be spent in a certain way. If it was not done, what remedy had they? Absolutely none. The Public Accounts Committee was the greatest and most important Committee which sat, but its jurisdiction was limited to matters of account, and if it trespassed beyond matters of account, the Department whose accounts it was dealing with had the answer that this

was a matter of administration, and with administration the Public Accounts Committee had nothing whatever to do. Notwithstanding that, the Public Accounts Committee had pronounced an opinion upon this maladministration, and they desired to call attention to the fact of the expenditure on the new royal yacht, which, up to the end of the financial year, had exceeded the amount of the Estimate by £37,000. The Committee then say;

"As this excess is said to be mainly due to inexperience in building ships of this kind, the Committee are of opinion that work of this character should not in future be undertaken in His Majesty's dockyards."

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

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (continuing) said: The passage I have read states that this excess "is said" to be due to inexperience. Said to whom? Said by whom? The evidence laid before the Public Accounts Committee has not yet been printed, but I am told by members of the Committee that this statement was made by way of defence by the officials responsible. That certainly was the main contention when this matter was first considered, and I think that I am justified in demanding not only such explanation as can be given now, but also, which is still more important, that in view of the exceptional circumstances of the case

and the discredit which this work casts upon the dockyards, we should have a special inquiry into this matter. For obvious reasons it cannot be a departmental inquiry. The Department itself is involved, and no Departmental Committee or Committee appointed by the Department can possibly satisfy the conscience of the House or of the country. If there is at all a real financial conscience in the country, I believe it will approve the demand I am making for an inquiry into this grave administrative scandal, for there must have been not only profligate expenditure but incompetent administration. In the face of these facts, and in the absence of any means whatever for placing the responsibility or of tracing the whole history of this disastrous blunder, I ask the hon.

Gentleman to promise that the matter shall be made the subject of a special inquiry; preferably by a Select Committee of this House. We who vote the money are bound to tell our constituents whether it has been properly expended, and for the purposes of such an inquiry there are upon both sides of the House Members who are familiar with engineering and shipbuilding, and in whom we should have every confidence. In order to enforce my recommendation I beg formally to move the reduction of this Vote by £;1,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £;5,305,500, be granted for the said Service."; (Mr. Edmund Robertson.)

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY (Yorkshire, Shipley) said the occasion of the demand so powerfully made by the hon. Member for Dundee for a special inquiry was that the royal yacht was designed in the Admiralty, and that its cost had exceeded the first estimate by about 100 per cent. The facts were comparatively simple. The yacht was designed mainly for the use of the Head of the State. The hon. Member opposite had said that, like the "Hohenzollern," the yacht should have been so constructed as to be available for the purposes of both warfare and pleasure. But Mr. Goschen, when introducing the Estimate for the yacht, stated that it was the intention of the designer that the vessel should be capable of as much of the offensive and defensive power of a cruiser and a scout as was compatible with the pleasure and official purposes for which it was designed, but that its primary purpose was that of a means of conveyance for the Sovereign. The only criticism of detail brought forward by the hon. Member on the question of its defensive and offensive powers was with regard to the use of non-inflammable wood. But the very object with which this wood was fitted was that of defence; to prevent the vessel taking fire in time of action. It was complained that a mistake had been made in the calculation as to the stability of the yacht. The vessel fulfilled all the intentions of the designer except in this one point.

Was this the only

instance in which a mistake had been made in calculations in regard to ships? There was not a shipbuilding yard throughout the country in which from time to time mistakes had not been made. In this instance the mistake was discovered in a theatrical manner, thereby attracting a large amount of public attention. The Admiralty had designed a very large number of vessels during the last twenty years, and the percentage of errors of calculation had been exceedingly small. A year or eighteen months ago a Departmental Committee was set up to inquire upon whom the responsibility rested for this particular mistake. No statement had

ever been made to the House as to the Report of that Committee, and before he could consent to the proposal for a Select Committee he would respectfully invite the Secretary to the Admiralty to take the Committee into his confidence and state what was the result of that Departmental inquiry. If the result had been, as he anticipated, to exonerate the Director of Naval Construction, and to place the responsibility upon some other official, he felt sure that even the hon. Member for Gateshead would be pleased to find that the fault did not lie with an officer who had designed some 160 or 200 ships of various classes for His Majesty's Government, and who had had so large a responsibility and so overpowering an amount of work. Another point of considerable importance was as to the Admiralty not having acted upon the recommendations of its own Committee as regarded boilers.

MR. KEARLEY asked, on a point of order, whether the discussion ought not to be confined to the question of the royal yacht.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for Dundee has moved this reduction with a view to raising the question of H.M.S. "Victoria and Albert," and that alone. After that has been disposed of it will still be open to the hon. Member to discuss other questions.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY said he would defer the remainder of his remarks.

*MR. WILLIAM ALLAN (Gateshead) was surprised at the line taken by the hon. Member for the Shipley Division. The hon. Member was a clever engineer and shipbuilder, and the views he had expressed were not at all in keeping with his business ability and shrewdness. He hoped the Secretary to the Admiralty would get to the bottom of this matter of the royal yacht. What a pitiable story it was; what a satire upon our modern engineering and shipbuilding ability. First of all, £200,000 was voted for the vessel. That was enough to build a most palatial yacht at Denny's, Fairfield, or any other yard. Every year since the catastrophe to the royal yacht she had been running up hundreds of thousands of pounds, until now there was an amount of £520,000 put against her, and, in his opinion, there would be more yet. That amount would be far exceeded, and it was the duty of the Committee to demand from the Department an explanation of where the money had gone to and who had been to blame for this tremendous blunder. This was not a personal matter with him; it was a national matter. If there was a Government official in any Department who spent the nation's money helter-skelter in this way, who produced an article which was not genuine or not built on scientific lines, no matter whether it was a gun or a steamer, it was the duty of the Committee to inquire into the matter. The yacht had been neither more nor less than a simple experiment, and he exonerated no man, whoever he might be, for making so flagrant an experiment and so flagrant a blunder. It would not do to tell the Committee that some under-strapper was to blame. If his firm made an engine that broke down, he, as the head of the concern, and not his foreman or anyone else, was to blame and had to take the responsibility. The matter must be probed to the bottom, so that the Committee and the country might know who was to blame for the design of the yacht and for all this additional expenditure. It was said that the chief constructor had designed 150 or 200 ships. That might be, but he was afraid that they also, like the royal yacht,

were designed far too fine. These modern, fashionable, fine-line cruisers could not

carry the guns; they were all under-gunned, and simply because they were built on too fine lines.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY asked if the hon. Member would state which of the cruisers were under-gunned, and to what extent.

*MR. WILLIAM ALLAN was quite prepared to take up the challenge. The much-lauded "Powerful" had a displacement of 14,200 tons, and the total weight of metal or shot discharged in one round from her guns was 1,960 lbs. whereas a Japanese vessel, the "Asama," built by Armstrong's;

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: How many years after the "Powerful" was designed?

*MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: Much about the same time.

SIR FORTESCUE FLANNERY: No.

*MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: I beg pardon, That boat could steam 21 knots day in and day out, and she was fitted with ordinary boilers. The total weight of metal discharged by this cruiser was 2,400 lbs., while the much-lauded "Powerful" could only discharge 1,960 lbs. of metal in one round.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I think it would be better to return to the question before the Committee.

*MR. WILLIAM ALLAN said the same weakness or fault which had existed in the royal yacht; namely, that she was too fine a ship to carry any top weight; was exactly the same with the new cruisers built lately, and that was why they were under-gunned and could not bear top weight. Parliament ought to know who was to blame for this scandalous waste of public money. He appealed to the House to support the reduction of the Vote.

THE EARL OF DALKEITH (Roxburgh) said there was a good deal in what the hon. Member had said in regard to the line of the royal yacht being too fine. There was no doubt that the failure of the royal yacht had caused a good deal of anxiety in the country. For this

reason he thought the question ought to be thoroughly gone into, although he did not think a Committee of the House of Commons was the best committee of inquiry to go into the matter. As regarded the royal yacht, he agreed with what had been said by the Member for the Shipley Division, that if one was to be made it was better that it should be constructed primarily to be a royal yacht worthy of the Sovereign of this country. He thought that all practical men would agree that it was impossible to make a satisfactory combination of a thoroughly good yacht and a warship of any kind. If the Admiralty had to undertake; as was not at all unlikely; the building of a new royal yacht, he hoped they would confine themselves to building a yacht, and not something intended to be half a yacht and half a cruiser. He agreed that it was a great mistake that this yacht should have been built in a royal dockyard at all, and it should not have been designed by an Admiralty official. It would have been far better if the yacht had been designed and constructed by one of the many private firms which were familiar with that class of work, and who had been able to produce better work in that respect than any other country in the world. He hoped the Admiralty would acknowledge that the royal yacht was a failure, and that they would ask the

House to provide a yacht suitable for the Sovereign, and that this yacht, which had not the coaling capacity for a long voyage at a high rate of speed, and drew too much water for the ordinary purposes of a yacht, might be used for a hospital ship in the Mediterranean or for some other purpose for which a high rate of speed was not required. He hoped the Admiralty would use it for something of that kind, and ask the House to vote money for a new yacht such as would be suitable for the Sovereign of this country, instead of one which was at present a laughing-stock.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I think there is, after all, a great deal about this question upon which there can be no difference of opinion at all. There has been a great miscalculation, great over-expenditure; in fact, a great deal to be regretted. But the question is, what is the practical thing to be done now.

MR. WILLIAM ALLAN: Break her up.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is not my point. Now what is the extent of this miscalculation? It has been stated to be something like 100 per cent. upon the original Estimate. I must correct that statement. To a certain extent, to a considerable extent, the additional expense we are now asking for is due to another cause. There has been a contributory cause, which, I think, is not likely to be discussed, and of the effect of which we are not likely to complain. The fact that this yacht was constructed and designed for the use of her late Majesty led to a great amount of internal fitting and decoration which were not suitable for the use of his present Majesty. There is a considerable alteration going on now as a direct result in consequence. I do not disguise from myself or from the Committee that a very large part of this extra cost is due to miscalculations in the original designs of the yacht. As to who is responsible there can be only one reply. The Admiralty and the Chief Constructor to the Admiralty are responsible for the designs of all the King's ships, and the responsibility must lie with the very competent designer who has done so much to strengthen the Navy. I believe he is prepared to take the responsibility of the miscalculation, which must be a very grievous sorrow and burden to him. I do not think that very much will be gained by enlarging upon it. When I am told, however, that the yacht in its present condition is only fit to be broken up, I must enter my demur. That is not the case. The yacht is now in an absolutely perfect state. There is no doubt that the yacht is absolutely stable, and can be trusted to go to sea under any circumstances. There is no doubt, also, that the suggestion which has been made that the yacht can only be relegated to purposes where no speed is required is an entire misstatement. The yacht can go over nineteen knots.

THE EARL OF DALKEITH: For how long?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: She has run at that speed as far as her coal would carry her.

THE EARL OF DALKEITH: How far?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: That is a question which I am not prepared to answer. Although we have had to spend a great deal of money upon this vessel, she is now a seaworthy boat, and in a very short time she will be a very luxurious and well-fitted boat, and, I believe, well suited for the purpose for which she was

designed. When my hon. friend says that it was a mistake in judgment to relegate the construction, of a vessel of this kind to the royal, dockyards, I cannot honestly say that I differ very much from him. I believe that it would have been better; it is easy to be wise after the event; if she had been specialised at the commencement and entrusted to some great shipbuilding firm which has made a European or world-wide reputation in the construction of luxurious vessels. As to the desirability of making this vessel a warship first and a yacht afterwards, I do not agree with the views which have been expressed. That matter was gone into when the first idea of the yacht was proposed. I quite agree that money has been spent needlessly in doing work that ought not to have been done, and in repairing errors which ought not to have been committed. It is now proposed to ask for a Committee of Inquiry into the matter. It is not desirable to relieve the Admiralty of their responsibility; and, therefore, I cannot agree; with the appointment of any Committee. We do not propose to ask a Committee of this House to inquire into the matter. If the functions of the Public Accounts Committee are so large as the hon. Member for Dundee has suggested, it is not advisable to enlarge them by charging that Committee with the duty of inquiring into this matter, the responsibility for which lies with the Admiralty. I am not prepared to assent to the appointment of a Committee which will deprive the Admiralty of its responsibility in such matters, and until we have received some definite instruction from this House;

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: I suggested an independent inquiry. I admitted that the House was rather against that kind of thing. What I wanted was the appointment of an independent Committee.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I still maintain that it is not desirable to relieve the Admiralty of their responsibility. Therefore, I cannot agree to the appointment of any independent body to usurp the functions of the Admiralty in this matter, and I hope the Committee will not consent to the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Dundee. Nothing would be gained by it. This expenditure will not be curtailed, and it will not be saved. I have admitted, as I am bound to admit, that these misfortunes have occurred, and we all regret them, but they are irreparable, and I can see no good purpose that will be served by accepting the Amendment. We must be content to accept the facts as they are.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (Chester-le-Street) said he was glad to find from the speech of the Secretary to the Admiralty that there were many points with regard to the royal yacht upon which they were all agreed. Nevertheless, he thought that neither the hon. Member who had replied for the Admiralty nor the noble Lord who preceded him had quite realised the importance of this subject. This question of the royal yacht had created very great interest throughout the country, and more particularly in the shipbuilding districts. He assured the hon. Member who represented the Government upon this question that there was a much greater anxiety in regard to the royal yacht than he seemed to realise. That anxiety was not caused by the fact that the royal yacht was not a suitable ship, but because it had been designed under the superintendence of a gentleman who had complete control of the designing of all our warships. What the country felt was that if a mistake like this or a miscalculation had been made with regard to the royal

yacht, it was quite possible that a similar mistake or miscalculation might be made with regard to some of our warships. He did not pretend to be such an expert upon shipbuilding as the hon. Member for Shipley, but he owned thirty steamers, and he had had the honour of giving a good many orders for them himself.

Therefore he did know something about the subject. Every ship which had been built for him had been engined in the river, and in every instance when the engines had been put in his steamers had been found to be perfectly stable. He hoped the hon. Member would not consider that they were dealing with this as a party question. His anxiety for the welfare of the Navy was as great as that of anybody else. What he wanted to call the attention of the Government to was this; that there was great anxiety in the country on this subject, and that it would be very much better if they consented to an independent and impartial inquiry to satisfy the public feeling. He did not wish to score a point over His Majesty's Government or the Chief Constructor to the Navy, but he wanted to satisfy public feeling in the matter and remove their doubts as to whether the warships would fulfil the purposes for which they were built. Their experience in regard to this royal yacht was unique in the shipbuilding history of this country, and he questioned whether there was ever a case anything like it before. Notwithstanding the assurances of the Secretary to the Admiralty as to the seaworthiness of this ship, if what he had heard was true, he was not satisfied, that she would prove seaworthy in case of a storm at sea. The masts of the yacht had been lowered, her funnels had been cut down, the houses on the deck had been taken away, and a large amount of pig-iron had been put in to keep her steady; and, notwithstanding the hon. Gentleman's assurances as to her seaworthiness, as a loyal subject of the King he hoped His Majesty would not go to sea in her. They had much better break up the yacht and spend another £209,000 to build a new ship. He thought that course would be far more satisfactory to the country and also to His Majesty. He hoped that the Government would take this matter into their serious consideration. He had made many mistakes in his time, like other people. [Ministerial cries of "No, no."]; He was quite frank about his mistakes, and hon. Members opposite evidently were not, but whenever he had made a mistake he had always done his utmost to rectify it. He would seriously recommend the Government to consider whether it would not be more satisfactory to dispose of this yacht and to build a new one. He was anxious to know who was responsible for the miscalculations that had been made. He quite agreed that if His Majesty had given a commission to any shipbuilder on the Clyde or the Wear they would have built a yacht which would have been satisfactory, most certainly for £250,000; and he was certain that if such a ship, when launched, would not stand upright the Government would have refused to take her over. When a blunder was made in the Army a court of inquiry was held, as in Sir Henry Colvile's case, and the officer was condemned; and, whether the miscalculations that had been made were due to negligence or incompetence, the person who made them was equally culpable and should be called to account. He confessed that he looked upon this matter as much more serious than some hon. Members were inclined to regard it. The country were watching

very closely the action of the Government, and they would not be satisfied with a mere departmental inquiry.

MR. REGINALD LUCAS (Portsmouth) said that most of the hon. Members who had addressed the House were experts upon shipbuilding. He had had the advantage of paying frequent visits to the yacht under discussion, and had taken pains to inform himself as to the actual position of matters in connection with the subject under discussion. He did not profess to be an expert on yacht building, but, speaking as a layman, it seemed to him that this yacht was a most remarkable vessel, unlike any other vessel, and he understood that the reason was that she was designed for a royal yacht. It seemed to him that the designer of the yacht thought he was producing one best fitted for the purpose, and that he was perfectly justified in making the experiment he did. If the plan he hit upon had not been wholly satisfactory he was perfectly justified by the circumstances under which he was working. He was informed that the use of non-inflammable wood had been an undoubted failure, but he was also told that the fault, on being discovered, had been to a great extent remedied. It might be said that

the country was very indignant because of the money that had been spent on the yacht, but when a vessel like this was being built they could not be certain beforehand that the experiment would be a success. The criticism and continual abuse levelled against the designer, the Admiralty, and the Government were a little intemperate, and he was prepared in the circumstances to support the Government.

*SIR EDWARD REED (Cardiff) said the motion of his hon. friend rested, as he understood, upon two grounds; firstly, that a great mistake had been made in the Admiralty Office, and, secondly, that a very large expenditure had been incurred in excess of the Estimates and without the authority of this House. Even the Secretary to the Admiralty admitted these propositions; firstly, that a grave error had been made in the design of the yacht, and, secondly, that the expenditure was much more than double what was originally estimated had to be laid out upon her in the dockyard. These two points seemed to be entirely different. As to the design, he was obliged to separate himself from those who thought it was necessarily an error to design a royal yacht and build her in His Majesty's dockyards. He had not the smallest doubt that the constructive department of the Admiralty was perfectly competent to design any class of vessel, and he saw no error in committing the design to them originally, nor any error in committing the building of her to the royal dockyards. Indeed, there were some advantages. Those who knew something about these matters had often great grounds for complaint against the Admiralty that, after having entered into contracts for the building of His Majesty's ships, a great number of alterations were made and great expense incurred, and great niggardliness shown as regards the expense so incurred. Here was the case of a vessel that was peculiarly liable to have to undergo many at least minor alterations and modifications, for the reason that the vessel was to fulfil the requirements of her late gracious Majesty, and it was not to be expected that either her late Majesty or his present Majesty could settle everything designed for their

dignified use or entirely grasp drawings and specifications. Even builders sometimes had undertaken to build vessels from designs and specifications which were to them incomprehensible. He thought that was a fair and natural reason why this vessel should be built under conditions in which there would be more elasticity of construction and arrangement than ordinarily, and that was the ground, and the only ground, on which he rested his approval of the vessel being built in a Royal dockyard. At the same time, looking to the fact that the royal dockyards had been for some years past full to overflowing with work on battleships and cruisers, it might have been wiser to have called upon the great private firms of the country, who were well competent and practised in the designing of such ships, to deal with the matter. But he had no blame to throw upon the Admiralty, for the reason he had stated. As to the question of the error in the design, he did not wish to lay any stress upon it, and, indeed, he should have hardly mentioned it, but the Secretary to the Admiralty seemed to recognise no responsibility in the Admiralty or in this House for a matter of the kind.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: I said the exact contrary. I said the Admiralty was wholly responsible.

*SIR EDWARD REED said the hon. Gentleman desired to preserve the responsibility of the Admiralty by denying all responsibility to the House. The hon. Gentleman spoke of the responsibility of the Admiralty, and advised the House not to take any part of that responsibility off the Admiralty by instituting an independent inquiry. He was very sorry indeed that a man of such great ability and experience as his friend Sir William White should have met with this calamity. No designer, no matter how able, was free from an error of this kind creeping into his design; and if any reproach could be levelled against Sir William White at all, it was for having undertaken a work which he might very well have passed on to a private firm. An accident of this sort would occur sometimes in calculation. He had him-self known an accident occur in this way. Some negligent draughtsman calculating the detailed weights of some parts of the structure or machinery had forgotten to multiply something on one side by two. It was very difficult in a case like that for the chief designer and the responsible head to detect it if it did not cover a very large amount of ground. In this particular case what happened, he believed, was this. The vessel was to be provided with very ample deck accommodation, with very ample deckhouses, with elevated bridges, and with many things tending to greatly raise the centre of gravity. These weights were estimated before the design was settled but, as it happened, unfortunately they were under-estimated. He had no specific authority for stating, but he believed it was true, that Sir William White himself had no conception of any oversight having been committed in the vessel until she actually capsized in the dockyard. That was the first intimation he had of any defect, and an overwhelming blow it must have been. He came now to the second point, and he must say that he went entirely with his hon. friend who moved the Amendment. This House, feeling its responsibility to the country in connection with the expenditure of public money, assented to an outlay of £237,000 for a royal yacht, but since the

accident happened the Admiralty had gone ahead lavishing expenditure on this vessel without the smallest respect for the responsibility of the House. The appalling figure now reached was £512,000 for the vessel. His hon. friend did not come with a savage, vindictive motion, calculated to greatly stigmatise and injure the Government. No, he came with an Amendment so moderate and so small that it was difficult to understand how any responsible Member of the House could escape voting for it. He did not suppose that the Government would accept the Amendment, but why they should oppose it he did not know. The Secretary to the Admiralty had given no explanation of the course of proceedings on this vessel. Here he would make an admission of sympathy with the Government. They all knew since the decease of the late Sovereign that this vessel was bound to undergo large changes in accommodation to adapt it to the uses of His Majesty the King, and if the Secretary to the Admiralty had come to the Committee with a separate Estimate for that, in view of the new circumstances and conditions, he believed they would have passed the Vote without the slightest demur. We had this expenditure, which already amounted to £512,000, still going on, and if the deplorable vaticinations of the hon. Member for Gateshead should prove correct, the amount would be much larger. He would support the Amendment, with the conviction that he was performing a reasonable public duty.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I agree with a good deal of what the hon. Member for Cardiff said in his speech. There has been no attempt on the part of the Government to repudiate their responsibility; of course the Government must be responsible for what takes place in the Admiralty; or to minimise the fact that there has been a great error in the construction of this vessel. It is admitted absolutely. One hon. Gentleman has said that there ought to be an inquiry. Well, the facts are not in doubt. The object of an inquiry is to see which of two sides in a matter on which there is a dispute is in the right. There is really no dispute in this case. The error is admitted in the frankest and fullest way by my hon. friend who represents the Admiralty in this House. Why there should be an inquiry, and what kind of an inquiry it should be, I really know not, for we have never attempted in the smallest degree to represent that there has not been an error, or to deny the fact that the error has cost the country a great deal more money in connection with the construction of the royal yacht than was at one time anticipated. So much for the inquiry. On that matter I am not in agreement with the hon. Gentleman who has just sat down, but I am entirely in agreement with what has fallen from him with regard to Sir William White, the distinguished gentleman who has been responsible for the designs of this yacht, as for so many of the finest ships of war afloat in the world. I did not hear the statement myself, but I understand that one hon. Gentleman opposite suggested the propriety of turning Sir W. White out of the public service. [Opposition cries of "No, no," and Ministerial cries of "Joicey."] As the hon. Gentleman is not present I do not wish to press the matter, but I am informed that he said that if he had been served in that way he would have turned the gentleman who had so served him out of his service.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON said the statement was not made in reference to Sir W. White.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand it was made with regard to the technical, adviser responsible for the mistake. That technical adviser is Sir W. White, and under these circumstances I am right in saying it has been suggested that he should be turned out of the public service. Let me tell the House why we do not pretend, any more than Sir W. White himself would pretend, to defend what has occurred with regard to the royal yacht. Sir W. White is a man who has done more to revolutionise naval construction in this country and other countries than any man now living. He entered the public service of this country at a pecuniary loss to himself, and since he entered that service he has done admirable public work, of which this House and the country ought to be, and I believe are, gratefully aware. I am sure the hon. Gentleman opposite will associate himself with me in saying that he has done work which has earned the admiration of the world and the gratitude of his countrymen. Under these circumstances I think we ought not to weigh upon a single mistake made in a brilliant career. I do not know who of us is sufficiently proud of himself to think that he has not made a great mistake in his career. Few of us have had such a career as Sir W. White has had as regards the public benefit he has given to his country. It is a cruel injustice to a great public servant that any man should dwell upon this single error and regard it as casting a shadow over a life such as Sir W. White has lived.

SIR JAMES JOICEY (who had returned to the House): I understand that the right hon. Gentleman has been alluding to me. I should like to make it clear what I did say. I said that if any large employer had had in his service any person who had committed a great blunder entailing such serious consequences, he would not have kept him in his employment twenty-four hours. I was not alluding to any particular person. We are asking for a Committee of Inquiry. I certainly did not say it was Sir W. White.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I frankly admit that I think better of large employers than to believe that such is the case. I do not believe that a large employer who had under him a technical adviser who for ten, fifteen, or twenty years had done him brilliant service, and had given his firm its position among the firms of the world, would in consequence of a single blunder act in that way. The hon. Member for Cardiff explained what I am sure the House is ready to accept from him, and not from him alone, but from all those who have had official connection with Sir W. White, the statement of the debt of gratitude this country owes him, and the further statement that we do not think a great record of public service ought to be seriously discounted on account of a single error. Having said that, I may venture to appeal to the Committee upon a point connected with the conduct of the debate on this Vote. The royal yacht is undoubtedly an important question. I do not wish to minimise it, but I would respectfully suggest that we should come to a decision on this Amendment rapidly, because there are larger issues still to be discussed which do deserve and require the attention of the Committee.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON hoped the Committee would permit him to say a few words in answer to the First Lord of the Treasury. He must protest against the right hon.

Gentleman having sought to turn this question of the control of expenditure into one of the personal responsibility of Sir W. White. The right hon. Gentleman had not been present during nine-tenths of the debate, and he (Mr. Robertson) had a better right than the right hon. Gentleman to speak in praise of Sir William White,

because he had been more distinctly and personally associated with Sir W. White than the First Lord of the Treasury could possibly have been. He adopted every word which the right hon. Gentleman had said in praise of Sir W. White; but he did not adopt the fixing of responsibility on Sir W. White, and he refused to accept the theory that Sir W. White was responsible for this miscalculation. Sir W. White's responsibility was no more than that of the Admiralty. He would most willingly have withdrawn his Amendment had there been any approximation by the representative of the Admiralty to an independent inquiry, but that not having been done, he must press his Amendment to a division.

MR. GODDARD (Ipswich) said that the hon. Member for Dundee in introducing his Amendment had laid special stress on what he described as a rather remarkable sentence in the Report of the Public Accounts Committee with reference to the royal yacht. He was not sure if it had not even been hinted in the debate that that Committee had gone out of its province in making the suggestion to the Admiralty as conveyed in that sentence. As a member of that Committee he would like to say that they would not have put that sentence into their Report, which they had done unanimously, had it not been for the evidence submitted to them that the error in regard to the cost of the royal yacht was due to the inexperience of the Admiralty in the construction of vessels of that description. The Public Accounts Committee were aware that this was not the first instance in which the House of Commons had been induced to embark on expenditure on the understanding that a certain sum of money would be required for a certain purpose, while subsequent years had shown that the amount required was far in excess of that first asked for. That practice had become a very serious thing indeed. He would briefly recapitulate the facts. When the subject of the royal yacht was first brought before the House it was stated that £;237,000 would be required, as a rough estimate, for the yacht. Then, when details were prepared, including the sums for labour, material, etc., that sum, based on definite calcula

tions, was raised to £;353,000. It had been suggested that the alterations to the royal yacht were necessary because of the lamented death of the late Sovereign, and the accession of the King; but he would point out that last year's Estimates had shown a substantial increase on the previous year's Estimates in regard to this yacht, and that could not possibly have been due to the death of Queen Victoria. The Estimate had increased from £;353,000 to £;450,000. That was a very serious increase indeed. Now, this year they were asked for £;512,000 for a yacht which was originally estimated would cost £;237,000. That was a serious point, and a high principle was involved in it. He did not imply for one moment that the whole blame was due to Sir W. White; indeed that question was never raised in the Public Accounts Committee. It had simply been stated that the mistake was due to inexperience in the building of

ships of that kind by the Admiralty. But surely there was very good cause why the question should be raised in all seriousness in the House, and an inquiry be made.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) said that year after year the increase on the Estimates had been piled up, and as a rule the only attack against these ever-recurring increases had been made from the Irish benches. He was not at all surprised that the Leader of the House was anxious to get away from the tight corner in which he found himself that night. This was only an instance of the condition into which the Government had got the finances of the country; but they seemed prepared to defend any extravagant expenditure so long as they had a majority behind them to swallow it. Hon. Members on these benches, however, were not in the habit of taking for granted that everything the Government said or did was right. If anybody was to blame for reflecting upon Sir W. White in this particular instance, he thought it was those hon. Gentlemen who were inclined to close the debate. He might say that the reflection upon Sir W. White would be far more severe in the country than anything that had been said in the House. What he wanted was to saddle the blame for this gross blunder on the right shoulders. How expert the construc-

tors of the Admiralty must be, when they could scarcely read the drawings which were placed before them! He had himself seen drawings which the gentlemen who made them could not themselves interpret. Time after time alterations in the designs were made, and the result was that private firms dreaded to take work from the Admiralty. He knew of a case of a small boat in which, on account of these mistakes, the contractors were £4,000 out of pocket. He did not believe the Government would realise the position in which they stood with regard to the Navy until the Fleet had been subjected to a strain similar to that which the Army had been and was still undergoing. This yacht was an object-lesson. If in connection with a vessel of such supreme importance; for it was for the conveyance of their Sovereign; these things happened, it was not an extravagant supposition to assume that many of the other vessels constructed under the same authorities would, if properly tested, be found to be equally defective.

MR. KEARLEY asked whether it was a fact that, before this accident occurred, an Admiralty official went down to Pembroke Dockyard to check the final draught and trim of the ship, and that after his examination he reported to the Admiralty that everything was satisfactory. A rumour to that effect had been going about for some time, and if it was well-founded it placed a very direct responsibility upon the shoulders, of the Admiralty. He regretted that the name of Sir W. White had been imported into the discussion, because they all knew what a very able man he was, and what a serious blow it had been to him that this misfortune had occurred. If an inquiry was held he had no doubt that it would be shown, that Sir W. White was not the official in fault, although in his official capacity he took the responsibility upon himself. It was an open secret that the really responsible person was a man no longer in the employ of the Admiralty.

SIR JAMES JOICEY asked whether it was a fact that the official who had been found to be responsible for this miscalculation was no longer in the employment of the Admiralty. He also repeated the inquiry he had made earlier in

the evening, but which had not been answered, as to whether the royal yacht had a large quantity of pig-iron in her as ballast, and whether it was true that she was over two feet deeper than her designer intended her to be.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER was understood to say, in reply to the hon. Member for Devonport, that the survey was made in the ordinary course by the Admiralty officials at the launching of the vessel, before any of the weights were added.

It appeared that the top-weights of a vessel were those which very largely affected its stability. It was quite possible for a survey to be made of a vessel externally without any error being detected if the error was in the distribution and calculation of the weights during construction. The fact was, however, that the survey was made before the weights were put on the vessel.

MR. KEARLEY asked whether the hon. Member would give the date on which this official visit was made. If he could not give the date at once, would he give it if a question was placed on the Paper? Every expert knew that the checking operation was a very serious one, but yet it was not then discovered whether the vessel was seaworthy or not. He had been told that many of the fittings used in the yacht had been made to the dockyard scheduled pattern. For instance, the sidelights weighed 3½ cwt. each, precisely the same weight as would have been used for a battleship, and that procedure was adopted all the way through. If he put down a question, would the hon. Gentleman give the date on which the vessel was officially inspected?

SIR JAMES JOICEY said that the First Lord of the Treasury had made an attack on him for one statement in his speech. His hon. friend had stated that the official responsible in the matter was not now in the employment of the Admiralty. He again asked whether that was the case or not; also whether there was a large amount of

pig-iron on board the vessel as ballast, and whether she was not two feet deeper than she was intended by her designer.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he could not give the date asked for by the hon. Member for Devonport, but if a question were put down he would certainly reply to it.

The hon. Member asked whether any person had been discharged on account of the error.

SIR JAMES JOICEY said what he asked was whether the official responsible was now in the employment of the Admiralty.

MR. KEARLEY said he did not assert that the official had been discharged.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that he believed the drafting staff remained the same, with the exception of one member, who left on his own accord to take other employment. The hon. Member for Devonport had rebuked him for bringing in the name of Sir William White, but he had no option in the matter; he brought his name in as Chief Constructor of the Navy, in which capacity he was responsible. The hon. Member also asked whether the vessel exceeded her draft. She did exceed her draft when first launched, but had since been readjusted, and the extremely heavy fittings had been removed in order to bring her back to her sea-going trim.

SIR JAMES JOICEY said he had asked the hon. Member whether it was true that the vessel had a large quantity of pig-iron on board as ballast, and if she were not

now 2 ft. deeper than her designer intended her to be.

*MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said that the pig-iron had been placed on board the vessel to bring her down to her load-line when she was brought from Pembroke to Portsmouth. The whole of the weights had been readjusted, and she was now ballasted in the ordinary way. She had now the designed draft.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 110; Noes, 182. (Division List No 255.)

AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)

Gilhooly, James

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Goddard, Daniel Ford

O' Kelly, James (Roscommon, N

Allen, C. P. (Glouc, Stroud)

Hammond, John

O'Malley, William

Ambrose, Robert

Harmsworth, R. Leicester

O'Mara, James

Barry, E. (Cork, S.)

Hayden, John Patrick

O'Shaughnessy, P. J.

Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)

Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-

O'Shee, James John

Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.

Helme, Norval Watson

Partington, Oswald

Bell, Richard

Holland, William Henry

Pearson, Sir Weetman D.

Black, Alexander William

Joicey, Sir James

Pirie, Dnnan V.

Boland, John

Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)

Power, Patrick Joseph

Bolton, Thomas Dolling

Kearley, Hudson E.

Priestley, Arthur

Brigg, John

Kennedy, Patrick James

Reddy, M.

Burke, E. Haviland-

Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.

Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Caine, William Sproston
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Redmond, William (Clare)
Caldwell, James
Leamy, Edmund
Reed, Sir E. James (Cardiff)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Rickett, J. Compton
Channing, Francis Allston
Levy, Maurice
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Clancy, John Joseph
Lough, Thomas
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Robson, William Snowdon
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Craig, Robert Hunter
M'Crae, George
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Cullinan, J.
M'Govern, T.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Dalkeith, Earl of
Minch, Matthew
Spencer, Rt. Hn C R (Northants.
Dalziel, James Henry
Mooney, John J.
Stevenson, Francis S.
Delany, William
Morton, E. J. C. (Devonport)
Sullivan, Donal
Dewar, J. A. (Inverness-sh.)
Moss, Samuel
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Dilke, Rt. Hon. Sir Charles
Murnaghan, George
Walton, Joseph (Barnsley)

Donelan, Captain A.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Doogan, P. C.
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Weir, James Galloway
Duffy, William J.
Norman, Henry
White, Lake (York, E. R.)
Duncan, J. Hastings
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipperary, Mid)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Elibank, Master of
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Emmott, Alfred
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Williams, O. (Merioneth)
Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.)
Field, William
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Mr. M'Arthur and Mr. Causton.
Fuller, J. M. F.
O'Dowd, John
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Duke, Henry Edward
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Cautley, Henry Strother
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Finch, George H.
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)

Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Fisher, William Hayes
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Fitzroy, Hn. Edw. Algernon
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc'r
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Balcarres, Lord
Chapman, Edward
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. (Manch'r
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Flower, Ernest
Balfour, Capt. C. B. (Hornsey)
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Galloway, William Johnson
Balfour, Rt. Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Garfit, William
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond
Banbury, Frederick George
Compton, Lord Alwyne
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Gore, Hn G. R. C Ormsby- (Salop
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Bigwood, James
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Bill, Charles
Cranborne, Viscount
Green, Walford D. (Wedn'sbury
Bond, Edward
Crossley, Sir Savile
Gretton, John
Brassey, Albert
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Greville, Hon. Ronald

Brodrick, Rt. Hn. St. John
Denny, Colonel
Hamilton, Rt. Hn Lord G (Mid'x
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'ry
Bull, William James
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Butcher, John George
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Carlile, William Walter
Doxford, Sir Wm. Theodore
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Heath, Arthur Howard (Hanley
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Heath, James (Staffords, N. W.)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Heaton, John Henniker
Morgan, David J. (Walthams' w
Scott, Sir S. (Marylebone, W.)
Helder, Augustus
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh.
Seely, Charles Hilton (Lincoln)
Hermon, Hodge, Robert T.
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Morton, Arthur H. A. (Deptford
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Hogg, Lindsay-
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Murray, Rt. Hn A Graham (Bute
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Spear, John Ward
Hutton, John (Yorks. N. R.)

Nicholson, William Graham
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Jessel, Capt. Herbert Merton
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Stroyan, John
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Keswick, William
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Thornton, Percy M.
Knowles, Lees
Pease, Herbt. Pike (Darlington)
Tollemache, Henry James
Law, Andrew Bonar
Penn, John
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Lawrence, Joseph (Monmouth)
Pierpoint, Robert
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Lawson, John Grant
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Valentia, Viscount
Lee, Arthur H (Hants, Fareham)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Walker, Col. Wm. Hall
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Plummer, Walter R.
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Wentworth, Bruce C. Vernon-
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Whitmore, Chas. Algernon
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Williams, Rt. Hn J Powell (Birm)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Purvis, Robert
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pym, C. Guy
Wilcox, Sir John Archibald
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne

Wilson, A. S. (York, E. R.)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Macartney, Rt. Hn W. G. Ellison
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh, N.)
Macdona, John Cumming
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Rentoul, James Alexander
Wylie, Alexander
M'Calmont, Col. H L B. (Cambs.
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Majendie, James A. H.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Manners, Lord Cecil
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Ropner, Colonel Robert
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Maxwell, W J H (Dumfriesshire
Royds, Clement Molyneux
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Milton, Viscount
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Original Question again proposed.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said that he did not know whether all the Members of the Committee now present were aware of what had occurred during the evening. He did not want to blame anyone in particular, and probably if he went into that question the blame would have to be distributed. For five or six years it had been the custom to discuss the shipbuilding programme of the Government late in the session, and the representative of the Admiralty took an opportunity in June or July of making a statement on the subject. That night the Vote for the personnel of the Navy was taken first, which was unusual in recent years, and he was quite unaware that it was the intention of the Government to bring forward the personnel Vote before the materiel Vote. When it was found that that was the intention of the Government, it would be admitted that hon. Members interested in the personnel Vote did everything in their power to shorten the discussion, with the result that in a short time a sum of two and a half millions was voted. Then an Amendment, no doubt of an important character, was moved, and that occupied the remainder of the evening. He had certainly expected that the Secretary to the Admiralty would make a general

statement, as was the practice of Mr. Goschen when he was First Lord of the Admiralty; but he did not, and the Committee passed at once to the Amendment. The Committee had never been asked to consent to a Shipbuilding Vote without full information as to the character of the ships being supplied, or else reasons why that information could not be given. That had been the invariable custom, and therefore it seemed to him impossible that the Government should get the whole Vote that night. It was the duty of the Government to give the Committee another opportunity of discussing the materiel Vote, as they had not had the opportunity which had always been given on previous occasions.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER said he must really decline to take the blame for what had occurred. No one regretted more than he did that the Committee had been unable to discuss the Shipbuilding Vote in detail. He had consulted with the late Secretary to the Admiralty opposite, and fell in with the arrangement he suggested. The discussion on the first Vote was completed in half an hour, and certainly it was not his fault that the remaining questions, of very great interest, had not been proceeded with. Instead of that, the whole of the evening had been spent in discussing a matter of secondary importance, for which he was not prepared to take the blame on himself.

*SIR CHARLES DILKE said he did not put it down to the fault of the hon. Gentleman, except that he might have made a statement at the commencement of the discussion such as was made last year.

MR. KEARLEY said that the effective point was, whether another day would be given for the discussion. He would remind the Leader of the House that the debate did not commence, until a quarter to eight o'clock, and that therefore they were not asking anything unreasonable when they asked for another day in which to discuss these great naval Estimates. The country would be very much disappointed if the Vote were now closed, and he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would not attempt any such course. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would kindly inform the Committee when the next opportunity would be given.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: All that the Leader of the House can do is to do his best to distribute the time given to Supply so as to suit the convenience of Members, and the public service. If unofficial Members expend on two consecutive days several hours in discussing motions for the adjournment, and if when Supply is brought on Members will insist in discussing matters which, however important, are still of secondary importance, the blame does not rest with me. I do my best, sometimes by moving the closure, sometimes by other means, to try and direct discussion into the proper channels, but my power in this respect is limited, and it must rest with the House itself to determine in the main how the allotted days should be disposed of.

SIR CHARLES DILKE moved to report progress.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report progress; and ask leave to sit again ";(Sir Charles Dilke), put, and agreed to.

Resolution to be reported upon Monday next; Committee also report progress; to sit again upon Monday next.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) (No. 2) BILL

Mr. CAUTLEY and Mr. NOLAN, the Tellers in the Aye Division Lobby in the division on the question on the Amendment to the Second Reading of the Local Government Provisional Orders (Housing of Working Classes) (No. 2) Bill, came to the Table, and stated that they had erroneously reported the number of the Ayes as 307, instead of 296, which was the proper number.

Mr. SPEAKER directed the Clerk to correct the said error by stating the number of the Ayes in that division as 296, instead of 307.

Adjourned at three minutes after Twelve of the clock until Monday next.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 17th June, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

BRIGHTON CORPORATION BILL.

As amended, considered.

MR. JEFFREYS (Hampshire, N.) said he begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name, the object of which was to entitle the farmer to compensation for any loss he might sustain or suffer by reason of the making of an improper order. He would only ask his hon. friend the representative of the Local Government Board whether it would not

be possible to insert the clause in every private Bill of this kind, because he held that there ought to be a uniform system with regard to corporation Bills, and it ought not to be left to private Members or anyone else to get such clauses inserted in a Bill. Let the Local Government Board introduce some comprehensive measure making all the Bills uniform in this respect.

MR. STRACHEY (Somersetshire, S.) seconded.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "In Clause 50, page 33, after paragraph (i) of Sub-section 5, to insert;(j) If an order is made without due cause, or if the Corporation unreasonably refuse to withdraw the order, the dairyman shall, if not himself in default, be entitled to recover from the Corporation full compensation for any damage which he has sustained by reason of the making of the order or of the refusal of the Corporation to withdraw the order. The Court or the Board of Agriculture may determine and state whether an order the subject of appeal has been made without due cause, and whether the Corporation have unreasonably refused to withdraw the order, and whether the dairyman has been in default. Any dispute as to the fact whether the order has been made or maintained without due cause, or as to the fact of default where any such fact has not been determined by the Court or Board of Agriculture, or as to the fact of damage, or as to the amount of compensation, shall be determined in the manner provided by Section 308 of the Public Health Act, 1875, and that section shall accordingly apply and have effect as if the same were herein re-enacted, and in terms made applicable to any such dispute as aforesaid."

*MR. BILL (Staffordshire, Leek) said that as Chairman of the Committee before which the Brighton Corporation Bill came he would like to say that they were very careful to consider the case for compensation. They realised that there was a good deal to be said for it, but, on the other hand, no case had been brought to their knowledge in which any farmer had suffered by reason of the absence of such a clause, and they therefore

decided to leave it out, and adhere to the model clauses as they were passed last session. They had in the course of the inquiry the evidence of Dr. Niven, the Medical Officer of the Manchester Corporation, who certainly appeared to the Committee to have exercised the difficult and delicate powers entrusted to him in that particular with the greatest discretion. The witness told them he was aware of no case in which compensation could justly have been claimed, and it was chiefly owing to that gentleman's evidence that the Committee determined not to insert the compensation clause. At the same time, they recognised there might be a case in the future in which damage might be caused to the farmer, and under the circumstances, therefore, he did not oppose the motion before the House.

MR. LODER (Brighton) said that in accepting the Amendment on behalf of the promoters of the Bill he wished it to be clearly understood that they in no way desired to prejudice the case of other corporations with whom they had been acting up till this time, and if any modification of the clause were deemed desirable at any future stage they reserved to themselves the right to bring it forward. With regard to the suggestion that a similar clause should be inserted in every Bill, he thought the success of model clauses in the past did not augur well for such clauses in the future, especially when they remembered the departure made two years previously in regard to the question of tuberculosis.

*SIR F. S. POWELL (Wigan) agreed that the time had come for the Government to deal with this question. To his knowledge, fifteen years ago Committees upstairs were asked to give an opinion on this matter. The controversies on it had been acute, and they had also been continuous. This was a subject of growing importance, and he hoped that they would more and more devote their attention to the value of milk as a food for young children. The Government ought to take care that clauses dealing with this matter were both uniform and effective. Good work had been done by general legislation in regard to the registration of infectious diseases, and he

hoped that the House of Commons would in that matter follow the example which they had themselves set in the past.

MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) pointed out that there were two distinct interests involved in this question, and he did hope that the representative of the Local Government Board would save the time of the House by agreeing to have the whole subject submitted to a Select Committee, so that they might put an end to these interminable discussions.

SIR JOHN LENG (Dundee) said the dairy owner had, of course, an interest in this question, but the paramount point was the health of the people in our large towns. Before model clauses were adopted they ought, however, to be carefully considered, and it should be clearly understood that the acceptance of the Brighton clause did not bind other corporations without careful inquiry.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) objected to the adoption of this clause without further discussion. The subject was one which required careful consideration.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R. Thirsk) said the Local Government Board were in favour of the clause, because they thought it highly desirable in the interests of the public health. Under the Public Health Act, 1875, if a corporation made a wrong order it was liable

to pay compensation to the person injured thereby, but that provision did not extend to the present case, and he thought it was only fair that it should. He did not think that other corporations were likely to object to the insertion in their Bills of a similar clause, and he could assure the House that though the Local Government Board had no power to veto, they would use their influence to get a like clause adopted in similar cases. But in reply to the hon. Member for Wigan, he was bound to say there was no chance of the Government bringing forward a Bill this session to make the clause obligatory in all such cases.

Their hands were already full.

New clause agreed to.

Other Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time.

BETHLEM HOSPITAL BILL [Lords]. (BY ORDER).

Order for Second Reading read.

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

*MR. CAUSTON (Southwark, W.) said it would not be necessary for him to move the motion standing in his name for the rejection of the Bill, but as a matter of public interest he desired to explain why he originally opposed the measure and now withdrew his opposition. The hospital was situated in the borough of Southwark, the buildings and grounds covering an area of about fifteen acres, and forming a most valuable breathing space in the neighbourhood described by Mr. Charles Booth as the most crowded part of London. The site of the hospital was held under leases from the City Corporation dated 1810 and 1838, and under the Bill before the House the governors sought powers to lease a part of their possessions. The Borough Council of Southwark vigorously protested against the powers being given, and petitioned against the Bill. Since notice of opposition had been given the governors had been in communication with the Borough Council, and had given an assurance that they had no intention of parting with any portion of their Southwark possessions, the real object of the Bill being to enable them to sell some land in Kent, somewhere between Margate and Westgate. They had also given an undertaking to introduce in Committee a clause to the effect that nothing in the Act shall empower the governors to demise for any term of years for building or any other purposes, or to sublease or otherwise effect a deal with, any of the, lands comprised in the leases, and the Borough Council were satisfied that that clause would prevent the governors dealing with the land without obtaining further powers. He might add that a large proportion of the cost of erecting the present hospital was found out of money provided by Parliament. Although he should have liked the proposed clause to be in somewhat stronger terms, he was so far satisfied with the undertaking of the governors that he should not move his proposed motion.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read second time and committed.

PRIVATE BILLS (STANDING ORDER 62 COMPLIED WITH).

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

Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway (New Ross and Waterford Extension) Bill.
Ordered, That the Bill 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.:

Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Bill [Lords];

Bolton Corporation Bill [Lords];

Bristol Corporation Cemetery Bill [Lords];

Dover Corporation Bill [Lords];

Great Southern and Western Railway Bill [Lords];

Heywood and Middleton Water Board Bill [Lords];

Wisbech Water Bill [Lords].

Ordered, That the Bills be read a second time.

EDUCATION BOARD PROVISIONAL ORDER CONFIRMATION (LONDON) BILL [Lords].

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

case of the Education Board Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill [Lords] originating and now pending in the Lords, and referred, pursuant to the Order of this House of the 12th day of June, a statement of the number of houses of the labouring classes proposed to be taken, has been deposited in the Private Bill Office of the House of Commons and at the Office of the Central Authority.

ECCLES CORPORATION BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

LONDON (CITY) SCHOOLS FOR ORPHANS OF FREEMEN BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without amendment.

METROPOLITAN ELECTRIC SUPPLY BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

OTLEY GAS BILL [Lords].

Read the third time, and passed, without amendment.

YORKSHIRE ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

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

METROPOLITAN DISTRICT RAILWAY BILL.

Read a second time, and committed.

BRIDEWELL HOSPITAL BILL [Lords] [BY ORDER].

Read a second time, and committed.

STANDING ORDERS.

Ordered, That so much of Standing Order 91 as fixes Five as the Quorum of the Select Committee on Standing Orders be read and suspended.

Ordered, That, for the remainder of the Session, Three be the Quorum of the Committee. (Mr. Halsey.)

BOURNEMOUTH CORPORATION BILL [Lords].

Ordered, That the Petition of the Vicar and People's Churchwarden of the Church

of Saint Peter, Bournemouth, against the Bournemouth Corporation Bill [Lords], if presented not later than seven clear days from the date hereof, be referred to the Committee on the Bill; and that the said Petitioners be heard by themselves, their Counsel, or Agents, against the Bill, and Counsel heard in support of the Bill.:(The Chairman of Ways and Means.)

FALKIRK AND DISTRICT TRAMWAYS ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

(UNDER THE PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.)

Lords Amendment considered, and agreed to.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 1) BILL.

Read the third time and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

Also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the Electric Lighting Acts, 1882 and 1888, relating to Aberavon, Ashton-in-Maker-field, Hampton, Hoddesdon, Ince-in-Makerfield, Mountain Ash, Neath (Rural District), Pontypridd, Teddington, and Worsley." Electric Lighting Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill [Lords].

And also a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the authority of the Gas and Water Works Facilities Act, 1870, relating to Horsham Gas, Nuneaton Gas, Pinner Gas, and Swaffham Gas." Gas Orders Confirmation Bill [Lords].

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 6) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 213.]

GAS ORDERS CONFIRMATION BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 214.]

TOOK THE OATH.

One other Member took and subscribed the Oath.

PETITIONS.

EDUCATION BILL.

Petition from Newcastle-on-Tyne, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Lewisham and Beverley; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petition from Burnley, against; to lie upon the Table.

Petitions in favour, from London County Council; Child's Hill (three);

Droylsden; Garnant; Oldswinford; Lewisham; Manchester (two); Warrington;

Portsmouth; Bacup; Bethnal Green; and Southsea; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour, from Dunsyre and Arderseer; to lie upon the Table.

SINGH, MAGAN.

Petition of Magan Singh, for redress of grievances; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

COAL TABLES.

Return presented, relative thereto [ordered 14th June; Mr. Gerald Balfour]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 213.]

HARWICH HARBOUR.

Copy presented, of Abstract of the Accounts of the Receipts and Expenditure of the Harwich Harbour Conservancy Board from the time of their incorporation down to and inclusive of the 31st March, 1901, &c. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 214.]

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copies presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2628 to 2630 [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICA; SIR DAVID BARBOUR'S REPORT.

MR. DALZIEL (Kirkcaldy): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether His Majesty's Government have yet come to any decision in reference to the recommendations contained in Sir David Barbour's Report, and, if so, can he state when it will be communicated to the House.

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

The Report deals with a very large number of complicated and important details, and it will be evident to the hon. Member that an immediate decision is not required in the majority of cases. His Majesty's Government agree with the general principles laid down, and their application will be confided to Lord Milner, who will deal with them as opportunity arises. I cannot give a pledge that he will follow the Report in all particulars, and there are, of course, many points on which further information is required which can only be gained on the spot.

MR. DALZIEL: Can the right hon. Gentleman hold out any hope that we shall have the particulars of the decisions on the points as they arise?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: No, Sir. If the hon. Gentleman wishes information on any particular point I shall be glad to give it to him as far as it is in my power to do so. As I have pointed out before, in reference to resettlement in South Africa, it is a matter which is most involved, and which cannot be settled all at once.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): Will the House have an opportunity of discussing this Report?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Certainly, Sir. The hon. Gentleman can discuss it on my salary.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman in a position to inform the House as to whether the Government are in agreement with that portion of Sir David Barbour's Report which recommends that the tax on the mines shall be increased from five to ten per cent., and, if so, will that be done soon?

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: We are in general agreement, as I have said, with the principle laid down that an increased tax on the profits of the mines should be imposed. But as the hon. Gentleman is aware, Sir David Barbour also recommends that a decrease of taxation should take place upon other articles.

LAND SETTLEMENT COMMISSION'S REPORT.

MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the

Colonies whether, now that the Report of Sir David Barbour on the financial position of the Transvaal has been issued, he will proceed to complete the facts laid before Parliament by issuing also the Report of the South African Land Settlement Commission.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. Member does not appear to be aware that the Report in question was laid on the 7th instant.

CAMPS OF CONCENTRATION;MORTALITY STATISTICS.

MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can now inform the House as to the number and situation of the camps of concentration formed in Cape Colony, and how many men, women, and children are confined therein, and what have been the figures of mortality therein.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The places where the camps have been formed are;Kimberley, Orange River Camp (near Hopetown), Vryburg, Warrenton, and Boer Exile Camp at Port Elizabeth. Lord Kitchener has promised me some figures by telegraph as to the numbers and mortality,

MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will state the numbers of white persons now or recently in the concentration camps in Natal and the Transvaal, Orange River, and Cape Colonies respectively; also the dietary for adults and for children in force in these several districts. I beg also to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he can state what regulations are now in force in the various concentration camps in South Africa as to the detention of the women and children confined in them; and whether he will consider the desirability of permitting at least those women and children who have no male person with them in the camps, and who have friends or relatives in Cape Colony willing to receive them, to leave the camps and go to these friends.

MR. BRODRICK: The numbers are approximately as follow;Transvaal, 37,739; Natal, 2,524; Orange River Colony, 20,374; Cape Colony, 2,490; Of these a large number are natives. The dietary of free issues consists of meat, bread or flour, meal, coffee, sugar, salt, and condensed milk. As the proportions vary somewhat in the different colonies, it is not possible to give full details in reply to a question. The supply of meat is from two to four pounds, and of bread, flour, or meal about seven pounds per week. To children under five, four tins milk and meal. The women and children have been in most instances brought into the camps because they cannot be fed at isolated stations, or because it was necessary to clear the districts in which they were living. I am communicating with Lord Kitchener respecting the release of those who may have friends willing to receive them.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE (Carnarvon Boroughs): Can the right hon. Gentleman give the rate of mortality among the women and children?

MR. BRODRICK: I have had notice or a question in the name of the hon. Member for Flint Boroughs, and I can answer it with regard to Johannesburg if he wishes to put it.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): Perhaps it will be convenient

if I read the question, of which I gave private notice two days ago; Whether the right hon. Gentleman is aware that for three weeks ending the 13th May there were 80 deaths out of a total of 3,125 persons in the refugee camp on the racecourse at Johannesburg, and that 220 are reported sick in the camp; whether he can state what medical provision there is for treatment of the sick in this camp, and whether the sanitary and other arrangements for the health of the refugees in this and other camps are satisfactory; between what dates did the deaths take place of 41 men, 80 women, and 261 children in the camps in the Orange River Colony reported on the 7th May; how many deaths of men, women, and children took place in such camps before and after those dates; and what is the total number of deaths of men, women, and children respectively which have taken place in the refugee camps up to the present time.

MR. BRODRICK: The deaths at Johannesburg camp from the 1st to the 31st May amounted to six men, six women, and 68 children, and are accounted for by an epidemic of measles. There is an experienced medical officer in charge, assisted by a qualified matron and a large staff of nurses. The hospital is a well-suited, commodious brick building. The deaths for the first week in June were one woman and three children. There is no reason to suppose that the medical arrangements in this or other camps are unsatisfactory. As to the third and fourth paragraphs of the question I have no information. The deaths in the Transvaal camps for May were 39 men, 47 women, and 250 children. Further statistics have been promised me as to the other three colonies.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Are these persons regarded as prisoners, or are they at liberty to leave the camp if they think fit?

MR. BRODRICK: As I have explained, the women and children have been brought in because in most cases they required relief or they were in parts of the country which for military reasons it was necessary to clear. As to the point of their leaving, in no case will the

Government permit them to go, or will Lord Kitchener permit them to go, unless they have got places to go to in which they can be fed. The Government cannot undertake to feed a large body of people in isolated positions. As regards permission to quit the camp to those who have friends I am in communication with Lord Kitchener.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: In regard to these figures for the Transvaal, and in regard to the 336 deaths for May, do they cover the native as well as the white camps?

MR. BRODRICK: My impression is that these figures cover the whole of the camps.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: As this is a very serious matter, I wish to ask the Government whether they do not consider that it would be infinitely more humane if these women were to be kept prisoners;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member cannot enter into a debate on this question.

MR. C. R. SCOTT: Will the right hon. Gentleman state whether the figures given in reply to my question include natives as well as white persons?

MR. BRODRICK: The figures include a large number of natives.

DR. AMBROSE (Mayo, W.): Is the death-rate from measles as high for any hospital in the United Kingdom?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND rising;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! Any further questions must be given notice of. The question on the Paper has been fully answered.

GENERAL CARRINGTON.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that, in the view of the Government, there is nothing in Major Sir F. Carrington's recent service in South Africa to call for special report, it is now intended to restore that officer to his command of the Belfast district, which will be vacated in the ordinary course by Major-General Leach in September next, or if it is intended to again employ him; and, if not, can he say why this officer will not be again employed; and whether the appointment of this officer to command troops in Rhodesia was made in direct opposition to the advice of members of the Army Board at the War Office.

MR. BRODRICK: I must decline in this and all other cases to give reasons for the employment or non-employment of a particular officer. All recommendations for command are made to the Secretary of State, both in war and peace, by the Commander-in-Chief, and Sir Frederick Carrington is no exception to the rule.

MR. PIRIE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say whether the decision of the Army Board was unanimous?

MR. BRODRICK: I shall entirely decline to give an answer to that or any other question addressed to me of similar import. The proceedings of the Army Board are private. The recommendations of the Commander-in-Chief are made to the Secretary of State, and on these recommendations officers are either appointed or not appointed to commands.

MR. PIRIE: Was General Carrington relieved of his command;

*MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. Member wants to put any further questions he must give notice.

MR. PIRIE: I will give notice.

MILITARY MANŒUVRES;VOLUNTEER OFFICERS' ALLOWANCES.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR (Tower Hamlets, St. George's): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War, having regard to the fact that Volunteer officers receive an allowance of 11s. 6d. per diem when attending manœuvres or camps of instruction, will he say whether any additional allowance will be made to field officers, who have to provide and feed a horse.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westthoughton): The mounted officer will, in addition to the allowance mentioned, draw an allowance to cover forage at the rate of 1s. 6d. a day.

BUCKS VOLUNTEERS;PAY OF SOUTH AFRICAN DETACHMENT.

MR. CARLILE (Buckinghamshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, in view of the fact that the Wolverton detachment of the 1st Bucks Rifle Volunteer Corps, recently returned from South Africa, was discharged within seven days of its arrival, and as other Volunteer detachments returning under the same circumstances, having completed their term of service in South Africa, have received up to thirty days furlough, he will provide that the Bucks Volunteers should receive the same treatment as others have had, and will he say whether the gratuity in lieu of furlough is granted to all branches of the

service, or only to Volunteers.

LORD STANLEY: As I have already informed the House, a furlough of thirty days with pay will be granted to all members of Volunteer service companies. It will also be granted to all Imperial Yeomen discharged before the higher rates of pay came into operation.

WAR OFFICE DECENTRALISATION.

MR. CHARLES HOBHOUSE (Bristol, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will present a return of the recommendations of the Decentralisation Committee of 1898, showing how far these recommendations have been carried out, wholly or partially, and where only partially adopted in what manner they differ from the original recommendations of the Committee.

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member will find the principal changes approved in consequence of the recommendations of the Committee of 1898 on page 460 of the Evidence of the War Office Organisation Committee of 1901; and the minor changes on pages xii. to xxiv. of the Report of 1898.

ARMY REFORM.

MR. PIRIE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether a scheme of Army reform was prepared by Lord Wolseley for Mr. Cardwell, of which a portion, including short service, was adopted by the Ministry of the day and by Parliament; and, if so, if he will lay upon the Table of the House the original draft of such scheme.

MR. BRODRICK: It is not clear to what the hon. Member refers. When Mr. Cardwell introduced his scheme to this House in 1870 Lord Wolseley was serving in Canada. He afterwards served on a Committee which worked out the detailed reorganisation required by Mr. Cardwell's scheme and reported in 1872, but he does not appear to have drafted any separate scheme.

DECEASED SOLDIERS' ESTATES; CASE OF JOHN CURTIN.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether any further inquiry has been made in reference to the subject of a letter from Mr. John Curtin, of Tallow, county Waterford, dated 8th October, 1900, to the Under Secretary of State for War, relative to the affairs of Private Patrick Curtin, No. 4,255, deceased, of the 2nd Battalion of the Royal Irish Regiment; if not, whether an effort will be made, by due inquiry on the spot, to ascertain whether the colour sergeant or the coffee contractor referred to therein are unlawfully retaining possession of moneys of the deceased soldier.

LORD STANLEY: I have nothing to add to the reply communicated to the hon. Member by letter on 21st November last, after exhaustive inquiries. The transaction was entirely a private one, with which the War Office is in no way concerned. I am, however, satisfied that the full amount of the money deposited with the contractor by the deceased soldier was duly returned either to him or to his representatives.

SOLDIERS' RATIONS; POISONED TINNED MEATS.

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM (Cork, N.E.): I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether his attention has been called to the poisoning of about fifteen soldiers of the York and Lancaster Regiment at Fermoy Barracks through

eating tinned beef served out for breakfast rations; can he state the name of the contractor who supplied this tinned beef and the name of manufacturer and place of manufacture; and will he explain why tinned meat is still being issued to the troops on home stations instead of home-grown meat.

LORD STANLEY: Perhaps the hon. Member would kindly refer to the full answer given by me on Friday last to the hon. Member for the Partick Division of Lanarkshire.*

MR. WILLIAM ABRAHAM: But that is not an answer to my question.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Will orders be issued prohibiting the further issue of tinned meats to the troops?

LORD STANLEY: It was not a question of issuing them. They were drawn by the men from the canteen and paid for. I am not prepared to interfere with the discretion of the commanding officer in this matter.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): Have the officers anything to do with the running of the canteen in this particular place?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir.

TROOPS IN IRELAND; BEER CONTRACTS.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to a resolution passed at the meeting of the Irish Trades Congress at Sligo protesting against the contract for beer and porter for the troops in Ireland being withdrawn from Irish firms; whether any complaint has ever been made as to the quality or purity of the beer or porter supplied by the Irish

* See page 412.

brewers; and whether, seeing that an influential authority has stated that all articles for barrack necessities should be obtained in the districts where the troops are stationed, he will see that the old system be reverted to.

LORD STANLEY: A copy of this resolution was sent to the War Office. Nothing is known there of any such complaint, nor would be, as this is purely a matter for the local military authorities to deal with. There has been no change of system, as the local military authorities have power to place orders for malt liquor with the firms they consider most desirable.

IRISH BARRACK STORES.

MR. NANNETTI: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether his attention has been called to the Report of the evidence of the Commander-in-Chief for Ireland on War Office organisation, in which he complained of the practice of sending to Woolwich for articles such as ladders, brushes, brooms, and other barrack stores, which he alleges could be more readily and cheaply got in Ireland; and will he take such steps as will give effect to the statement and views of his Royal Highness by the establishment of works for their manufacture in that country.

LORD STANLEY: The General Officer commanding the forces in Ireland has already been instructed to use his discretion in regard to such local purchases. The supply, however, is too small to justify the creation of any local factory.

PENRHYN QUARRY DISPUTE-MILITARY AID TO THE CIVIL POWER.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg to ask the Financial Secretary to the War Office whether

he can state who applied for the aid of the military at the Penrhyn quarries, when the application was received, and whether any disturbances have arisen in the district which the police are unable to cope with; and, if so, when these disturbances occurred.

LORD STANLEY: The chief constable of the county asked that the troops might be held in readiness. The application

was received by the general officer commanding the district on the 4th June. The nature and period of the disturbances are not questions which come within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of State for War.

LONDON VOLUNTEERS; DRILL SHEDS AND RANGES.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he is aware that under the provisions of Section 31 of the London Government Act, 1899, borough councils in the Metropolis have no power of proceeding under the Military Lands Act, 1892, towards assisting and co-operating with the Volunteers of London in the provision of drill sheds, drill grounds, and rifle ranges; and if, having regard to the importance of the question, he will consider the advisability of taking steps to grant London borough councils analogous facilities in this matter to those enjoyed by provincial municipalities.

LORD STANLEY: I am aware of the disability of the metropolitan borough councils in this respect. I do not, however, consider that any good purpose would be served by legislation in the direction proposed, as the powers already possessed by the London County Council appear to be ample.

NAVAL PRIZE MONEY.

MR. MAJENDIE (Portsmouth): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty if he can inform the House what portion of the £;370,895 18s. 7d., proceeds of Naval Prize Money, Bounty and Salvage, referred to in the Return to an Order of the House of Commons, dated 3rd March, 1863, has been paid out to the persons entitled, and what is the balance remaining unpaid; and whether any list of the several persons entitled to this unpaid balance has ever been put up at the Admiralty and notified to claimants; if not, whether any attempts have been made to trace out and inform the persons respectively entitled to receive the same.

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. ARNOLD-FORSTER, Belfast, W.): The balance of Naval Prize Money

remaining unpaid and payable, if applied for, on the 31st March, 1900, was £;50,353. The account for the present year will be published next month.

Announcements are made from time to time in the London Gazette, when funds become available for distribution, and there is reason to believe that these notices are largely copied in other newspapers. A Return showing the names of the several persons who became entitled and have yet to be paid, with the amounts due to them respectively, is in course of preparation, and will be published when completed.

HAULBOWLINE DOCKYARD.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he is aware that in the original design for the construction of Haulbowline Dockyard it was proposed to build two dry docks; and whether, in view of the increasing

necessity for additional dock accommodation, the Admiralty will consider the desirability of carrying out the original plan and constructing a second dry dock at Haulbowline.

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: The original design for the extension of Haulbowline Dockyard allotted a portion of the available space for the construction of two dry docks, but it was recommended that only one should be proceeded with at the time, and this dock has been completed. In 1895 a Committee appointed to investigate the question reported that the construction of a slipway on a portion of the ground allotted to the second dock was desirable in the interests of the service, and the slipway was accordingly constructed. There is still space available if it should be necessary at a future date to construct a second dry dock, but it is not proposed to commence this work at present.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Is it not the fact that all the work executed in this dockyard has given complete satisfaction?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: Undoubtedly it has.

CAPTAIN DONELAN: Then will the hon. Gentleman suggest that this matter be reconsidered?

MR. ARNOLD-FORSTER: No, Sir. The question is one for the naval authorities, who have to decide what are the most pressing needs of the naval service.

CHINA;PERMANENT BRITISH GARRISON.

MR. HERBERT ROBERTS (Denbighshire, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he will state what troops will constitute the permanent British garrison in China, in addition to the troops at Peking, and at what points they will be stationed.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I am not in a position now to state exactly what troops will be left, or the composition of the force to be left at specific points; but the permanent garrison will only form a comparatively small proportion of those who constituted the expeditionary force.

GERMAN GARRISON AT SHANGHAI.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any communications have passed between the British Foreign Office and the German Government as to the decision of the latter to leave a German garrison at Shanghai.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): No, Sir.

INDIA COUNCIL BILLS AND TELEGRAPHIC TRANSFERS.

SIR EDWARD SASSOON (Hythe): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India whether he is aware that the difference of a sixteenth of a penny ordinarily made by the India Council between the sale of bills and telegraphic transfers represents a charge of 9½ per cent. per annum; and whether, in view of this impost upon banking and commercial transactions, he will give instructions for reducing the difference by one moiety, except on occasions when conditions of financial stringency prevail in India.

LORD G. HAMILTON: The difference of a sixteenth of a penny per rupee between the price of bills on India and that of telegraphic transfers represents

a charge of 9½ per cent. per annum if it can be assumed that all such bills, whether drawn on Calcutta, Madras, or Bombay, can be presented in fifteen days; but this is not the case. To give the telegraphic transfers at only one-thirty-secondth of a penny more than the bills would, with the present rate of discount, be in effect to lend the money at cheaper rates than that at which the Presidency Banks are lending it.

IMPERIAL COURT OF APPEAL.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he can state what progress has been made in reference to the establishment of the proposed Imperial Court of Appeal; and whether the colonies have intimated their approval of the establishment of such a court.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: Arrangements have been made for holding towards the end of this month a Conference on the subject at which all the colonies will be represented. The object of this Conference is to elicit an expression of the opinion of the colonies on this subject, and pending the conclusion of its labours I am unable to make any further statement.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Have the Government abandoned the intention mentioned in the King's Speech of introducing legislation this year on the subject?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Well, Sir, I think that, owing to the time which has been taken by the negotiations with the colonies, it would be impossible to hold out much hope, even if the Conference should prove unanimous, of giving effect this session to any conclusion which may be arrived at.

ALIEN IMMIGRANTS IN LONDON.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he is aware that a Return recently issued shows that a number of aliens, mainly from Russia, Roumania, and Poland, came to this country last year under the impression that they would find in London either an organisation prepared with plans and funds to equip and forward all applicants to Canada, or an assured career in England; and having regard to the fact that pauper aliens of these nationalities have increased in the East End of London during the year, will he consider the advisability of instructing the British representatives in the countries indicated to take such steps as may be necessary to correct any false statement which may be circulated in regard to the prospects of pauper aliens arriving in London.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The statement alluded to was derived from the Report of the Jewish Board of Guardians, and rests upon the authority of that body. Until the Census Returns are completed it cannot be said whether the numbers of aliens in East London have increased. Warnings in regard to the prospects of pauper aliens in London were circulated by Her Majesty's Consuls in 1891 and 1893.

MR. JAMES LOWTHER (Kent, Thanet): Is there any prospect of the introduction of the Government Bill prohibiting the importation of aliens?

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: That question should be addressed to my right hon. friend.

GIBRALTAR WORKS.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will lay upon the Table of the House the Report of the Gibraltar Committee in reply to the questions addressed to it made at Gibraltar on 30th

March, and also the subsequent Report made by some members on 15th May; and, if so, when; and will he say when and how he proposes to afford the House an opportunity of discussing these Reports.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): Yes, Sir.

There are, as the hon. Member says, two Reports in question. There is the Interim Report;(laughter);avowedly an Interim Report;of 30th March, and there is a Report of 15th May,

signed by all the members of the Committee except the Member for King's Lynn.

There are parts of these Reports which, by universal consent, ought not to be laid on the Table of the House; but I see no reason why the greater part of both Reports should not be textually laid on the Table, and I propose to do that.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY (Roscommon, N.): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether any diplomatic protest or representation has been made by the Spanish Government against the carrying out of the Naval works at Gibraltar.

VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: No, Sir. No such representation has been made.

MR. JAMES O'KELLY: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether His Majesty's Government will open negotiations with the Government of Spain with a view to obtaining the cession of the western shore of Gibraltar Bay and sufficient of the adjacent territory to enable the port to be securely fortified, and whether any offer to purchase the Spanish side of Gibraltar Bay has ever been made by His Majesty's Government.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): May I respectfully ask whether, considering the mischievous excitement already created in Spain, the right hon. Gentleman will decline to answer such a question?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I agree with my hon. friend that no great public advantage is served by putting such questions, but as this question has been put it is as well to answer it. I will say that the Government have never made any proposal to purchase, and do not propose to make any proposal to purchase, any part of Spanish territory.

SUGAR DUTY;LOW GRADE MOLASSES.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, with respect to the reduction in the duty on low grade molasses imported chiefly for cattle-feeding purposes, whether the importers of such molasses between 18th April and 10th June, who have been charged with the higher duty imposed during that interval, and who have warehoused the article pending a final decision as to the duty, will be refunded to the extent of the excess of the amount paid by them over the rates as finally settled.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): I do not think that the suggestion of the hon. Member could be adopted. In the first place, various importers who have paid the 2s. duty must, under Section 20 of the Customs Consolidation Act of 1876, have added it to their prices and recovered it from their customers, so that it would be most difficult to repay the extra duty to those who have actually paid it; and, in the second place, this particular reduction is only one item in an amended scale for molasses and glucose, and there is no reason for making the reductions retrospective unless

the increases are to be treated similarly, and this would not be practicable. My intention is therefore to ask Parliament to sanction the duty on the scale originally proposed up to the 10th instant, and the new scale from that date. It must be remembered that these importers must have known that a reduction of the duty was under consideration, and might have placed their molasses in bond until required. If no bonded premises were vacant for these purposes, temporary bonding privileges would have been granted to their private premises on application to the Customs.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS.

MR. M'CRAE (Edinburgh, E.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will consider the advisability of introducing into the Finance Bill a clause repealing the proviso to Rule Fifth of No. 2, Schedule A., s. 60, 5 and 6 Vic, c. 35, by which, contrary to the principles dealing with all other kinds of income, fines received in consideration of any demise of land or tenements are, if applied to productive capital, exempted from income tax, and whether he can state the amount so exempted for the year 1900–1901.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The proviso does not appear to be "contrary to the principles dealing with all other kinds of income." It provides that fines (which may arise in many different ways and circumstances) should be chargeable as income when, as a matter of fact, they are treated by the recipient as income, but should be exempted when treated as capital. In the case of Settled Estates, for instance, fines must by law be treated as capital, and the life tenant is not entitled to anything more than the interest arising from their investment. It would be manifestly unjust to require that in such circumstances the amount of the fine should be subject to income tax. Moreover, it must not be overlooked that the property from which fines issue is taxed on its full annual value, irrespective of actual rent, so that in a sense there is a double assessment where fines are charged with income tax. It is not possible to give the amounts exempted under the proviso.

MR. M'CRAE: Seeing that the exemption of building lease fines is totally different to the state of affairs contemplated when the Act was passed, cannot the right hon. Gentleman reconsider the matter?

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I can add nothing to the answer I have given. It explains the reason for the exemption.

WAPPING STREET DISTURBANCE.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he can give any explanation of the absence of the police for over twenty minutes while a disturbance was taking place in St. George's Street, Wapping, over the breaking into of a house by an under tenant, who alleged his landlord had illegally evicted him early on Saturday, 8th June, 1901, and whether any proceedings were taken by the police against the under tenant, who was arrested by them; if so, can he state what punishment was inflicted on him.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): This case was one of assault preferred by a private person, and the prisoners were arrested on his charging them. They duly appeared before the magistrate, and were discharged. Nothing was said as to the absence

of police during the disturbance, which occurred chiefly inside the house, but constables were there at 7·40 and again at 8 on the night in question. MR. MURPHY: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that I was a witness myself of the absence of the police?

MORTALITY AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE IN SOUTH WALES COLLIERIES.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department if he can afford any explanation of the fact that the death rate from accident of persons of sixteen years of age and under employed in collieries in the South Wales district has latterly increased, and that it was higher in 1900 than in any previous year in the decade; and if his attention has been drawn to the fact that, whereas in each of the five years of 1891 to 1895 inclusive, the death rate was less than that among persons of over sixteen years of age, in each of the years 1896 to 1900 it was higher, and that in the last five years it was forty-five per cent. greater than in the previous five years.

*MR. RITCHIE: It is true that there has been a rise in the death rate among persons under sixteen in mines in South Wales, and that for the last five years it is higher than the death rate among persons over sixteen, whereas in the preceding five years it was lower. In the preceding five years, however, the death rate among persons over sixteen was abnormally heavy, and the rate has declined from 3·50 during those years to 2 during the last five years. A large proportion of the accidents to boys occur in connection with haulage underground, and the reasons for the increase in the death rate among them are perhaps to be found in the greater amount of haulage done in the mines now as compared with previous years, the increased use of machinery, and the greater number of boys employed in connection with machinery.

FATAL ACCIDENTS IN WELSH COLLIERIES.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been called to the disparity in the death rate from falls of roof and side during the last seven years in collieries in the South Wales district employing over 1,000 persons, as shown in Mr. Robson's report for 1900, and that the highest annual average death rate in these collieries was three times that of the lowest; and whether he can give any reason for this.

*MR. RITCHIE: Yes, I have seen the figures which appear in the report recently made by Mr. Robson. The hon. Member will have observed that the figures show disparities not only between different mines, but also between different years at the same mine; and where, as in the case of these collieries, the numbers involved are comparatively small, fluctuations in the death rate from year to year are sure to occur. On the other hand, some mines are shown by the figures over the whole seven years to be safer than others; and the reason of this may possibly be that the roof in these mines is of a better quality, while something is also to be attributed to differences of management and supervision.

GAMBLING IN GRAIN.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether any measures have been taken by the Board of Trade in order to co-operate with Germany and other nations which have introduced legislation with the purpose of preventing

gambling in futures or options in grain, for the purpose of discouraging corners in foodstuffs, as opposed to the interests of producers and consumers.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF TRADE (Mr. GERALD BALFOUR, Leeds, Central): No such measures have been taken.

MERCANTILE MARINE;REGISTRATION OF TONNAGE.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he has considered the advisability of introducing regulations which will ensure a uniform proportion of registered tonnage of vessels engaged in the cross Channel and coasting trade of the United Kingdom.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The matter to which the hon. Member refers is receiving careful consideration, and so far as reasonable uniformity can be obtained by Board of Trade regulations I shall endeavour to secure it.

PREVENTION OF RAILWAY ACCIDENTS;RULES.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade what steps other than publication in the London Gazette were taken by his Department, as required by the Railway Employment (Prevention of Accidents) Act, 1900, to inform the persons affected of the place where the draft of the Prevention of Accidents Rules, 1901, recently issued, might be obtained, and of the time within which objections or suggestions might be lodged with the Board of Trade; whether he is aware that in many cases owners of wagons received the information indirectly and some time after the draft rules were issued; and whether, having regard to the interchange of traffic that takes place between the various railway systems, and the fact that no wagon constructed or reconstructed after twelve months from the coming into operation of the rules may be received or used for traffic on any railway without brake levers that can be conveniently operated upon from either side of the wagons, he will, with a view to securing uniformity, consider the advisability of indicating a standard brake to which all brakes should conform in order to meet the minimum of convenience required by the Board of Trade.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: A copy of the Gazette notice was sent in April to each of forty-six newspapers and reviews, as well as to four press agencies, and to the various companies and persons to whom railway accidents reports are usually sent. Copies of the draft rules were sent on the same date to the Railway Companies' Association, the Association of Private Owners of Railway Rolling Stock, the Railway Carriage and Wagon Builders' Association, and the Mining Association of Great Britain. About 900 copies of the Draft Rules have been supplied, in all, to persons and companies affected. The point raised in the last part of the hon. Member's question is one to be considered in connection with the objections which have been made to the draft rules under Section 2 of the Act. These objections will, in the first instance, be submitted to Lord James of Hereford, who will advise the Board thereon.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that there are a number of colliery owners, owning considerably over a thousand wagons, who never received any notice at all?

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: I am not aware of that, but I should imagine it is impossible to directly notify everybody.

FARMERS AND METEOROLOGICAL REPORTS.

MR. LLOYD MORGAN (Carmarthenshire, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture, seeing that requests have frequently been made by farmers' clubs and associations interested in agriculture for the daily publication at sub-post offices in agricultural districts of the forecast of the weather, whether, in order to assist farmers during the harvest, he will consider the question of having every evening until the end of September the forecast of the weather for the following day telegraphed to those sub-post offices in agricultural districts to which there is telegraphic communication.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE (Mr. HANBURY, Preston): In 1893 arrangements were made by the Board of Agriculture for exhibiting, by way of experiment, at telegraph stations in Northumberland and Essex, the daily weather forecasts issued during the hay and corn harvests by the Meteorological Council. In the following year a similar experiment was tried in the counties of Somerset, Carnarvon, Ayr, Cambridge, the East Riding of Yorkshire, and Haddington. Residents in the counties were invited to record their observations of the weather during the period, and the reports were carefully tabulated and examined. The areas to which the forecasts apply were found to be too wide and varied to allow of anything like close accuracy as regards the weather to be expected at any given place, and it did not appear that the assistance rendered to agriculturists was sufficient to justify the Board in asking the Treasury to sanction the continuance of the experiment or its application to the country generally.

BUTTER ADULTERATION.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Agriculture whether the case of the Stepney Borough Council versus Isaac Simons, grocer, 20, Samuel Street, St. George's-in-the-East, at the Thames Police Court, in which defendant was fined 20s. and costs for selling butter containing 40 per cent. of water, according to Somerset House analysis, was brought under his notice; whether, with the view of settling a legal standard of water allowable in butter, he will at once appoint a Committee to inquire into the question; and, if so, will he state whether the evidence of experts in the Irish butter trade will be received, and where will the inquiry be held.

*MR. HANBURY: My attention has been called to the case mentioned in the question. I hope to appoint the Committee almost immediately.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: Has the right hon. Gentleman read the evidence?

*MR. HANBURY: Yes, and the case will be carefully considered.

LONDON LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDITORS.

MR. LOUGH: I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether any general instructions will be issued by the Local Government Board to the auditors to be appointed under the London Government Act of 1899; and, if so, whether these instructions will be sent to the borough councils for their information and guidance, and, in the event of any auditor making a surcharge on the ground of illegal expenditure, will the council at fault have any right of appeal; and, if so, to whom.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): The

auditor whom I have appointed to conduct the audit of the accounts of the London Borough Councils is an officer of considerable experience. His duties will in the main be similar to those of other district auditors, and I have not deemed it necessary to issue any general instructions to him. There will be a right of appeal to the Local Government Board or to the High Court against any surcharge made by the auditor.

BOY COPYISTS IN THE CIVIL SERVICE.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury if he can say how many boys have been admitted into the Civil Service as boy copyists for the last three years; how many have left the service or been dismissed during that time; and how many have got permanent employment in the Civil Service.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): During the three years 1898–1900 3,189 boys have been added to the register, 956 boy copyists have left the service or been dismissed, and 768 have been appointed to permanent situations in the Civil Service.

SOLDIER POSTMEN AND THE GOOD CONDUCT STRIPE.

MR. THOMAS DEWAR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will consider the expediency of allowing postmen and porters returning from active service in South Africa the right to wear a good conduct stripe, and will he arrange for the extra pay which the stripe carries to be granted to these men on their resuming duty at the post office.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: A good conduct stripe is awarded as a reward for five years unblemished service. It is not proposed to alter the qualifying period on account of service in South Africa.

WRONGFUL DISMISSAL OF SCHOOL TEACHERS.

MR. CHARLES SHAW (Stafford): I beg to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education, in respect to the promised Government Bill for affording to teachers in public elementary schools a method of repeal or redress against wrongful dismissal from employment, whether the difficulties which were engaging the attention of the Lord President of the Council have been successfully dealt with; and when the Bill will be introduced.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The Bill is in preparation and will be introduced shortly.

RICHMOND PARK GATEKEEPERS.

MAJOR RASCH (Essex, Chelmsford): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether he is aware that the present holder of the post of gatekeeper of Ham Gate, in Richmond Park, is a former valet of the Deputy Ranger; and if he would urge upon the Ranger of Richmond Park the propriety of appointing old soldiers of good character to these offices.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): I am informed that the man referred to was formerly in the service of Admiral FitzGeorge, the Deputy Ranger, and that he had been previously in the Royal Navy. I have no right to interfere with the Ranger in the exercise of his patronage; but I may say on the best authority that his Royal Highness does give consideration to the claims of old soldiers, but not to the exclusion of old servants.

MAJOR RASCH: But is the right hon. Gentleman aware that a Balacava veteran has been removed from the Kingston Gate and a domestic servant of the Duke appointed in his place by His Royal Highness as Ranger?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: No, Sir, I have no knowledge of such fact, and, as I have already reminded my hon. and gallant friend, I have no voice in the appointment of these gatekeepers.

NATIONAL GALLERY.

MR. MIDDLEMORE: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the National Gallery will be completely isolated from the buildings which now adjoin it by effecting the changes which will be authorised by the passage of the National Gallery (Purchase of Adjacent Land) Bill; and will he state what distance from the National Gallery the nearest buildings will be.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Yes, Sir. The National Gallery will be completely isolated from the buildings which are adjacent to it on the west; the nearest building will be the south-east angle of a stable, which will be 35 feet from the north-west corner of the National Gallery; with this exception the space between the buildings will be about 40 feet.

LORD BALCARRES (Lancashire, Chorley): Will no portion of the barracks be in touch with the National Gallery?

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: The southern portion of the barracks adjoining the National Gallery will be pulled down at the end of the present year.

BALLYVAUGHAN FISHING INDUSTRY.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will inquire into the position of the fishing industry in the neighbourhood of Ballyvaughan, county Clare; and whether he will see that something is done to assist the fishermen of that district.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): The fishing industry in the neighbourhood of Ballyvaughan has been for some time the subject of inquiry by the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, and it is hoped that it may be possible materially to develop it.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Cannot the right hon. Gentleman hold out some hope that something will soon be done in the matter?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do hold out that hope.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

MR. FLYNN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state why the Commissioners of Intermediate Education in Ireland have not attached marks to the honour subjects in the intermediate programme, and if he can say whether these subjects are of equal value.

MR. WYNDHAM: In the new Intermediate Programme, as all honour subjects are of equal value it was deemed unnecessary by the Board to attach marks to these subjects.

INSPECTORS OF IRISH FISHERIES;REPORT.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can say why the Report of the Inspectors of Irish Fisheries for 1900 has not yet been presented to Parliament, and when it will be presented.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Report is in the printers' hands, and, it is expected, will be ready for presentation about the end of this month.

POTATO SPRAYING IN IRELAND.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can give the number, names, and qualifications and emoluments of the persons appointed in connection with the spraying of potatoes in Ireland this season.

MR. WYNDHAM: Instruction in the spraying of potatoes forms part of the duties of the six Agricultural Instructors in the service of the Congested Districts Board. A statement of the names, qualifications, and emoluments of these persons is being prepared and will be forwarded to the hon. Member.

IRISH FISHERY COMMISSIONERS.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether any appointment has yet been made of a Fishery Commissioner in the place of

MR. Cecil Roche, and, if so, will he state who it is; and, if not, can he say whether there is any difficulty in the way of making an appointment, and, if so, what is its nature, or for what other reason the place has not been filled.

MR. WYNDHAM: Mr. D. H. Lane has been appointed temporarily as Inspector of Fisheries in succession to Mr. Roche.

MR. FLYNN: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this gentleman is a brewer, and has spent all his life in brewing?

MR. WYNDHAM: I am not aware of that.

MR. FLYNN: Well, I am.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am well aware that he has given great assistance to Mr. Green, one of the Fishery Inspectors, and that he has a practical knowledge of the question.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): What is the practical knowledge which this brewer has?

MR. WYNDHAM: He has held the position of manager of a large salmon fishery, although he is now vacating it in order that he may be quite independent.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Is it not the fact that he was appointed not because of his knowledge of the subject, but because he belongs to a particular political denomination?

DR. AMBROSE: Has he any acquaintance with deep sea fisheries?

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: The right hon. Gentleman says the appointment is temporary. Can he make it permanent without legislation?

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes. He has been appointed provisionally for one year at a salary of £500. He has an acquaintance with deep sea fisheries, for he assisted Mr. Green in one of his deep sea surveys.

Other Members rose to put questions.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The question has been fully answered.

PROSECUTIONS FOR TRESPASS AT MALLARANNY.

DR. AMBROSE: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the inhabitants of Mallaranny, county Mayo, are put to inconvenience and expense owing to the conduct of the police in summoning them

for allowing their donkeys and goats to wander on the public road; that these people have the right to graze on the adjoining mountain, for which they pay a rent, and that the mountain is not fenced in from the public road; and would he see that, pending the proper fencing of the mountain by the landlord, the inhabitants are saved the expense of repeated prosecutions by the police.

MR. WYNDHAM: There have been eleven prosecutions at Mallaranny since the 1st January last for the offence mentioned, and fines amounting to 12s., with costs, have been imposed. Cultivated land lies adjacent to the road, and is fenced; the grazing mountain is at the other side of this land. The prosecutions were instituted in respect of offences committed on the fenced portion of the road.

TAWIN WATER SUPPLY.

MR. DUFFY (Galway, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the people living in the village of Tawin, near Oranmore, in the South Galway Parliamentary Division, amounting to close on ninety families, are in need of water; that an application, supported by the parish priest, the medical officer of health, and other residents of Tawin and district, was presented to the Rural District Council of Galway asking that a pump should be constructed in the village, and, seeing that this request was refused, whether he will state what steps he will direct the Local Government Board to take to prevent an outbreak of fever in the neighbourhood owing to the comparative absence of a fresh water supply.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Local Government Board has been in correspondence with the district council in this matter, but so far the council has taken no action. The Board has no power to take any steps with the view of compelling the council to provide a water supply unless it receives a formal complaint under Section 15 of the Public Health Act, 1896, from the ratepayers. If such a complaint be made to the Board it will receive immediate attention.

DINGLE BAY FISHERY.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I bog to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that on 22nd May, 1901, a steam trawler was detected four miles inside the prohibited line in Dingle Bay, name and number being "Goldfinder, G.Y. 526," and that the fisherman who saw this vessel reported the matter to the chief coastguard, asking at the same time that the owner be prosecuted; and, seeing that under existing laws no prosecutions could be entered against such offending vessels except they are boarded by coastguards, whether he will take steps immediately to alter the law so as to enable prosecutions to be made in such cases as that described.

MR. WYNDHAM: A Bill is now before Parliament which, in the event of its becoming law, will strengthen the hands of the responsible authorities in suppressing illegal steam trawling.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: Has the gunboat any orders to assist in preventing illegal trawling?

MR. WYNDHAM: That does not arise out of the question. But I may say that the authorities have no power under the existing law to make the owners amenable.

FORESTRY IN IRELAND.

MR. FIELD: I bog to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland

whether he can state if it is the intention of the Department of Agriculture in Ireland to take up the work of reafforestation, and whether he can state if a qualified official and special Committee will be appointed, and what amount of money is available for the

purpose, or if it is intended to obtain a special grant from the Treasury.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have already stated that the Department hopes, in due time, to take up the work of reafforestation in conjunction with county councils. The councils are empowered to make provision for tree-planting operations and the necessary expert advice in the schemes they are promoting under the Act. These schemes, if approved, will be subsidised by the Department out of the fund at its disposal. It is not intended to obtain a special grant from the Treasury, as suggested.

GLENGARIFF NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHER.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland why it is that the teacher of Glengariff National School, Roll No.

2,379, District 58, has not yet been paid results for Irish taught as an extra, though the annual examination was held in July, 1900; and will he explain why no answer has been sent to the letter written by the managers to the Education Office complaining of this delay.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am informed that payment of the grant referred to has been made, and that the reasons for the delay in payment have been explained to the manager.

TULLAMORE SESSIONS-CROWN v. PETERSON.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he will lay upon the Table of the House a copy of the order made by the county court judge in the case of the Crown v. Peterson, heard at the late quarter sessions for King's County, held at Tullamore, on the 28th ultimo.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. ATKINSON, Londonderry, N.): Perhaps I may be permitted to reply to this question. The order made by the judge was to the effect that the case should be adjourned to the next quarter sessions, the defendant being

admitted to bail in his own recognisances. It is not proposed to lay a copy of the order on the Table of the House,

BELFAST DISTURBANCES;MR. TREW'S SPEECHES.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether the police in Belfast have been in the habit of taking shorthand notes, or any notes, of the speeches inciting to disorder that have been delivered for a long time past every Sunday at the Custom House by a man named Trew; and, if so, whether he has any objection to place the reports of those speeches on the Table of the House.

MR. ATKINSON: At the request of my right hon. friend, I will reply to this question. Notes in shorthand, or longhand, have been taken for some time past of the speeches made by Mr. Trew; I cannot, however, admit the accuracy of the description applied to these speeches in the question, though, no doubt, they were in many instances reprehensible in character. The reports of the speeches

are confidential documents, and it would be contrary to practice to lay them on the Table of the House

MR. FLYNN: In what way were they reprehensible if they did not incite to disorder?

[No answer was given.]

IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDER BILLS.

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that the South Tipperary and other county councils have passed resolutions urging them to have the provisions of the Local Government Provisional Order Bill put in force from the 30th September next so as to enable them to give practical effect to the said provisions in the coming year; and whether he can promise to be able to comply with the expressed request of those councils.

MR. WYNDHAM: The Provisional Order fixes the 1st April next as the date on which it is to come into operation, that date being the beginning of a new financial year. This date was fixed after consultation with the several county and district councils affected, and current rates have been struck with regard to the liabilities under existing contracts which will expire on that date. For these and other reasons, which it is impossible to state in detail in answer to a question, the suggestion of the hon. Member cannot be adopted.

DUBLIN FOUR COURTS; TAXING MASTERS' SALARIES.

MR. CULLINAN: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state the salaries of the taxing masters engaged in the Four Courts, Dublin; what are the hours during which they should attend for the transaction of business; and whether it is competent for one of them to strike out cases to leave the court, and thereby put parties interested to inconvenience.

MR. WYNDHAM: The salary of each of the taxing masters is £1,000 a year. The public business of the department extends from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. The taxing masters do not strike out cases in order to leave the court. They occasionally adjourn cases owing to the non-attendance of the parties or the non-production of vouchers.

BALLINTOGHER RAILWAY STATION.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the President of the Board of Trade whether he is aware that the town of Ballintogher, county Sligo, on the line of the Sligo, Leitrim, and Northern Counties Railway, is at present only accommodated with a flag station, to the inconvenience of the people, merchants, and traders of that town and also the cattle dealers who frequent the fairs held there; and, seeing that this company were bound by the original power granted them by Parliament to erect a passenger and goods station at Ballintogher, whether he can take any steps to induce the company to fulfil their promise by having a station erected.

MR. GERALD BALFOUR: The company state that there is a suitable passenger platform station with every accommodation at this place. It does not appear that they are under any statutory obligation to construct such a station as the hon. Member suggests, and the company allege that the traffic would not warrant the

necessary expenditure.

*MR. O'DOWD: If I satisfy the right hon. Gentleman that the company are under such statutory obligation, will the matter be reconsidered?

[No answer was returned.]

BALLINTOGHER POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. O'DOWD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he is aware that at present there is only one daily mail delivery in the town of Ballintogher, county Sligo; that the mails are conveyed from Cullooney by road, arriving at 10 a.m., although a morning mail train from Sligo passes some hours earlier by Ballintogher, and delivers mails along the route at the various towns and villages, performing the same duty on its return at 8.15 p.m.; and will he institute inquiries, with the view of having the same facilities accorded Ballintogher as are enjoyed by smaller towns on the same route of railway

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General will cause inquiries to be made with the view of ascertaining whether it is practicable to afford increased postal facilities at Ballintogher, county Sligo, and the hon. Member shall be informed of the result as soon as possible.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

Queen Anne's Bounty.;That they propose that the Joint Committee appointed to consider the constitution of Queen Anne's Bounty Board, and to report whether economy and efficiency of administration would be promoted by any change in its constitution or by its amalgamation with any other body, do meet in Committee Room A, upon Thursday, at half-past Two o'clock.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY.

Lords' Message [this day], relating to the time and place of meeting of the Joint Committee, considered, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Committee of this House do meet the Lords' Committee as proposed by their Lordships.

Message to the Lords to acquaint them therewith.:(Sir William Walrond.)

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to amend the Law relating to lunatics in Ireland." Lunacy (Ireland) Bill [Lords].

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR;MORTALITY IN CAMPS OF DETENTION.

[MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.]

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE, Member for the Carnarvon District, rose in his place, and asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, "the condition of the camps of detention in South Africa, and the alarming rate of mortality amongst the women and children detained there"; but the pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. SPEAKER called on those Members who supported the motion to rise in their places, and not less than forty Members having accordingly risen;

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: After the answer which the Secretary of State has given this afternoon, I do not think that any apology is necessary for this motion. About three weeks ago the hon. Member for East Mayo and myself called attention to this subject, but the facts which have been revealed since showed that we

considerably understated the case at that time. On 2nd May the right hon. Gentleman said that in the Transvaal there were 284 deaths from 1st January, and on 7th May he said that the deaths in the Orange River Colony camps since February had been 41 men, 80 women, and 261 children. The answer given to-day proves that, so far from this being the result of temporary conditions, it is growing worse. The deaths in these camps in the Transvaal in a single month were 336; that is a mortality rate, according to the rough computation I have made, of 120 per thousand. For the sake of the credit and good name of this country something should be done to put an end to this condition of things, which is going from bad to worse. A newspaper published last week the details of mortality in one camp. Full particulars were given, including the names of those who had died; a question was based on them, and the right hon. Gentleman consented to ask Lord Kitchener as to the facts. We are constantly hearing of the calumnies of the pro-Boer press. But it is not for hon. Gentlemen opposite to talk about calumnies in view of those recently circulated by their own press. Lord Kitchener, it turns out, confirmed every figure of the Return which had been published in the newspaper, and admitted that the death-rate in this one camp had been 450 per thousand. A deputation went out to these camps from this country. One was a former Member of this House; Mr. Joshua Rowntree; and everyone who knows him will be convinced of the accuracy of every statement he makes. His word is as good as his oath. An English lady went out also. She was permitted to go as far as Bloemfontein; but Mr. Rowntree was not permitted to go beyond Cape Town, though a great deal of persuasion was brought to bear on Sir Alfred Milner, as he then was. No doubt what has happened since in these camps and elsewhere has entitled him to his peerage. What has he done? He has allowed one lady to proceed as far as Bloemfontein, but no farther. We now know the reason why no one is permitted to proceed beyond Bloemfontein. The facts revealed by the right hon. Gentleman, which have come straight from Lord Kitchener, show that there was a state of things at Johannesburg which the Government were afraid to exhibit. This lady has made some reports as to what was taking place in the best of these camps; the best equipped and the longest established; and they are sufficiently deplorable. These were camps, not of fighting men, every one of whom would pass a physical test, but of women, many of whom were in a weak condition, and of children. Food, insufficient; such as was supplied, bad; the women herded together, sometimes twelve in a tent; tents leaking; clothes saturated; not much clothing allowed; little children half starved; the food they had, bad; their clothes soaked through with rain and dew. What marvel is it that the right hon. Gentleman has to tell us this tale of hundreds of children dying? [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Another Weyler.] The quantity of the food is less; I carefully compared it; than the amount allowed in this country to criminals under hard labour. Here is the official Report of the medical officer in this very camp about which we are inquiring to-day; "Examined samples of the mealies, and of the sugar used. Sample one: mouldy and contains mite; unfit for human consumption." This is given to little children.

"Sample 2: contains mite, but I could not discover any living mite; it is very dangerous as human food. Sample 3: a moist sample of brown sugar; smells somewhat sour, but with microscope could not find ferment or other foreign matter, except water; the sugar is unfit for the use of young children."

Until recently there were two scales in these camps. The full scale for children was; flour and meal, half a pound; meat, half a pound; milk, quarter of a tin; and so on. But this is for children under six years of age. If relatives on commando, no flour; and only one-third of the quantity of meat given to other children. Little children under six years of age to have no flour, one-third the quantity of milk, and no meat at all on five days a week, because their relatives are on commando! [A NATIONALIST MEMBER: Generous England!] When this statement was first made the right hon. Gentleman denied it very violently, and it is to his credit that he did so, for he did not believe it possible that such inhumanity could be committed by anybody in authority. The warmth of his indignation is creditable to the right hon. Gentleman, and it is still more creditable that when he discovered that it was a fact he stopped at any rate that part of the transaction.

That the state of things with regard to the clothing is very bad is proved by the appeal which has been made to America by the wife of the Military Governor at Pretoria to raise funds;

"for the purpose of providing warm clothing for the Boer women and children in the refugee camps in South Africa, many of whom are totally destitute, and unable to provide against the cold weather which is now setting in."

Then she goes on to say;

"It is in the name of little children who are living in open tents, without fires, and possessing only the scantiest clothing, that I ask for help."

An appeal has to be sent by the wife of the Military Governor of Johannesburg; to America to provide for the women and children we have taken under our protection.

This, Sir, is the idea of bringing a great war to a successful issue. We are told that war is war, and that, after all, these are the necessary consequences of a state of war. I do not think that is so. We know perfectly well that this is the result of a deliberate policy. I cannot challenge that policy at the present moment, and I do not propose to do so. I say that this is the result of a deliberate and settled policy. It is not a thing which has been done in twenty-four hours, for it has taken months and months to do it. The military authorities knew perfectly well it was to be done, and they had ample time to provide for it. They started clearing the country about six months ago, and it is disgraceful that five or six months after that children should be dying at the rate of hundreds per month in the different camps. But let me point this out to the House. The rate of mortality among children; and I think this is the most disgraceful fact in the whole situation; is higher than that amongst the soldiers who have braved all the risks of the field. The mortality amongst our own troops is something like thirty-six per thousand. When the epidemic was at its height in Bloemfontein the death rate was fifty-two per thousand. Even taking the argument that war is war, and that Women and children should not be altogether

exempt from its dangers, it is unfair to class the mortality of soldiers in the field with that of women and children.

But while the rate of mortality amongst the soldiers in the field is fifty-two per thousand, the mortality amongst the women and children in these camps is 450 per thousand, and we have no right to put the women and children in this position. What is the assumption of the right hon. Gentleman? He says that it is by voluntary submission on the part of these women and children that they are refugees, and that they sought our protection. If they are seeking our protection, then we are ill requiting their confidence. They are British subjects, and they are voluntarily British subjects. They came voluntarily to seek the protection of the British flag, and how do we treat them? Why, we half starve them. We give them bad food, no shelter, we clothe them badly, their houses are burned, and their stock taken away. This is how you treat those who have voluntarily submitted to us. This is the first object lesson for them under British rule.

MR. NOLAN (Louth, S.): We know all about that in Ireland. [Ministerial laughter.]

MR. CULLINAN (Tipperary, S.): Yes, it is common in Ireland; laugh at it if you like.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: The right hon. Gentleman says they sought our protection. Protection against whom? Is it against their own kith and kin? Is it against the natives? Is there a single case recorded where the natives have attacked these poor women and children out on the veldt? No, but they have been driven and compelled to come in. I have got case after case which I might quote to the House where they were compelled to come in; cases where the husband never fought against us, and cases where the husbands are now on commando. There were no charges against the women, and there could be none against the poor little children, but they were compelled to come into these camps. The right hon. Gentleman says he is perfectly willing that they shall go elsewhere if they have anyone to protect them. They have sent petitions in to the military authorities begging to be allowed to

leave these camps. [The hon. Member read one of the petitions referred to, and continued:] We are told that these people are voluntary refugees who ask for our protection, but if this is so will the right hon. Gentleman explain why the terms of this petition at Kimberley were refused, and why there was a barbed wire fence surrounding the whole camp? If such a camp is not a prison, it is very like one. All round the camp there are sentries outside. These refugees have asked permission to be allowed to go away, and it has been refused. There are cases in which relatives in Cape Colony have offered to take these women and children under their protection and to pay the expense of conveying them and of keeping them, and even this offer has been refused.

The right hon. Gentleman cannot possibly state, in face of all these facts, that these are voluntary refugees. I say that it is the very worst policy in the world to keep these women and children there in these camps against their will, and under such conditions. It is perfectly impossible, owing to the circumstances, that these children should not suffer. You cannot have children

of eighteen months and three or four years old under these tents, in all sorts of weather, without injury to their health. You cannot give them the class of food which you can give to a man in full health and strength, and there certainly ought to be some means of protecting them rather than herding them together in these refugee camps, and I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to do something in this respect. He must know that it is quite impossible under the conditions existing in the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal to do anything to adequately provide for women and children in those parts. There are two camps which are fairly good, I am told, at Port Elizabeth and Norval's Pont, in Cape Colony. There the refugees are within reach of a sympathetic population, and I put it to the Government that it is better to send these people to places where they will have the sympathy of their kinsmen, for it is too much to expect of flesh and blood that they will not sympathise with these refugees. Is it not better that they should occupy themselves and exhaust, as it were, their sympathy upon providing for the women and children of the men in the field, and thus relieve us of the anxiety and the burden, and at the same time occupy themselves with work of this character? Would this not be infinitely better than herding these women and children together in camps in the Orange Free State, from which place all kinds of reports are coming with regard to their condition and treatment, which have given rise to a state of things approximating to rebellion? I put it to the right hon. Gentleman as a matter of policy that this would be infinitely better. I could give cases, if time permitted, showing what has been done in these camps. Some of these women are the wives of well-to-do farmers whose husbands are on commando. Some of their husbands are in prison, and some of them are curious comments on the reports we get of great captures. In one case the husband is in prison, and he is an old man of something between seventy or eighty years of age, and subject to epileptic fits. This old man never fought at all, and he was never on commando, but he was arrested and sent to prison, and reported as one of our great captures. What an absurd thing it is to do things of that sort. I have case after case of women in these camps whose husbands have been sent to Ceylon, Green Point, or St. Helena as prisoners of war, and who never fought at all against us. They include old men between seventy and eighty years of age, and the women are thrown on our hands while these men are kept as prisoners of war. The whole country is disturbed and denuded in this way, and that is the state of things with which we are confronted. I hear it stated very often that to feed these women and children at all as long as their husbands are fighting against us is an illustration of our generosity. Really, let us look at the circumstances. We set to work clearing the country. I have one case here where the first thing we did was to take over the whole of the cattle in stock from the farm. Then we destroyed every bag of mealies, and afterwards fired the house, burning the furniture and everything else in it. Thus we deprive these poor women and children of everything, and then we take them to the camps. Is it really suggested, under these conditions, when you deprive these women and children of the last crust, that it is an instance of great generosity on our part that we herd them

together into camps, giving them food of this character, and keeping them in such a state that hundreds of children die off every month? To put that forward as an illustration of our magnanimity is to show that we have not grasped the situation at all. After what we have done we are bound to keep these women and children.

I say that this policy which has been adopted is a perfectly novel method of warfare. It is all very well to say that we are simply doing what other countries have done before us. The only precedent for what we have done that I know of is that of Spain and Cuba before the American occupation. We are following that precedent, and President M'Kinley in his appeal to the American people described the system pursued in Cuba in terms which are identical with the system we are pursuing in South Africa, and he gave an accurate description of what the condition of things would necessarily be. This is what is going on. We cleared the country and denuded it, and we left nothing for these poor women and children to live upon. We herded them together in camps, and, after doing all this, I say that it is our bounden duty to keep them. I should be very sorry to make this a mere party question. [Cries of "Oh."] Well, why should it be a party question? Surely the protection and feeding of children who are brought under our protection, and who are our fellow-subjects according to our own theory, ought not to be a party question. It has nothing to do with the origin of the war or the policy of the war. Assuming the policy of the war to be perfectly right, assuming it to be a perfectly just and necessary war, surely it does not follow that we ought to pursue a policy of extermination against children in South Africa. The worst of this method of proceeding is that the burden of it is falling not upon the men on the field, but upon the weak and innocent who are outside.

Why should the children be punished? Assume that President Kruger and his counsellors, assume that the Volksraad and the leaders of the people there, and all the men in the commandoes, are responsible for all this business in Africa, does it follow that these children should be punished for the sins of their fathers? I really would appeal to the humanity of the House, and I would appeal to policy in this matter.

I cannot discuss the policy of the reconcentrado camps, but let us take it for granted that it is a wise step to form these camps; would it not have been better to give more time to provide more shelter and to see that there was better food, more of it, more suitable food, and plenty of clothing? What will happen as the result of all this mortality among the children? The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the one thing to do was to finish the war. It is not so. If once we have annexed this country we want to make loyal British subjects of the people. Is this the way to do it? Brave men will forget injuries to themselves much more readily than they will insults, indignities, and wrongs to their women and children. I have looked through a mass of evidence given by those poor women in the camps, and one and all have indicated that there was great readiness amongst the well-to do people, especially in the Orange Free State, to submit to British rule. There were a good many of them who felt that they had made their protest, and they would have accepted it. There is one case

given of a man of English blood. A cousin of his fought at Magersfontein on the other side. I believe he is in the Black Watch. That man had been a burgher in the Orange River Colony. A good many of the burghers there and in the Transvaal are of British blood. He was prepared to submit. On coming home to Jacobsdaal, what did he find there? He found his home had been burned by the British. There was a fight going on at Jacobsdaal. The wife did not take part in it. Her husband was with the commando. They burned her out of her home and left her with her little children there. After a fortnight she was taken to some camp. The husband found his home a blackened ruin, and his children beggared. He said, "I came home to submit; but now, never." Hon. Members can understand this better when they are thinking of Englishmen. Is not that what you would expect from an Englishman? He comes home and finds this condition of things for no harm that he has done. He was bound as a loyal subject of the State to fight. He did his best as a brave man, and having done his best he was prepared to surrender.

*MR. SPEAKER: This is a matter that cannot be discussed on the motion now before the House. The hon. Member obtained leave to discuss the condition of the camps of detention in South Africa and the alarming rate of mortality among women and children contained therein. I think references to how their presence in camps came about cannot be made. The hon. Member cannot discuss cases of farm burning or the way in which the war is being carried on.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: This is one of the cases in a refugee camp.

*MR. SPEAKER: That reason would involve the discussion probably of a great deal of the war.

MR. LLOYD-GEORGE: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I bow at once to your ruling. I give that as an illustration, and what I want to point out is that this is the very worst policy we can possibly pursue. It is our interest to treat women and children well. The men are our enemies. We are fighting them, but we are bound to fight them according to the rules of civilised nations, and by every rule of every civilised nation it is recognised that women and children are non-combatants. We are bound to treat them as neutrals, whatever their feelings and whatever their sympathies, and, of course, their sympathies must be with their own people. We are bound to treat them in the best possible way. I want to point out to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, when I quote this case, that he is going about the settlement of this question in the very worst way. When I say "him," I take him as the Minister responsible for this state of things. I would not imagine for a moment that he is directly and personally responsible for the condition of affairs in South Africa. When children are being treated in this way and dying, we are simply ranging the deepest passions of the human heart against British rule in Africa. The love of men for their children, for their home, for their country, and for humanity; we are ranging all these passions against settled government under the British flag in Africa. It will always be remembered that this is the way British rule started there, and that this is the method by which it was brought about. I will not talk about the probabilities of risings in the future, but if you want to provide material for them it is to be found in the

condition of these camps. I am making no attack upon the troops or the officers in the field, or Lord Kitchener, whose hands are full. This is a question of policy. It is a question the right hon. Gentleman ought to take upon himself. This policy has desolated the country. It has left these poor people beggared. They have come and sought the protection of the British flag, and I say it ought not to be dishonoured by allowing women and children to starve in such places.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS (Nottinghamshire, Rushcliffe): I rise to second the motion which has been made, and in doing so I would say that a motion for the adjournment of the House is not a very convenient way of discussing this or any other question. But as matters stand it is the only method open to us. It has been my lot during this session to ask a large number of questions with respect to these camps, and I can assure anyone who does me the honour to listen to me that my sole and single object in asking these questions has been to get at the truth. I do not think that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, who has shown anxiety to answer to the full those questions according to the information in his possession, will find any fault with questions on this matter. Indeed, I shall be very much surprised if he finds any fault with this motion for adjournment, because

if he has a case we are giving him an opportunity of placing it before the House. The only fault I have to find with the right hon. Gentleman is that he has not insisted upon those responsible in South Africa giving him, a little earlier, full and accurate information. The House is, indeed, discussing a very grave and serious matter. The figures read to us this afternoon prove that. If I mistake not, there are not far short of 60,000 of those whom the Government call our fellow subjects interned in these camps, for the most part surrounded by barbed wire fences, with British sentries walking round, and, for the most part, unable to get out, a large majority of them being women and children. There is no greater delusion in the mind of any man than to apply the term "refugee" to these camps. They are not refugee camps. They are camps of concentration, formed by the military as the result of military operations in the field. The right hon. Gentleman ventured to say earlier in the session that the people in these camps were not prisoners of war, and that those who came might go. These are his words. He never gave the House more inaccurate information than that. When a camp was formed in Cape Colony Mr. Sauer, who has been one of the Ministers of the Crown a good many times in Cape Colony, and probably will be again, did his best to get from the camp those who had plenty of persons outside the camp in good position who were willing to take them and treat them as their guests. I have his permission to read this letter. He says;

"Permission to leave the camp is absolutely refused. Shortly after the women taken to Port Elizabeth were placed in camp guarded by armed soldiers, I applied for the release of a number of these women whom friends and relations in Cape Colony had offered to take care of and provide for. I asked the Attorney General (Innes) to lay the request before the military. He did so, but the request was not granted."

My information regarding these camps is derived from personal interviews with people who have come home, more especially my relative Mr. Rowntree, formerly

Member of this House for Scarborough, who went out at my request in December last and returned

home in April. The idea that these people are inside these camps at their own request is an absolute and entire fallacy. It arises from the military devastation of the country. Even Sir Alfred Milner; now Lord Milner; I was glad to see, in a despatch which was more of a leading article than a despatch as it contained more argument than information, said;

"I am glad to think that this measure "

;that is, the devastation of the country;

"is very seldom, if ever, resorted to."

But Lord Kitchener told the people whom he called together in the market square at Pretoria that;

"it is essential that the country should be cleared; our forces are compelled to denude the country of everything movable."

I am not going to discuss the policy at the moment, but merely to state the facts. How do these people reach the camps? The pictures drawn by those who have shared in the journeys to and the life in these camps are terrible. Hundreds and thousands of women and children sat in open trucks for twenty-four, forty-eight, and even seventy-two hours; pent up like the passengers in the old third-class carriages in this country which men of my age can remember forty-five years ago.

They were not allowed to leave these trucks. At more than one station what happened when these trains came in? The children were wailing; not crying; they had lost the power to cry; they were wailing with hunger. Their mothers were trying to leave the train to get provisions for them, but they were forced back into the trucks at the point of British bayonets. The very soldiers were so heart-broken and grieved by what they saw that they distributed their own rations among the women and children; a tribute to the humanity of the British soldier, a humanity which I acknowledge is exhibited on those benches opposite as fully as on these in many instances. Do not think I am making this, a political matter. It is too high and sacred to be dragged into politics. These trains arrived after these long journeys at the camps. I will not trouble the House with many quotations, but I must give

one from Mr. Rowntree, What he says is this;

"In one tent news was brought us that more prisoners were coming."

They do not talk there about refugees.

"Their quick eyes caught them detraining when I could distinguish nothing at all."

I am told that the eyesight of these Boers is of two miles greater radius than that of the British soldiers.

"A few soldiers first, who looked good-natured and as if they did not greatly relish their work; then a long procession, broken often into clumps. They were chiefly mothers and children, many babies in arms, many clutching at gown or hand. Most of them were weary, sad, and grave, a look of destitution imprinted on faces and clothing alike. All, down to the infants, had some little thing; presumably the most precious and necessary possession; clasped in one hand. A water-bottle, a kettle, a bundle (Small) of clothing, a bag with a few

provisions (rare). One lone woman was cherishing a cat. One old woman came along in a ricksha, the rest were all on foot. One little lad of seven or eight was so tired that he laid down twice in the grass and was made to go on. They had no umbrellas against the sun. Their head-dresses were mostly dark voluminous hoods. The general effect was very sombre, and infinitely sad; two or three I saw in tears, and I had to move away by myself for a time."

That picture might be multiplied by the dozen.

The right hon. Gentleman told us expressly the other day that these people were not prisoners of war. They are British subjects in the eyes of the Government. Surely the responsibility on us is great and terrible to see that the conditions of their environment are healthy and decent under the circumstances. What are the actual conditions? You have these vast batches of humanity swept into these camps; and let the House remember that you have among them all sorts and conditions of people. You have what you might have if you swept an area of a few acres of Chelsea or other portions of London; persons who have been accustomed to live; I speak from knowledge; in great luxury, delicate children who have been accustomed to have all their wants supplied, along with persons of considerable poverty, accustomed to endure hardships. I am told, and I believe, that in the majority of the camps the shelter is very deficient indeed. It is deficient both against the South African heat and specially against the South African winter. The overcrowding in some of the tents has been something terrible. If we were not discussing this matter we should be probably discussing the Factory and Workshops Acts Amendment Bill. Now, we have taken the very greatest possible security within the last thirty or forty years that factories and schools should be provided with an adequate number of cubic feet of air. But I have been told by those who have been in these tents that the only description which can be applied to them is that they are like the Black Hole of Calcutta. As to the food, I have gone through the rations, which from the point of view of women and children are not at all satisfactory. As to the differentiation of rations between those whose husbands and fathers have surrendered and those whose relatives are still on commando, I will say that a more diabolical arrangement was never entered into by any civilised nation. I acquit the right hon. Gentleman of being responsible for this. I go further. I acquit the Government. Curiously enough, I do not see the Colonial Secretary present. When we are discussing one of the many fruits of the policy of the Secretary for the Colonies he always absents himself from the House. I acquit the Government of responsibility for what I call this diabolical arrangement, and I was delighted when I heard the right hon. Gentleman get up and say that this thing was at an end. But still the food is insufficient and bad, and the matter requires looking into at once. Then there is the water supply; it has, in many cases, been extremely bad, extremely impure, and extremely insufficient. There have been camps in which for weeks there has not been; I almost half smile when I mention it; a particle of soap, although there are thousands of women and children in these camps. We know what an apparently small matter like that really means. Then in regard to cooking; the means of firing and cooking have been entirely insufficient. The furniture in those tents, the household utensils

and implements, have also been deficient. Some of my informants tell me that there were scores and hundreds of women unable to get a needle and thread. Think what that means! I turn to a more serious grievance. Births are taking place in these camps, and there has been insufficient medical attendance in the hour of woman's greatest need. There have been deaths, but I will not dwell upon or emphasise the Returns; the awful Returns of mortality. I daresay the right hon. Gentleman will get up and endeavour to show that matters are improving. It may well be so, but let us have the full facts as to mortality month, by month. I ask him to lay on the Table of the House a schedule of the actual deaths in each of these camps. He told me a good many weeks ago that he had inquired for Returns to be presented, to the House. Let us have the actual figures. It would be very easy to place them in the shape of a Return, which I hope he will consent to have laid on the Table of the House. Again, the nursing and the hospital accommodation leave a great deal to be desired. I turn now to what I call the social aspect of the matter. Here are these 60,000 people, more or less, going to rest, but many of them not to bed, every night knowing that they are practically in a prison, and waiting every morning to meet another long, weary day. What provision is there for their occupation? They come into these camps naturally brooding over their wrongs; wrongs with which we can sympathise; wrongs against which we ourselves would fight to the death. What provision is being made for the education of the children? I am aware that something is being done, but not very much. Again, what provision is made for religious services? We open our proceedings every afternoon with a recognition of our common Christianity. What access has been, allowed to the camps to ministers of religion? What is done on the Sundays for religious services?

I hope, Sir, that the right hon. Gentleman will give us some information on these points. This is not a passing matter. These people are there day by day, week after week, month after month, and Heaven alone knows how soon these things will come to an end. I am quite sure there is not a man on the Treasury Bench who will make a prophecy on that. We are responsible in the sight of God and man for these people, who are British subjects. It is pitiful to read the letter of the wife of the British general at Pretoria appealing to the people of the American Republic for help for these women and children. We ought not to have allowed such a letter to be written. All honour to that good woman, but we ought not to have allowed that letter to have gone across the Atlantic when we are voting hundreds of millions sterling for prosecuting this war. But that good woman's heart was wrung at the scenes of misery in the camps. It is a slur upon us, upon the British House of Commons, upon the British Government, that that letter should be necessary. Our honour is concerned. I have endeavoured, and I hope I have succeeded, in avoiding any political asperity in my remarks. I would not have risen to second this motion unless I had, what I venture to term, the humanitarian aspect of the question mainly in my mind. It is on that ground that I appeal to the right hon. Gentleman. I ask him to give us full information and let us have all the facts and figures; but, above all, I ask him that duly accredited persons from this

country, ladies of the type of Miss Florence Nightingale, shall have free access to these camps, and that the British public will be able to send whatever they may desire under proper safeguards. I received this afternoon, and I was very thankful to get it, a letter from a lady now in South Africa who spoke in the highest terms of the facilities which Sir Hely Hutchinson had given her to visit some of these camps. I hope that is the beginning of a new departure, and that in future accredited ladies will not be refused access to these camps. I acknowledge at once the manner in which Sir Hely Hutchinson has acted. The lady in question, by the way, is not of my own political way of thinking. She went out to South Africa not to criticise the Government, but to do what she could to alleviate distress. War is a terrible thing. The people of this country are now finding it out. It may be that among those who do me the honour to listen to me there are some who have suffered family bereavements in this terrible war.

Towards all such

our sympathies go out. But I would ask, in the name of our common Christianity, that the Government should at once take such steps as will alleviate the sufferings and improve the condition of the women and children in the camps in South Africa.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."; (Mr. Lloyd-George.)

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guild-ford): I do not suppose that any Member who has listened to the hon. Member who has just sat down doubts for a moment his real and earnest belief in the case which he has put before the House. But the hon. Member for Carnarvon in introducing this question asked very pertinently why this should be a party question. I confess I thought his own action in the matter and the manner in which this subject has been introduced into the House to-night gave some answer to the question which he himself asked. This question is brought before the House as a definite matter of urgent public importance; so urgent that no notice can be given to the Government that such a question is going to be raised; [An HON. MEMBER: Blocking motion]; this, curiously enough, being the third Parliamentary Government night on which a definite matter of urgent public importance has been found to be brought forward to delay the progress of public business. I submit that under those circumstances there does seem to me to have been a lack of precaution in avoiding the element of party which the hon. Member himself might on reconsideration discover in his own motion. When I speak of notice I say again, as I have said before in this House, that I am ready at all times to answer for any subject connected with the war for which Lord Kitchener or the authorities can be called in question; but if the House of Commons desires to have anything except a partial and a hurried consideration, on the spur of the moment, of the matters brought before us; brought before us by elaborate speeches with long notes by hon. Members opposite; if the object is not to snatch an argument unawares or to snatch a division unawares, then there can be no objection, upon a matter of great public importance, to giving some notice to the Government of intention to bring it forward. And there is another point upon which I must dwell for one moment. If these questions are

to be brought forward from a purely humanitarian and patriotic standpoint, I think they ought not to be accompanied by these attacks which were made by the hon. Member for Carnarvon upon the general humanity with which the war has been carried on. I resent these attacks. I resent them because the mistakes of the war in that respect have been an excess of confidence in the advantage which humanity would give us in dealing with the Boers throughout the campaign. Lord Roberts began by making what has since been found to be a great blunder; that was, by allowing Boers on parole in the Orange Free State to go back to their farms. That piece of humanity has, no doubt, cost us a considerable prolongation of the war. These men went back to their farms, and they did not keep their parole. Every farmhouse became a fresh recruiting agency for the enemy, and after the men had gone back on commando the farmhouses occupied by the women became depots from which they got supplies and stores and from which they obtained information of the movements of our troops. It was absolutely necessary to put a stop to those proceedings. It was a necessity which every general would have felt, and which if he had not recognised he would have been greatly wanting in his duty. Then what occurred? Lord Roberts in several instances endeavoured to get the Boer generals to look after their own women and children. If they had been willing, as they were able, when they retired before us; they had the line of railway; to provide for their women and children, many of those difficulties which are now complained of would never have occurred; but they persistently threw on us the charge of looking after their women and children; they traded on our humanity in the matter.

*MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid I must stop the right hon. Gentleman when he goes into the military policy

which led to these women and children being in the camps. The question for discussion is the condition of the camps and the treatment of the women and children there.

MR. BRODRICK: Certainly, Sir, I desire to speak entirely within the limits of your ruling; but my desire is to show that a large number of those individuals who are now in the camps would not be there if we could have induced the enemy to recognise their own responsibilities in the matter. I would say that a large number of these refugees are now in camp, not owing to any wish of the Government, but owing to the action of their own friends. Then we have gone a step further, and we have in camp a certain number who have come voluntarily, because they wanted food and shelter, and we have a certain number who are there because the country had to be cleared. All those put upon us a burden which it was hoped by the enemy we should not be able to bear, but which we are endeavouring to bear. If hon. Members could realise what it is in a country like this, with every convenience, to keep 63,000 persons properly sheltered and fed, even with every opportunity and every source of supply, they would have some conception of what the difficulty is in a country fed by single lines of railway, along which most of the food has to be brought from the base, and where there are 250,000 soldiers whom it is our first duty to supply. When I am told that the case of these individuals is not what we should wish it to be, I entirely agree. It cannot be so, and it will not be so. When you have a country

in a state of war you will have to hear of sufferings you do not like to hear of. So you would if you went into our own camps to-night and saw what men who are on trek are enduring at this moment, in spite of every provision we have there and every arrangement we can make for them. The only question between the House and the Government can be if you challenge our policy in keeping these women in camp. Then we are willing to answer for it, for we know well that from the moment we begin to scatter these people broadcast throughout the country one of two things will happen; either a considerable number of persons will starve, and there will be material for diatribes even more violent than those we have heard in this House, or you will have again those difficulties to encounter of your own troops finding themselves at every moment coming across depots made for the enemy, leading without doubt to the prolongation of the war. We are not willing to face either of these contingencies. It is urged that we have not done sufficient to make these camps sanitary, and to preserve human life. I deny it altogether. It is said that they are going from bad to worse. Those who have been out there, and who have come to see me since they came back, having gone out there to distribute goods and luxuries beyond actual necessities among the women and children in the camps, have, I think, in every single case, assured me that things, so far from going from bad to worse, have been steadily ameliorating.

The camps were begun at a peculiarly unfortunate time. In the month of January, shortly after they were established, owing to the incursion of De Wet into Cape Colony, which resulted in the lines being cut in the rear, there was the greatest difficulty both in supplying the troops and supplying the camps; but since they have been established every attempt has been made to get up shelter, to supply sanitary conveniences, to see that proper medical appliances are within their reach. As I told the hon. Member this afternoon, in the camp of Johannesburg there has been undoubtedly a severe epidemic. I will go further. I say that a great deal of that epidemic is, so far as my information goes, due to the conduct, unluckily, of the Boer women themselves who are there. They find it very difficult to make up their minds to accept the ordinary medical arrangements for separation and the ordinary precautions which are taken against an epidemic of that character. They will not accept the rule as to dieting patients. An instance has come to my knowledge to-day in a private letter. A woman who had a child suffering from dysentery in the camp gave that child; although proper food was there and was ordered by the doctor; a raw carrot, and the child died in four hours. That is only one of many instances in which it has been found impossible to get women who have not been accustomed to life in camp to recognise that the first law for the preservation of life and health, when an epidemic is raging, is to obey the precautions the doctor enjoins. With regard to the other camps, I have to complain a little that this motion is put forward so hurriedly. It was only on Friday that I received notice that a question on the subject was to be asked, and I have not yet received from Lord Kitchener the most recent statistics as to the mortality during the month of May. These I hope to receive within the next two or three days. But, generally speaking, our principle has been to have the food which is given

examined. There may, and there must, be instances over so large an area when the food cannot always be given in the best condition, but, generally speaking, it is good and sound. I have heard it said this evening that the food is the food of criminals. It is the food that is given to the British soldier. You cannot give luxurious food under circumstances such as prevail at this moment in the Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. The hon. Member asked me a question as to religious ministrations in these camps, and I specially inquired into that matter. There has been an attempt in each camp to provide schools of instruction, and I understand from Lord Kitchener that arrangements have been made for religious ministrations. Attempts have been made to set up various forms of labour in order to occupy the inmates of the camps, and many attempts have been made to provide amusements, so as to prevent the inmates from suffering from dejection and despondency. But when the hon. Member asks that there should be free access to the camps, we enter on a different category. The opinion of Lord Kitchener, which is shared by Lord Milner and by His Majesty's Government, is that it is highly desirable that in each locality there should be a local committee formed, on which there might be Dutch representatives and ministers of religion, and which, in conjunction with the commandant, will have the opportunity of organising to some extent amusements or other means of occupation in the camps. The committee will also be able to distribute such things as may be sent

out from this country or given by charitable people for the relief of inmates. Local effort of that kind has the entire concurrence of the Government. But if by free access from here is meant the sending out of individuals who, however little they may desire it, are to become centres of agitation and trouble, then we are opposed to that form of intervention. We do not want the men who have been spreading in Cape Colony blood-curdling pamphlets, highly-coloured statements, and untrue narratives, which have accentuated the bitterness of the war, to intervene in order to make still more difficult a difficult situation. Through these local committees philanthropy will have full scope; and upon this point the hon. Gentleman has made a personal appeal to me and to the Government not to be backward in taking up a fresh position. Our position throughout the matter has been this.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS: I do not quite understand the right hon. Gentleman. I did not ask the Government to take up a fresh position; that would be a political matter, and I did not deal with the policy of the Government in this matter.

MR. BRODRICK: I understood the hon. Gentleman to suggest that it was a matter of policy; that we ought to intervene.

*MR. JOHN ELLIS: I did not say a word about the policy.

MR. BRODRICK: I only spoke from recollection, but;

*MR. JOHN ELLIS: I have my own opinion as to the policy of the Government in the matter, but I did not state it.

MR. BRODRICK: We cannot scatter these individuals over the colony again. We are in communication with Lord Kitchener as to those who can find homes for themselves where they can be maintained. To that extent we shall be only too glad to rid ourselves of the responsibility of looking after them. We cannot

undertake that life in the camps shall be otherwise than simply healthful, as far as we can secure that, and we shall also, as far as we can, surround them with

proper medical and other attentions. But the one thing which can help these camps is the cessation of the war.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS (Carnarvonshire, Eifion): It rests with you.

MR. BRODRICK: The cessation of the war will not be accelerated by speeches such as were made by the hon. Member who has just interrupted me, who has given every encouragement;

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Pooh!

MR. BRODRICK: The hon. Member may not have the manners I should desire, and he is not chary of what he says himself either about his opponents-or about British soldiers in the field.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: I challenge the right hon. Gentleman to prove any inaccuracy except;[Laughter.] Everything I said was true, and was admitted by the right hon. Gentleman, except that it was of the Kaffrarians and Brabant's Horse, and not of the Australian Horse.

MR. BRODRICK: I do not wish to pursue the subject, but before I leave it I desire to say that the hon. Member charged a body of men with mutiny who had never mutinied.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: I claim the right to reply to that statement, and to point out that that was an error, which I corrected before the right hon. Gentleman. I apologised to the Australians, and named the persons who were responsible.

*THE DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. J. W. LOWTHER, Cumberland, Penrith, who had taken the Chair during the temporary absence of the Speaker): I fear that the discussion is rather disorderly.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Then he ought not to have begun it.

*THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: It was the hon. Member himself who first interrupted the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. BRODRICK: My past experience of the hon. Member teaches me that he is very little careful of what he says about others. The hon. Member interrupts me, and I think I am entitled to reply to what he says. I wish hon. Members would be a little more careful in the language which they use, for expressions used in this House come back to me from South Africa by every mail. Our one desire is that there may be restored that condition of peace in the Transvaal which will enable these women to go back to their homes. [An HON. MEMBER: Never, never!] We will do what we can to preserve them from unnecessary suffering, whether they come to us of their own accord, or through our exercise of force, or through the neglect of their own people. More than that we cannot say. I believe there is a universal feeling among those who have gone out that the desire of the commandants of the camps is to exercise all the humanity they can. But humanity has its limits in this one respect. We are not going, either by releasing these people in large numbers or by any sign of faltering in our policy, which is to pursue this war to its conclusion, to hang a burden on the backs of the military authorities in South Africa, or to take any other step which would lead to the prolongation of the war.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): The right hon. Gentleman made a complaint, at the beginning of his speech, of the way in which this matter has been brought before the House, and he complained especially that there had been no opportunity for him to prepare the facts for the argument he would have to use. There was an interjection at that point which I think showed that there was perfect justification for the action of my hon. friend in not giving any public, or even semi-public, notice of his intention. The justification is simply this; that if any such notice had been given, there would have been immediately put down a "blocking" notice, which would have prevented this motion from being brought forward.

MR. BRODRICK: Notice might have been given me this morning.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN: The right hon. Gentleman has only to look at the Notice Paper and he will see there are three subjects; one of them of very small importance, but the other two of very large importance; which the House of Commons is absolutely debarred from discussing by notices of motion so transparent in their purpose, and so shadowy and useless in themselves, that they ought not to be allowed to remain for that purpose on the Notice Paper any longer. There is the question of farm burning. No one can say a word upon it, because the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Wigtonshire wishes to call the attention of the House to the Return on farm-burning in South Africa, and to move a resolution. There is the question of press censorship, and the nature of the information which is vouchsafed to the people of this country with regard to all that is being done in their name; but the hon. Member for North Ayrshire is anxious to call the attention of the House, at some unknown distant date, to the communication of news from South Africa and to the exercise of the censorship, and to move a resolution. The other day a comparatively trifling incident occurred. Two Boer prisoners attempted to escape, were caught, tried, and punished. That may have been right or wrong; I am not speaking as to that now; but immediately the conscience or the interest of the hon. Member for a division of Sussex is so exercised that he also wishes to call the attention of the House to this incident, and to move a resolution. Why, Sir, the farce is transparent. I wonder how long the House of Commons is going to endure this. It may, perhaps, excite some strange feeling amongst us to know that these camps of Boer women and children are surrounded by fences of barbed wire, but there is a barbed wire fence around the House of Commons, which prevents us exercising the ordinary rights of speech which belong to this Assembly.

So much, Sir, for the motion which has been made. The whole question is two-fold, and I confess, a once, that the part to which my hon. friend confines the attention of the House, although eminently urgent and deserving of attention, cannot, I think, be discussed without reference to the other portion, and that other portion

we are precluded from discussing. What I object to is the whole policy of concentration, the whole policy of destroying the homes of women and children, driving them in circumstances of considerable cruelty, certainly of unintentional cruelty, into these camps. Under the very natural and proper ruling of the Speaker we cannot discuss the whole of that side of the question,

and what we have, therefore, to speak on is merely the condition of those camps. Now, Sir, I have not seen the report of Mr. Rowntree, long a respected Member of this House, but I am acquainted with the reports of the gallant and plucky lady who went out to South Africa in order to do what benefit she could to these unfortunate people; and I wish to say this. I am confirmed in my belief in the accuracy of her reports because of their most remarkable fairness. She brings no accusation, and I am sure that none of us would do so; at least, speaking for myself, I have never said a word that would imply cruelty or even indifference on the part of officers or men in the British Army. It is the whole system which they have to carry out that I consider, to use a word which I have already applied to it, barbarous. There are no people in the world who feel that barbarity more than the unfortunate men whose duty it is to enforce that system. But there can be no question that much of what the right hon. Gentleman said is well founded when he assured the House that every effort has been made by the commandants of these camps in most cases to alleviate the sufferings of the unfortunate people entrusted to their care under difficulties of a perfectly overwhelming character. The numbers coming in were so great as to swamp all the preparations that had been made. This lady went to a camp, and after spending a little time there was satisfied that things were a little better. She goes back after a few weeks, and finds that perhaps 2,000 more of these so-called refugees have been brought into the camp and therefore the whole thing is upset, and the difficulties are worse than ever. That is the sort of hopeless task that these unfortunate British officers have put upon them; to undertake to provide the necessaries of life for those unfortunate people.

One word I wish to say which I omitted to say, and which is recalled to me by the use of the word "refugee." I believe that two pleas used have very little foundation. The first is that these are refugees who have fled from starvation, and perhaps fear of worse evils, to go into the camps; and the other plea is that they have had to go there or to be taken there in order to escape from the vindictiveness of the native population. I have not seen a single authenticated case of women and children in any farm, however outlying or remote and undefended, suffering anything from the natives. On the contrary; and I do not know whether it has struck hon. Members as it has struck me; all through these many months the natives have stood loyal and closely by the Boers, who have been their nearest neighbours. Nor is that all; at any rate, I have not heard of any case where the women have received anything but the most humane assistance from the natives. There is no doubt at all that the state of things in the camps is perfectly horrible, and I trust that these reports will be published, so that the British people may know the state of things.

After all, what we have to do is to consider what is to be done with these people now that they are there. The right hon. Gentleman says that we cannot break them up and disperse them and have the women starving all over the country. No one proposes that. There are two classes of women. There are those who have relatives and friends to whose houses they could go in Cape Colony, who would receive them and treat them well. When they have asked for that permission it has been refused. There is another class of women who say, "Let me and my

children go back to my farm, and, even if there be only scorched walls, I would be able to scrape, with the help of those in the neighbourhood I know, a few vegetables or something to keep us alive. Only take us out of this place in which we are." Surely that, at least, could be done. And with regard to those who must remain, who have been brought there in a ruined and starving condition; with regard to them I am not at all satisfied or disposed to be content with this idea of a local committee which is to look after them. Where are the materials in the greater part of these localities for these local committees? What I would urge upon the Government is to send out a staff of nurses and competent civilian medical men. In some of these camps there is hardly any medical assistance at all, and in others there are only one or two Army doctors. I do not wish to speak disrespectfully of Army doctors, but the diseases of women and children are not quite the branch of the profession with which they are most accustomed to deal, and I know that in many cases there has been really no competent medical advice to be obtained on the spot. As to nursing, this gallant lady, of whose report we have been speaking, herself in two or three camps organised a sort of scratch team of nurses of the younger Boer women, and accomplished a great amount of good. What is the objection to sending a certain number of skilled doctors and, above all, of nurses in order to do what is necessary both for the sanitation and the healing of the inhabitants of these camps? The right hon. Gentleman says that we do not want people to go in there to stir up agitation. [Cheers.] Certainly not. The hon. Gentlemen who cheer, therefore, think you cannot find in the United Kingdom a dozen or twenty doctors and perhaps a score or a hundred of nurses who can be trusted to go into these camps without spreading unnecessary political agitation. I think better of both doctors and nurses. I am quite certain that this is the course which humanity dictates, and it is the only course which will convince these unhappy women and children, so far as they can realise the circumstances, that the British people really care for them and desire to save them from unnecessary pain and suffering. The right hon. Gentleman talks of closing the war, of "bringing it to a conclusion." That is the desire of everyone, but the last way to bring it to a conclusion is by doing what has been done for the last two or three months. Will not the view naturally adopted be; of course, I do not suppose for a moment that it was the intention of His Majesty's Government; but are we not open to having it said that because we cannot effectively deal with the men we are trying to get hold of the women? Yes, and that is the view taken by the women of it. They say, "You bring us here, and you think that by inflicting hardships upon us and our children you will induce us to bring pressure to bear upon our husbands." But they answer in the well-known words of Lord Chatham, which have already been quoted to-night, "Never, never, never." Is this the way to train up these people to be kindly, contented, and friendly fellow citizens, imposing upon them sufferings which by a little foresight might have been avoided? The best way of avoiding it would have been to have left them in their own homes, but if they must be deported, surely ample provision should be made beforehand; and as that was not done, let us make up for past

remissness. Let the Government send out not only sufficient stores, if they are wanting, but, above all, a number of capable men and women who will teach these people the laws of health, which the right hon. Gentleman says they are inclined to transgress, and thus induce a better state of things than that which has been brought before us.

*MR. C. P. SCOTT (Lancashire, Leigh): We are told that all these things of which we have heard are part of the terrible realities of war and cannot be avoided; that nothing is being done which cannot be defended or which is contrary to humanity. We are also told that these things may be very dreadful, but if the war is to be brought to an end they are necessary. I think it will be admitted, however, that there are some things which we have not a right to do even in order to shorten somewhat the duration of the war. I do not think we can for a moment admit that women and children ought to be swept up in this way and taken from their homes unless we have some means of providing for them. It cannot be contended that we are justified for any purpose whatever in bringing these women and children into a condition in which they are bound to die or to undergo terrible sufferings. But, even granted that these measures are necessary; which I do not for a moment admit, for I think that even from a military point of view the whole proceedings are a mistake; we have to consider whether the Government are doing their best for these women. I

think it is perfectly obvious that in an immense number of cases they are not. We have heard a great deal to-night about the sufferings of these people, but I do not believe that either on this or the other side of the House hon. Members in the least degree realise the extent of the sufferings. I do not believe that any hon. Members can realise what it means for women and children to be living, a dozen of them together, lying on the bare ground, in a little bell tent with the thermometer at 100°; or 110°; with torrential rains and morning dews coming through and wetting everything inside. But even supposing we are bound to do this, then the question arises, Are we obliged, having brought the people there, to keep them there? That is a question which I think the Secretary of State for War has not sufficiently considered, and to which he certainly has given no satisfactory answer. We want to know why it is that these people are kept as prisoners in these camps. There have been practically none released. Some months ago there were two or three cases in which certain of the women were allowed to go to their friends. That, however, was stopped, and now we have the state of things that there are some 60,000 women and children, many of whom have friends elsewhere willing to receive them and to pay for their journey to them, kept in our hands as prisoners. I say that this is a disgrace, and if children die and women fall ill it is upon us that the responsibility lies, and upon the fair fame of this country lies the discredit. I hope we may hear more from the Secretary for War on this subject. He has given us a little hope to-night, and we were glad, at any rate, that we have obtained a little good from the debate, and that the right hon. Gentleman has promised to look into this matter for himself. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will go a good deal further. We were told at first that the women went into the camps voluntarily as refugees, but it is now admitted that they are prisoners. Some of them tried to run away, but

soldiers were sent to bring them back. We are entitled to ask that the women and children who are in the camps against their will, and who have relatives in Cape Colony willing to take them, should be allowed to leave. I am told if the women and children were allowed to do this a great majority of them would be provided for in Cape Colony. Further, we ask that the Secretary of State for War shall not on any consideration whatever add to the already enormous number of these refugees unless he can provide for them in a decent and humane manner, and also that he will, to the utmost of his power, endeavour to find homes for these people, or permit them to find homes for themselves in Cape Colony, where they can be kindly treated and taken care of. Unless these things are done, the responsibility for the terrible mortality that occurs will rest upon the right hon. Gentleman and the Government. It is all very well to say that it is only measles, but the constitutions of the children are utterly undermined and enfeebled to such an extent that they are unable to resist any illness which may attack them. This is a terrible state of things, and one which the House and the country cannot be satisfied with, and we have a right to appeal to the humanity of the Government to see that a remedy is found.

MR. HALDANE (Haddingtonshire): My hon. friend who has just sat down is, I think, justified at all events to this extent; that the facts to which he has alluded are facts to which the House of Commons ought to attend. The statistics as to the death-rate alone constitute a subject on which we might well spend some time in debate. While, however, I entirely sympathise with my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition in his objection to "blocking notices," my sympathy goes out also to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, who finds himself plunged into a debate of this kind without any notice. I think it would have been in the interests of the question itself if some intimation, however informal, had been conveyed to the right hon. Gentleman this morning that the topic was going to be discussed, in order that we might have had before us a full statement on what, to my mind, is a very grave subject; namely, the amount of mortality which has taken place in these camps. It is one of the infortunate circumstances connected with the discussion of all topics cognate to the war that they cannot be handled without the importation of a great amount of bias and feeling. With many of the statements made by the hon. Member for Carnarvon Boroughs and the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division probably we all agree. They hate the war; we hate the war. They hate these evils; we hate these evils. They would fain have an end put to the miseries which these unhappy women and children are undergoing; we all desire to see that done as quickly as possible. But I cannot help thinking that no useful purpose is served by bringing such phrases as "even Sir A. Milner" or the word "barbarous" in connection with military operations. These things do not tend to bring the war to an end. What is likely to have that result? Surely the inspiring not only of the Boers in South Africa, but also of the nations on the Continent, with a sense of our desire to be fair, at all events, in these matters. I do not blame people who differ strongly from me with regard to the war, but I cannot think that in discussions on specific matters of this kind it is well to travel over the line even a little and to introduce these

controversial questions. It must have the effect of strengthening the attitude of resistance of those opposed to us; if, indeed, that be possible.

The material question at issue is whether a case of neglect has been made out against the Government. If I thought that such a case had been made out, I should, without hesitation, vote for the motion, because a matter which concerns the weak, helpless, and defenceless is one which, above everything else, ought to enlist sympathy in this House. But the conclusion at which I have arrived, as regards not only this matter but many others connected with the war, is that a case has not been made out. There have been many blunders; some on the other side, such, for instance, as the permitting of large numbers of burghers to go on parole to their farms, a course of action which had no good result from any point of view. There have been policies in connection with farm-burning and other matters which enlightened opinion has probably agreed were mistaken. Blunders of that kind have been made, and they always will be made in a great military campaign, because of the want of organisation which it produces. Still, I see nothing to lead me to question the desire of everybody, from the generals in the field to His Majesty's Ministers, to conduct the warlike operations in South Africa with as much humanity and as little cruelty as possible. War is always a horrible and terrible thing; you will never make it otherwise than miserable; but, notwithstanding the many hardships which have resulted, I cannot see that His Majesty's Government have had brought home to them any neglect or oversight in this matter. The right hon. Gentleman told us of certain steps which, I understand, have been taken. He has to deal with a very large number of women and children. We are not in a position to discuss the question of concentration. Concentration is a most disagreeable necessity of war, if a necessity of war it be. But one has to consider whether it is a better or a worse alternative to something else. I cannot discuss the matter now, but before I pronounced against concentration I should like to know what other methods are open. I have listened in vain to the speeches on this side of the House for an alternative suggestion.

MR. BRYN ROBERTS: Stop the war.

MR. HALDANE: My hon. friend behind me, whose devotion to this cause no one will question, says "Stop the war." A great number of people on this side who wish to see the war stopped think that to stop it in the way that my hon. friend suggests would be the most disastrous thing that could happen. I have never shared the views of my hon. friend upon this matter. I have never had a doubt that the cause of this war was the policy adopted by President Kruger, and I have never had a doubt that the bringing of this war to a satisfactory conclusion can only be accomplished by the present policy of the Government. I think that in saying

this I am expressing the views of a large number of hon. Members on this side of the House. [Opposition cries of "Order, order," and Ministerial cheers.] I know that we shall not be allowed to enter into these matters now, but I must emphasise them, because time after time;

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): Has my hon. friend any right to discuss the opinions entertained on this side of the House in regard to the policy of this

war?

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has not a right to discuss upon the present motion the opinions on the war held by hon. Members of this House. I understand that the hon. Member only spoke about it for a very few moments, in consequence of an interruption.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N.): It is distinctly out of order.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I rise to a point of order; otherwise I should not have risen at all. I desire to ask you, Mr. Speaker, for my own information, whether in the course of this debate the hon. Gentleman is in order upon this motion in discussing the policy of Mr. Kruger and what led to the war, because, if he is, I shall be inclined to take part in the discussion.

*MR. SPEAKER: I did not understand that the hon. Member was doing anything of the kind. I hope he will not follow any line of argument of that character.

MR. HALDANE: I know that I should have been wholly out of order if I did that, and I had not the smallest intention of doing more than merely saying what I have already stated. I say that this matter has been discussed and colour has been brought into it, and my desire was to make it clear that I do not partake in that colouring.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: Then why did you bring Kruger in?

MR. HALDANE: I did it to make it perfectly clear that there is a difference between myself and some hon. friends of mine who sit on this side of the House.

MR. PIRIE: The strongest difference.

MR. HALDANE: The question which has been raised, I am aware, relates simply to what has been done in these camps, and not the policy of keeping the refugees there; and if that fact had been observed in the discussion we should have been spared a considerable amount of these interruptions. The right hon. Gentleman has informed us that instructions have been given to the military authorities to discontinue some of the practices complained of in these camps. In the first place, I am very glad that the differentiation between the kinds of food, which was a blunder, has been abolished, and I understand that there is now no difference between the food given to the children there, whether they belong to the Boers in the field or to the people who are not in actual warfare. In the second place, I gather that provision is being made for the instruction of the children. I trust that this policy of keeping the women and children in camps is not one which it is necessary to carry on for a long period. It is right that the provision for the instruction of these children is one which should be maintained. In the third place, as regards the question referred to by the hon. Member for Rushcliffe, I am not quite sure whether that is satisfactory, but I gather that the right hon. Gentleman is in sympathy with what the hon. Member for Rushcliffe desires in regard to the religious question, and that steps are being taken in that direction. As regards occupation, provision is being made for the refugees, and local committees have already been formed. Then there is the question of visiting. I cannot help thinking that too much stress is apt to be laid upon the danger of allowing relatives and friends, who may happen to come from other places, access to those whom they know in these camps. I think that, as far as is consistent

with our policy; and it is almost impossible for us to judge of the details 6,000 miles away; I should like to see every relaxation made in that direction. As regards sending these unfortunate people back to their homes, I understand the right hon. Gentleman is considering that as a practical matter. It is all very well to say that permission to leave has been refused. I notice that my hon. friend the Member for Carnarvon said that Mr. Rowntree; with whom I am personally acquainted, and who is a gentleman as honourable as any to be found in the length and breadth of England; had not been permitted to go to Bloemfontein.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: He never tried to get permission to go to Bloemfontein.

MR. HALDANE: He must have proceeded on mere hearsay in some of these matters.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: It was not so.

MR. HALDANE: It is difficult for such people as Mr. Rowntree to be certain at first hand, and I cannot help thinking that things have not been quite so bad in some particulars. I trust the right hon. Gentleman will develop this policy of endeavouring to make the lives of these people brighter and happier, and of allowing them to return to the homes which may be provided for them as soon as possible.

MR. JOHN ELLIS: These complaints were made by Sir Sauer in specific terms.

MR. HALDANE: But Mr. Sauer could not write letters on behalf of the women and children, and what has been alluded to must have been some general proposal. At any rate, now we know that this policy of allowing these people to return to their homes is being considered. Again I say that I am glad this matter has been raised and discussed upon this occasion. The subject is a very grave one. These death-rate statistics are

very serious, and I wish it had been possible to have had some more specific details than we have had to-night. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be able to reassure the House on these matters, and in sitting down I wish to repeat my emphatic conviction that everything will be done that can be done by the right hon. Gentleman, and by the distinguished soldiers in command of the military operations to alleviate the condition of these people. It is our duty in the House of Commons to be vigilant in these matters, and we have done right in being vigilant. I have yet to be convinced that there has been brought home to them any blameworthiness for a state of things which, if it is blameworthy, is blameworthy because of causes far deeper and reasons more far-reaching than any mere incidents that can happen in the course of a great military campaign.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: The hon. Gentleman who has just resumed his seat has, like other hon. Members of this House, no doubt the greatest sympathy with these unfortunate women and children whose case is now being considered. At the same time, I think there are a number of hon. Members who will agree with me that the tone and the trend of the speech of the hon. Member for Haddingtonshire is not calculated to urge the Government to relieve in any way the things which we complain of in regard to their conduct in South Africa. When a specific charge is made in this House that certain things are being done in South Africa which are a dishonour to the name of this country and to the very name of civilisation, the proper way to have these things altered is not to get up and express your utmost confidence that the case in regard to them has been

exaggerated, and to say that everything possible will be done, and no doubt has been done. I think if a remedy is looked for it will have to be sought rather in the tone adopted by the hon. Member for Carnarvon and the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division, who, in my opinion as an Irishman, are redeeming the very name and credit and honour of England by the action they are taking. The hon. Member

for Haddingtonshire said he regretted that this matter could not be discussed without having a heated tone imported into the debate. Nobody wants, in a serious case of this kind, where serious allegations are made, to have a heated discussion or to introduce anything at all in the shape of party recriminations; but I venture to say that whatever has been introduced into this debate of that character has largely been introduced by the hon. Member for Haddingtonshire himself, because instead of confining himself to the particular matters which were raised by the motion of the hon. Member for Carnarvon, to a large extent he went into the history of the commencement of this war. If the hon. Member did not want to introduce heat, why did he make the charge that President Kruger was responsible for this war knowing as he did the ruling which had been given, and the limits within which this debate had to be confined, there was no justification whatever for the hon. Member venturing the opinion that Mr. Kruger was to blame for this war, when he knew very well that you, Mr. Speaker, would not allow any subsequent speaker to go into the Causes which originated this war or into the conduct of Mr. Kruger. The hon. Member for Haddingtonshire was most anxious to say that he does not believe any cruelty is knowingly or willingly indulged in by those in authority in South Africa, and he is quite sure that there is not a single Member in this House who is not inclined to condemn cruelty and inconsiderate treatment to women and children in South Africa. I re-echo that opinion. As I understand the hon. Member for Carnarvonshire and the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division, they do not make specific charges against persons or individuals in South Africa. They do not charge hon. Gentlemen opposite who support this policy with being themselves individually in favour of what is complained of in their conduct toward these women and children. On the contrary, as far as my information goes, so far from charging those in immediate authority in South Africa, and certainly so far from charging the rank and file of the Army of the British Empire, it is quite the contrary.

But while we

make these complaints as to the treatment accorded to the women and children in these camps we say, at the same time, without the slightest fear of contradiction, that the rank and file of the British Army, if canvassed, would be found to be absolutely and utterly disgusted at the work they are called upon to do, and the deeds they have been called upon to perform, which is not the work they enlisted in the Army to carry out, and which is not the work of a soldier. I venture to say that to have armed sentries surrounding, the camps of defenceless and helpless, women and children in different parts of South Africa is not the work of soldiering in the Army, and it is repugnant to their feelings and disgraceful and discreditable to those who place such work upon them. Sir, we have had extraordinary instances of the want of consideration on the

part of those in authority many times since this war commenced, but nevertheless I do not charge individuals or persons; they are obliged to carry out the system, but I shall deliberately and absolutely, without the slightest fear of contradiction, and with the full responsibility which attaches to my words, so long as I am a Member of this House, denounce as barbarous, outrageous, scandalous, and disgraceful, the way in which these wretched, unfortunate and poor women and children have been treated in South Africa. [Ministerial cries of "Divide, divide."] You may cry "Divide," but you cannot alter the words I utter, and you cannot prevent me as a Member of this House saying to you, and to the world outside through the press, that your conduct in South Africa in connection with these women and children is conduct which would bring shame to the cheeks of the most savage and most barbarous people in existence. We sometimes hear wonder expressed why the war is still dragging on. We sometimes wonder, when the news of another engagement comes, why the Boers are still holding to their arms. I do not know what reasons may animate them in continuing this war, but I do say that in all probability the worst part of this war would have been now over, and hundreds of lives would have been saved, but for the treatment you have meted out to the wives and the daughters of these men who are now in the field against us. Therefore I am not surprised at the action of the Boers in continuing this struggle, and I say here that if I belonged to the race of Boers; and if I did I should be very proud of it; and if the faintest echo of the news of the treatment which has been accorded to poor Boer women and children in the refugee camps had reached my ears, it would steel my heart and make me determined, if nothing else affected me, to fight to the last against the flag and the country, and the people and the Government, which could sink so low as to attempt to make war upon helpless women and children in this way. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Haddingtonshire speaks softly of these matters. I say that the time has come for everyone in this House, whether he be from Scotland, England, Wales, or Ireland, who believes in humanity, honour, and civilisation, to raise his voice against this state of things. The speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition was a calm and moderate one, but it illustrates in this House what is going on outside, and it is that the masses of the people of England and Scotland are tired and sick at heart of these brutalities, and the Leader of the Opposition has echoed that feeling in his speech to-night. We are told that the Government will do their best to remedy this state of things, and we are told that we ought not to spring debates like this upon the House. That is all very well, but unless we do this how are we to get grievances removed? Are grievances removed by consulting the convenience of the Government, or by refraining from moving the adjournment, and sitting silent on these benches? No. I say that what has been done in South Africa; and I admit that something has been done; to mitigate the suffering of these unhappy women and children, is the direct result of action taken in this House. We know that there have been two scales of food; a full dinner and a full meal for the poor child whose father has pulled his flag down, and handed in his arms and surrendered to the British, and half a meal for the wretched little child in camp whose father still holds on to his rifle. Is that

making war in a British way? Is that making war in a way calculated to bring credit upon this nation? Is that carrying on war in the spirit in which it would have been carried on by the men who fought for England in days gone by? No. Such conduct as the starvation of poor women and children in order to make their able-bodied relatives surrender is a course of action the most discreditable, the most contemptible, and the most dastardly which I have ever heard of. No man can deny the truth of what I have said. [Ministerial cries of "Oh, oh!"] Do hon.

Members deny that at the commencement of these encampments there were two scales of food; that one scale was supplied to the women and children of the men who were not in arms against us, and that the lesser scale was supplied to the women and children of the men who were still on commando? [AN HON. MEMBER: I deny the whole tenour of the hon. Gentleman's speech. There was only a certain amount of food to go round, and that is the answer to his argument.] I do not ask the hon.

Gentleman opposite to approve of the whole tenour of my speech. If I thought for a moment that I should have the approval of the whole tenour of my speech from him and hon. Gentlemen sitting around him I should be ashamed. I do, however, ask him, can he deny the specific statement made that more food was given to the wives and children of those who had surrendered and less to the wives and children of those who were still in arms against us? His answer to this is one which has never been heard of from any other quarter of the House up till now.

He states that there was not food enough to go round, but I have not heard that argument advanced by the Secretary of State for War, or from anybody in authority. But, granted that it is true, what a curious coincidence it is that, when there is not enough to go round, the larger share shall be given to the women and children of those who have surrendered, and the smaller portion to the women and children of the men who are still on commando. That system did exist, and it cannot be denied. I am heartily glad, and so is every other man here, whether he be an Englishman, Scotchman, or Irishman, to know that that system has been abandoned; and

now I understand that the same food is given in equal quantities to all these wretched women and helpless children, whether their husbands and fathers are still fighting or whether they have been taken prisoners. I am glad to know that this system has been abandoned, but when was it abandoned? I ask the hon. Member for Haddingtonshire why was it abandoned? It was not abandoned until the hon. Member for Carnarvon and men like him exposed this system in the House, and brought home to the attention of the British public this kind of treatment.

After the Government had been put to some inconvenience, then this policy was changed and something was done in the matter. I know many hon. Members of this House deprecated interference at the time, but the result of that interference was that this diabolical system was destroyed.

We are told the question of allowing these women and children to go to whatever homes any of them have still left standing is being considered. We know many of them have lost not only their breadwinners, but their very homes have been razed to the ground. Many of them have no homes to go to, and still we are told that the question of allowing their friends to take care of them is being seriously considered. I am making no personal attack upon the Secretary of State for War

in this matter, because I can hardly conceive that any man who really has information of what is going on could approve of the things which are being done. The right hon. Gentleman has said that the question of allowing these people to return to their homes is being considered, and why is it being considered now? Exactly for the same reason that the two different scales of provisions for the women and children was considered. It is now being considered, because a few good and true men in this House, like the hon. Member for Carnarvon and the hon. Member for the Rushcliffe Division, have raised their voices here. I do sincerely hope and trust that the day is very near when all these things which are complained of most justly will have disappeared, and when better treatment will be meted out to these wretched women and children. When this has been achieved great credit will be undoubtedly due to those hon.

Members

who, though they have been denounced by the majority, have, to the honour of England, protested against such treatment.

There is only one point to which I wish to refer, and it explains why I, as an Irish Member, interfere in this debate at all. Are these women, some of whom are old and others young, prisoners or are they not? I want a straight answer to that question. I say that a straight answer has not yet been vouchsafed to the country by the Government. We are told that they are pauper refugees. We are told that they are destitute, and might perhaps be outraged and murdered by the natives. We are told that all of their own free will came into the camps and stay there now. Is that true? I say it is not true. I say that, just as Boer men are prisoners surrounded by British sentries with rifles and bayonets in St. Helena, Ceylon, and other places, the Boer women and children are prisoners surrounded by sentries in South Africa at the present time. I have got strange confirmation of my suspicion in this matter from the Secretary of State for War at question time. He let fall the word "release." What does he mean by the release of these people? You do not speak of the release of voluntary refugees. You speak of the release of people who are prisoners. Prisoners these people are, and I say it is a dishonour and a discredit to this country, to the very name of civilisation, that this should go on, and, moreover, I say this; and I have some slight knowledge of the Dutch in South Africa, having spent some time years ago in Cape Colony; every day you continue this treatment, every day you allow women and young children to die in these wretched camps, you make more difficult and more impossible British rule in South Africa, and you instil into the hearts of the Dutch people a deadlier hatred, if possible, than exists at the present time for your rule. If not for the sake of humanity, if not for the sake of the sufferings of the women and children; and there is no gentleman in the House of Commons but must have sympathy with these wretched women and children who are huddled together; I ask that a new arrangement should be made for the sake of the common interest of this country.

I ask you, out of common prudence and out of common regard to what you propose to do for South Africa in the future, having regard for the peace and contentment of the country, to put an end to these camps of hell which are at the present time simply maddening every man of the Dutch race throughout the

length and breadth of Africa and Europe as well.

There are some hon. Members opposite who take this matter lightly. I confess that I myself belong to the Irish race, and I say, whatever the light-heartedness of the Irish race may be, that there is not one of us who has not been stricken with sorrow and sadness as the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War read out the figures with regard to these camps. Hundreds of poor, wretched, helpless little children dying every month! Hundreds of women dying! An abnormal death-rate which, even according to what the Secretary of State for War has himself stated, is sufficient to appal every man who realises what it really means. I can only say from my heart and soul that I pity the man who can find cause to smile in the story related by the Secretary of State for War. If you had nothing else, the rate of mortality of women and children is reason enough itself for moving the adjournment of the House in this matter; and, as an Irishman, having very little reason to have consideration, and much less admiration, for English Members of this House or the conduct of the English Government, I say, and I believe it is the feeling of my countrymen around me, that we do honour and admire the gentlemen who have brought this discussion forward, and if there is a gleam of hope or generosity or honour in the present situation it has undoubtedly been afforded by the action of the Welsh and English Members, who differ from us on many questions, but who have shown us in this matter that they have hearts to feel and minds sufficiently statesmanlike to perceive that danger;[A laugh.] Yes, he is not an Englishman who is laughing now. He is an Irishman who is sitting away from his own countrymen, and who has joined the foreign commando. I say that whatever gleam of hope and honour there is has been afforded by

those independent Englishmen, Welshmen and Scotchmen who are not debarred by the sneers and jibes of the great party that have secured a big majority from coming to the House of Commons and raising their voices on behalf of the wretched people who have no others to speak for them at the present time. I say that their action does honour and credit to the countries to which they belong, and as far as gentlemen from Ireland are concerned, I say that we join with them heartily and, to some extent, hopefully in this effort, and we trust that as the result of the exposure something will be done to alleviate the lot of these people in South Africa. Do not tell me that this must be kept up till the war is over. Send them to their husbands in various parts of the world. Although I have denounced the First Lord of the Treasury for eighteen years in this House, and although at one time he was my jailor, I still say here from my observation of him for many years that I do not believe he has a heart which would approve or sanction in the slightest degree things which were really cruel and unnecessary. I ask him as head of the Government to inquire if the charges which have been made are true. How can that be done? It can only be done by sending a fair and impartial Commission to South Africa. Let it be composed of men who have the confidence of Liberals and Tories and the Irish Members. Let them inquire into the conditions of these camps, and if that Commission reports against the system, in the name of God and for the sake of Christianity I ask you to abolish that system and to restore these people to the comforts and the decencies of

ordinary civilised life.

*MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs): It has been stated that Mr. Rowntree was only able to visit one or two of the camps in Cape Town and Natal. I would like to ask whose fault was that? Was it the fault of Mr. Rowntree or the Government, or those who represent the Government in South Africa, who did not allow Mr. Rowntree to proceed further than the limits I have stated? But fortunately we have evidence at first hand, taken from a considerable number of the camps by a lady whose word will command implicit confidence from everyone who knows her. The right hon. Gentleman in the course of his speech referred to a case in which Boers refused to be separated from their children, and would not allow them to go into the hospital. Now, may I give the House one or two reasons for this? [Interruption and cries of "Divide."] This question affects 60,000 people, of whom 40,000 are children, and I venture to think that under the circumstances, although hon. Gentlemen may be anxious to go to dinner, they could listen for a few moments to a few of the details which have been asked for. Why have the Boer families refused to be separated? I will give the right hon. Gentleman one case which may show the reason for that. The lady who visited the camps says; "In our tent a girl of twenty-one lay dying on a stretcher. The father, a big, gentle Boer, kneeling beside her; while in the next tent his wife was watching a child of six, also dying, and one of about five drooping. Already this couple had lost three children in the hospital, and so would not let these go, though I begged hard to take them out of the hot tent. 'We must watch these ourselves,' he said."

That may give the right hon. Gentleman some inkling as to the reason why in certain cases Boer families refuse to be separated from one another. The right hon. Gentleman has given us to-night the usual official optimism with perfect honesty, as he always does, but may I recall to his recollection the questions asked in this House on 1st and 8th March. On the 1st March the right hon. Gentleman said;

"Lord Kitchener has informed me that a sufficient allowance is being given to all families in camp, and that they are satisfied and comfortable."

On the 8th March he said;

"Lord Kitchener telegraphed to me that he himself has gone into the question, and finds that the people in the laagers are all contented and comfortable."

Well, I have something to say upon that point. [Cries of "Divide!"] You have asked for details, and I propose to give the House some. Here are the circumstances under which the Boer prisoners were "contented and comfortable" on 13th March. This is Miss

Hobhouse's description of the camp at Kimberley five days after the right hon.

Gentleman made his statement in the House of Commons;

"It is the smallest in area that I have seen. The tents too close together, and the whole enclosed in an 8ft. high barbed wire fencing, which is supposed to be impregnable, and cost £;500. Sentries at the gate and walking inside; no nurse; an empty unfurnished marquee, which might be a hospital; overcrowded tents; measles and whooping cough rife; camp dirty and smelling; an army doctor, who naturally knows little of children's ailments; fuel almost none."

Then again;[Cries of "Divide!"];I think the House has asked for facts. I am attempting to give the House some facts, and may I appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite to listen? The war has now been proceeding for eighteen months, and this is only the second occasion on which I have said a single word. I am going to make one appeal to the right hon. Gentleman with regard to the children. There are certain mothers who have been separated from their children. They are mad to get to those children, and I would ask him to consider whether he will allow the mothers to go and search for their children. They have been compulsorily separated, and I trust the Government will, at all events, as an act of grace allow the mothers to rejoin their children. We have already heard something of the condition of the children in the camps. What has been said so far has been by way of general statement, and I should like to give;[Cries of "Divide!"] The effect of the camp system, as described by eye-witnesses, presses hardest on the children. Thousands of them are physically unfit to undergo the conditions of life there. They have not the strength to endure it, and we are told that to keep these camps going is murder to the children. The Government has taken upon itself a grave responsibility in sanctioning what is going on at the present time. Who would have thought when General Weyler had his concentration camps in Cuba that similar measures would be adopted within the bounds of the British Empire? The right hon. Gentleman has defended all that has taken place in connection with these camps on the ground of expediency. I would venture to say, looking at these 40,000 children in the camps, that we are only sowing the seeds of discontent, and that we may reap a terrible harvest some day;not perhaps this year or next year, but in time coming a nation will grow up which will remember all these iniquities. If, on other grounds, our remonstrances are disregarded, I would venture to appeal to the right hon. Gentleman on the lowest ground;that of expense. As an instance of the extravagant cost of these camps, I may mention that in one place twenty iron rooms were put up, and they cost on the average £125 each. There are a large number of women beseeching to be sent to their own relatives. The relatives offer to pay the expense. Why should they not be allowed to go to their relatives in Cape Colony? I do not wish to arouse any party feeling in this House, nor have I done so. The facts surely speak for themselves, and I have confidence that when the case is presented to the right hon. Gentleman he will take what steps are in his power. I am afraid he is not convinced of the sad state of things in these camps. I beg him to obtain early and full information on the point. Hon. Gentlemen opposite have made it extremely difficult for me to speak on this question. I only wish that someone would be allowed to set forth some of the actual details and circumstances of what has occurred. I have had the advantage of reading reports by independent eye-witnesses. I venture to think if hon. Gentlemen opposite would read these reports they would feel there was a case for prompt intervention. I appeal to the Government

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

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

Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds)
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Balfour, Maj K R (Christch'rch)
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Banbury, Frederick George
Bull, William James
Allsopp, Hon. George
Beach, Rt Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol)
Butcher, John George
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants.)
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bigwood, James
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Bill, Charles
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Blundell, Col. Henry
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Austin, Sir John
Bond, Edward
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Bousfield, William Robert
Chamberlain, Rt. Hn. J. (Birm.)
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r)
Baird, John George Alexander
Bowles, T Gibson (King's Lynn)
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Balcarres, Lord
Brassey, Albert
Chapman, Edward

for the sake of the little children who are passing away like so many faded flowers in South Africa, for the sake of the parents who have to see them sick and dying before their eyes, to give their attention to this matter. The only

effect of the present policy is to madden and exasperate the enemies of this country. They will be enemies to all eternity unless we reverse this policy.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.) rose in his place and claimed to move, "That the Question be now put." [Nationalist cries of "Oh" and "Gag."]

*MR. SPEAKER: accepted the motion.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: You want to stifle the truth.

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! I must ask the hon. Member to use more regular language.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: In regard to this I repeat that you want to stifle the truth. You are ashamed of this work, and you are trying to shelve it.

[Nationalist cheers and Ministerial cries of "Name him."] Name away. You are trying to cloak it all up.

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

The House divided:;Ayes, 252; Noes, 149. (Division List No. 256.)

Clare, Octavius Leigh

Hobhouse, Henry (Somert, E.)

Pierpoint, Robert

Coddington, Sir William

Hogg, Lindsay

Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard

Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)

Platt-Higgins, Frederick

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Hozier, Hon. James Hy. Cecil

Plummer, Walter R.

Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready

Hudson, George Bickersteth

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)

Pretymann, Ernest George

Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas

Price-Jones, Lt-Col. Edward

Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)

Jackson, Rt. Hon. W. Lawies

Purvis, Robert

Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse

Pym, C. Guy

Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge

Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick

Cranborne, Viscount

Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton

Quilter, Sir Cuthbert

Cripps, Charles Alfred
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Randles, John S.
Crossley, Sir Savile
Rankin, Sir James
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh)
Rasch, Major Frederic C.
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Dalkeith, Earl of
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Keswick, William
Remnant, James Farquharson
Dewar, T. R. (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo
Kimber, Henry
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Rentoul, James Alexander
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Renwick, George
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Lawson, John Grant
Ropner, Colonel Robert
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Lecky, Rt Hn. William Edw. H.
Round, James
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham
Russell, T. W.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Duke, Henry Edward
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.

Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Seton-Karr, Henry
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Sharpe, Wm. Edw. T.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Long, Col. Chas. W. (Evesham)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Long, Rt. Hn Walter (Bristol, S.
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks.
Fardell, Sir T. George
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Spear, John Ward
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J (Manc'r)
Lucas, R. J. (Portsmouth)
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Finch, George H.
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Finlay, Sir Robt. Bannatyne
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W. G. E.
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Fisher, William Hayes
Macdona, John Cumming
Stock, James Henry
Fison, Frederick William
Maconochie, A. W.
Stroyan, John
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Fletcher, Sir Henry
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim. E.)
Flower, Ernest
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ
Majendie, James A. H.

Thorburn, Sir Walter
Malcolm, Ian
Thornton, Percy M.
Garfit, William
Manners, Lord Cecil
Tollemache, Henry James
Gibbs, Hn. A. G H (City of Lond.
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H. E (Wigt'n
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Gore, Hn G. R. C. Ormby-(Salop
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Goschen, Hon George Joachim
Middlemore, John Throgmort'n
Valentia, Viscount
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Graham, Henry Robert
Mitchell, William
Walker, Col. William Hall
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Warde, Col. C. E.
Green, Walford D. (Wednesby.
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Morgan, David J. (Walthams'w
Webb, Col. William George
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monm'thsh.
Welby, Lt.-Col A. C. E. (Taun'n).
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Hain, Edward
Morrison, James Archibald
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne).

Hall, Edward Marshall
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Mount, William Arthur
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G (Middx
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G (Bute)
Wills, Sir Frederick
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R.
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Myers, William Henry
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Wodehouse, Rt. Hon E R (Bath)
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Nicholson, William Graham
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Wylie, Alexander
Hay, Hn. Claude George
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Heath, James (Staffords. N. W.
O'Neill, Hon. Robert Torrens
Younger, William
Helder, Augustus
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Henderson, Alexander
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Higginbottom, S. W.
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robert W.
Hoare, Edw Brodie Hampste'd
Percy, Earl
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Grant, Corrie
O'Dowd, John
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Kelly, Conor, (Mayo, N.)

Allen, Charlea P. (Glouc. Stroud
Hammond, John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N
Ambrose, Robert
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
O'Malley, William
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Harwood, George
O'Mara, James
Atherley-Jones, L.
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Shee, James John
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Helme, Norval Watson
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham)
Bell, Richard
Hemphill, Rt. Hn. Charles H.
Pirie, Duncan V.
Black, Alexander William
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Power, Patrick Joseph
Blake, Edward
Horniman, Frederick John
Price, Robert John
Boland, John
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Reckitt, Harold James
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Jacoby, James Alfred
Reddy, M.
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Jones, D. Brynmor (Swansea)
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jones, William (Carnarvons.)
Redmond, William (Clare)
Burns, John
Jordan, Jeremiah
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Buxton, Sydney Charles

Kennedy, Patrick James
Rickett, J. Compton
Caine, William Sproston
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Rigg, Richard
Caldwell, James
Labouchere, Henry
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Lambert, George
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Leamy, Edmund
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Carew, James Laurence
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington)
Robson, Wm. Snowdon
Causton, Richard Knight
Leng, Sir John
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Channing, Francis Allston
Lewis, John Herbert
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Clancy, John Joseph
Lough, Thomas
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (N'rth'nts)
Craig, Robert Hunter
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Sullivan, Donal
Crean, Eugene
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Crombie, John William
M'Crae, George
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Cullinan, J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Thomas, Alfred (Glamorgan, E.)
Dalziel, James Henry
M'Govern, T.

Thomas, D. Alfred (Merthyr)
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Thomas J A (Glamorgan, Gower)
Delany, William
Mather, William
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Donelan, Capt. A.
Mooney, John J.
Tomkinson, James
Doogan, P. C.
Morton, Edw. J.C. (Devonport)
Wallace, Robert
Duffy, William J.
Moulton, John Fletcher
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan.
Duncan, J. Hastings
Murnaghan, George
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Edwards, Frank
Murphy, John
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Emmott, Alfred
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Nolan, Col. John. P (Galway, N.
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Ffrench, Peter
Norton, Capt. Cecil William
Wilson, Charles H. (Hull, W.)
Field, William
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipp'rery Mid
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Yoxall, James Henry
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Gilhooly, James

O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Gladstone, Rt. Hn Herbert John
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. John Ellis.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Question put accordingly.
The House divided::Ayes, 134; Noes, 253. (Division List, No. 257.)
AYES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Boland, John
Causton, Richard Knight
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Channing, Francis Allston
Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Clancy, John Joseph
Ambrose, Robert
Burke, E. Haviland-
Cogan, Denis J.
Ashton, Thomas Gair
Burns, John
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Atherley-Jones, L.
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Craig, Robert Hunter
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Caine, William Sproston
Crean, Eugene
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Caldwell, James
Crombie, John William
Bell, Richard
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Cullinan, J.
Black, Alexander William
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Dalziel, James Henry
Blake, Edward
Carew, James Laurence
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
Delany William
Leng, Sir John
Price, Robert John

Donelan, Captain A.
Lewis, John Herbert
Reckitt, Harold James
Doogan, P. C.
Lough, Thomas
Reddy, M.
Duffy, William J.
Lundon, W.
Redmond, John E. (Waterford
Duncan, J. Hastings
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Redmond, William (Clare)
Edwards, Frank
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Reid, Sir R. Threshie (Dumfries
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
M'Crae, George
Rickett, J. Compton
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
M'Dermott, Patrick
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Ffrench, Peter
M'Govern, T.
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Field, William
M'Kenna, Reginald
Robertson, Edmund (Dundee)
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Mather, William
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Flynn, James Christopher
Mooney, John J.
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Murnaghan, George
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Gilhooly, James
Murphy, John
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Spencer, Rt Hn. C R. (Northants
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
Sullivan, Donal
Grant, Corrie

Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)
Hammond, John
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Thomas, A. (Glamorgan, E.)
Harcourt, Rt. Hn. Herbert John
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr)
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Thomas, J A (Glamorgan, G'wer)
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
O'Connor, James (Wicklow W.)
Thomson, F. W. (York, W. R.)
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur D.
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Tomkinson, James
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Wallace, Robert
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Charles H.
O'Dowd, John
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.)
White, Patrick (Meath, North)
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
O'Malley, William
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Jacoby, James Alfred
O'Mara, James
Wilson, Chas, Henry (Hull, W.)
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Shee, James John
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Kennedy, Patrick James
Pease, J. A. (Saffron Walden)

Kinloch, Sir John George S.
Pease, Sir Joseph W. (Durham
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Labouchere, Henry
Pirie, Duncan V.
Mr. Loyd-George and Mr John Ellis.
Leamy, Edmund
Power, Patrick Joseph
NOES.
Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Butcher, John George
Douglas, Rt. Hn. A. Akers-
Agg-Gardner, James Tynte
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Cautley, Henry Strother
Duke, Henry Edward
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Allsopp, Hon George
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbyshire
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
Anson, Sir William Reynell
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Fardell, Sir T. George
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Arnold-Forster, Hugh O.
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Fergusson, Rt Hn Sir J. (Manc'r)
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Fielden, Edward Brocklehurst
Austin, Sir John
Chapman, Edward
Finch, George H.
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Bain, Col. James Robert

Coddington, Sir William
Fisber, William Hayes
Baird, John George Alexander
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Fison, Frederick William
Balcarres, Lord
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r)
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Atbole
Flower, Ernest
Balfour, Maj K R (Christchurch
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Forster, Sir Michael (Lond Univ
Banbury, Frederick George
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Garfit, William
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Gibbs, Hn. A.G. H (City of Lond
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn
Beach, Rt. Hn. W. W. B. (Hants.
Cranborne, Viscount
Gore, Hn G R C. Ormsby-(Salop)
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Bigwood, James
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Bill, Charles
Crossley, Sir Savile
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Blundell, Col. Henry
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Graham, Henry Robert
Bond, Edward
Dalkeith, Earl of
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Bousfield, William Robert
Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Green, Walford D (Wednesb'ry
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Dewar, T R (T'rH'mlets, S. Geo.
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn
Dickinson, Robert Edmond
Greene, Henry D. (Shrewsbury)
Brassey, Albert
Dickson-Poynder, Sir John P.
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Hain, Edward
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Hall, Edward Marshall
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Bull, William James
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Hamilton, Rt. Hn. Ld G. (Midd'x
Hamilton, Marq of (L'nd'nderry
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinburgh W
Round, James
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Majendie, James A. H.
Russell, T. W.
Hardy, Laurence (Kent, Ashf'd
Malcolm, Ian
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Manners, Lord Cecil
Seton-Karr, Henry
Haslett, Sir James Homer
Maxwell, W. J. H. (Dumfriessh.
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Heath, James (Staffords., N. W.
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Helder, Augustus
Middlemore, John T.
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)

Henderson, Alexander
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Hermon-Hodge, Rbt. Trotter
Mitchell, William
Spear, John Ward
Higginbottom, S. W.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Stanley, Edward J. (Somersets)
Hoare, Edw. Brodie (Hampst'd)
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Montagu, Hon. J. Scott (Hants.
Stewart, Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Hogg, Lindsay
Morgan, David J. (Walthams'w
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Morgan, Hn. Fred. (Monm'thsh
Stock, James Henry
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Morris, Hn. Martin Henry F.
Stroyan, John
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Morrison, James Archibald
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. L.
Mount, William Arthur
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Murray, Rt Hn A Graham (Bute
Thornton, Percy M.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath
Tollemache, Henry James
Jessel, Captain Herbert M.
Myers, William Henry
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Nicholson, William Graham
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Nicol, Donald Ninian
Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
O'Neill, Hn. Robert Torrens
Valentia, Viscount
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Vincent, Cl. Sir C. E. H. (Sh'ffi'ld
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Keswick, William
Peel, Hn. Wm. Robt. Wellesley
Walker, Col. William Hall
Kimber, Henry
Percy, Earl
Warde, Col. C. E.
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Pierpoint, Robert
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Laurie, Lieut.-General
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Wason, John Cathcart (Orkney
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Webb, Col. William George
Lawson, John Grant
Plummer, Walter R.
Welby, Lt.-Cl. A. C. E (Taunton
Lecky, Rt. Hon. Wm. Edw. H.
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm
Pretymann, Ernest George
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u-Lyne
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Purvis, Robert
Williams, Col. R. (Dorset)
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Pym, C. Guy
Wills, Sir Frederick
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert

Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Randles, John S.
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Long, Col Charles W (Evesham)
Rankin, Sir James
Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S.
Rasch, Major Fredc. Carne
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Wylie, Alexander
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Remnant, James Farquharson
Younger, William
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Macartney, Rt. Hon. W. G. E.
Rentoul, James Alexander
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Macdona, John Cumming
Renwick, George
Sir William Walrond and Mr. Anstruther.
Maconochie, A. W.
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge
M'Arthur, Chas. (Liverpool)
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Charles T.
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Ropner, Col. Robert

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Main Question [11th June],

"That the Bill be now read a second time."

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed;

MR. ASQUITH (Fifeshire, East): When I ventured to move the adjournment of the debate on Tuesday last, on the stroke of midnight, the First Lord of the Treasury, in assenting to the motion, expressed regret that it had been made, and some hon. Members below the gang, way opposite went so far as to challenge a division. I must confess that that was a rather unreasonable exhibition of impatience, for, as the Home Secretary knows very well, I have been anxious to facilitate the Second Reading of the Bill and to have it sent with all possible speed to the Committee, where its

complicated details will be thoroughly overhauled. But it should be remembered under what conditions the debate has been carried on. By one of those caprices in procedure from which we all suffer in turn, and while suffering denounce, though no one seems to have courage to grapple with it, the best hours of the afternoon are occupied with private Bills, and this was followed by a motion from the Government to take the whole time of the House, with the result that it was not until half-past nine that the Home Secretary was able to make his explanatory statement on the motion for Second Reading, and only two hours of Parliamentary time were actually devoted to the discussion. I venture to say to those hon. Gentlemen who were so intolerant of my motion, that having regard to the length and complexity of the Bill, and that it is the largest and most ambitious in its scope of any measure of the kind, though it will not I hope prove to be contentious, some allowance should be made for the anxious desire of those who have been responsible for factory legislation in the past to have opportunity for a few words of criticism on its general scope. Let me add that I believe, from the character of the debate the other night, the time will not be un-profitably consumed. I have prefaced my observations with a perfectly frank acknowledgment that the Bill represents a very substantial advance, not only on previous legislation, but in a still more marked and significant degree as compared with the proposals put forward by the Government last year. The provisions of the Bill, speaking generally, may be divided into two categories; on the one hand, what I may call new development in factory law, and on the other hand amendments in the existing law in the way of defining it in form and enlarging the scope for facilitating enforcement. As regards the new developments, I hail them unreservedly as in all respects improvements on existing legislation. The first and most important is that in the 15th clause, requiring every occupier of a factory or workshop to provide and maintain sufficient ventilation. It would perhaps surprise a great many Members not familiar with factory legislation to find there was no such provision on the Statute-book. A factory at present must be clean, must be kept free from effluvia, must not be overcrowded, and all injurious gases, dust and other substances generated in manufacture must be rendered harmless; but there is no general provision such as is now proposed for the provision and maintenance of a sufficient system of ventilation. I welcome this as being strictly in harmony with lines of legislation in the past. In the proposals to which I obtained the sanction of Parliament in 1895 were measures for securing, for the first time, that every room in a factory or workshop should be kept at a reasonable temperature; a provision which I am glad to see is sensibly strengthened in another clause of the Bill. Still dealing with the new provisions, there are two others which either bring within the scope of the law trades which are at present excluded, or other operations which are a source of danger. I am glad to see the new provisions in Clause 19 for the periodical examination of steam boilers, and for bringing factory or workshop railways and sidings within the scope of the principal Acts. Both of these are very useful provisions; but I regret that like provision is not made for machinery in docks, loading and unloading from barges; an urgent and necessitous case. I had a

difficulty in 1895 in getting a modified amount of security, for shipowners, not unnaturally perhaps, were apprehensive that, while being under a code of regulations and inspection and supervision by the Board of Trade, they would come under another code of regulations supervised by the Home Office, and be harassed in every direction. The apprehension was quite unfounded, and the right hon. Gentleman might well have considered the expediency of enlarging the dock clause.

Before I proceed to deal with alterations in the substance of the existing law, I must refer to the alterations in procedure for the regulation of dangerous trades and the substitution for the existing system of arbitration, which has been denounced year by year for the last ten years, an absolute power with the Home Office to make regulations, subject to the supervision and control of Parliament to make such regulations for ensuring safety. The Home Secretary, when dealing with this part of the Bill, was good enough to credit me with having anticipated this provision, and that is perfectly true as regards the principle, but I must enter my caveat

against the proposal in the third clause in its present shape. It would be enough, I think, if the Secretary of State satisfied himself by inquiry through a Departmental Committee, hearing all interests, and then sanctioned a code of regulations instead of calling in a competent person to go over the whole ground again and hear objections. That procedure, if properly followed, would be quite sufficient, and the Home Secretary would see that the code was submitted to and approved by Parliament. Subject to this criticism, I agree that there is a great improvement in the proposed procedure.

As to the alterations in the existing law, some, no doubt, are for the better, others for the worse. I will not dwell upon a number of useful but apparently unimportant changes, such as prohibition of the cleaning of machinery in motion. The extension of that prohibition to the case of children cleaning any place under machinery is a very excellent and necessary change. I am also glad to see the clause requiring the provision of the means of escape from fire, and that the right hon. Gentleman has gone a step further towards securing a proper sanitary condition for bakehouses. In 1895 I was fortunate enough to induce the House to agree that after January 1st, 1896, no new bakehouses should be opened underground. I was then told this would destroy the baking trade, that it would be quite impossible to carry out the law among great urban communities. But there has been no serious objection from any quarter, and the provision has worked very well. I am glad that the right hon. Gentleman, encouraged, I suppose, by experience, is going to carry the law a step further and provide that after 1st January, 1904, no underground bakehouse shall be used, unless certified to be suitable for the purpose by the district council. That is a very distinct advance in the law on this point. Now I come to two or three matters of great importance, and of somewhat more dubious, or, at any rate, more contentious character. First of all, I will refer to the provisions of the Bill dealing with laundries. The right hon. Gentleman pointed out the other night that in the first sub-section of this clause, as it is now framed, he was reverting to a proposal which I myself made in 1895, namely, that

every laundry which was carried on by way of trade or for the purposes of gain should be deemed, according to whether mechanical power was or was not used, to be either a factory or a workshop. The right hon. Gentleman has reverted to that now. If he asks me why that proposal did not become law, I am afraid I must refer him for an answer to his colleague the Under Secretary to the Home Department.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): It is not the same proposal.

MR. ASQUITH: It is as far as the first sub-section is concerned, but I am dealing now with the main principle, that, subject to certain exemption, every laundry carried on for gain or by way of trade must be subject to inspection either as a factory or a workshop. I made that proposal, but was unable to carry it, largely owing to the strenuous efforts of the present Under Secretary to the Home Department, loyally supported, I must say, by the Colonial Secretary. Many of us who remember the hours and days we spent on that Bill discussing this topic must have it indelibly engraved on our minds. The woes of the wash-tub had never found so eloquent or pathetic an exponent. The right hon. Gentleman drew a harrowing picture of the poor widow with a mangle toiling night and day to support her orphan children, who would be crushed out of industrial existence by the ruthless inspector. What was the result? The Grand Committee, under the alluring but misleading pleading of the right hon. Gentleman, was swept away on a flood tide of emotion, with which I was wholly incompetent to contend. The result was that not only the widow with the mangle, but the whole of the laundries connected with conventual or other charitable institutions, were exempted altogether from the law, and those which remained, the laundries in the strictest sense of the word, carried on by way of trade or for gain, were left under conditions which I ventured to predict at the time would be absolutely unscientific and unworkable. That prediction has been amply verified by experience, for the right hon. Gentleman told us that the law has been practically a dead letter for six years, and these laundries have been living, moving, and having their being in a kind of industrial Alsatia of their own. The general rule now is to be that laundries are to be brought within the Factories and Workshops Act, but while I welcome that provision; I am not expressing on the point a very decided opinion; I confess I entertain very considerable doubt as to the wisdom of the second sub-section which enables the Secretary of State, subject to a maximum, to modify the provisions of the Factory Acts with regard to the periods of employment and meal hours for women, young persons, and children. I am not myself satisfied as to the necessity of treating laundries in this special way. I may point out, and I am sure this is a consideration which will carry great weight with the right hon. Gentleman and everyone concerned with the practical administration of a clause of this kind, that the moment we begin to have a shifting system of hours we practically destroy the value of our system of inspection. With a regular time-table inspection is useful and effective, but with a shifting time-table the work of inspection becomes enormously difficult, and the possibilities of evasion or subterfuge are greatly increased.

There is another matter of great importance in the law as regards laundries which, to use the language which was embodied in the Act of 1895, "employ only the inmates of institutions conducted in good faith for religious or charitable purposes." The hon. Member for Waterford the other night made a speech on this subject. I am sure he did not intend in any way to convey a misleading impression, but he rather conveyed the impression that that was a proposal of mine or one to which I willingly assented. It was nothing of the kind. The exemption of these conventual and charitable institutions from the scope of the law was very reluctantly agreed to by me under pressure, most of it exercised by the Irish Members and as the price of carrying my Bill through the Committee. If I had not consented, I do not believe I should ever have got the Bill through the Grand Committee at all, as the circumstances were somewhat acute. I am not making any charge against the conventual laundries in particular, but with regard to many of these laundries conducted in connection with so-called charitable institutions I have looked into the matter recently, and I am satisfied, from the correspondence I have had on the subject, that there is a vast field for inspection. The sanitary conditions which prevail in many of these laundries are disgraceful, and so long as they are not subject either to inspection or legal control it is very difficult to find any leverage which will effectually operate on the minds or affect the conduct of those responsible for them. In France they have extended the system of inspection to all institutions of this sort. The first result of that inspection was to disclose the existence of enormous and widespread evils in these very places. I quite sympathise, I will not say sympathise, but I quite understand the reluctance, particularly of institutions conducted by Roman Catholics, in which the work is mainly done by nuns or by persons more or less under religious control, to accept the ordinary system of inspection; but I cannot help thinking that the grounds on which that objection rested have been enormously weakened, if not altogether removed, since we have had lady inspectors. I cannot possibly see, if the se institutions are well conducted, and no doubt the majority of them are, why they should object to a lady occasionally coming in and seeing how they are going on. I cannot feel sanguine, or indeed entertain any expectation whatever, of good resulting from the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman that managers are to name their own inspectors, and that the persons who are to report whether the legal standard of requirements is or is not being observed are persons who have been appointed by the managers themselves. If that is the only possible alternative I almost think it may be as well to leave the law as it stands.

I pass from that to another clause of the Bill on which I must make a comment not wholly favourable. I mean the proposed amendment of the law with regard to notice of accidents in Clause 35. Under the existing law, as the House is aware, notice of every accident which occurs in a factory or workshop has to be sent to a factory inspector, providing the accident is sufficiently grave to disable the person injured for five hours in the first or three following days. Under a provision inserted in the Act of 1895, every such accident has to be registered by an officer of the factory, and the register is always open to examination by

the inspector. The right hon. Gentleman proposes; I do not know why, because we have not had any explanation of this proposed change, which I cannot help thinking is a very retrograde step; he proposes very substantially to relax the stringency of the provisions for giving notice of accidents. Under the clause in the Bill, instead of notice being required of every accident which is sufficiently grave to disable the person injured in the manner specified in the Act, the only accidents, except fatal ones, which it is required should be reported are those belonging to a class "specified in that behalf by an Order of the Secretary of State." What is the object of that proposal? I presume; I can only presume, because I have not the least idea; that it is to diminish the work of the inspectors by doing away with the necessity for their receiving these notices, and making the consequent inquiries in the cases of what are called trivial accidents. I strongly deprecate that change, and I will tell the House why. In the first place, it must be remembered that these so-called trivial accidents are the very class of accidents which, whether for good or bad; I have my own opinion about that; are excluded from the scope of the Workmen's Compensation Act. As the House knows, if the effect of an accident does not last more than a fortnight, the injured workman can get no compensation whatever under the Workmen's Compensation Act. If, therefore, as regards this class of accidents the employer has not the inducement to take that care which results from the liability to make compensation, and at the same time you take away that further inducement which exists in the necessity put on him to report every one of these accidents as soon as it has occurred, it seems to me that it will very substantially diminish the motives which at present operate in the minds of the worst class of employers. What will be the consequence? I am afraid the consequence will be that not only will there be an increase in these accidents, but that considerably less care will be taken than at present in fencing dangerous parts of machinery. I will tell the House why. It is the very fact that a large number of small accidents of a so-called trivial description have occurred that makes it of the utmost importance to have the inspectors' judgment as to whether particular machinery or the state of that machinery is dangerous, and therefore should be fenced, and we have the right to make the inspector's opinion on that point prima facie evidence that the machinery is dangerous. You will deprive by this proposal the inspector of the best means to enable him to form a trustworthy opinion, and you will also destroy, as the right hon. Baronet the Member for Forest of Dean mentioned the other night, what I may call the statistical stability of the returns. If you introduce this change into the system of reporting accidents you will not be able to compare the periods after the new system with the periods before it, and if the Secretary of State is able to alter by way of enlargement or curtailment the class of accidents which has to be reported, then one period will cease to be scientifically comparable with another. We have made enormous progress during the last ten years in the fulness and accuracy of our industrial statistics. They are not only of importance to the politician and economist, but also to medical men and all persons engaged in social reform, and I think it would be a very unfortunate step if we were to destroy the fulness or stability of our

statistics.

Lastly, I come to another provision of the Bill, which I think requires criticism. It is a new proposal, namely, the partial substitution of a local for a central authority. The clauses in question are Clauses 9, 10, and 11, Clause 9 proposes that the outworker's list is to be sent in every case to the district council. I have no objection to that myself, and, further, I entirely approve of the removal

of the existing restrictions on the power of the Secretary of State to deal with unwholesome areas where home work is carried on. But when we come to Clauses 10 and 11 we find that the prohibition of home work in places where there is infectious disease, or in unsanitary places, is in future to be enforced, not by the inspector of the Home Office, but by the district council. I regret that change. I am not going to draw up any indictment against the local authorities. In years gone by they have been grossly remiss in the enforcement of sanitary provisions, but during the last five or six years they have been, in London particularly, much more vigilant in detecting offences against the law. But the local standard is a varying standard. It may be high in one place and very low indeed in another, and although the progress to which I have referred has been undoubtedly taking place in our large self-governing urban communities, we cannot say the same for the rural districts. We must have regard to the fact that there is a growing tendency to plant new factories not in the old congested centres of population, but in new rural districts. You cannot travel along the London and North Western Railway between London and Crewe without seeing dotted about large factories giving employment to hundreds of men and women, and if the authority in regard to places of that kind is to be the rural district council, the members of which often have not the knowledge and training fitting them to deal with insanitary conditions in factories which members of urban councils often have, I cannot help feeling that we will relax our standard of stringency in the enforcement of the law. While we should encourage local authorities to co-operate in every way in enforcing the law, which no doubt materially affects the sanitary condition of their own areas, we should retain, at all hazards, and for all purposes, the supervision and control of the Home Office as the central authority. I am satisfied that that is the only way we can have uniformity of system and a regular enforcement of the law.

I have said all I have to say by way of detailed criticism, and I will only make one concluding observation. This is the latest, or it may be destined to be the last, of a series of enactments which have gradually raised the standard of health and safety which was spontaneously recognised and followed by the best and most humane employers of labour. In all our factory legislation the humane employer, if I may use an Aristotelian phrase, has always been the canon, measure, and standard of health and safety which the State as a State may wisely prescribe and safely enforce. But there has never been a single step taken of which it has not been predicted by its opponents that the next advance would be fatal to British industry in its competition in the open markets of the world. I think it may be worth while to show the House that that is not so. Curiously enough, since this debate was

adjourned last Tuesday, in The Times on Thursday morning I happened casually to cast my eye over the report of the annual meeting of a company whose name is not altogether unfamiliar in the House, I mean that of Messrs. Kynoch, which happened to be held in Birmingham on the previous day. The chairman of the company, I need not mention his name, presided, and after denouncing what he called the craze for education, which, as he said in his epigrammatic language, "spoiled good workmen in order to make bad and superfluous managers," he proceeded to discuss the peculiar burthens from which British industry suffered. He said that the first burthen was the constant interference with methods and management now introduced by Parliament and local boards and he proceeded; "They were inspected and hampered to death at every step. What economies could be effected if the manufacturer could carry on his business free from local boards and by-laws, free from sanitary inspectors, free from smoke inspectors, free from chemical inspectors, free from School Board inspectors, free from Home Office inspectors and factory inspectors; free, in fact, from the whole brood of officials who not being producers themselves, lived on the produce of manufacturing industry and strangled it."

That is the sort of thing which actually at this time of day is believed and uttered and applauded in Birmingham. I have only one observation to make about it. I have no doubt that we shall hear an explanation from the Under Secretary to the Home Department, but as an independent and detached critic, I have only one observation to make, and it is this, that while the chairman of this company does not appear to be aware that the regulations in countries with which we are in acute competition in the labour markets of the world are far more drastic than our own, as regards the age and period of employment and as regards the standard of education required, it is equally true that we ourselves, so far as the evidence goes, have not suffered, but that, on the contrary, leaving outside all higher and wider considerations, our industrial population is an infinitely more efficient productive machine than it was six or seven years ago. In those days women and children worked for unlimited hours by day and night; children in the large majority of our mines and factories were little better than beasts of burden, uncared for and untaught; the most ordinary sanitary safeguards were uniformly neglected, and I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that the whole system was a vast sacrifice of human life. What would Great Britain have been to-day as an industrial and producing country but for the labours of Lord Shaftesbury and those who have succeeded him in this factory legislation? We should have a stunted, sickly, ignorant population, wholly unfitted to hold its own in the growing stress and strain of industrial competition, and it is because this Bill takes a new and substantial step in the direction of reform that I shall support it in this and in all its subsequent stages, for I believe that by means of it we shall proceed one degree farther in the path which it is as much our interest as our duty to travel.

*MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said he must express his regret at the first portion of the first clause. The whole desire of the Home Secretary seemed to be to take the onus upon himself instead of placing it upon the inspectors, and that would in his opinion be a serious blot upon the Bill. In dangerous

trades, such as that of the docker, he apprehended, many occasions arose where dangerous plant ought to be removed or protected. This power, he submitted, ought to be in the hands of the inspector, but he found that when attention was called to anything

of the kind the matter had to be referred to the Home Secretary, and pass through a system of red tape, and during all that time more accidents might occur. Everything should be done to minimise the chance of accidents occurring, and the best way of doing so would be to have inspectors on the spot, and when such a thing occurred they should have the power to have the plant removed, and to secure satisfactory conditions of employment. He also thought it was unfortunate that the local inquiries should be handed over to the local authorities, for the reason that in the majority of cases the members of the local authorities were precisely those people who were interested in the industries which were very often the subject of inquiry. In these days of trusts and public companies it would be difficult to find some member of a local authority that would not be interested in frustrating the intentions of the Bill. He thought therefore that the Bill should be left in the hands of the inspectors to carry out. Another matter to which he desired to refer he regretted to say was not mentioned in the Bill. The men who worked on the quays and docks were men who had no safeguards against the dangers which beset them in their work, and who, in his opinion, ought to come within the operations of the Act. In the case of these men it would be necessary for immediate action to be taken, because defective tackle, defective planks, and defective machinery had been the cause of a great many accidents. It should be in the power of the inspector, who could only now report, to order the removal of any defective tackle, defective planks, or defective gangways; he should be vested with authority to compel the employer, the stevedore, or the captain to remove the cause of so much loss of life and accident. From a Return which was issued in 1900, he found that out of 74,340 of these men no less than 4,958 had been either maimed or lost their lives. There was surely some reason for a prompt remedy for such a state of things when so many people met with an untimely death, and it was the duty of the framers of the Bill to do everything in their power to

minimise the causes of those accidents. So far as he had read the Bill, however, there was nothing to meet the case of the dockers and coal-porters. Something should be done to secure the safety of these people. He asked why the recommendations contained in the Report on the Causation and Prevention of Accidents issued by the Home Office were not adopted and put in the Bill by the Home Secretary. It was an appalling Report, and the suggestions made by the two factory experts; Messrs. Maitland and Erant; should have found a prompt acceptance by the right hon. Gentleman. He appealed to him to adopt the recommendations, and make the prevention of accidents as perfect as possible in the interest of the dock workers.

Another matter to which he desired to call attention was what was called the "particulars clauses." On this point the dockers made serious complaint. These men were sent out to work at perhaps a shilling a ton, and they were compelled

to take the word of the captain or the stevedore who employed them as to the number of tons that had to be dealt with. In consequence of that system, it was alleged there had been many cases in which the men employed had been defrauded of a portion of their honest earnings. The Lord Mayor of Dublin had brought the matter before the Port and Docks Board in order that something might be done for these men, but the Port and Docks Board had no power to assist them. He submitted that the dockers should have the same privilege granted to them as was granted to the textile workers and the miners. In those trades the men had a tally-man to keep tally of the work they did, and were paid accordingly. Why should not the same concession be given to the dockers and the coal porters? It showed a most unfortunate state of law when men could be told to load and unload a ship, and had to take the bare word of the captain or stevedore as to the number of tons to be moved. It was only owing to the exertions of the Lord Mayor of Dublin and himself that what might have been a most serious strike had been averted on many occasions, so dissatisfied were the men with the present state of things, and that was only done by their promising to bring the matter before the House, and endeavour to have the grievance remedied. He asked the Home Secretary to give this point his sympathetic attention. With reference to the laundries clause, so far as Ireland was concerned there was no demand for their inspection, and consequently he would oppose their inclusion under the provisions of the Bill. He could see no reason why religious institutions should be brought within the provisions of the Bill. These institutions were not factories in the real sense of the word. Moreover, they were not insanitary; the hours, after deducting the time devoted to devotion, meals, and recreation, were much less than the prescribed number, and there was really no necessity for the application of the provisions of the Factory Acts to these reforming institutions. In conclusion, he desired to state that he shared with other Members the belief that the Home Secretary had brought forward a Bill which, when amended in the directions that had been indicated, would meet with the approval of all classes. As far as he could see, it was an honest endeavour to meet the requirements of the case, and he hoped that in Committee the blots to which he had referred would be removed, so that there might be reported to the House a Bill which should be worthy of the Home Secretary and a benefit to the workers of the country.

SIR WILLIAM CODDINGTON (Blackburn): I do not propose to go into the clauses of this Bill, as I understand they will more properly be considered in Committee, but I wish to call the attention of the Home Secretary to what I consider and is considered by many of my friends to be an unnecessary interference with and a harassing of the textile industries, namely, the multiplication of inspectors.

In the town that I represent, which is almost entirely devoted to textile industries, there are three resident inspectors, each of whom has the right to enter the mills at any time, and to look into the departments which he represents. One is the inspector for "particulars," another is the inspector for "time," and the third is the inspector for "ventilation." In addition to these, there is a lady inspector

who comes from London. She comes only now and then, and has, I believe, to do

with the sanitary arrangements of the workshops. These sanitary arrangements are well and carefully attended to by the medical officer of health, who also is practically an inspector, and has the right of entering the works exactly as the factory inspectors have. Therefore, there are three inspectors doing work which one man could do equally well. In fact, I believe that one man would do it better than three, because he would know the various managers, and he would be able to talk to them and arrange matters in a way which is impossible with three men, because each man has a different mind and a different mode of procedure. It is intolerable that where one man would suffice three men should have the power of going into the works at any time of the day, interfering with and absorbing the managers' time, and of taking proceedings for offences in regard to which, if there was only one inspector, there would be no necessity to take proceedings, because one man would not have the same interest in getting convictions as is the case when there are three inspectors. Competition, especially in the textile industries, is growing every day. We have competing with us not only Europe, but America. America is increasing her textile industries at an enormous rate, and in that country very little interference is allowed with the working of the factories. We do not complain at all of the Factories Acts; we are quite willing to see them carried out in as perfect and as fair a manner as possible; but we do say that the easier you can carry them out the better it is, not only for the proprietors of the mills, but also for the Home Office itself. I think that if the Home Secretary could see his way to modify this enormous tax upon the country of having so many more men than are required for the work, it would be a great relief to the industries which I particularly represent, and at the same time it would be an advantage to the country, because the less you interfere with trade, so long as you take care that the people are protected in every way, the better it is for the nation at large.

*MR. JOHN BURNS (Battersea): Not for the first time the present Home Secretary has inaugurated his accession to a new office by introducing a new legislative project, and I venture to think that if Ministers in charge of certain other Departments during the last three or four years had signalised their appointments to office by similar legislative activity, the Ministerial Bench would be more popular in the House, and the Conservative Government more popular in the country than is now the case. As one who has taken an interest in factory legislation, I thank the right hon. Gentleman for this Bill; not because it is a large Bill, for it is not a very large Bill, neither is it a very small Bill; if I used the language of the Regulation of Fish Bill brought in last year, I should describe it as an "immature" Bill; but such as the Bill is, I am reasonably content with it. And when the Bill is connected, not before time, with a Consolidation Bill, I am more pleased with it than I otherwise should be. It is evident, however, from the remarks of the last speaker, that the Bill is not to have the smooth passage that some of us expected. On the contrary, I interpret the hon. Member's speech as the premonitory symptom of an opposition in the Standing Committee, and I sincerely trust the right hon. Gentleman will harden his heart against suggestions of the kind we have just heard. But we must

be careful that this Bill is not praised too much. I believe that it is a useful measure, and that it is the logical complement of Bills which have preceded it, but I should be sorry to regard it as a final measure of factory legislation. If it is so conceived by Members on the other side of the House, all I can say is that they are living in a fool's paradise, and will certainly soon be awakened. It is an encouraging fact that factory legislation is being kept out of the arena of party politics more and more every year. That is a very good sign, because it shows that public opinion in the interests of public safety is harmonising the conflicting interests both of labour and of the manufacturers, and that, without desiring to hamper unnecessarily industry, trade, or commerce, there is a general understanding that England ought to be in the forefront of all the manufacturing countries of the world in its charter of industry and in sanitation and ventilation. But I cannot at this juncture refrain from reminding the House of Commons what happened in 1894–95, when the Bill of the late Home Secretary was introduced. The newspapers, especially the technical journals, were most amusing reading. We were told that we were harassing industry, that we were worrying commerce, that trade would be killed; the air was full of vamped-up fears and melancholy forebodings as to the future of British trade and commerce if that particular Bill passed. I said then, and I say now, that the fact is that all industries which lag behind the best employers ought to go under. Anything that good or bad Factory Acts can do to sustain those industries will be ineffectual. What is more, I believe that any industry which is to be kept on its feet only by relaxing Factory Acts and low sanitary conditions cannot last for more than a year or two at the very most. The fact is that the factories which go in advance of the Factory Acts in sanitation, ventilation, safety, hours, and wages are the factories which are able to beat their competitors at home and to dominate the markets abroad. Objection to Factory Acts symptomises commercial incompetency and industrial inefficiency. I believe it was the Factory Acts alone that gave Lancashire its worldwide supremacy in the cotton industry for sixty or seventy years. I believe that it was the fact that in Lancashire the system was based upon a six working days per week of nine hours each, and working under reasonable sanitation, ventilation, and inspection that enabled the manufacturers of that county to put their house in order, and by virtue of the organisation that Factory Acts and fixed conditions imposed hold their own against the competitors in all other countries in the world. Where you find factory owners and employers of labour objecting to factory legislation on the ground that it goes too far, there you generally find commercial incompetency showing itself. The most profitable industries just now are those which are conducted a long way in advance of the Factory Acts, and the object of factory legislation should be to make the worst employers "toe the line." That would be the best thing for the workmen, and would be advantageous to the country. I well remember some time ago the Member for the Bordesley Division and myself wrestling with the question of laundries upon the Grand Committee. Experience, however, teaches, and all those predictions about laundries have been falsified. There never has been a trade in which the profits

have been so good all round as in the case of laundries since 1895. I would remind the House of what was said in regard to bakehouses. It was quite pathetic to listen to the depositions of master bakers as to what would have happened if underground bakehouses were abolished. I have not received a single complaint, and I do not believe other hon. Members have received many complaints in regard to bakehouses either above or underground as to the possible danger of the introduction of this particular clause, and I sincerely trust that the Home Secretary will stand by his Bill in that respect. There are some hon. Members, of whom the hon. Member who spoke last is an example, who are under the impression that we have gone far enough in regard to factory inspection. If there is, as he states, overlapping and too many inspectors in Lancashire, then let us get rid of it. If we have four persons to do one or two men's work, that should be a hint to the Home Office to reorganise the supervision of factories, and perhaps by heavier penalties reduce the cost and number of inspectorates; but it is not an argument against the passing of this Act.

I have one other fact to mention. I have been making a statistical investigation into the question of the lengthening of life in the trade to which I belong. During the period in which the Factory and Workshops Acts have been operating in this country the average life of the working engineer has increased remarkably, during the last forty years by ten years. By that I mean that whereas the average age of the engineer forty years ago at death was from forty-two to forty-four years, now the average age at death is from fifty-two to fifty-five years. This great improvement is due to some cause. The fact is the lower death rate the higher wage, the greater and steadier profit the increased employment all testify to value of Factory

Acts. In my own trade, I believe it is largely due to raising the age of child labour, to the gradual diminution of overtime, to employers' liability and compensation, to workmen's legislation, and, above all, to the Factory Acts, ventilation, and inspection. I think it is a great advantage to the nation that ten years should have been added to an engineer's life after he has had so many years of experience. I think this is an asset of the Factory Acts which the House of Commons ought to cheerfully welcome and endeavour to extend. I am glad to see that in this Bill the arbitration farce is practically abolished. I congratulate the Home Secretary upon doing, in this Bill what I am sorry to say I was denounced six or seven years ago for advocating, and I am very glad that the Home Secretary has come almost entirely my way. The effect of this proposal is practically to abolish arbitration with regard to dangerous trades. But while I welcome this instalment I cannot see why he wants to do it in this way. He wants arbitration dispensed with, and by the order of the Secretary of State there is to be an inquiry, and the report is to be laid on the Table of the House of Commons for six weeks, and if it is not seriously challenged it is to become law.

*MR. RITCHIE: Not the Report, but the decision.

*MR. JOHN BURNS: Then the decision is to lie upon the Table for six weeks. In my opinion six weeks is too long, and I do not see why you should have an inquiry at all. The most competent investigator is the factory inspector who is located

in the district. He sees all the facts, and he is not particularly anxious to worry or harass the employer. I believe that the majority of employers and the majority of workmen would be quite content to accept the decision of the factory inspector, without a long inquiry as to what was or was not a dangerous trade. I cannot help appealing to the House of Commons for increased safety in this respect for this reason. I do not know whether hon. Members look over the casualty list or the butcher's bill of labour in this country. I want to show to the House the necessity there is for inspection. Last year 5,000 workmen were killed by industrial accidents alone. That is more than the actual number of men killed by bullets in twenty months of the war in South Africa. The total number of fatal accidents last year was no less than 5,000. But beyond this, notwithstanding our present imperfect standard of accidents, no less than 100,000 men sustained very serious accidents. I do not want to point out to the House that so long as we have five battalions of men sent to a premature death and three army corps of men seriously injured every year, there is strong reason for Factory Acts and for inspection. I am a member of the Hearts of Oak Society, which is the only society which goes seriously into the question of accidents. Men engaged in dangerous trades are excluded, but of the 206,000 men in the society in 1897, 11,000 were injured and a large number killed. If we apply that number to the army of workmen affected by this Bill we shall have 6,000 men killed and nearly half a million of accidents in which the men were disabled for more than a week, and when our reports show an increase, a startling increase, in industrial accidents, there is need for better prevention. Add to this the lead poisoning and anthrax disablements, that is the reason why we should have stricter factory legislation than we now have. I now come to the dangerous trades. When a certain newspaper in London some years ago started a crusade against "phossy jaw" we were told that this kind of thing could not be prevented, that it must go on, and could not be stopped. I have here an advertisement issued by one of the largest match manufacturing firms, whose name I will not give, for they do not deserve an advertisement. I find that after five years of this crusade they state in their advertisement that there will be no more "phossy jaw" and poisoning of their workpeople, and that they are now able to make matches which will not be injurious either to those who use them or make them. If it had not been for the agitation started by the Star and the Morning Leader we should not have had this reform. But it was a reform easily carried out but for the ignorance of vested interest. I should like to know why the Home Secretary wishes to upset our standard of calculation in regard to accidents. There is really no need for it.

The present period of notification of injury is long enough, and I believe that all accidents disabling a man for work should be notified. The knowledge of the figures will make for safety. I consider that this alteration will be a serious incentive to the negligent employer to be more negligent, and will prevent some good employers from being still more careful, and I trust that the Bill will be improved in that particular.

I now come to a lamentable omission in this Factory Bill with regard to the docks. My position in life has placed me closely in contact with the dock

labourers of this great city, and nothing affects me more than to go to a mass meeting of dock labourers, either in the evening or on a Sunday morning, and to ask some 4,000 or 5,000 dock labourers to vote on any resolution by show of hands. If hon. Members would only go to a dockers' meeting at Liverpool or at Glasgow, and ask the stevedores or dock labourers to assent to or vote against any resolution by show of hands, they will be struck by the large number of mutilated fingers and hands and twisted wrists which they will see, and a more sickening spectacle I have never witnessed. Many of these accidents are preventable, and they largely destroy the efficiency of the workmen. Go to almost any hospital or workhouse in the East End of London, and you will find quite thirty or forty dock labourers incapable of following their employment through injuries. These strong young men are subject to these preventable accidents, and they consequently become a great burden to the ratepayers. I think all hon. Members will agree with me that in this matter prevention is better than cure. We ought to protect them where we can, and then they would not become a burden on the rates, and we should get more recruits for the Militia from the dock districts. The docks should be scheduled by the Home Office as a dangerous trade, because the proportion of men injured in the dock industry is larger than in the lead poisoning industries, wool sorting, mines, or railways. If great loss of life is a reason for making any industry a dangerous trade, then you ought to do this in regard to the dock industry. If the Home Secretary will come with me down to the Poplar Hospital and see for himself those four accidents per hour which are brought there mainly from the docks and riverside industries, he will see a reason why the dock industry should be registered as a dangerous trade. The dock labourer works under a great disability. If he is working on the jetty connected with the ship he is unloading by a gangway, then he comes under the Acts, but if even a bigger vessel was being unloaded under more dangerous conditions in midstream, that ship ceases to be a factory and workshop for the purpose of compensation under the Factory Acts. I suggest that the Home Secretary should take his courage in both hands and declare that for all the purposes of the Factory Acts and for workmen's compensation a ship should be a "factory" when it was being loaded or unloaded in a harbour, in midstream, in a canal, or alongside a jetty or wharf. The admirable report of dock accidents which has been made by Mr. Maitland and Mr. Erant should induce the right hon. Gentleman to make two or three of the present factory inspectors special dock inspectors, in order to concentrate and confine all their energies upon docks. Anyone who goes to Woolwich, Pembroke, Chatham, or Portsmouth, and considers the number of workmen employed in a Royal dockyard, where the chains are tested, the gangways inspected, and where much of the gear and tackle is subjected to periodical inspection, will find that in the Royal dockyards the proportion of men injured and killed per thousand is enormously less than in the ordinary docks, where the testing of tackle and gear and other precautions are not taken. The inspector on p. 91 of the 1900. Report confirms this by saying that "at some docks the accidents due to breakage of chains have been almost avoided." We ought to have all the shipbuilding yards and docks subjected to the same conditions of tests, inspection, and

examination, and that is what I hope will be done. The inspector should be allowed on the spot to condemn defective gear and tackle. If the right hon. Gentleman does this I shall personally thank the Home Secretary on behalf of the dockers of London.

Another point with which I wish to deal

is concerning Clause 9, which deals with sanitation, and which gives powers to the local authority. If it happens to be a good sanitary authority I do not object, but if it is a bad one it will be most objectionable. Supposing we have a district council in a district where there is a very large factory employing 1,000 or 1,500 men, and supposing that the owner of that large factory happens to be the chairman of that district council. Perhaps one of his own foremen might be the chairman of the sanitary committee. Are we to allow that big factory owner under Clause 9 to dominate the sanitary and hygienic conditions, not only of his own factory, but of other factories in that district? With regard to home work, I do wish the Home Secretary would take courage and abolish it altogether. That would solve a very knotty problem. Home work is difficult to control and very difficult to follow in the East End of London. It is practically impossible to control it, and it is very difficult to watch. I notice that there are no overtime restrictions in this Bill. There is no limit to Saturday afternoon work, and Sunday work is allowed under certain conditions, and that I regard as a blot on the Bill.

I come now to one of the chief blots on this Bill, and it is contained in Clause 26. I am very sorry to say that I cannot see my way to agree with some of my Irish friends upon this clause. I wish to deal with this question as it affects laundries. I am not ashamed to say that I am the son of a washerwoman. Two of my sisters used to be ironers in the laundry which now does the laundry work for the House of Commons. Therefore, I can look upon the question of laundries from a practical standpoint. From my own personal experience I can speak of the struggles and the worry of the brutal overwork in domestic laundries to which washerwomen are subjected, and I should rejoice to hear to-morrow that every small domestic laundry was abolished altogether. It is mistaken sympathy for the Home Secretary to buttress up these small and insanitary laundries. They are dying, and the sooner they die the better for everybody concerned. Some laundries are now making from ten to twenty per cent. profit by overworking these women. I am sorry to say that only too many of the women working at the washtub and ironing trade and the calendering machine have their willingness to work exploited by lazy sons and drunken husbands, and loafers who live on the industry of their sisters and wives. Let the right hon. Gentleman look upon the laundry as a definite profession and a well-organised industry, and a profitable trade, and let him apply to the washing of linen the same six working days per week, of nine hours each, and the same conditions of labour as are applied to the less profitable Lancashire textile industry. If he does that he will earn the everlasting gratitude of the son of a London washerwoman.

I now come to another defect in this Bill. Before dealing with it, however, I wish to say a few words with regard to conventual laundries. The hon. Member for

Waterford said that this clause was a serious one so far as his co-religionists were concerned. His objection, therefore, is only on the ground of religion. [No, no.] I am not going to be embroiled in a religious controversy, because it is generally abortive. The hon. Member for Waterford objected to this clause, and opposed it on the ground that it was defeated in 1895. I think we ought to be clear in our facts upon this point. The laundries clause was opposed in 1895, and conventual laundries were treated in this way because the Factory Bill was hustled through just prior to the dissolution of Parliament, and that was mainly responsible for the way in which these institutions were treated. I want to point out to the hon. Member for Waterford, whom I am very sorry not to see in his place, that he was not quite accurate when he said that no case was made out for this clause. I would remind the hon. Member for Waterford that there are laundries and laundries, there are charitable institutions and charitable institutions, and there are philanthropic laundries and philanthropic laundries. If we give way upon conventual laundries to one religious body, then we shall be driven to give way in the case of other laundries for religious and other reasons. General Booth tried that game on with regard to his refuges and what was the result? Why, that his refuges, shelters, and philanthropic institutions, which were carried on in perfect good faith for a good cause, and with a religious as well as philanthropic motive, became a pest and a nuisance to the neighbourhood in which they were stationed, and the County Council and the Borough Council were compelled to bring General Booth within the law in regard to sanitation and ventilation. I want to call the attention of the Irish Members to the fact that it is not only the refuge laundries we are dealing with. I have here a list of eighty-two institutions, all of which are claiming and will claim exemption. Supposing you give that exemption to one set of laundries, what will happen? Hon. Members will recollect the celebrated Zierenberg case, in which the hon. Member for Northampton instituted a prosecution against a religious institution which was taking money from the public for philanthropic objects. Mr. Zierenberg posed as a philanthropist, and claimed to be a religious benefactor. He had a laundry in connection with his home, and how did he run that laundry? There was no inspection. He got seventy or eighty girls there, and some of them were working from eighteen hours to twenty hours, and in some cases even thirty hours, continuously. He actually got girls to stoke the boilers and look after the engines; they were badly fed and got no holidays, and they were kept in a shocking and disgraceful condition. I think that if you were to inspect some of those institutions which five years ago protested against the Factory Acts being extended to them, you might find one or two Zierenberg cases. I do not think that we should give any man, whatever his religion may be, an opportunity of doing what Zierenberg did. If the conventual laundries are kept in good condition there will be no need for interference. If they are not kept under these sanitary conditions, then I say that, whether they are conventual or philanthropic laundries, or whatever religion they belong to, they ought to be made to "toe the line." Let me point out the inconsistency of some hon. Members from Ireland on this point. Whenever we have had the Home Office Vote what have we always found the Irish Members

doing? They have always worked for the humanising of prison life, and making it conform as far as possible with the conditions outside. When the Home Office Vote is taken the Irish Members have always worked for the humanising of prison life, and it seems to be rather inconsistent on their part to endeavour to maintain these religious institutions in their present condition. The hon. Member for Water-ford gave his case away when he said there were certain industrial schools which were inspected by the medical officer and the sanitary inspector of the district in regard to infectious disease and other purposes. Well, if that is not opposed, and the inmates are young Catholics, it seems to me that what they submit to there they ought to submit to with regard to these refuge homes for fallen women. Hon. Members want to differentiate between Catholic industrial schools and five or six conventual laundries used as refuges for fallen women. I want to point out that that is inconsistent. I know the type the hon. Member referred to. I am sorry to think that so long as drink ravages our male and female population in some classes there are sure to be a certain number of people sunk deplorably low. I am for reclaiming these people, whether it be by the County Council or benevolent agencies, but the worst way of reclaiming fallen women, however low they may be sunk, is to put them in institutions where they may be subjected to harsh treatment, and which may go unchecked for lack of knowledge which inspection alone can give. The more humanely you treat them the more likely you are to succeed. The only points on which there could be conflict of opinion would arise between the person in charge of the refuge and the inspector; but the inspector would not be likely to go in the direction of imposing conditions of greater severity on the inmates, whilst he would not interfere with their discipline except where such was desirable. I believe that the Irish Members, whose motives and intentions are good, have been inconsistent in asking that conventual laundries should be withdrawn from the Bill. I am nothing if not a practical man, and I have here the special report on laundries. I find that some of the lady superiors of homes for fallen women in Ireland were utterly indifferent on the question of inspection. This is what the inspector found;

"Visited two convent institutions where most children are employed. Found hours moderate; no dangerous machinery; sanitation good. The superioress of one has no objection to go under the Factory Act. In the second, superioress indifferent to inspection, but dislikes "Government rules;" hours worked within those of Factory Act."

I come to the laundry proprietors in Ireland who are of the same religious views. The inspector says;

"All the proprietors I visited in Ireland are opposed to inclusion, if the convent laundries are exempted. They complain of the advantages which such laundries would then possess; for instance, exemption from the cost of fencing machinery, and exemptions from the regulations affecting child labour. The latter point was emphasised by the managers of the Rathfarnham and Edmonstown laundries."

I say with all due respect that if they can only compete with private enterprise

outside their walls by leaving their machinery unfenced and by neglecting the sanitary regulations with regard to the labour of the young, the sooner that philanthropy is done away with the better for the children and everybody else. In the Factories Report for 1900, I find the inspector says;

"If all the conditions of work are ideal, acquiescence in the general law (which requires a minimum standard far short of ideal) could not be troublesome, while the example set by a body which holds itself superior to the ordinary commercial public would be of far-reaching value.

"Carrying on his business in a law-abiding manner, and without making any high-sounding claim to philanthropy, thereby incidentally benefitting his employees, he sees other establishments in which the national standard respecting certain elementary conditions is being ignored with impunity.

"It certainly offends his sense of justice when he learns that the offenders being philanthropists enjoy immunity from the law.

I say ditto to the factory inspector. I join with the private laundry owners in London, Ireland, and elsewhere, who are frequently hit hard in the competition in their industry because of work done in religious and charitable institutions. Frequently charity covers a multitude of industrial sins. I would urge my Irish friends not to press the point, and they will find an inspector appointed, most probably a lady of the Catholic faith, and the law will be enforced with all due respect to the religious susceptibilities of those who carry on these homes. It has been so with regard to industrial schools, the prison inspection of Catholics,

the supervision of schools controlled by nuns, and the experience of France justifies such control; and in the case of refuge laundries they will be brought up to the best level without irritation to anybody. If they are not able to compete with outside laundries their remedy is not in overworking the girls, not in keeping the laundries in bad sanitary condition, and not in having machinery unfenced, but by appealing to the benevolent for proper sanitary equipment. I sincerely trust that the laundries will be compelled by this very good clause to be properly equipped. I have earned the right to speak on this question, and do it with every consideration for those who differ from me. I have no religious prejudice against convents, because I put all these institutions, of whatever religion, under one head and make them toe the line. I have no animus against Catholics, I have none of the rival prejudices of a competing sect. I am a respectable Freethinker, and I am not, therefore, bigoted.

I leave that point, and I come now, Sir, to an important clause in the Bill with regard to underground labour. I ask the Home Secretary to deal with this seriously. The passing of the underground bakehouses clause in 1895 has done an enormous amount of good in improving the health of the working baker. It has created a great improvement in their industry, and what is more, the masters do not object. But why confine it to bakehouses? This clause should be so extended as to include kitchens of hotels and restaurants. Personally I do not differentiate between bakehouses where a loaf of bread is cooked and an underground kitchen in which an omelet, an entree, or a dinner is prepared for Members of this House when they dine outside. If the Home Secretary is inclined

to inspect, let him go through the hotels and restaurants in the Strand and Soho, and see the filthy conditions in which some of your swell dinners are cooked in these underground places. I once worked as a boy in an underground bakery, and that is why I am in favour of the abolition of underground bakeries. But the worst underground bakehouse is sanitation itself compared with some of your underground restaurant cookhouses.

What proof have I of that? I have the Master Bakers and Confectioners' Journal of 5th June this year, which says;

"When the Strand and every one of the West-End thoroughfares are dotted every few yards with restaurants having underground kitchens which the labours of Hercules himself could not cleanse nor any amount of sanitation make healthy, if the persons who denounce underground bakehouses are sincere, let them have a fling at underground kitchens, and they need not walk many yards from Charing Cross to find enough nastiness to nauseate them in real deadly fact. Public health really demands that this should not be allowed to continue."

I rarely dine at restaurants; I hardly ever dine at hotels, yet I am anxious to prevent Members of Parliament who do indulge in these luxuries from either serious illness or premature death. In the interest of my parliamentary colleagues I do ask the Home Secretary to place restaurant and hotel kitchens which are underground in precisely the same position as regards sanitation and ventilation as underground bakehouses now are. He can do this because hotels are very profitable. The men are over-worked, and the sanitary conditions are simply indescribable. I sincerely hope the Home Secretary will bring these kitchens within the Bill. I have one convincing argument why they should be brought in. I was talking to a man whose name must be withheld, because the mention of his name would be ruin to his industry. His business is to clear restaurants, hotels, and bakehouses of rats, vermin, and insects of every description. He said to me;

"If the bakehouse clause was applied to hotel and restaurant kitchens, my occupation, like Othello's, would be gone. If you were to see the places I visit in pursuit of my trade you would be positively staggered at the indescribable filth I have to deal with. I find this in pursuit of my occupation as rat catcher, vermin killer, and insect destroyer."

"Well," I said, "you are really the embodiment of disinterestedness, you are the soul of public spirit." He replied;

"Better that my trade should perish and that my occupation should disappear than that these conditions should continue."

On this subject I agree with him, and this Bill should be made the medium of preventing such things.

I hope I have been practical in my criticism. In the proper place upstairs I shall endeavour to give expression to my objections. I hope I shall in respect of hotel and restaurant kitchens, at least, have every Member on my side.

*MR. JAMES KENYON (Lancashire, Bury) thanked the hon. Member for Battersea for the great compliment he had paid his county with respect to the way the Factory Act had been carried out. He was astonished that the hon. Member was trying to

do away with, what, he ventured to think, was a most important employment for poor people in this country. The hon. Member had talked about the conditions in the East End of London, but it was wrong to judge of home industries by the experiences there. The same conditions did not prevail in the provinces, where this class of employment provided work for a great many people, and it was a very great help to them. Some of them were in rather delicate health and not able to do a full day's work. This Bill, like many of the Factory Acts, was too vague. The bulk of the employers he was quite certain were anxious to conform to the conditions of the Factory Acts, but he was confident that they would be much better if plain definitions were given. He pointed out that Clause 15 was particularly vague, for here they were placed entirely at the mercy of the inspector, who might be a very reasonable man, a very decent fellow, or he might be a faddist; and the Lord preserve them from the faddist. For instance, in the Rivers Pollution Bill, they had never clearly defined what was meant by "pollution." They never had a standard of pollution. Let the Bill tell them what they were to do, and they would do it. They had heard references to being "humane." The great bulk of men in Lancashire were humane; and the employers would be very much ashamed not to carry out any sanitary regulations which were asked of them. The great bulk of the mills in Lancashire were something of which they had a right to be proud. He believed the inspectors as a body were able men who did their work well, but some of them were a little wanting in politeness. He mentioned the case of a friend who showed an inspector over his works, and said to him when the inspection was over, "I hope you have nothing to find fault with."

The inspector replied, "I have not come here to pay compliments." He thought a little politeness would tend to lessen the irritation which was sometimes felt in carrying out the regulations under the Acts.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar): I would like to draw attention to one matter that has not received much attention up to the present moment. This Bill is connected with the Consolidation Bill, and if the Consolidation Bill passes, the House will hardly be asked again for years to undertake factory reform. Therefore I think it is essential at the present moment that such reforms as are in accord with public opinion should be undertaken by the Standing Committee on Trade and introduced in this Bill. We have had five years experience of the Act brought forward by my right hon. friend the Member for East Fife, and that experience has shown that in certain particulars it was not altogether satisfactory in regard to laundries, home work, and docks. I agree with the Members for Dublin and Battersea that more activity is required on the part of the Home Secretary in dealing with the dockers' question. With regard to labour in docks, the administration of the Home Office has been very limited since 1895, and it will be well worthy of consideration when the Bill comes into Committee whether such labour should be included among dangerous employments and subjected to special rules. At present a dock labourer at work in loading or unloading a ship attached to a quay comes under the Factory Act, but when he is doing similar work on the same ship in mid-stream he is excluded from that Act. This is an anomaly which ought not to exist. The Workmen's Compensation Act

followed the same lines as the Factory Act, and a labourer would be entitled to compensation if injured in working on a ship attached to a quay, but not if injured in doing similar work on the same ship, if the ship were in mid-stream. I trust that the attention of the Home Secretary will be directed to this anomaly, which arose out of the compromise with the shipowners in 1895, and that he will give favourable consideration to its amendment in Committee.

In my opinion, the chief blot in the Bill is that it does not in any way deal with the question of overtime allowed in certain industries. We had hoped that the Bill would deal with overtime in the sense of diminishing it. In 1895 the hours of overtime were reduced, and I believe that public opinion, and the employers themselves, are in favour of a further diminution of overtime. The chief inspector said that overtime might be abolished altogether except in regard to work on perishable articles in certain trades; it would be a simple matter of trade arrangement. The other question to which I wish to refer is that of home work. The hon. Member who has just spoken seems to think that it would be impossible to abolish home work altogether; and I agree that at the present time it is out of the question; but what is possible is the improvement of the conditions of home work. The propositions in the Bill regarding home and domestic workshops tend in a wrong direction, and I think makes the conditions worse. In the keeping of a proper register and proper lists there is, however, considerable improvement. The most important matter connected with this question is the control of home work. We have an immense number of regulations for the control of what I would call the aristocracy of labour; but I have been surprised to find, in reading through the reports of the inspectors to the Home Secretary, only one reference, of two or three lines, to any question connected with home work or domestic workshops. The greater part of these reports is devoted to textile trades, and more attention ought to be given to the inspection of domestic workshops in the sweating dens of the east end of London and in other large towns. I was very glad to hear the Home Secretary give a very conciliatory answer to my right hon. friend the Member for Forest of Dean, who was asked to withdraw his particular Amendment on this question, with the assurance from the Home Secretary that he would give the matter favourable consideration in Committee. I trust that when we get into Committee hon. Members will be allowed a free hand in order to strengthen the right hon. Gentleman's position on this question of home work. We want to know where the work given out to be done at home is sent to, and under what conditions; and that can only be done by registered lists and periodical supervision. The Bill follows in many of its provisions the policy of the Act introduced by Mr. Matthews in 1891, and leaves with the local authorities a considerable amount of responsibility for the inspection of factories and workshops. I do not want to say a word against local authorities, but it is quite certain that in rural districts and small towns they had no desire or intention to carry out their duties in this respect. I thought, in regard to this matter, that we had a promise that it would be carefully considered, and I hope that the right hon. Gentleman will do something to reverse the policy of still leaving in the hands of the local bodies the duties of inspection. I trust

that when the Bill gets into Committee we will be able to improve it, as was done in the case of the Bills of 1891 and 1895.

MR. RENSCHAW (Renfrewshire, W.): I approach the consideration of this Bill not only from the point of view of an employer of labour, but from that of the local authority. It seems to me that in recent factory legislation, whether it came from this side of the House or from hon. Gentlemen opposite, there has been a determined endeavour to transfer the cost of factory inspection from the Imperial Exchequer, at all events to some extent, on to the shoulders of the local authorities. It is against that policy that I wish to make my protest to-night. The duty of factory inspection was a duty laid on the State, and carried out by the State for a large number of years. In the Factory Act of 1878 provision was made by which the administration of the sanitary laws in respect to factories and workshops rested upon the State Factory Inspectors. By the Act of 1891 that was changed in respect to workshops, and was placed on the local authority, while in 1895 it was placed on the Sanitary Committee of the Local Authority. In Scotland we have a Public Health Act, passed as recently as 1897, which gives to the local authority, independently of any factory legislation, very much wider power in respect to inspection and sanitation than are enjoyed by the local authorities either in England or Ireland. Under the Public Health Laws, as they exist at present in Scotland, I believe it is perfectly possible for the sanitary inspection to be carried out effectively and thoroughly, so far as it ought to devolve on the local authority, especially in regard to out-work, workshops, and work-places. But in regard to factory inspection and the sanitation of factories, I still hold that the responsibility rests with the Imperial authorities. The only point of objection I have to the measure now before the House is that it proposes to impose further duties on the local authority in regard to factory administration. The provisions as to the outworkers' lists, which is most complicated, will throw a large amount of labour unnecessarily on the local authorities. These lists ought to be kept, not by the local authorities, but by the employers of labour, and should be open to the sanitary authorities and the factory inspectors. Then, too, duties are to be imposed on the local authority in regard to prohibition of home-work in places injurious to health, which duties are at present discharged by the State factory inspectors; and in regard to abstracts for domestic factories and workshops, and registers of workshops; and according to Clause 17, the already heavily-burdened medical officer is to report specifically on the administration of the Factory Acts in workshops and places, and send a copy of his annual report, or so much as deals with this subject, to the Secretary of State. By the Act of 1895 certain duties were cast on the local authority in respect to the inspection, in factories, of the provision of means of escape from fire. Now, the local authorities in Scotland have no power whatever to provide fire-escapes or any vehicle for the extinction of fire, and, having no machinery for the administration involved in connection with the inspection of fire-escapes, that duty ought not to be imposed upon them, but ought to be discharged by the State, and dealt with by a special bye-law drawn up by the Secretary of State. I think that great danger will result from such a system of dual control, for wherever

you have got dual authority you will always have weak administration. I would have it perfectly clearly established, now that we are rightly taking steps towards the consolidation of the factory laws, that the burden should be laid on one man, and that he should be recognised by all the authorities as the one man to take charge of sanitation and factory inspection.

*MR. MATHER (Lancashire, Rossendale) said it was not often they on that side of the House were able to heartily support legislation proposed from the Government Benches. As a large employer of labour in various industries he could say that this Bill was calculated to remove a considerable amount of the impediments which created difficulty in the relation between employers and employees. There was no intelligent employer in the country who regretted restrictive legislation as to the conditions of work, but there were some portions of the Bill in which the clauses were not sufficiently definite. He agreed with an hon. Member who had spoken that the phraseology would be difficult to understand in some clauses on the part both of employer and the workmen. Clause 5, which was very indefinite, might arrest the application of some new discoveries to many important industries. It placed in the hands of the Home Secretary the right, under regulation, to prohibit the employment of, or modify or limit the period of employment of all persons, or any class of persons, in any manufacture, machinery, process, or description of manual labour certified to be dangerous, and it prohibited the use of any material or process admitted to be dangerous. But there were so many new materials and new processes invented day by day, that if any great obstruction were placed against their use, the developments of science in its application to industry would be discouraged. That was a clause which would be capable of modification in Committee without disturbing the principle underlying it. Take again Sub-section 2 of Clause 15, which said; "In any room in a factory or workshop in which any process is carried on which renders the floor liable to be wet, adequate means shall be provided for draining off the wet."

But there were many definitions of wet, and of a floor moist to a degree of wetness, and therefore in that respect the Bill required to be amended. In fact, the draftsman of the Bill had no quite seen the importance of many points. Then as to steam boilers; according to Clause 19, every boiler was to be internally and externally examined by a competent engineer at least once every twelve months. Well, he was an engineer, but they had no standard of engineering skill for the inspection of boilers. Under these circumstances he thought the right hon. Gentleman must admit that he should more clearly define what was a "competent engineer." As to the general tenour of the Bill, he believed that hon. Members on both sides of the House would welcome it as a great step in the right direction and in progressive legislation, to control industries in the interests of both employer and employed. He could say from long observation in many countries where there was the best application of sanitary science, where the greatest care was bestowed, where the largest outlay was made in making the workshops at all times of the year healthy and comfortable to the operatives; there the best work was done, and the best trade was done. He hailed this measure as a distinct step in the right direction for enabling employers of

labour to control their industry in the way most of them wished to do. He believed that the chairman of the Birmingham firm whose words had been quoted by his right hon. friend the Member for East Fife stood absolutely alone among the great employers of labour in the United Kingdom in deprecating the interposition of Government in such matters as were included in this Bill, and he was confident that the great majority of employers were quite willing that there should be discreet Government interference to secure for the workers the best results of sanitary science. With regard to dangerous employments, he happened to be connected with an enterprise liable to endanger the workpeople if the greatest care was not employed in the conduct of the business and in the management of the necessary appliances. One of the greatest difficulties with which manufacturers had to deal was the carelessness on the part of the workmen themselves in not adhering to the rules laid down for their safety and benefit, even after the most earnest exhortations had been addressed to them, both verbally and in printed rules. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would make this Bill helpful to employers in inducing or compelling workpeople to take care of themselves, and to bear their share of the burdens. It was of the greatest importance to every industry in the country that these should be conducted under conditions the most perfect for health.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: With regard to the exact position in which we stand with reference to this Bill, and to the motion consequent upon it, the House will remember that we were disappointed in not obtaining the Bill on Tuesday last. I explained to the House then how convenient it would be to get the Bill on that day, but we were disappointed. I hope, however, that the House will now consent to close the discussion on the Second Reading at such an hour as will enable us before twelve o'clock to take the Second Reading of this Bill, and also of the Factories and Workshops Acts Consolidation Bill. The discussion has been of a very interesting character, but I trust there will be no objection to finishing it before twelve o'clock.

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): Will the Finance Bill be taken to-night?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir.

MR. HARWOOD (Bolton): I should like to call the attention of the House to what seems to me a very striking matter in connection with this Bill, and that is the altered tone of the employers of labour in regard to legislation of this character. My father used to tell me that the early Factory Acts were passed in a spirit of revenge, and that it was thought by everyone that they would be injurious to the textile trade; but we have discovered that that is not true, and that factory legislation has been not only good for the workpeople, but also for the employers and for trade generally. Nothing is better for trade than that it should be carried on by healthy workpeople who are not overtaxed. Therefore I say to the Home Secretary that, as an employer of labour myself, I welcome this Bill. I am not speaking at all from the point of view of opposition to it, but I wish to point out a few omissions from it. My hon.

friend suggested that there should be some definition of what was sufficient ventilation, but I think it would be very difficult to define a matter of that kind. I think, however, the matter should be under the control of one central

authority. Clause 18 will very largely affect trade in my part of the country. It provides that a person shall not be allowed to clean any place under any machinery even when a portion of the machinery remains still. Now I take it, as an amateur lawyer, unless some further explanation is given, that this provision will be extremely awkward and injurious to our trade, and I may say that the operatives and their representatives will feel just as strongly about it, and more so, than I do. I can assure the right hon. Gentleman that that is so. I know the feeling of the operatives as well as he does, and I am not prepared to yield my own opinion in this matter even to such an omniscient authority. Then again with regard to boilers, it is proposed that they should be examined every twelve months. I would like to remind the right hon. Gentleman that the universal custom in our part of the country is to examine the boilers during holiday time, and that time may not always come within the twelve months. Therefore I think there should be an extension of time, say, to fourteen months, which would cover the variation of the holidays. We have been reminded by more than one speaker that if this Bill is passed we cannot expect more factory legislation for a long time. That is a perfectly fair and just principle. We cannot expect the House of Commons and the country to give attention to legislation of this kind at short periods, and therefore we have to take great precautions that anything about which we care shall, if possible, be brought in now, because if it is not we may make up our minds that it will not be brought in for a long time to come.

There are two important omissions in this Bill to which I venture to call the attention of the Home Secretary. One has reference to Clause 32 respecting "particulars." The Home Secretary is well aware that in regard to this there has been an agreement come to in one of our largest industries, namely, the weaving industry, after much discussion and difficulty, between employers and employed, which I believe has been laid before the right hon. Gentleman, and I say it would be a thousand pities, when such an agreement has been arrived at, if the opportunity is not taken to bring that agreement within the compass of the Bill. Therefore, I hope the Home Secretary will see his way to embody that agreement in Clause 32. The Other question to which I should like to refer is, perhaps, too utopian to hope for; but still I will put it before the right hon. Gentleman. It is this: there is a strong feeling among people in my part of the country, a stronger feeling probably than the right hon. Gentleman or other Members of this House are aware of, in favour of shortening the working hours on Saturdays. I should like to remind the House that there has been no change in the hours of factory employment for nearly a quarter of a century. As an employer of labour acquainted with the conditions of trade, I know that the strain and intensity of labour have enormously increased, and that the productiveness of labour has increased more than 10 per cent. during the period I have mentioned. I hope therefore that the right hon. Gentleman will bear this fact in mind. The hours of labour have been decreased in other industries, and it does seem a reflection on Parliament that the one industry in which women and children are chiefly concerned is the one in which no reduction of hours has been made for a quarter

of a century. I venture to assure the right hon. Gentleman that this is a matter of intense, domestic sentiment. I can speak for my own part of the country when I say that men and youths engaged in occupations are able to return home on Saturdays at twelve o'clock, while their sisters, wives, and children do not get home till one hour afterwards. I ask the right hon. Gentleman and the House to consider this, because it will reflect on Parliament if the working classes realise that Parliamentary care means the prevention of reforms which would be brought about if the trades were free. I hope the right hon. Gentleman will see his way to introduce this much needed and moderate reform into the Bill. There was a ballot as to whether the workpeople would be prepared to give up a proportion of their

wages, and the result was a majority of twenty-eight to one in favour of the change. I therefore trust that the present opportunity will be taken to include in this Bill a reform so much desired.

*MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe): Though speaking on the opposite side of the House from the Home Secretary, I desire to join in the chorus of approbation that the Bill of this year is so much better than the Bill of last year. I do not know whether, if we had waited a year longer, we should not have got even a better Bill; but, at all events, several of the proposals in the present Bill are distinct improvements. I agree with my hon. friend that the ventilation proposals are useful, although they might be more useful still. As regards the provision with reference to wet floors, I assume, it does not refer to floors which are merely moist, because there are many branches of manufacture in which the floors must be wet in that sense, and I think words to that effect should be inserted. I do not, of course, refer to pools of water on the floors. Clause 17, which authorises the medical officer of health in a locality to give a specific report on the administration of the Factory Acts in his district, seems to be a most excellent clause. I suppose we may take it as being one of the first fruits of the very excellent appointment of Dr. Arthur Whitelegge as His Majesty's Chief Inspector of Factories, and I may be permitted to congratulate the Home Office on that appointment. I welcome the introduction of the medical officer of health into the administration of the Factory Acts, though he must not be confused with the certifying factory surgeon. With regard to the cleaning of machinery, whether wholly or partly in motion, I did not quite catch the meaning of my hon. friend the Member for Bolton. Clause 18 says;

"A child shall not be allowed to clean in any factory any place under any machinery other than overhead mill gearing while the machinery is in motion by aid of steam, water, or other mechanical power."

I welcome the introduction of that clause, which is a very great improvement in the present law, because undoubtedly a very large number of accidents, not only to children but also to adults, have resulted from the dangerous practice of cleaning machinery while it is in

motion. Clause 19 deals with steam boilers. It is really almost a reflection on Parliament that we should only now be making it necessary to have a steam gauge and a water gauge on every boiler. That shows how deficient the law is at present. But why should railway companies be exempted? Is it because the railway

interest in this House is so powerful? Why should we not endeavour to prevent locomotive explosions? Only a few weeks ago a railway locomotive boiler exploded, and the stoker and the engine-driver were blown to atoms. That might have happened in a crowded railway station; and I should say myself that boiler explosions are more apt to occur when steam is being kept down than when the locomotives are running. There seems to me to be no good reason whatever for excluding railway locomotive boilers, and of course agricultural boilers also. I quite agree that we must have a better definition of what a "competent engineer" means. Many of us employ competent engineers, and I myself might say that inspection by my own engineer of a boiler should be sufficient. But in the interests of the community at large boilers of private firms ought to be inspected not only by a competent engineer, but by some outside independent expert authority. As hon. Members representing manufacturing districts know well, the custom is for all sensible proprietors of factory boilers to have the boilers periodically inspected by the Inspector of the Boiler Insurance Company with whom they are insured. Not only do we insure our boilers, but we also insure our economisers, and I would recommend to the Home Secretary that insurance of economisers is just as necessary as insurance of boilers. Clause 25 introduces a new principle; namely, that the factory surgeon in issuing a certificate to a young person or child may qualify the certificate in such a way as to prevent that child or young person being employed in labour for which he or she is unfitted. I think an option of this kind is a very desirable proviso. I myself know that factory surgeons have very often felt themselves under the obligation, as it were, of certifying children and young persons for work for which they were not fitted, and I am sure that this option will be frequently exercised by the factory surgeons. In Clause 38 we have a very interesting exemption which still continues to be made in favour of factories doing Government work. It is a fact that factories in the north of England have been availing themselves of the power to manufacture goods on their own account by working overtime, when that overtime ought to have been confined to Government work only. I would suggest, in order that this provision should be properly carried out, that whenever it is desired to exercise it there should be sent not only to the local factory inspector a special notice, but that a special notice should be exhibited in the factory itself at the time, so that the workpeople may know to what the proviso applies. I am glad also to see in this Bill that electrical stations and railway sidings are to be brought within its scope. I am only a new Member, and I intend to make short speeches. This is a subject of which I know a great deal, and I have only said a quarter of what I wished to say, but I do not believe in long speeches. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for East Fife referred to the speech of that eminent business man the chairman of Kynochs the other day, with reference to inspection. I am not in any fear of inspection, nor is any good employer, as long as we have not to pay too much for it. But in the same speech to which the right hon. Gentleman referred, it is cheering to find that the prospects of the general trade seemed to the chairman of the company brighter than they had been for a long time past. He said;

"Individual businesses no doubt waxed and waned, but the manufacturers of this country were never, as a whole, it appeared to him, more confident, more energetic, more successful, and;perhaps he ought to say it in a whisper;more wealthy.

If this be the case, then we have no more to fear in the future from these supposed restrictions on our liberty than we, have had in the past.

MR. J. W. WILSON (Worcestershire, N.): I am glad that the Home Secretary and the Government have brought forward this Bill at a moderate time in the session, and have not left it to a later period to send it to the Committee which is to deal with it. I hope the Committee will spare no pains in making the, Bill as distinct, as intelligible, and as clear as they possibly can, not only to employers of labour and factory inspectors, but also to employees, and that its consideration will not be in any way hurried. It is not my intention to go into a detailed criticism, especially after what the First Lord of the Treasury has said, but I hope that both Bills will pass their Second Reading before twelve o'clock to-night. I would, however, associate myself with the suggestion that this Bill throws too much power on the local authorities, not because I am afraid of decentralisation, but because of the inconvenience of having several inspectors representing different authorities and causing friction and difficulty. I believe in the local authority, particularly the medical officers of that authority, being able to call the attention of the Home Office to things required to be done, but I believe particularly in having at the Home Office inspectors of higher calibre and greater judgment than can be possibly employed by the local authorities, and in keeping with the supreme power and ultimate judgment in these matters. With reference to Clause 5, I hope great care will be used in declaring what process or material shall be employed or not. I am a great believer in prevention, and in the power of science to overcome difficulties, whether chemical, mechanical, or of any other kind. Prohibition will never advance the commercial prosperity of this country. I should regard that as the last resort, believing that, if only the right pressure is brought to bear, English science, ability, and dogged-ness will eventually overcome the difficulties and bring to a successful issue what might appear to be a most difficult, dangerous, or intricate mechanical process. That is another reason why I think that full publicity should be given to all such inquiries, and that due time should be given for discussion either here or in Select Committees upstairs before any ultimately too severe or restrictive legislation is passed affecting the industries of the country.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich): I trust the right hon. Gentleman will not find this discussion too sweet for his palate. For myself, I do not consider Government inspection to be a good thing in itself, and I Would very much prefer that manufacturers

and owners of workshops should keep their establishments in good order than that more and more inspection should be demanded. I think it is a pity that such unqualified words should appear in any Government proposal as those contained in Clause 5;that regulations may be made, among other things, prohibiting the use of any material or process. I have been engaged in taking up new processes for

more than a quarter of a century, and I remember very well that process after process that I and my partner have adopted has been at the time dangerous to life and health, but we have fought out our difficulties until those processes have become a benefit not only to those who have carried them on but to the country at large. I would ask hon. Members to consider whether such an extraordinary and unheard of power should be put into the hands of a public official, ignorant, as he is bound to be, of the matter, if it is a new process or material. I welcome the provision that the medical officer of health should report on the administration of the Factory Acts in workshops and work places, but I am reminded of a futile endeavour which I made in 1888 to induce the Government to provide that all medical officers of health should be made independent of private practice. I am afraid that this new power, put into the hands of men of high character and qualifications, but who unfortunately receive at the hands of the public authorities salaries of only £40, £50, or £60 a year, will not altogether tend to the public advantage. That consideration may induce the right hon. Gentleman at a future date to provide that medical officers of health should be put into the thoroughly independent position which they would occupy if they had large districts, large salaries, and no private practice. There are other points upon which I should like to touch, but, in view of the appeal of the First Lord of the Treasury, I will say nothing more than that, viewed broadly, I think the Bill is an improvement upon the present practice.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.): The other night my hon. friend the Member for Waterford asked the Government to exempt from inspection a certain class of laundries conducted by the nuns of the Good Shepherd Order. The hon. Member for Battersea, in saying tonight that he disagreed with my hon. friend, said that these convent schools very often did not object to inspection, and he instanced the case of the industrial schools. But the cases are by no means parallel. In the case of industrial schools the Government gives a certain capitation grant for the children, and naturally has a right of inspection in order to see that everything is conducted in a proper manner. These laundries are carried on by ladies who have devoted their lives to the most honourable and charitable of all avocations, and certainly the ladies themselves and those whom they have given their lives to reclaim would resent any intrusion or inspection. I would go further than my hon. friend, and say that there should be no inspection of any of these schools or laundries in regard to which at present it does not exist. This question was threshed out some years ago, and the then Home Secretary, Mr. Matthews, took the stand we are now taking, and asked that these schools should be exempt on the ground that inspection was unnecessary and uncalled for. Moreover, a motion that they should be inspected was defeated in Committee by thirty-eight to ten. Nothing has happened since then to justify the re opening of the question, and we shall resist the proposal in Committee and elsewhere, believing that it is a proposal which will be subversive of discipline, and one for which there is not the slightest demand.

MR. H. J. WILSON (Yorkshire, W.R., Holmfirth): With regard to the question just referred to, the hon. Member has spoken of only one class of laundries, namely,

those carried on by nuns. But there are in London and elsewhere in this country a large number of institutions of a similar character, and I know that there is a considerable apprehension amongst them as to the effect the full application of this Bill as it stands may have upon them. I believe an intimation has been given that some concession may be made, and I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be prepared to receive any representations which may be made by the ladies who are carrying on these benevolent institutions.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, etc.

FACTORY AND WORKSHOP ACTS CONSOLIDATION BILL.

Read a second time, and committed to the Standing Committee on Trade, Etc.

ISOLATION HOSPITALS BILL.

As amended (by the Standing Committee), considered.

A Clause (Power of Hospital Committee to contract for hospital accommodation), brought up, and read the first and second time, and added.:(Mr. Long.)

Bill read the third time, and passed.

DUBLIN CORPORATION BILL.

On the Order for Second Reading;

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford) said this was clearly to some extent a controversial measure, and, as it had come on quite unexpectedly, he thought it ought not then to be pressed.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR said he would not press the Second Reading if that was the view of the hon. Gentleman.

Second Reading deferred till tomorrow.

NATIONAL GALLERY (PURCHASE OF ADJACENT LAND) BILL.

[SECOND READING.]

Order for Second Reading read.

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

*MR. JOHN BURNS: I do not object to the purpose of this Bill, but I think an opportunity should be given for the discussion of one or two points contained in the measure. We all desire to make the National Gallery as safe as such a valuable institution ought to be, but I am afraid the plan suggested by His Majesty's Office of Works does not go quite so far as some of us would wish. The proposal is to make a forty-foot roadway by taking a jeweller's shop on the western side of the Gallery. That is all very well as far as it goes, but unless some stables belonging to a noble Lord also on the north-western side of the Gallery are taken, the building will not be as safe as it ought to be. I rise not for the purpose of opposing the Second Reading of this Bill, but to suggest to the First Commissioner of Works that he should give us as good a scheme as possible, and that for that purpose he should acquire this additional property from Lord Lonsdale, who, I believe, is willing to sell, so that there is no need for compulsory powers. I take a special interest in this question because I happen to be on the Fire Brigade Committee of the London County Council. Wherever possible that Committee co-operates with His Majesty's Government in protecting public buildings. As a member of that committee I visited this particular neighbourhood only last week, and I can assure the right

hon. Gentleman that if he allows these stables to remain, the National Gallery will be left as susceptible to fire as it is at present.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): This Bill, which is an entirely uncontentious measure, was brought in in fulfilment of a pledge which I gave last year. By it property will be acquired which will enable us to make between the National Gallery and the adjoining buildings practically a 40-feet space, except at the one small point alluded to by the hon. Member for Battersea, where it will be 35 feet. The southern portion of the barracks will be pulled down at the end of the year, and that will still further isolate this very valuable building. With regard to the remarks of the hon. Member for Battersea, I am quite prepared to consider the proposal that we should take this further property, especially if it can be obtained voluntarily. An Instruction to the Committee has been put down by the hon. and gallant Member for South St. Pancras. If that were persisted in I am afraid the Bill would have to fall for this year, because if the purchase is compulsory the usual notices must be given in November. I hope, therefore, that that Instruction will not be pressed. I will consult with my right hon. friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and see whether it is possible to acquire this additional property, which, I am inclined to agree with the hon. Member for Battersea, it would be an advantage to do.

CAPTAIN JESSEL (St. Pancras, S.): I shall be very glad to withdraw the Instruction which I have placed upon the Paper on the understanding that an attempt will be made this year to come to terms with the owner of these stables. I would press upon the Government and all who are interested in the National Gallery the desirability of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, even in this year when so much money is required, providing the necessary sum to make this building perfectly safe in the future.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed to Select Committee of five Members, three to be nominated by the House, and two by the Committee of Selection.

Ordered, That all petitions against the Bill presented five clear days before the meeting of the Committee be referred to the Committee; that the petitioners praying to be heard by themselves, their counsel, or agents, be heard against the Bill, and counsel heard in support of the Bill.

Ordered, That the Committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records.

Ordered, That three be the quorum.;(Mr. Akers Douglas.)

REGISTRATION OF BIRTHS AND DEATHS BILL.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. GRANT LAWSON, Yorkshire, N.R. Thirsk) said this was a simple Bill, introduced for the purpose of removing an anomaly which had existed from 1836. For purely technical reasons ten or twelve boards of guardians were not allowed to appoint their own superintendent registrars of births and deaths. That tentative arrangement had existed for sixty-five years, and it appeared to the Government that the time was ripe for giving equal rights to all boards of guardians.

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

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) thought that if the state of things which this Bill was intended to alter had existed for sixty-five years, it might very well be left for another two or three weeks, in order that the House might have time properly to consider the proposed alteration of the law.

It being Twelve o'clock the debate stood adjourned.

Debate to be resumed to-morrow.

OUT-DOOR RELIEF (FRIENDLY SOCIETIES) BILL.

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

TRUSTEE SAVINGS BANKS.

Return ordered, "showing (1) from each Savings Bank in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, containing, in columns, the names of the Officers, their respective salaries, and other allowances, if any; the amount of security each gives; the annual expenses of management, inclusive of all payments and salaries, for the year ended the 20th day of November, 1900; the rate per centum per annum on the capital of the Bank for the expenses of management; the rate of interest paid to Depositors on the various amounts of deposit, and the average rate of interest on all accounts; the number of accounts remaining open the total amount owing to Depositors; the total amount invested with the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt; the balance in the hands of the Treasury at the 20th day of November, 1900; the total amount of the separate Surplus Fund on the 20th day of November, 1900; other assets, including estimated value of Bank premises, furniture, etc.; the total assets; the total amount of Government Stock standing to the credit of Depositors; the number and amount of annuities granted; and the average cost of each transaction; also the year in which business commenced in each Bank, and the name of the day or days, and the number of hours in the week, on which the Banks are open for the deposit and withdrawal of moneys; including in such Return a list of all such Savings Banks as, under the provisions of the Act 26 Vic, c. 14, or otherwise, have been closed and have transferred their funds, or any part thereof, to the Post Office Savings Banks; showing, in each case, the number of such Banks, as well as the number and amount of Depositors' accounts so transferred, and the amount of compensation, if any, made to all or any of the Officers of such Banks respectively; and showing also the years in which such Banks were respectively opened and closed, and the number and amount of their Depositors' balances, and the number of days and hours in each week on which the same

Banks were open for public business at the close of the year next preceding the date of such closing; distinguishing the same, as in the form of the Return, for each separate county, as well as collectively; for England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Channel Islands, and for the United Kingdom; and (2) for the year ending the 20th day of November, 1900, showing the total number of Depositors in Trustee Savings Banks; the total number of deposits; the average amount of each deposit account; the average sums paid in and drawn out; the total number of persons who have deposited in single sums the entire amount allowed to be deposited during the year (in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 230, of Session 1900).";(Mr. Mount.)

NEW BILLS.

VACCINATION PROSECUTIONS.

Bill to declare the law that no prosecution under the Vaccination Acts shall be commenced without the authority of the guardians, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Channing, Sir John Rolleston, Mr. Goddard, Mr. Cremer, Mr. Brigg, Mr. Carlile, Mr. Bell, and Mr. Broadhurst.

VACCINATION PROSECUTIONS BILL.

"To declare the law that no prosecution under the Vaccination Acts shall be commenced without the authority of the guardians," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 215.]

MEAT MARKING (IRELAND).

Bill to provide for the marking of foreign meat in Ireland, ordered to be brought in by Mr. Field, Mr. Condon, Mr. Patrick O'Brien, and Captain Donelan.

MEAT MARKING (IRELAND) BILL.

"To provide for the marking of Foreign Meat in Ireland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 25th June, and to be printed. [Bill 216.]

Adjourned at five minutes after Twelve of the clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 18th June, 1901.

PRIVATE BILL BUSINESS.

BELFAST AND NORTHERN COUNTIES RAILWAY BILL. (BY ORDER.)

Order for Second Reading read.

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

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said he thought the House was entitled to some explanation with regard to that

Bill, which raised issues of importance which were not ordinarily raised by railway Bills. Questions of public policy were involved. The House was now beginning to take an intelligent interest in English railway matters, and he hoped to see that interest directed to Irish Bills. He had not risen for the purpose of opposing or obstructing this Bill, but he had a particular grievance. He was not opposed to railway amalgamation, particularly in Ireland; on the contrary, he thought it a public advantage for a large railway to take over a small one, provided, of course, that the public interest was properly safeguarded. But, so far as he could see, that was not done in this case. The Derry Central Railway was under this Bill being absorbed by the Northern Counties Railway. Now the latter railway, he understood, was one of the few well-managed lines in Ireland; its charges were moderate, its officials were civil and courteous, and it served its district well. However, there were some peculiar features in connection with the Bill. It seemed that the Derry Central Railway Company was indebted to the Commissioners of Public Works in the sum of £113,720 18s. 4d, in respect of a loan and interest, and under the Bill the Commissioners were to receive £85,000, while £28,720 was to be divided among the shareholders of the company and officials who were being deprived of their positions. The preference shareholders were to get 4s. 6d. for every £1 share, and the ordinary guaranteed shareholders 3s. 1d. Surely some explanation ought

to be forthcoming of that. Again, he had to complain that in no clause was there any guarantee whatever that the public rights would be protected and safeguarded, or that greater facilities and better accommodation would be provided for travellers. It was simply a transfer of the line from one company to another, under certain financial arrangements, and he did think the promoters should vouchsafe some explanation to the House.

*MR. O'NEILL (Antrim, Mid) explained that the Government advanced £;100,000 for the making of this particular line, but, unfortunately, the company had not been able to pay the agreed instalments, and the indebtedness had consequently risen to £;113,720. The Government were bound to look after the interests of the taxpayers, and so they foreclosed, with the result that after considerable negotiations the Northern Counties Company had agreed to take over the line on the terms mentioned by the hon. Member. It was in the public interest, therefore, that this Bill should be passed; otherwise the Government might get no return at all on their loan. The Bill cited the maximum rates and charges which the company were to be entitled to charge as those which were fixed under the original Act.

MR. FIELD: That is what I complain of. I say those rates are too high, and ought to be reduced.

*MR. O'NEILL next referred the hon. Member to the agreement on page 11 in the schedule of the Bill between the Government and the Northern Counties Railway Company, and expressed a hope that the opposition to the Bill would not be persisted in.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said he did not feel at all satisfied that the rates, of this railway under the amalgamation scheme would not be raised, and great care should be taken to protect the interests of the public in this respect. Owing to the many amalgamations which had taken place in Ireland, railway traffic in Ireland had gone into the hands of very few companies, and competition had disappeared. This House should be very careful to guard against matters of this kind, and under no circumstances whatever;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! It is extremely unusual to discuss, upon the Second Reading, details such as rates, which, if they are considered unsatisfactory, can be amended at a later stage. The point the hon. Member is raising hardly relates to the principle of the Bill.

MR. O'MARA then said he would move as an Instruction to the Committee;

*MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member cannot move an Instruction upon the Second Reading.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): I think it will perhaps be for the convenience of the House that I should now state the position of the Government in regard to this Bill. My hon. friend opposite has spoken of this Bill as being promoted by the Northern Counties Railway and the Government, but that hardly expresses the position which the Government are in. The Government are interested in the Derry Central Railway in consequence of a loan they made. By the aid of that loan the railway was constructed, and since its construction it has been purchased by the Northern Counties Railway under an agreement between the Northern Counties Railway and

the Government. Unfortunately, the Derry Central Railway has been surrounded by another system, and it cannot get through by itself at all to the north or south, and it is not in a position, in my opinion, and in the opinion of my advisers, to work successfully as an independent line. The position is that the loan is outstanding, expenses are being incurred, and arrears of interest are accumulating. Therefore the Government had to consider what they should do under the circumstances. The debt is mounting up, and as it appeared to the Government that the line was not likely to be successfully worked as an independent line, we had to consider what steps should be taken to remedy the position in which we were placed. The Derry Central Company approached the Treasury in 1899 for a revision of the existing conditions, and the Treasury decided that they must either sell their interest in the line or they must foreclose and sell the line itself. They were inclined to sell their interest, together with their rights, but they did not find it easy or possible to get a suitable purchaser. After having called for tenders to see what other companies would give, and having only one offer, and that a very inadequate one, they decided to foreclose, and now, as the mortgagees in possession, they have decided to sell the line to the Northern Counties Company. This Bill is promoted by the Northern Counties Company to carry out the agreement which, subject to the sanction of Parliament, they have made with the Government for the purchase of the line. We have three main interests to deal with. The hon. Gentleman opposite asks what is the position of the taxpayer who advanced the money. The position of the taxpayer is that he gets back £85,000 of the loan of £100,000 which he made, and he saves the loss of any further interest which he would otherwise have to put up with. As a matter of fact, the Government were advised by an independent valuator whom we sent down to value the line that £85,000 was a fair value of their interest in the line. The taxpayer gets back £85,000, he is secured against any further loss of interest, and he gets the full value of his interest.

MR. FIELD: But he loses £28,000.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: That is not all a loss of capital, but it is partly arrears of interest, which under other circumstances he has no chance whatever of recovering. There is also the interest of the shareholders. We felt that the shareholders who had put their money into the Derry Central Company had some equitable right to consideration, and that it was in accordance with the practice in such cases of purchase or amalgamation that their case should be considered. We therefore arranged that £20,000 should be set aside for the shareholders of the Derry Central Company as compensation for losing all further interest in the line. We also provide that the secretary should have a small sum as compensation, and the hon. Member opposite did not dispute the justice of that as regards the distribution of this compensation among the shareholders. I think this is evidently a question for the shareholders themselves, and one in which we ought not to interfere, and, moreover, it is one upon which we have consistently refused to express any opinion. The only position we take up in the matter is that the Northern Counties Company, which is itself a considerable shareholder, shall have no part in the compensation. Then there is the interest of the public which is served by this line, and it is that interest which hon.

Gentlemen opposite are particularly anxious about. I say that, in my opinion, this line cannot be worked independently with any prospects of success. If hon. Gentlemen from Ireland would look at the railway map of Ireland they would see that it needs no elaboration to prove that it cannot be worked successfully as an independent line. I do not think, therefore, that there would be any prospect of the line being worked to the satisfaction of the districts concerned by the Derry Central Company if we had sold to them, as they are not a rich company, and they would have had some difficulty in equipping the line satisfactorily. We have, therefore, sold it to the Northern Counties Company, which is one of the best of the Irish railways, a line which, in the words of the hon. Gentleman opposite, is well managed, charges moderate rates, and gives a good service. I think that in doing this we have probably done the best we could for the district to be served by the line. We have, however, taken some precautions. In the first place, it may be true, and I know the allegation has been made, that the Northern Counties Railway, under the working of their agreement, have rather starved the line. Under the arrangement made in this Bill it will be no longer to their interest to starve the line, for this line will become part of their general system, and it will be as much their own line as any other part. If the hon. Gentleman will look at the schedule on page 14, which has been referred to by my hon. friend, he will see that we have taken further precautions. I refer to Clause 3 of the schedule, and not to Clause 2, which the hon. Gentleman opposite mentioned. Under Clause 3 the actual rates charged at the date of this agreement on the railway are not to be increased directly or indirectly without the consent of the Railway and Canal Commissioners. It provides, further, that the rates charged in respect of traffic conveyed on the railway shall, where higher, be reduced to the level of the rates charged by the purchasers in respect of corresponding traffic conveyed or carried under similar circumstances, and for similar distances on the Northern Counties Railway; and, lastly, that the purchasers shall afford at least the same facilities to the public as

at present, and shall in no way or under no circumstances work or use the railway to prejudicially affect the full and free flow of traffic of every description over the same for and from Dublin, Belfast, Londonderry, Larne, and all intermediate points. I think the hon. Gentleman will see that while it is the duty of the Treasury to consider the interest of the taxpayers, who have made this line, we have not been unmindful of the interests of the district, and we have done all that we fairly could do to secure that those interests would be safeguarded by the agreement we have made for the sale of the line. I very much hope the House will read this Bill a second time, and if there be any questions in dispute I think they may safely be left for settlement by the Committee. I do not think the objections raised are such as ought to induce the House to refuse its assent to the Bill.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid) wished to know who would be responsible to this House for the precautions alluded to being carried out. The House ought not to part with the control of an Irish railway without serious consideration. There

ought to be somebody in the House of Commons to answer complaints about Irish railways, for at the present time they had no department to which they could apply for information in regard to railway matters. He thought he was entitled to have some information from the Government as to how these precautions were secured.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: Any aggrieved person has his remedy, and he will not need the assent of the Government or of any Government department.

MR. MURNAGHAN said that they had been told that there would be other opportunities to consider their grievances, and that this was not a question of great public utility. But he maintained that the House of Commons should insist that some person representing the department of the State responsible should be there to see that those arrangements were properly enforced. At the present moment they could get no redress for private grievances in regard to railways in Ireland. They were told by the Clerks at the Table that they should go before the Railway Commissioners, but the Railway Commissioners had no standing in this House, and he declined to be shunted about by the Clerks at the Table.

MR. SPEAKER said that the hon. Member would have other opportunities of raising grievances of this kind. Details could not be gone into upon this occasion.

MR. MURNAGHAN said that a Member of the House of Commons was entitled to see that any law passed by Parliament was enforced, and he maintained that they should not give a Second Reading to a Bill without getting some assurance that the arrangements made in that Bill would be carried out.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL (Tyrone, S.) hoped the hon. Gentleman would not persist in his opposition to the Second Reading of the Bill. He thought the Treasury had made a very fair bargain, under all the circumstances. The Treasury would get £65,000, where, without this agreement, they would have got nothing.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN said the Treasury would receive £85,000. The £20,000 for the shareholders was in addition to the sum paid to the Treasury.

*MR. T. W. RUSSELL said that that made the case better than he thought, and therefore that the Treasury had made the best possible settlement by arranging for the purchase of the line by the Belfast and Northern Counties Company. He wished, however, to draw the attention of the House to one matter which would require consideration. If there was one line of railway in Ireland that had been badly managed, and was a nuisance rather than an advantage to the country, it was the Derry Central Railway. Many a long and weary hour he had spent at Magherafelt Junction. What he wanted to direct attention to in the agreement of purchase by the Belfast and Northern Counties Company was that the latter were not required to give any better facilities to the public than the Derry Central had done. Of course, it would be to their interest to do so, but if they did not agree to do that he would oppose the Bill when it came down from Committee.

MR. JAMES O'CONNOR (Wicklow, W.) agreed that the interests of the taxpayers had been fairly well looked after in the agreement, but he thought the shareholders had some ground of complaint against the Government. When the Government advanced £100,000 to the Derry Central Company, that seemed a guarantee to

investors that the railway was going to be a success, whereas it appeared that the Government were aware that the undertaking could not possibly be successful. Question put, and agreed to.

Bill read a second time, and committed.

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 Bill, 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.:

Manchester and Liverpool Electric Express Railway Bill [Lords].

Ordered, that the Bill be read a second time.

BURY CORPORATION TRAMWAYS BILL.

GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY BILL.

MIDLAND RAILWAY BILL.

Lords Amendments considered, and agreed to.

BLACKBURN CORPORATION BILL.

WALLASEY IMPROVEMENT BILL.

Read the third time, and passed.

ARIZONA COPPER COMPANY, LIMITED, ORDER CONFIRMATION BILL.

[UNDER THE PRIVATE LEGISLATION PROCEDURE (SCOTLAND) ACT, 1899.]

Read the third time, and passed.

STANDING ORDERS.

Resolution reported from the Committee:

"That, in the case of the Metropolitan District 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."

Resolution agreed to.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 4) BILL.

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

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 8) BILL.

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

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 10) BILL.

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

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 12) BILL.

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

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 3) BILL.

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

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 5) BILL.

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

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) BILL.

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

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDER (HOUSING OF WORKING CLASSES) (No. 2) BILL.

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

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

INCLOSURE (SUTTON) PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

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

Bill to be read the third time to-morrow.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING PROVISIONAL ORDER (No. 1) BILL.

Reported, with an amended Title [Provisional Order relating to Marylebone not confirmed; remaining Order relating to Marylebone confirmed]; Report to lie upon the Table.

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

CITY AND SOUTH LONDON RAILWAY BILL [Lords].

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

BARRY RAILWAY BILL.

Reported, without amendment; Report to lie upon the Table, and to be printed.

PAISLEY POLICE AND PUBLIC HEALTH BILL.

STRATFORD-UPON-AVON, TOWCESTER, AND MIDLAND JUNCTION, EAST AND WEST JUNCTION

EVESHAM, REDDITCH, AND STRATFORD-UPON-AVON JUNCTION RAILWAY COMPANIES.

AIRE AND CALDER NAVIGATION BILL [Lords].

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

CHESTER GAS BILL [Lords].

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

RODGERS' PATENT BILL [Lords].

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

Bill to be read the third time.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have agreed to the Military Lands Provisional Orders Bill.

That they have agreed to Amendments to Oakham Water Bill [Lords], without amendment.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to confirm certain Provisional Orders made by the Board of Trade under the General Pier and Harbour Act, 1861,

relating to Babbacombe and Great Yarmouth." Pier and Harbour Provisional Orders (No. 2) Bill [Lords].

PIER AND HARBOUR PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2) BILL [Lords].

Read the first time; referred to the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, and to be printed. [Bill 217.]

PETITIONS.

BOROUGH FUNDS ACT (1872) AMENDMENT (LONDON) BILL.

Petition from Wandsworth, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

EDUCATION BILL.

Petition from Long Eaton, for alteration; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS ON SUNDAY BILL.

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

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Burham; Cuxton; Upnor; Eccles; Snodland (two);

Peterborough; Hailing (two); Worcester; Bulwell; Liverpool; Arbuthnott;

Shoreditch; Hunslet and Stourton; Stoke; Stamford Hill; Hoy-lake; Halesowen;

West Ham; Ipswich; Blackpool; Plumstead; Blaina; Sheffield; Brynmawr; Upton

Manor; and Walkden; to lie upon the Table.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO CHILDREN (SCOTLAND) BILL.

Petitions in favour; from Birsay; Benholm; Lairg; Kingussie; and Kilninian and

Kilmore; to lie upon the Table.

SOVEREIGN'S OATH ON ACCESSION BILL.

Petition from Edinburgh, against; to lie upon the Table.

RETURNS, REPORTS, ETC.

BOARD OF EDUCATION.

Copy presented, of Draft Order in Council for transferring to the Board of

Education the powers of the Charity Commissioners to frame and establish Schemes

for Educational Endowments in England and Wales [by Act]; to lie upon the Table

TRADE REPORTS (ANNUAL SERIES).

Copy presented, of Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2631 [by

Command]; to lie upon the Table.

QUESTIONS.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR; CAMPS OF CONCENTRATION.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS (Flint Boroughs) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War

whether it is intended to bring any more women and children into the camps of

concentration; and, if so, whether in view of the overcrowding in some of the

existing camps, the Government will establish in Cape Colony new camps, well

supplied with water, near supplies and charitable aid.

I beg also to ask the Secretary of State for War whether women now in camps of

concentration in South Africa who are separated from their children will be

allowed to rejoin them.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. BRODRICK, Surrey, Guildford): The number of

people whom it may be necessary to bring into camps of concentration depends

entirely on military considerations. The position of any new camps must be

determined by Lord Kitchener, but the proximity to water and supplies will

undoubtedly be considered. Cases of women separated from their children will be

treated with all possible consideration, but I think in the cases mentioned by the hon. Member it is not known by the mothers where their families are situated.

FALSE WAR NEWS.

MR. WEIR (Ross and Cromarty) I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he is aware that on the 10th instant, when the War Office announced Lord Kitchener's denial of the report concerning the alleged surprise of General Beyer's commando, Reuter's Telegram Company telegraphed to their agent at Cape Town for the full facts, and on the 14th instant were advised by the Cable Company that their message of inquiry had been stopped by the censor; and will he state under what circumstances this telegram was suppressed, and what action has been taken by Lord Kitchener in regard to the person who communicated from Pretoria on the 5th of June the report, the truth of which has been denied by Lord Kitchener.

MR. BRODRICK: I am not aware of the action imputed to the censor. Lord Kitchener has warned the agent to be more careful, but is of opinion that the case is not one for suspension.

MR. WEIR: Will the right hon. Gentleman obtain the other information asked for in the question?

MR. BRODRICK: I do not think the matter is sufficiently important for further inquiry.

GENERAL PRINSLOO'S FORCE.

MR. O'SHEE (Waterford, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he can inform the House if the Boer general Prinsloo and the force of more than 4,000 men who surrendered with him in 1900 were all detained as prisoners of war and deported to St. Helena or elsewhere.

MR. BRODRICK: The majority of the men who surrendered with General Prinsloo were detained as prisoners of war, and are now in Ceylon.

SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVES; USE OF THE LASH.

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY (Derbyshire, Chesterfield): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he has now received official information as to the sanctioning by the High Commissioner for South Africa of the use of the lash in punishing natives under magisterial orders in the Transvaal, and has had an opportunity of discussing this and other matters affecting native interests with Lord Milner; and whether he will lay upon the Table of the House correspondence or proposals as to the provisions for the supply and control of native labour in the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies, or otherwise inform the House as to the contemplated arrangements before these arrangements are allowed to be enforced.

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

(1) I have discussed the subject referred to in the first question with Lord Milner, who fully shares my strong objection to the indiscriminate or excessive use of the lash as a punishment. He informs me that the proclamation just issued alters the previous practice by reducing the maximum number of lashes and by limiting the offences for which the punishment can be given, and it also makes necessary in most cases the sanction of a higher authority before the punishment can be inflicted. It is, therefore, a great improvement on the law of the late

Government of the South African Republic, and I am informed that the legal adviser of the Government; Mr. Solomon; has already issued a circular to magistrates warning them to be sparing in the use of the lash. (2) The question of native labour is under consideration, and it is probable that nothing will be settled till Lord Milner returns.

There is no correspondence which can be laid.

SOUTH AFRICAN CONSTABULARY.

MR. BLACK (Banffshire): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether, either from the terms of their enlistment or from their training, Baden Powell's Police are available as a military force outside the Transvaal and Orange River Colonies; if not, what precedents exist for making two-fifths of the cost of maintaining a colonial police force a permanent charge upon the Imperial Exchequer.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: (1) The South African Constabulary, by the terms of enlistment, are available for service in any part of British South Africa. (2) The present arrangement of charge is not permanent, and the Imperial Government will be relieved of its share when the numbers are reduced to 6,000. Meanwhile the additional 4,000 has been raised for Imperial service during the continuance of the war.

SECOND KING'S ROYAL RIFLES.

MR. MANSFIELD (Lincolnshire, Spalding): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that the Second King's Royal Rifles on their return from Ladysmith to Rawalpindi were compelled, firstly, to outfit themselves at practically their own expense, and, secondly, to provide themselves with a new kit to replace that left behind and lost at Pietermaritzburg, he will make the amendment of the Army Order of this year in reference to this matter retrospective, and order a refund of the amounts expended.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE WAR OFFICE (Lord STANLEY, Lancashire, Westhoughton): The circumstances have not been reported to the War Office, but inquiries will be at once addressed to the Indian Government. If the facts are as stated a refund will be made.

DUBLIN FUSILIERS.

MR. O'SHEE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether, seeing that the fourteen non-commissioned officers and men of the Dublin Fusiliers mentioned in the list issued by the War Office on the 15th instant as having rejoined have done so only within the past few days, can he state where they have been detained since the release of the body of their prisoners by the Boers in June, 1900; and will the arrears of their pay in respect of the period since they were reported missing, namely, seven on 30th October, 1899, and seven on 15th December, 1899, be now paid to them.

LORD STANLEY: These men probably rejoined their battalion many months ago, but the fact of their having so rejoined had not been reported from South Africa until last week. Prisoners of war who rejoin are paid all arrears of pay as soon as they have passed through the usual court of inquiry, and there is no reason to suppose that these men have not received their back pay.

IRELAND'S CLAIM TO GOVERNMENT WORK AND CONTRACTS.

MR. MURPHY (Kerry, E.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the evidence of the Duke of Connaught before the Committee on War Office Organisation, which shows that articles such as bedsteads, ladders, tables, bags, and brushes are now sent from Woolwich to Ireland, though similar articles could be procured at a cheaper rate in Ireland; and, seeing that the witness recommended that these articles should in future be procured in Ireland, and that the shipbuilding and repairing work done in that country should henceforward be increased, whether he has taken or proposes to take any steps to ensure that these recommendations will be acted upon by the War Office.

LORD STANLEY: Perhaps I may be allowed to answer this question. I shall be glad if the hon. Member will refer to my reply to a similar question put yesterday by the hon. Member for the College Green Division of Dublin.*

MR. MURPHY complained of the absence of the Chief Secretary, to whom the question was addressed.

* See page 548.

LORD STANLEY: The question has absolutely nothing to do with the Chief Secretary for Ireland. It deals with matters affecting solely the War Office and the Commander-in-Chief in Ireland.

BEER RATIONS ON TRANSPORTS.

MR. LLEWELLYN (Somersetshire, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War whether he will consider the advisability of sanctioning the issue of a daily ration of beer to troops at sea when returning from South Africa.

MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe): May I ask the noble Lord whether, if this allowance is made, the authorities will also consider the desirability of encouraging habits of total abstinence in the Army by issuing non-intoxicating liquors?

LORD STANLEY: Troops returning from South Africa are able to purchase a daily ration of a pint of good beer for one penny.

MR. LLEWELLYN: Is the noble Lord aware of the extent to which the illicit sale of abominable liquor goes on on board the transports?

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir.

MR. LLEWELLYN: I will give him some evidence.

ARMY RESERVE GARRISON ARTILLERY.

CAPTAIN NORTON (Newington, W.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he can state why men of the First Class Army Reserve Garrison Artillery quartered at Portsmouth are not permitted to proceed on continuous working furlough, although such permission is granted to those serving under like conditions at other stations.

LORD STANLEY: This is a matter entirely for the general officer commanding the district, who is guided in these matters by the requirements of his garrisons. There is no intention of interfering with his discretion in these matters.

RECRUITING STATISTICS.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for War if he will grant a monthly Return of the number of recruits to the cavalry, artillery,

infantry, and Militia, in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, Cd. 525.

LORD STANLEY: No, Sir. I am endeavouring to carry out the recommendations of the Committee which has recently reported on the War Office organisation and to minimise Returns. I cannot, therefore, consent to the hon. Member's request.

WAR HONOURS FOR NAVAL WARRANT OFFICERS.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Admiralty whether he can now state what decision has been arrived at as to the participation of warrant officers of the Navy in the promotions and honours now being awarded in connection with the South African campaign.

THE CIVIL LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. PRETYMAN, Suffolk, Woodbridge): I beg leave to refer the hon. Gentleman to the answer given to his previous question by the Secretary of the Admiralty.* The formal steps requisite for establishing this new decoration are being taken, and effect will be given to the decision at the earliest possible date by publication in the London Gazette.

GIBRALTAR WORKS.

MR. HERBERT LEWIS: I beg to ask the Civil Lord of the Admiralty whether he will state the estimated respective cost of completing the works now in progress and those which have been temporarily suspended at Gibraltar.

MR. PRETYMAN: The particulars asked for are not at present available. The whole of the work at Gibraltar is let in a single contract. Elaborate calculations would be necessary to ascertain the amount already expended and remaining to be expended in respect of the particular works referred to in the hon. Member's question. I may say that, roughly speaking, £;2,000,000 is about the sum required to complete all the works, some £;300,000 of which would

* See preceding volume, page 441.

be spent upon the items proposed to be deferred.

INDIAN STATE RAILWAYS; FOREIGN ORDERS FOR MATERIAL.

SIR CHARLES CAYZER (Barrow-in-Furness): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for India, in view of the fact that wheels and axles and other material for the use of the Indian State or Guaranteed Railways have been ordered from Messrs. Krupp and Company, Essen, and shipped at Hamburg for Calcutta by foreign vessels, and that tenders for railway wagons have been ordered in Austria and shipped at Trieste for Calcutta by foreign vessel, whether he can state the quantity in tons and value so ordered; and whether he will grant a Return showing the quantity in tons and value of all the railway material for the Indian State and Guaranteed Railways, and whether purchased at borne or abroad, and shipped in British or foreign vessels, for the last five years 1896 to 1900, inclusive, if moved for.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord G. HAMILTON, Middlesex, Ealing): I understand that one of the Indian railway companies has recently ordered thirty-one locomotive tenders from Messrs. Krupp, and fifty goods brake vans from a Hungarian firm, the total value of the two orders being £;26,066. I cannot give the weight in tons. As regards the second question, I can at once furnish my hon. friend with the information he wants so far as State railways are concerned.

KING'S ACCESSION OATH.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.): I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies if he has received an intimation that the Federal Cabinet of Australia is unanimously in favour of a revision of the oath taken by the King in reference to Catholics.

MR. J. CHAMBERLAIN: I have not received any communication from the Federal Cabinet of Australia on the subject.

SLAVERY IN ZANZIBAR,

MR. THOMAS BAYLEY: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's Government has sanctioned, or proposes to sanction, the suggestion of Sir Lloyd Mathews, in his memorandum of 19th January, 1901, printed in Parliamentary Paper, Africa, No. 4 (1901), for procuring native labour for Zanzibar and Pemba from the British East Africa and Uganda Protectorates on contracts for three years or longer, to be entrusted to Zanzibar merchants or a company empowered to draft such labour in gangs to wherever it may be required, and solely responsible for the wages and upkeep incident to it; and whether His Majesty's Government has received information as to the deportation of slaves from Pemba to Muscat since the Anti-Slavery Decree of the Sultan of Zanzibar; and, if so, whether any, or what, steps have been taken to prevent such deportation during the past three years by the action of His Majesty's warships in watching the coast.

*THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Viscount CRANBORNE, Rochester): His Majesty's Government have not sanctioned, and do not, as at present advised, propose to sanction, the suggestion in question. All the information received by His Majesty's Government regarding the deportation of slaves from Pemba has been laid before the House in slave trade papers, which also contain reports from naval officers as to the operations of His Majesty's ships.

TURKISH RAILWAY CONCESSIONS.

LORD EDMOND FITZMAURICE (Wiltshire, Cricklade): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, with regard to the concession made in November, 1899, by the Porte to a German syndicate represented by the Deutsche Bank for the construction of a railway from Konia to the Persian Gulf, to expire in 1906, whether he has any official information to the effect that since the concession was made the German syndicate has asked that a kilo-metrical guarantee should be given to them by the Porte, and that the Porte has proposed to raise the present tariff on imports with a view to providing the sum required; and if he has any information that an English syndicate offered in 1899 to construct the line to the Persian Gulf without a kilometrical or other guarantee.

I beg also to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has any information relating to the convention between the Porte and the Russian Government, of April, 1900, under which the Porte has agreed to grant no concession for the construction of railways in the north-eastern parts of Asia Minor except to Russian companies, and will he state whether any Papers will be presented to Parliament on this subject and the other railways communication in Asia Minor.

EARL PERCY (Kensington, S.): May I ask whether the noble Lord can say what line the railway mentioned in the first question proposes to follow; and in regard to the second question whether the Russian Government has any intention of constructing the railways themselves, and whether the Turkish Government are forbidden not only to grant concessions for these railways to foreign companies, but to make them themselves with foreign financial assistance.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: I cannot answer these latter questions without notice. It is believed that a preliminary agreement was made between the Porte and a German syndicate for such a concession as is described in December, 1899, but no information has been received that the concession has been definitely granted or its details settled. It is understood that a kilometric guarantee was contemplated as one of the conditions of the concession, but it is not known that any progress has been made towards settling the point. The Porte has proposed to raise the present tariff on imports, but no intimation has been given that this measure was intended for the purpose of providing the sum required for the guarantee. The Public Debt Commission would have a first claim upon any increased revenue so obtained. His Majesty's Government are not aware of an offer having been made by an English syndicate to construct the line in question without a guarantee. Whatever agreement has been made between the Porte and the Russian Government is of a confidential nature; and His Majesty's Government have no information which could properly be made public.

CHINA;ANGLO-GERMAN AGREEMENT;BRITISH INTERESTS IN THE YANG-TSZE VALLEY.

*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.): On behalf of the hon. Member for the Barnsley Division of Yorkshire, I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether, under the Anglo-German agreement, Germany is acknowledged by His Majesty's Government to be entitled to the same rights and privileges in the Yang-tsze region as Great Britain, except as regards railway enterprises.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: By the Anglo-German Agreement it is agreed that the ports on the rivers and littoral of China shall remain free and open to trade and to every other legitimate form of economic activity for the nationals of all countries wherever the signatory Governments can exercise influence.

CHINESE INDEMNITY.

SIR MARK STEWART (Kirkcudbrightshire): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether Great Britain has formally informed the Powers that she will not consent to China increasing the duty or duties on opium and rice to pay the indemnity.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: We have stated that the imposition of any tax on rice or cereals now free would be very impolitic, and, as far as we are aware, this view is shared by the other Powers. It is not proposed to make any change as regards the duty on opium.

CONSULAR APPOINTMENTS HELD BY RETIRED OFFICERS.

MR. HARRIS (Tynemouth): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether he can state how many retired naval and military officers there are at the present time holding consular appointments worth £200 a year or over, and who have not

passed any examination in foreign languages.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: There are twelve ex-naval and military officers holding ordinary consular appointments at the present time who have not, within the knowledge of the Foreign Office, passed an examination in foreign languages. But it does not follow that they are unacquainted with foreign languages.

TURKEY; BRITISH VICE-CONSUL AT KONIA.

EARL PERCY: I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether His Majesty's vice-consul has been recently withdrawn from Konia; and, if so, whether, in view of the commercial interests involved, steps will be taken to fill the vacancy as soon as possible.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: The British vice-consulate at Konia was abolished in February last, after communication with His Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople and Consul at Angora. British interests in that district are not such as to require the supervision of a consular officer, and, so far as our information goes, there are no other reasons for which the presence of a representative of this country in the district would be desirable; but if the information of my noble friend is different we shall be very glad to consider it.

MURDER OF AN ENGLISHMAN IN MEXICO.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne): I beg to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs if he has received any information with regard to the murder and robbery of Mr. Robert R. Emmett, an English mine manager, at Zacualtipan, Mexico; and if he will instruct His Majesty's representative in Mexico to take such action as will prevent the recurrence of the frequent and unpunished murders of British subjects in the mining districts of Mexico.

*VISCOUNT CRANBORNE: His Majesty's Government have no information on the subject, but inquiry will be made of His Majesty's Minister at Mexico.

COAL DUTY.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in view of the difficulty which has arisen in construing the Customs House rules in relation to the coal duty, he can state if it has been definitely determined upon whom the liability to pay coal duty rests in the case where the seller has sold coal free on board at a British port, and the purchaser has resold the coal for delivery, cost, freight, and insurance at a foreign port; also, in the case in which the first seller has sold the coal free on board at a British port and the purchaser has resold the coal to a second purchaser free on board at the same or another British port, and this purchaser has in turn resold the coal for delivery c.i.f. at a foreign port; whether a uniform practice with regard to charging the liability to pay coal duty in the cases named has been adopted at the Customs Offices at all British ports; and whether, in the event of there existing such a uniform practice, he can state what it is for the information of those engaged in the export coal trade.

MR. CHARLES M'ARTHUR (Liverpool, Exchange): was about to put a question on a cognate subject, but was ruled out of order by Mr. Speaker.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Under Section 139 of the Customs Consolidation Act, 1876, and by analogy with the provisions

of that Act respecting the importation of dutiable goods and the exportation of drawback goods, the exporter of the coal free on board must pass the entry for it and pay, or give bond for, the export duty. The exporter need not do this in person, but may employ for the purpose any agent he likes, be it the middleman to whom he has sold the coal or anyone else. Whom he employs is a matter for arrangement between vendor and vendee, not for the decision of the Customs. It is immaterial, from the point of view of the Customs, how often coal once placed free on board changes ownership before it leaves this country, or before it is landed in another. The person responsible for placing the coal free on board is also responsible for passing the entry and paying the duty at the time of its being so placed free on board. The difficulty to which the hon. Member refers has arisen, not between the Customs and exporters of coal, but between vendors and vendees or their agents.

MR. RENWICK (Newcastle-on-Tyne): I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he is now prepared to make any statement of the intention of the Government to reduce the export upon small coal to 6d. per ton.

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil): May I ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, having regard to the fact that very strong opposition has been expressed by patent fuel manufacturers, and also that notice of Amendments has been given on the Committee stage of the Bill, he will defer coming to any decision until he has heard all the pros and cons of the question.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: That is exactly my position. I have no statement to make on this subject, except that the report, which I understand appeared in the press, to the effect that I intended to propose the reduction suggested, is quite inaccurate. All I have ever said was that if the trade asked me for such a reduction and proposed a reasonable and workable definition of small coal, I would consider it; but I see great difficulty in arriving at such a definition.

PAYMENT OF INCOME TAX BY THE CROWN.

MR. M'KENNA: I beg to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in regard to the payment of income tax by the Crown, the same course will be taken as was taken by her late Majesty.

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: When Sir Robert Peel introduced the income tax in 1842 he was authorised by the late Queen to announce to Parliament that Her Majesty would pay income tax on the Privy Purse and on Class III. of the Civil List. It was so paid during her late Majesty's reign. We have advised that a similar course should be taken now, and that course will be followed.

WALSALL WATCH COMMITTEE AND LICENSING PROSECUTIONS.

MR. CAINE: I beg to ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether his attention has been directed to a report of the watch committee of the Walsall Town Council of last month forbidding the chief constable, on his own initiative, to take out summonses without first consulting the town clerk; and whether, seeing that such an arrangement is unusual, he will take steps to prevent the chief constable in this case being hampered in his endeavour to enforce the licensing laws in the borough.

*THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. RITCHIE, Croydon): My attention has not been called to this particular borough, but I am aware that

similar directions have been issued by watch committees in some other boroughs. I cannot say that such a direction is not within the powers of the watch committee, but evidently it is a matter which requires the exercise of the utmost discretion.

FOOD AND DRUGS ACT PROSECUTIONS.

MR. CROMBIE (Kincardineshire): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Local Government Board whether his attention has been called to the working of the Food and Drugs Act, under which a seller may be prosecuted on the sole ground of the analysis of a local public analyst, who is liable to error, and the public analyst himself may be prosecuted on the grounds that his analysis is wrong; and whether he would consider the expediency of introducing legislation to assimilate the working of the Food and Drugs Act to that of the Fertilisers Act in respect of having the analysis of the local analyst revised by skilled analysts of the Local Government Board before proceeding to a prosecution under the Act.

MR. PIRIE (Aberdeen, N): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers may I ask the Secretary to the Local Government Board if he is aware of the frequent cases of injustice due to the existing law regarding prosecutions under the Food and Drugs Act, whereby sellers can suffer material damage from a prosecution at the instance of local inspectors, although the prosecution is subsequently withdrawn; and also that claims against local authorities by those so injured through unfounded charges are dismissed in the law courts as being irrelevant; and whether his attention has been called to a recent case of such a nature; Aberdeen; in which a firm of aerated water manufacturers suffered unmerited and serious loss.

*THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. WALTER LONG, Bristol, S.): Perhaps I may answer both questions together. The case giving rise to them appears to have occurred in Scotland, and I have no jurisdiction under the Sale of Food and Drugs Act in that country. My attention has, however, been called to the matter referred to, but I do not think that sufficient ground has been shown for legislation.

FOOD PRESERVATIVES.

MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.): On behalf of the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire, I beg to ask the President of the Local Government Board whether he will say what is the present position of the inquiry of the Departmental Committee on the use of preservatives and colouring matter in articles of food, and when the Committee is expected to complete the evidence and present their Report.

*MR. WALTER LONG: The Committee have completed the taking of evidence and are now considering their Report. I hope that it will be presented during the present session.

CANADIAN TARIFFS ON BRITISH LITERATURE.

MR. TREVELYAN (Yorkshire, W.R., Elland): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been drawn to complaints from Canada that British magazines and periodicals mailed to Canada are taxed at the rate of eight cents a pound, while United States

periodicals can enter at one cent per pound; and whether, as this rate is driving out British publications by American competition, the Postmaster General can see his way to reduce the rates now charged.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN, Worcestershire, E.): The hon. Member would seem to be under the impression that there is some special rate of postage in this country on magazines and periodicals for Canada; but that is not so. The rate is that, which is uniformly charged on all book-post matter posted in this country, whether for destinations outside it or for the United Kingdom itself; namely, ½d. for every two ounces. The Postmaster General can see no reason why an exception from this universal rate should be made in favour of periodicals for Canada, and a general reduction would involve serious and unwarrantable loss. The rate of one cent per pound on magazines and periodicals sent from the United States to Canada is understood to involve a loss to the United States revenue. The rate is part of an old established arrangement between the Dominion and the States, whereby the domestic postage rates of the one are applied to all classes of correspondence for the other.

MONEY LENDING PROSECUTIONS.

MR. MANSFIELD: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury whether he is aware that the Board of Inland Revenue has issued a note order to its officers, to the effect that the Board do not propose to take upon themselves the duty of prosecuting money-lenders who fail to register themselves as required by the Money Lenders Act, 1900, and that offences of that nature need not therefore be reported; will he give the reasons for issuing such a note, and say how, in the absence of action by the Board of Inland Revenue, this Act will be enforced.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The officers of Inland Revenue have no special means of discovering infringements of the provisions of the Acts which are not possessed by the police and general public, but I think they should be instructed to report all cases which

come to their knowledge to the Board of Inland Revenue for submission to the Director of Public Prosecutions, and I am communicating with the Board of Inland Revenue to this effect. The Director of Public Prosecutions will be prepared to undertake the prosecution of any cases under the Act which may properly form the subject of proceedings, whether brought to his notice by the Inland Revenue or otherwise, as in the case of any other criminal offences.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK; TELEGRAPHIC WITHDRAWALS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if he will state the number of withdrawals by telegraph from the Post Office Savings Bank for the year ending the 31st December, 1900, and the average cost to the depositor of each such withdrawal; and will he also state the number of telegraph notices of withdrawal for payment on the following day, and the average cost to the depositor of each such telegraph notice.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The number of withdrawals by telegraph from the Post Office Savings Bank during the year ended 31st December, 1900, was 167,389, and the average cost to the depositor of each such withdrawal was about 1s. 3d. The number of telegraph notices of withdrawal for payment on the following day was

11,609, and the average cost to the depositor of each such telegraph notice was about 9d.

POST OFFICE TELEPHONE SERVICE.

SIR JAMES WOODHOUSE (Huddersfield): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state how much of the £;2,000,000 voted by Parliament in 1899 for the improvement of telephonic communication throughout the country by the Post Office has been expended; whether any portion thereof has been expended elsewhere than in the London area, and, if so, where; what will be the cost of the London exchange, and what is intended to be done with any balance unexpended;

and when the new postal telephone system for London, which it was stated last session would be opened by the end of 1900, will be available for the public, and what is the cause of the delay, and what the charges to subscribers will be.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The expenditure already authorised by the Treasury under the Provision of the Telegraph Act, 1899, for works in progress, or about to be undertaken, amounts to £;813,040. Of this amount £;677,945 is for the London exchange system, and £;135,095 for the development of the other parts of the Post Office telephone system in various places, but especially in the north-east of England and in South Wales. The actual payments for new works brought to account up to the 31st March last amount to £;269,941. It is not possible at this stage to state definitely what the final cost of the London exchange system will be, but the whole sum of £;2,000,000 authorised by Parliament will be expended in such extensions of the Post Office telephone system as seem most urgently necessary, whether in London or elsewhere. The delay in opening the more important exchanges of the London system has been due to the scarcity of skilled labour, the difficulty of getting materials for contractors, the necessary restrictions on the opening of streets to avoid excessive interference with traffic, and the difficulty of constructing exchanges in buildings in use for other Post Office work. Full particulars of the rates and conditions of the service will be brought before the public at an early date, and it is hoped that it will be available in some parts of London in the autumn.

PHTHISIS IN THE POST OFFICE.

SIR WALTER FOSTER (Derbyshire, Ilkeston): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Post-master General, whether, in view of the scientific interest attaching to comparative statistics of mortality from phthisis, he will grant a Return showing the mortality and superannuations from that disease in the Post Office, distinguishing between the various occupations, the outdoor and indoor staffs, London and the provinces, and the various ages of the employees.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: It would be difficult to give all the details referred to, but it may perhaps suffice to say that the average annual number of deaths from phthisis in the past three years was forty-seven, and the average number of established officers (men) in the United Kingdom in those years was 52,146, showing a death rate of ·9 per 1,000.

SIR WALTER FOSTER: Will the hon. Gentleman consider the advisability of giving a larger amount of detail in the annual Report of the Postmaster General.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: I will communicate with the Postmaster General on the point.

KING'S SCHOLARSHIP EXAMINATION.

MR. LLEWELLYN: I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he can give Returns showing approximately the number of pupil teachers from country schools examined at the King's Scholarship Examination in December last, the number placed in the first class, and the proportion this bears to the total number in the first class, and in the second and third classes; also a comparison of these numbers with those of the Queen's Scholarship Examinations held in 1880 and 1890; and, seeing that country schools are at present placed at a disadvantage, whether the local authorities, which the recently-introduced Education Bill proposes to create, will have the power to establish and maintain central classes for country pupil teachers in secondary schools and elsewhere.

THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION (Sir J. GORST, Cambridge University): The Board of Education can give the Return asked for in respect of the examination in December, 1900, if the hon. Member will move for it. It is impossible to give it for 1880 and 1890, because no distinction between town and country schools was then made in the Department. The answer to the second paragraph is "Yes."

INQUIRY AS TO CHILD LABOUR.

MR. LOUGH: On behalf of the hon. Member for East Northamptonshire, I beg to ask the Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education whether he will state what is the present position of the inter-departmental inquiry into the labour of children of school age out of school hours, and when the inquiry is expected to be completed and the Report presented.

SIR J. GORST: This is a Home Office question, and should be addressed to the right hon. the Home Secretary.

MR. LOUGH: Then perhaps the Home Secretary can give me the information?

*MR. RITCHIE: I know the Committee is pursuing its inquiry, but I am unable to say when it will report. If the hon. Member will put down the question, I shall be glad to inquire.

SCOTTISH JUDICIAL STATISTICS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the Lord Advocate, as representing the Secretary for Scotland, whether he is aware that in the last annual issue of the Judicial Statistics for Scotland, deeds recorded in the Sasine Office are not shown for the years subsequent to 1898; and will he explain the cause of this delay in the publication of the Register of Deeds.

THE LORD ADVOCATE (Mr. A. GRAHAM MURRAY, Buteshire): The hon. Member's question is based upon inaccurate information. The last issue of the Judicial Statistics for Scotland was published in October, 1900, and contained (page 175) the Returns from the Sasine Office for the year 1899. The Returns for 1900 were obtained from the Register in February this year, and will be published as usual towards autumn.

RICHMOND PARK OAKS.

MR. WEIR: I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works, in view of the fact that

many of the old oaks in Richmond Park are decaying, will he say whether arrangements can be made for the planting of oak saplings.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. AKERS DOUGLAS, Kent, St. Augustine's): A large amount of

tree planting is done each year in Richmond Park. For instance, last year 100 young oaks and 250 forest trees were planted. If the hon. Member likes to see the Return of the number of trees planted annually for the last few years I shall be happy to show it to him.

DRAINAGE OF ROYAL PALACES.

MR. WHITMORE (Chelsea): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works whether the Government intend to introduce a Supplemental Estimate for the structural alterations and drainage works which are being undertaken at Windsor Castle and Buckingham Palace.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Yes, Sir; necessary works of considerable importance are being undertaken at Windsor Castle and Buckingham Palace, and a Supplemental Estimate will be introduced to meet the cost.

THE MALL.

MAJOR BALFOUR (Christchurch): I beg to ask the First Commissioner of Works, in view of the proposals for altering the Mall in the neighbourhood of Buckingham Palace, whether he could arrange that there should be a public exhibition of the designs before they are finally approved.

MR. AKERS DOUGLAS: Should any decision be come to in regard to the memorial of Queen Victoria which will involve an alteration of the Mall, I think I can undertake to exhibit the proposed design for the information of the House.

LIMERICK DISTURBANCES; CASE OF DR. LONG.

MR. WILLIAM JOHNSTON (Belfast, S.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been called to the trial of the Rev. Edmond O'Leary, C.C., at the Limerick Petty Sessions, on Friday the 7th instant, on a charge of using threatening language to Dr. Long, in consequence of which a crowd gathered; whether he is aware that during the week Dr. Long was attacked when visiting a house in Thomondgate to attend a Protestant patient, and that,

after the Bench had adjudicated on the case against Rev. E. O'Leary, the Rev. Father Shanahan, P.P., said while Dr. Long continued in Limerick the same scenes would occur; and whether the Government will take adequate steps to protect Dr. Long in his rights as a British citizen.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY (Limerick, W.): Before the right hon. Gentleman answers, may I ask whether it is not a fact that the house at which the interview took place was the house of a Catholic?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That does not arise out of the question.

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I wished, Sir, to ask that, because the question on the Paper is inaccurate.

*MR. LECKY (Dublin University): May I ask whether the attention of the right hon. Gentleman has been called to the fact that the resident magistrate who adjudicated in the case is stated to have advised the people from the Bench to give no employment to Dr. Long;

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Mr. WYNDHAM, Dover): I will reply to the question on the Paper. Yes, Sir; the bench, consisting of five magistrates, decided unanimously to dismiss the charge, on the grounds, apparently, that the words complained of did not amount to a threat, and were no more than words of rudeness or incivility, and that the reverend gentleman was not responsible for the acts of the crowd. The reply to the second paragraph is in the affirmative. Dr. Long visited a Protestant who had for two months been a lodger in the house of a Roman Catholic. In consequence of the attack on Dr. Long two persons were summoned for assault on 7th June, and bound over in £5 for a month. (The prosecution of two other persons for riotous behaviour on 2nd June had been deferred for a month.) In reply to the third paragraph, the Government will continue the police protection which has been given to Dr. Long since 14th January. (The police reported at that time that Dr. Long's action was often injudicious, and that he seemed disposed to court an exhibition of hostile feeling. I directed on 22nd January that, although Dr. Long's conduct was injudicious, protection must be continued.) I ought to add, in justice to the police, that Dr. Long occasionally evades protection, and that it is, so far as I know, only on such occasions that he has suffered from the hostility of the crowd.

MR. LUNDON (Limerick, E.): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that on cross-examination Dr. Long acknowledged that his life was not in danger?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! The hon. Member cannot be allowed to go into this.

MR. DELANY (Queen's County, Ossory): I wish to ask is it not a fact that Dr. Long is a professional proselytiser, and whether he uses his position as a medical doctor for that purpose?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. JOHN REDMOND (Waterford): I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the question which my hon. friend desires to put is in order. This case was tried, as the right hon. Gentleman said, by a bench of magistrates, and I respectfully submit that the question is in order. That question is, whether Dr. Long did not admit on cross-examination that he was engaged in proselytising in the City of Limerick.

MR. SPEAKER: That was not the question asked. It was whether he was not a professional proselytiser.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Do I understand you to rule it out of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes; I think it is out of order. It does not arise out of the question on the Paper, which has been fully answered. To comment in justification of the case for either the defence or the prosecution is out of order.

CAPTAIN DONELAN (Cork, E.): Will the right hon. Gentleman recommend Dr. Long to confine his attentions in future to the bodily ailments of his patients, and to leave their souls alone?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. O'SHAUGHNESSY: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether his attention has been directed to the conduct of Dr. Long in distributing in the city of Limerick religious tracts; and whether, with a view

to prevent offence to members of the Roman Catholic religion and the provocation to a breach of the peace of the poorer Roman Catholics, steps will be taken to prevent him from continuing to carry on these practices.

MR. WYNDHAM: It is to be regretted that Dr. Long, or rather that the society which employs him, should;conscientiously;think it right to afford gratuitous medical attendance, with the avowed object of making converts in the midst of a Roman Catholic population. But in this, as in other cases of sectarian or agrarian conflict in Ireland, the duty of the Government consists in preserving the peace and prosecuting those who break the law, and does not extend to the prevention of actions which, however injudicious, are not in themselves illegal.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN (Kilkenny): Is the right hon. Gentleman aware of the fact that Dr. Long in the course of the trial admitted he was a proselytiser?

ULSTER RAILWAYS AND FRUIT CARRIAGE.

MR. MURNAGHAN (Tyrone, Mid): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he has received a copy of a resolution from the Armagh County Council condemning the action of the Great Northern Railway Company in failing to provide the necessary facilities to Ulster fruit growers; and, seeing that consignors frequently wait for hours before their perishable goods are forwarded, too late for market, and that choice fruit is conveyed in trucks previously used by cattle, and having regard to the rates charged, whether he will cause the Department of Agriculture in Ireland to inquire into and report upon these matters with the view of remedying by legislation or otherwise the alleged grievances.

MR. WYNDHAM: The resolution has been received, and inquiry is now being made into the matter by the Department of Agriculture.

IRISH RESIDENT MAGISTRATES.

MR. ARCHDALE (Fermanagh, N.): I beg to ask Mr. Attorney General for Ireland whether he can state who it was appointed Mr. Hickson resident magistrate, and what were his qualifications for the appointment.

MR. WYNDHAM: Perhaps I may be permitted to reply to this question. Mr. Hickson was appointed, temporarily, as resident magistrate in September, 1888, and a year later he was placed on the permanent staff. He is a barrister, and had served for twenty-one years as an officer of the constabulary prior to his appointment to the resident magistracy. The appointment was made by the Lord Lieutenant of the day, Lord Londonderry.

MR. ARCHDALE: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that this Gentleman recommended boycotting about ten days ago?

[No answer was returned.]

INSPECTORS OF IRISH FISHERIES.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL (Kerry, W.): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, seeing that Mr. Lane, who has recently been appointed temporarily as Inspector of Fisheries in Ireland, has been for years a member of the firm of Messrs. Lane and Co., Brewers, Cork, whether he can state what special training or experience he has had of deep sea fishing; and whether, in making a permanent appointment, the custom in Scotland of appointing a man who has had practical experience of the fishing industry will be followed.

MR. WYNDHAM: Mr. Lane was associated with Mr. Green in the survey of the West of Ireland Fishery Grounds, undertaken some years ago by the Royal Dublin Society, and he also afforded

material assistance when the working of the fisheries was started by the Congested Districts Board. The question of making a permanent appointment has not yet arisen, and I must decline to commit the Government to arrangements which it may be necessary to make at a future date.

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL: When the right hon. Gentleman makes a permanent appointment will he see that the new inspector has a practical acquaintance with the work of the office?

MR. WYNDHAM: I consider that Mr. Lane has practical knowledge.

MR. SHEEHAN (Cork Co., Mid) asked whether the Chief Secretary considered that assisting at a survey constituted sufficient practical knowledge.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

COMMITTALS TO IRISH REFORMATORIES.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is prepared to bring in a Bill this session to reform the law relating to committals to reformatories in Ireland.

MR. WYNDHAM: I believe it is the intention of my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department to re-introduce the Youthful Offenders Bill at an early date. This Bill, as I have already stated, contains clauses affecting committals to reformatories in Ireland.

MR. O'MARA: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the Bill which he mentions was not included in the statement made by the First Lord of the Treasury as to the Bills which the Government intended only to proceed with this session?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I made no such statement.

IRISH INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he can state what steps he has decided to take to remove the alleged evil effects to industrial schools of the circular dated October, 1898.

MR. WYNDHAM: On the 12th instant a circular letter was issued by Government to magistrates in petty sessions informing them that representations had been made that in some instances magistrates so interpreted the circular of October, 1898, as to influence the exercise of their proper discretion in the application of the provisions of the Industrial Schools Act, and pointing out that that circular was issued in consequence of the abuses then existing, but not with the object of in any way discouraging proceedings on behalf of the classes of children for whose benefit the provisions of the Act were intended. I have forwarded a copy of the circular of the 12th instant to the hon. Member.

BELFAST REVALUATION APPEALS.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick): I beg to ask the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland whether he is aware that several thousands of appeals have been lodged against the Belfast revaluations on the ground that they are generally too high, also that the Black-rock, county Dublin, Urban District Council have successfully appealed against the valuation made by the

Commissioner of Valuations of the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway running through their district; and whether, having those facts in view, he will consider the advisability of taking measures to assimilate the Irish system with that prevailing in England, where the local authorities are the rating authorities.

MR. WYNDHAM: I am afraid I cannot add to the replies to similar questions which the hon. Member addressed to me on the 19th and 21st February last.*

ENNISCORTHY POST OFFICE.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state the reason for the delay in commencing the building

* See Debates, Fourth Series, Vol. lxxxix., pages 484 and 703.

of the new post office at Enniscorthy; whether the responsibility rests with the Post Office, or the Treasury, or the Irish Board of Works; and why the promise given by him that the works should be commenced this month is not to be fulfilled; is he aware that the existing post office at Enniscorthy has been condemned by the sanitary authorities; and that the employees there carry on their work, under conditions of danger to health, in one small room without sufficient light or ventilation; will he give the dimensions of this room, the number of employees occupying it, details of the business dealt with there, and the number of sub-post offices served from Enniscorthy post office; and will the Post Office compensate any of their Enniscorthy employees who suffer in health from the conditions mentioned; and have complaints reached the authorities under this head; and whether, in view of the circumstances of the case, the authorities will adhere to their promise, and call for tenders for the construction of the new post office immediately.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The tenders for the erection of the new Crown Post Office at Enniscorthy have been called for and are to be sent in by the 25th instant. In the meantime arrangements have been made for moving the business to temporary premises, which have lately become available, and where better accommodation will be afforded for all branches of the business. The dimensions of the principal room in the old post office, which was provided by the postmistress, were 18 ft. 9 in. by 11 ft. 10 in. by 8 ft. 7 in., and for three periods of fifteen and thirty minutes respectively during the day the number of persons in it was seventeen. During the rest of the day the number varied from one to five. All the usual branches of business were carried on there, and the number of sub-offices under Enniscorthy is nineteen. It is not known that the premises were ever condemned by the sanitary authorities; the ventilation was not good, but no complaint was received as to the light. There is no reason to suppose that the health of any of the employees has suffered from the conditions mentioned, and only one complaint on the subject has been received.

BALLINFULL POSTAL ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. O'DOWD (Sligo, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether his attention has been directed to a memorial to the Postmaster General from the clergy, representative laity, and magistrates of Killadoon, county Sligo, asking for the establishment of a rural

post and money order office in the town-land of Ballinfull in that district; and whether, in view of the present state of the postal arrangements, steps will be taken to have the grievances alleged in the memorial remedied.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The Postmaster General has received a memorial asking for the establishment of a post office at Ballinfull. The matter has been carefully inquired into, but the Postmaster General is sorry to find that, in view of the high cost of the postal service in the district as compared with the amount of correspondence, the circumstances do not justify the establishment of an office at Ballinfull. There is a letter-box at that place, and stamps can be purchased from the postman.

CAHIRCIVEEN POSTAL SERVICE.

MR. BOLAND (Kerry, S.): I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether any, and, if so, what arrangements have been come to with a view to improving the postal service between Waterville and Cahirciveen, county Kerry.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: A service to Waterville has been established for the present season by the coach which leaves Cahirciveen on the arrival of the 6 p.m. mail train. Half the expense of the service has been contributed locally, the charges for conveyance by the coach being double the sum which the Postmaster General would have been justified in paying. As the hon. Member has already been informed, the expense of providing additional services at Waterville out of the season would be prohibitive.

IRISH POSTMEN'S PAY.

MR. O'MARA: I beg to ask the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, whether he can state what percentage of the postmen employed in Ireland are on established pay, and what are the similar percentages in England and Scotland respectively.

MR. AUSTEN CHAMBERLAIN: The present proportion of established to unestablished postmen is not known, and could not be ascertained without incurring more expense than would appear to be justifiable. But in 1897 the established postmen were in Ireland 54 per cent., in England and Wales 68 per cent., and in Scotland 73 per cent. of the whole number, and there is no reason to believe that these percentages differ much from those at the present time. The reason why the percentage is low in Ireland is that, owing to local circumstances, it is not practicable to make up a larger number of full daily duties justifying established situations.

THE EDUCATION BILL; COCKERTON JUDGMENT.

DR. MACNAMARA (Camberwell, N.): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he is aware of the fact that at this time of the year the great school boards throughout the country usually make their arrangements for the coming evening school session which commences in September; whether his attention has been called to the fact that in the present instance the school boards find themselves unable to proceed with any prospective plans because of the judgment of the Courts of Queen's Bench and of Appeal known as the Cockerton Judgment; and whether, seeing that the Education Bill now before the House of Commons cannot become law in time to permit of these necessary preliminaries being

fixed, the Government will give the school boards an assurance that the auditors of the Local Government Board will be instructed to remit any possible surcharge of any items of expenditure rendered immediately necessary for the carrying on by the school boards of the evening school session of 1901–2 on the lines of the session of 1900–1.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR): I think it is true that at this time of the year the great school boards throughout the country make arrangements for the autumn and winter sessions. I believe, however, that it will be quite practicable for them to defer their arrangements until a later time or to make special arrangements.

DR. MACNAMARA: What special arrangements does the right hon. Gentleman refer to?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It would be quite practicable to make some arrangements with the local authorities if they like.

DR. MACNAMARA: Is not that unduly anticipating the successful passage of the Bill?

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury if his attention has been called to the provisions of a measure for old age pensions now before the French Chamber; and whether he will have the provisions of this measure printed and circulated for the information of Members of this House who are interested in this question.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I understand that it is the fact that a measure on this subject is under discussion in the French Chamber. If it passes into law I shall be very pleased to take the course suggested by the hon. Member.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee): Will the right hon. Gentleman take the same course with regard to the measures which have been passed by certain colonial legislatures?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have not made reference, but I believe that some of these Acts have already been made available. I understand that the hon. Gentleman desires these earlier Papers to be brought up to date by the addition of any later Papers of a similar character.

PROPOSED MINISTRY OF COMMERCE.

MR. FIELD: I beg to ask the First Lord of the Treasury whether he will cause formal inquiry to be instituted as to the need and demand for the appointment of a Minister of Commerce in connection with a consultative committee to be chosen by chambers of commerce.

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I have to thank the hon. Gentleman for sending me an interesting article on the subject; but the Government do not think there is sufficient evidence at the present time to justify them in making the inquiries which the hon. Gentleman suggests.

DISTURBANCES AT BELFAST.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I beg to ask the Chief Secretary a question of which I have given him private notice, namely, whether there was a renewal of the rioting yesterday in one of the shipbuilding yards in Belfast, in the course of which certain Catholic workmen were ill-treated, and an engine-house, where they were employed, attacked with showers of stones and bricks by a large crowd, and

whether, finally, the Catholic workmen escaped from the building by the roof; whether there were any police present, and whether, in view of these continued disturbances in this shipbuilding yard, the right hon. Gentleman will order the police to patrol the yard.

MR. WYNDHAM: On seeing the newspaper paragraph on which I think the hon. Gentleman founds his question;

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The Times.

MR. WYNDHAM: Yes, The Times. I telegraphed to the Commissioner of Police, and he wires this morning as follows;

"On yesterday during meal hours some slight disturbances took place on the premises of Messrs. Workman and Clark and Messrs. Harland and Wolff, but no one was seriously injured. On Sunday evening a Catholic excursion returned to Belfast, when all was quiet, except at the Great Northern Railway Station. A young man named Robert Scott assaulted one of the excursionists, whose name appears to be unknown, by kicking him on the legs. The police promptly arrested Scott, and yesterday he was convicted of riotous behaviour and fined the full penalty of 40s., and was ordered in addition to find bail in two sureties of £;25 each, or to be imprisoned for six months. On the morning of the same day (Sunday) a few missiles were thrown at a Catholic excursion boat going to Rothesay, but they failed to reach the boat."

The Commissioner concludes by saying;

"The city is comparatively quiet. Yesterday's Nationalist papers allege that on Sunday some Gaelic Leaguers were brutally assaulted at the Giants' Ring, four miles from Belfast. A police report, now received, shows this to be an exaggeration. Some twenty Gaelic Leaguers went to the Giants' Ring to play hurley, when a man named Grey, on whose land the Giants' Ring is situate, warned them off. They refused to leave. A crowd of Grey's sympathisers assembled, and an altercation ensued, ending in blows. Stones and sticks were also used. Four of Grey's party were injured, but only one of the Leaguers was injured, and none were seriously hurt. Bernard M'Kenna, the Harbour Commissioners' employee, who was beaten on Tuesday, 11th, as previously reported, has identified his first assailant on the occasion, one Robert Mac Veigh, whom the police arrested. Mac Veigh was brought before the magistrates yesterday, and remanded without bail. On yesterday seven men and a woman were charged with riotous behaviour in different parts of the city on the previous day. The riotous behaviour consisted mostly of the use of party expressions. Six persons were fined 40s., and two of these were ordered to find bail in addition. The two remaining persons were ordered to find bail merely."

The Commissioner at Belfast wires;

"All the labourers, including Catholics, have returned to work to-day at Musgrave Channel, with few exceptions."

MR. JOHN REDMOND: I am obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for the information he has given, one portion of which;namely, the return of the men to work;is satisfactory to everybody. The question I asked, however, was confined entirely to what took place in the shipyards yesterday, and what I want to know is

whether any person has been made amenable for the disturbance in the shipyards. He mentions a number of persons made amenable for the disturbances in the streets. I want to know whether anyone was made amenable for what occurred in the shipyards, or does he allow them to pass altogether? Will he order the police to patrol the yard?

MR. WYNDHAM: I do not intend to allow these disturbances to go on. I gave the hon. Member the case of one man who was fined 30s. and bound over to keep the peace. I am still convinced that to order the police into the yards would not be the best process to adopt to put down the disturbances.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: The police were not present yesterday.

MR. WYNDHAM: I have no information on that point.

MR. PATRICK O'BRIEN: May I ask the Member for one of the Divisions of Belfast if he has any objection to the police going into his shipbuilding yards?

*MR. SPEAKER: Order, order! That question cannot be asked of the hon. Member for East Belfast.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

SIR H. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN (Stirling Burghs): May I ask what Votes will be taken on Friday?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I propose to take the Scotch Estimates.

MR. CAINE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say when the Second Reading of the Education Bill will be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: No, Sir, I cannot answer that.

MR. CAINE: Can the right hon. Gentleman say before when it will not be taken?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: It will not be taken this week.

MR. JOHN REDMOND: Will the right hon. Gentleman make arrangements to take Irish Votes on Friday week?

MR. A. J. BALFOUR: I will take note of the hon. Member's desire. I do not know of any rival claim, and if there be none I shall be very glad to meet the hon. Gentleman's wishes.

NATIONAL GALLERY (PURCHASE OF ADJACENT LAND).

[EXPENSES.]

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of all Expenses incurred by the Commissioners of Works under any Act of the present session for the acquisition of certain land near the National Gallery, in London, and for other purposes connected therewith (King's recommendation signified), Tomorrow.;(Sir John Gorst.)

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. Olroyd; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. HALSEY further reported from the Committee, That they had added to the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures, the following Fifteen Members in respect of the Factory and Workshop Acts Amendment and the Factory and Workshop Acts Consolidation

Bills:;Mr. Asquith, Sir William Coddington, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Emmott, Mr. Harwood, Captain Jessel, Mr. James Kenyon, Mr. Nannetti, Mr. John Redmond, Mr. Secretary Ritchie, Sir John Stirling-Maxwell, Mr. Talbot, Sir Walter Thorburn, Mr. Trevelyan, and Mr. J. W. Wilson.

Mr. HALSEY further reported from the Committee of Selection, That they had discharged the following Members from the Standing Committee on Trade (including Agriculture and Fishing), Shipping, and Manufactures:;Mr. Jeffreys and Mr. Beckett; and had appointed in substitution: Mr. Hargreaves Brown and Mr. White Ridley.

Reports to lie upon the Table.

MESSAGE FROM THE LORDS.

That they have passed a Bill, intituled, "An Act to provide for the constitution of a Bishopric of Southwark and for matters incidental thereto." Bishopric of Southwark Bill [Lords].

NEW BILLS.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND).

Bill to abolish Dealers' or Grocers' Licences in Scotland, ordered to be brought in by Sir John Leng, Mr. Crombie, Mr. Dalziel, Mr. Colville, Mr. Pirie, and Mr. Hunter Craig.

GROCERS' LICENCES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

"To abolish Dealers' or Grocers' Licences in Scotland," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Tuesday, 16th July, and to be printed. [Bill 218.]

MEDICAL ACTS AMENDMENT.

Bill to amend the Medical Acts, 1858 to 1886, ordered to be brought in by Sir Richard Jebb, Sir William Anson, Mr. J. A. Campbell, Sir Michael Foster, Mr. Lecky, Mr. Talbot, and Sir John Tuke.

MEDICAL ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

"To amend the Medical Acts, 1858 to 1886," presented, and read the first time; to be read a second time upon Monday next, and to be printed. [Bill 219.]

CIVIL LIST BILL

Order read, for resuming adjourned debate on Question [11th June], "That the Bill be now read the third time."

Question again proposed.

Debate resumed.

MR. CALDWELL (Lanarkshire, Mid) said that, as far as the amount of the Civil List was concerned, he took no exception whatever; he begrudged no amount that might be necessary to maintain the dignity of the Crown, but the point which he wished to press on the House was the inexpediency of paying the members of the Royal Family by hereditary revenues instead of by payment out of the Consolidated Fund. In a constitutional country the people were the rulers, and the King ruled by the will of the people. The hereditary revenues of this country were really the revenues of the State, and he thought it was far more appropriate that those revenues should be managed by the State, and that the King should receive a fixed sum in cash than that he should be in the position of having to farm what was really the property of the State. Now the revenues he

referred to were

the Woods and Forests, the Duchy of Lancaster and the Duchy of Cornwall. As regarded the first, the Committee had recommended that they should be managed by the State as formerly, and not by the Crown. But why should a distinction be drawn in the case of the Woods and Forests as against the other revenues? It might be said that in this case the revenue was not an increasing quantity, while in the case of the two duchies it was. He believed that in connection with both the Duchy of Lancaster and the Duchy of Cornwall there was a considerable investment in property in London, and in the course of a very few years numbers of leases would be falling in. He did not begrudge the increased revenue. That was not the principle he was contending for; what he advocated was a money payment to the King, whatever the value or prospective value might be, and the State management of these revenues. He submitted it was most inexpedient that the King or any member of the Royal Family should be in the position of holding property in the City of London, and consequently of standing in the relationship of landlord, with the subject for the tenant. It was no use saying that the Duke of Cornwall, as owner of the Duchy of Cornwall revenues, could afford to be generous in dealing with the property of the Duchy. A limited owner could not be expected to be generous; he must necessarily make the most he could out of the revenues while he was in the position of a limited owner; and surely it would be much better for the State to be the owner, as it could afford to await the future development of the property in a way which a limited owner could not. It would be most unseemly for the Duke of Cornwall, as owner of property in London, to have in his capacity of landlord to order evictions, and to be concerned in any of the other disputes which cropped up in the relationship of landlord and tenant. Things might be done in his name which would be a scandal. Hence it was he favoured a fixed money payment in regard to these revenues. And then when they came to the taxation of land values they brought the King and the Duke of Cornwall into relation as to how their interests would be affected by a debatable question of that kind. Of course he recognised that the Bill had to pass in its present shape, but he was availing himself of the opportunity of the Third Reading to impress upon the Government the expediency of reconsidering this whole matter. It could be done in the future, and it would be very much better both in the interests of the State and in the interests of the property of London that it should be dealt with by the State than by a limited owner. He had asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the Duchy of Lancaster would pay property tax in London the same as any other subject in the realm, and he thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said "Yes."

*THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir M. HICKS BEACH, Bristol, W.): Yes.

MR. CALDWELL said that then another little difficulty came in. How was the King to pay property tax in respect of his landownership? Was he to pay the property tax and the local rates the same as anyone else?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Yes.

MR. CALDWELL: said that the right hon. Gentleman replied "Yes"; but was His Majesty to pay the property tax and the local rates direct, because in the case of the Crown he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer would admit that it was

not likely that he would pay them direct, as being assessed on the value of the property. In the case of Crown property an equivalent sum was given, but the principle of the taxation of Crown property for either the property tax or the amount of the local rates was not admitted; and that question would be sure to arise in the future. He was not objecting to the amount given to the King or to the members of the Royal Family to maintain the dignity of their position. That had been settled by a Committee of this House, and he saw no reason for disturbing the settled policy of the country. Neither would he ask that a fair share of any increased revenue which the Duchy of Lancaster and the Duchy of Cornwall might hope to get by the falling in of the leases in London should not be set aside in the next twenty or thirty years for the benefit of these duchies. But he did object that, as they had taken the ground revenues of the Woods and Forests, they ought also to take the ground revenues of the duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall and give a certain fixed sum to meet these, and not put the King or any member of the Royal Family in the invidious position of being a ground landlord.

MR. LABOUCHERE (Northampton): I agree with my hon. friend that if we do maintain the existing system in regard to Crown lands, it should be made applicable to the Duchy of Lancaster and the Duchy of Cornwall, and that these should be directly administered by the State in the same way as the Crown lands. I do not entirely agree with him, however, that because the Committee upstairs reported in a particular direction it necessarily follows that good sound Radicals in the House of Commons should follow the leading of the Committee. For my part, I have addressed the Committee frequently and somewhat exhaustively on the successive stages of this Bill, and I should not have troubled the House with any remark this afternoon had it not been for certain observations which fell from the First Lord of the Treasury when the Bill was last before the House in regard to the right of property possessed by the Sovereign in the Crown lands and the hereditary revenues. The First Lord of the Treasury said that if the Sovereign does not voluntarily surrender the revenues of these Crown lands he has got a perfect right to maintain them himself, and that he may spend them as he best pleases. If I remember rightly, the right hon. Gentleman goes as far as to say that the Sovereign possessed the Crown lands precisely in the same way as anyone else possessed a life interest in any property that may have accrued to him. I say that that doctrine has never been pushed so far by any Minister of the Crown. A Conservative newspaper the other day said, "It is desirable that the Sovereign should retain in his hands the power to bargain with a niggardly and dis-

affected Parliament." That is to say, if these properties increased in value, the Sovereign for the time being may be encouraged to declare; "I will not take this money, but I will seize hold of these Crown lands, and thus exercise pressure on a niggardly Parliament." There are one or two historical points which support my contention that the Crown lands are part and parcel of the hereditary revenues of the country. Before the Revolution there was not the slightest difference made between the Crown lands and the hereditary revenues which went to the personal expenditure of the monarchy. When James II. was

evicted from the throne, if the Crown lands had been his personal property they would have belonged to James III.; but that right was not recognised, and his right of property in the Crown lands lapsed. When William and Mary were elected to the throne it was stated in the Parliamentary records, when the Civil List was voted, that; "The Civil List is a just sense and acknowledgment of the great things His Majesty had done for the country." There was no pretence at that time on the part of King William or Queen Mary that the Crown lands were their private property. Then, on the death of King William, when the throne came to Queen Anne, Queen Anne was not regarded as the heir of King William in any sort of way or on any sort of theory; she did not inherit it through King William. It is stated in the Parliamentary records that; "Your Commons have freely and unanimously resolved to give and grant, and do give and grant herewith," a certain Civil List. Here there was no pretension for a moment that in any sort of way, direct or indirect, Queen Anne had any right to any moneys except those voted by Parliament. What was granted to King William and Queen Anne? They were granted sums of money from "the hereditary duties of Excise and Post Office, from the revenues of the Crown lands, and from some small branches of the Revenue." No distinction was made between the Crown lands and the smaller branches of the Revenue or the other great branches of the Revenue, the Post Office and the Excise. If it be contended that there is some special right in the Sovereign to these

Crown lands derived from old times, and that he has a right to refuse to surrender them, then you must go on logically and maintain that the Sovereign has a right not only to the Crown lands, but to all the great sources of the Revenue such as the Excise, Post Office, etc. That is why I say that the historical position taken up by the First Lord of the Treasury is preposterous and absurd. I happen to be no lawyer, and when the First Lord of the Treasury made that statement I said to my hon. and learned friend the Member for Dundee, "Get up and contest it." He explained to me afterwards why he did not get up; it was because he did not know what he was to contest. And yet he is a lawyer! I see my right hon. friend the Member for West Monmouthshire, who is a great authority on constitutional law, and I should like to know what he thinks of the matter.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT (Monmouthshire, W.): I will tell you.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Very well. George I. and George II. had the Crown lands revenues voted to them on the same conditions precisely as they were voted to William and Mary and Queen Anne; but when George III. came to the throne he introduced into the preamble of the Civil List a surrender, not of all the revenues of the Crown, but a surrender of the Crown lands. He did not make a surrender of the smaller or the greater revenues. I maintain that it is absurd to say that that constitutes a personal title in the Sovereign to the Crown lands. It does not make a title in any sort of way. I am glad that my right hon. friend will address the House on this subject, because he is a learned pundit on the subject, and I think he will agree with me that a title to property cannot be acquired by surrendering it. I take my statement from the Finance Committee's Report of 1872, which was a Committee of the Treasury. I defy anyone to read

that Report fairly and impartially and not agree that I am in the right, and that the First Lord of the Treasury is in the wrong. I have opposed the Civil List, not because I think that the Sovereign ought not to have a sufficiency of money to live in

decent magnificence, but because I think the amount of money proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Government in the Bill is in excess of what is required. We are told that we ought to vote this amount because we should not put any restriction on Royal hospitality. But we are placing a restriction; if we are to be logical we ought not to fix a sum, but to give the Sovereign a right to draw an unlimited credit on the Treasury. We vote, however, what we deem is sufficient and adequate for the hospitality which the Sovereign is expected to exercise, and for the ceremonial duties incumbent upon him from his position. I have seen it stated that certain supporters of the Government regard it as something almost criminal, something traitorous to venture to move the reduction of the amount that is asked for by the Government for the Civil List. I can only say that times have very much changed for the Conservative party, because after the great Revolution it was the Whigs who proposed a Civil List, and it was the Tories who opposed them. What did the Tories say then? They said the Whigs were "hired slaves and corrupt instruments" because they proposed the Civil List. Under these circumstances it seems rather curious that a Radical should be attacked for doing something monstrous when he follows the lines laid down for him by the Tories of a former generation.

The fact is, we have got into very servile days; there is no question of that, and days of reckless extravagance. When any sum is proposed to be provided for the Navy, for the Army, or for the Court, we tumble over each other in our zealous approval of it. I am opposed to all this lavish expenditure on the Army and Navy, or armaments, and on the Court; and as long as I have the honour to be a Member of this House I shall do in the future what I have done in the past in regard to the Civil List and other demands made on the public purse for the Court and the Royal Family. I am quite ready to give them a reasonable sum. I believe the late Sovereign carried out her official duties in a way that was perfectly satisfactory to the country. I have shown in Committee that we are positively increasing the amount of the Civil List and at the same time reducing the charges on it, with the result that the Civil List is swollen to something enormous. It now amounts to £;110,000; but, besides that, there are the revenues of the Duchy of Lancaster, which bring it up to £;170,000. Anyone has only to look through the different arrangements made to see that the reductions which have been made in different classes will not go to the benefit of the country, but to the benefit of the Civil List. I shall certainly vote against the Bill, not that I think for one moment that there ought not to be a Civil List, but because I think the Government ought to take back the present Civil List and bring in another more reasonable.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT: My hon. friend has invited me to express an opinion on this subject, and to deal with a statement which I have not heard; a statement made, as he alleges, by the First Lord of the Treasury. I was not in the House on that occasion, and, therefore, I must make my observations on a statement

reported at secondhand by my hon. and learned friend the Member for Northampton. If it be correct that the First Lord of the Treasury has asserted that the hereditary estates of the Crown are held by the Sovereign personally, in the same character as any private person holds his estates, then I absolutely dissent from that doctrine altogether. The Crown holds the hereditary estates, as it holds all its prerogatives and all its rights, as trustee for the State and the people. That is the situation of the Crown with reference to hereditary estates. If I had thought that this question was to be raised I would have read to the House extracts from an extremely able and trustworthy work, Mr. Spencer Walpole's "History of England," where he deals with the Civil List, and where he states expressly the absurdity of such a doctrine that there is a personal and private right in the hereditary revenues of the Crown. The constitutional practice is accurately stated in that book. If the estates are personal property to be bargained away by Parliament, why should the proprietor receive and the public give more than the estates yield, which has been the case on all occasions on which the Civil List has been settled? Parliament grants the Civil List solely out of consideration for what appertains to the dignity of the Sovereign of these realms. If the hereditary estates yield less than that, the House of Commons is not governed by that consideration to give a smaller Civil List. If they yield a great deal more the House of Commons is not bound to give a great deal more in the form of a Civil List. Of course, if it were true that these estates could at any time be resumed by the Crown, they could only be resumed, as my hon. friend has properly said, subject to the obligation under which the Crown lies of maintaining the civil charges of this country, which, I believe, which be a very bad bargain for the Sovereign. But it is quite plain that a right which has never been exerted for a century and a half is not likely to be asserted now. No doubt the technical form is retained, as in the exercise of many other prerogatives of the Constitution. A great many rights are asserted, and properly asserted, in the name of the Crown, but to deal with the hereditary estates of the Crown as if they were the estates of a private individual would be an entire error and, in my opinion, absolutely contrary to the constitutional principles of this country.

MR. KEIR HARDIE (Merthyr Tydfil): There is one matter which I hope the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be able to enlighten us on before we proceed to a division. I find in the Report presented to the House in 1899, in connection with grants to the Royal Family, the following paragraph: "The revenues of the duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster were not included in the surrender of the hereditary revenues." The question I want to ask is, why was an exception made in the case of these two estates when the Crown lands were being surrendered in exchange for a very generous Civil List? Why should estates which are now yielding something like £130,000 a year be reserved, apparently as private property, by the Crown? I join issue with the hon. Member for Mid-Lanark in his statement

that the present Civil List is not too large. I need not remind the House that from my point of view any Civil List would be too large; but admitting the necessity for a Civil List, I submit that the amount proposed to be given is

exorbitant. When this matter was last under discussion a statement was made as to the enormous income enjoyed by the President of the United States. I have taken the trouble to learn the actual sum paid to the President of the United States, and I find it is 50,000 dollars, or about £10,000 in British money per annum; and yet the President of the United States rules over seventy millions of people, whereas the King of England rules over only fifty millions. The President has to maintain a state consistent with the dignity of his high position, and, although the cost of living in America is not less than in England, he yet finds £10,000 amply sufficient. If that can be done in America, why not in England? Are all the functionaries who attend on the Court necessary to the maintenance of the dignity of our ruler? The many supernumeraries who attach to the Court add neither dignity nor grace to the proceedings connected with royal functions. May I point out also that the sum voted for the Civil List does not exhaust the amount spent by the nation on royalty. The total amount of the Civil List is £548,000, but in addition to that there is spent on the upkeep of royal palaces £18,000, on royal yachts £23,000, and further, there is the income from the Duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster of £130,000, making a total of £719,000. It would be an abuse of language to say that that is a moderate sum to pay for the duties performed by His Majesty the King at a time when, as I have said before, the nation is entering upon a period of trade depression, and when hundreds and thousands and tens of thousands of His Majesty's subjects; the life of every one of whom is quite as valuable as that of the King; are living not only on the verge of poverty, but actually in poverty itself. It is an outrage upon all our forms of government to propose a sum of this kind for the maintenance of the head of the State. I shall vote against the Third Reading, because

I think the amount is too large, and because it is the only way open to me of entering my protest against the continuance of a hereditary ruler over a nominally democratic people.

*MR. STEVENSON (Suffolk, Eye): It was not my intention to take any part in this debate, but as several references have been made to the question of the hereditary revenues of the Crown, I should like to say a few words on that subject. It seems to me that the Civil List Committee acted with great wisdom in not taking into account the increase in the revenues of the Crown. If, on the one hand, it left out the increase in the revenue from Crown lands, on the other hand it left out the increase in the revenue from the Duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster. I concur very much with what fell from my hon. friend the Member for Mid-Lanark, that at some future time it may be desirable to apply to the Duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster a similar principle of commutation to that which has been applied to other Crown lands. But that question does not arise on the present occasion. It is not a question of urgency, and does not form any part of the present Civil List arrangement. Moreover it is a question which requires very great consideration. With reference to the question raised by the hon. Member for Northampton as to whether the King is or is not bound to surrender the Crown lands on his accession to the throne, that has been very clearly dealt with by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouth. Surely that is a

question of no great practical importance, although no doubt it is one of historic interest, because it is perfectly obvious, apart entirely from the question whether the King could or could not refrain from surrendering these revenues, that if he did not he would incur liabilities infinitely greater and more onerous than the benefits that would be derived from retaining them in his own possession. Therefore the question is not of great practical importance. The hon. Member who has just sat down asked why the Duchies of Cornwall and Lancaster had not been surrendered in the same way as other Crown lands. There is, no doubt, some

difference of opinion as to the precise status of these estates, and it seems to me that these properties have been differentiated to some extent from Crown lands, but on the other hand they certainly cannot be regarded as private property. If they had been private property in 1688 it is perfectly clear that they would have been put in a very different position. Moreover, the Duchy of Lancaster is represented by a Minister, and it is quite evident that that property is not on the same footing as any ordinary private property. If the Duchy of Lancaster cannot be properly classed with other Crown lands, it is perfectly certain that it is not the private property of the Sovereign, not being the subject of bequest. As to the precise terms of the will of John of Gaunt there is a great difference of opinion between historians. It seems to me, therefore, that there is a strong reason why this question should be fully considered, and some attempt made in future years to assimilate the conditions under which the Duchy of Lancaster is held to those of the Crown lands. It is clear that there are a number of difficulties which surround the subject, which would have to be met, and that is a good reason why it should not have been considered by the Committee upstairs, and that the Civil List should be passed without importing into it a question very much wider in its bearing and its scope. No doubt there is one current of opinion which holds that the amount of the Civil List is too large, and another which considers that it is by no means excessive; but I think, having regard to the increase of population, and the calls upon the Sovereign and his responsibilities in one way and another under the conditions which now prevail it is only right and proper that the matter should be considered with the utmost regard to the convenience and dignity of the Sovereign. I think the amount at which the Committee arrived was a fair amount, and it certainly was arrived at after sufficient consideration had been given to all these matters. At the same time, I do wish to press upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer that there are other matters with regard to the revenues of the Crown which deserve careful consideration at a future date, and I hope that

during the period the right hon. Gentleman occupies his present position he will be able to devote some time to this complicated question.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: There are only two points upon which I think it is necessary for me to occupy the time of the House. In the first place, the hon. Member for Northampton has attributed to my right hon. friend the First Lord of the Treasury a statement which I am sure he did not make, with regard to the position of the hereditary revenues of the Crown. I understood the hon. Member

to say that my right hon. friend stated that the hereditary revenues of the Crown could be dealt with by the Sovereign precisely as if they belonged to a private person.

MR. LABOUCHERE: What the right hon. Gentleman said was that it belonged to the Sovereign in the sense that if he did not surrender his life interest he had a perfect right to retain it, and in that case he could spend it as he liked.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR, Manchester, E.): I said he held it as the Sovereign, and that is so.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Gentleman has only repeated to-day, as he has on previous occasions, his view as to the historical position of these revenues. I do not think it at all necessary to follow the hon. Member into that question. I am content with the Parliamentary title to those hereditary revenues which was certainly conferred on the present King by the Civil List Act of the late Queen. By the second section of that Act it was enacted that those hereditary revenues "from and after the decease of her present Majesty shall be payable and paid to Her Majesty's heirs and successors." Of course, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for West Monmouthshire said, the King takes those hereditary revenues subject to the performance of the duties which belong to the Crown. How far that implies or involves the maintenance of the civil administration of the State is a matter on which I do not think I should be quite prepared to accept what fell from the right hon. Gentleman; but it is really nothing more than an academical discussion, because, as a matter of fact, His Majesty, on the advice of the Government, has followed the action of his predecessors, and surrendered those revenues on the condition that a suitable Civil List is provided for him. In my judgment, it seems absolutely clear, by the second section of the Civil List Act of the late Queen, that it was perfectly open to His Majesty, if he had so desired, to retain those revenues in place of having a Civil List provided for him by Parliament. Now a question has been raised as to the position of the revenues of the Duchies of Lancaster and Cornwall. I do not think it can be alleged that those revenues are on the same footing as the hereditary revenues of the Crown. There is a clear distinction, because nobody could contend that the performance of any public duties attached to the possession of the revenues of the two Duchies. On the other hand, there is a distinction between them and the private property of the Crown, such as Osborne and Balmoral. The question has been raised whether the revenues of those two Duchies ought or ought not to be surrendered by the Sovereign and the Heir-Apparent. That matter has been very carefully considered from time to time, and I believe was discussed at the time of the accession of her late Majesty, and it was decided then that it was better for every reason that those estates should remain the appanage of the Sovereign and of the Heir-Apparent, as they had been for many generations, and many hundreds of years. I differ entirely from the view that it is contrary to public policy that the Sovereign or Heir-Apparent should own the estates of the Duchy of Lancaster and the Duchy of Cornwall.

MR. CALDWELL: I think it would be contrary to the public interest that they should be in the position of landlords having tenants under them.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I differ entirely from the hon. Gentleman. On the contrary,

I think it greatly for the public advantage that in both cases the Sovereign and Heir-Apparent

should themselves have some personal experience of the duties and rights and position of an owner of property, whether in the country or in London, and we all see what an admirable example our present King has set in that capacity to his subjects.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON (Dundee) said the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had rendered it unnecessary for the debate to be prolonged, for he had explained away the false impression which existed in the country. The words of the First Lord of the Treasury had been universally misunderstood by the press; namely, that the Crown lands were in some peculiar sense the private property of the Sovereign. It was the invincible ignorance of the press which led to this. He agreed that the second section of the Civil List Act of the late Queen did convey a reversionary interest in those lands to the present King. On this subject he quoted a statement written twenty years ago by one whose authority would be acknowledged by the whole House. This writer stated that;

"It is a fallacy that the Crown lands are in some peculiar sense the private property of the Sovereign";. The title of the Crown to the Crown lands is indisputable, but it is only entitled to them subject to the somewhat onerous obligation of defraying the whole of the ordinary expenditure of the State";. The reversionary interest of the heir to the Crown is saddled with an annual burden of 70 millions. It is therefore practically valueless, and may be disregarded."

That burden was now 140 millions. The writer he referred to was the accomplished and learned lawyer who drafted this Civil List Bill.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Who is that?

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: The chief draftsman to the Treasury, Sir Courtenay Ilbert.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: He did not.

MR. EDMUND ROBERTSON: He was responsible for it if he did not. He was the head of the Department responsible for the drafting of this Bill, and he was an historical lawyer of great knowledge and high personal authority.

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Cohen, Benjamin Louis

Gore, Hn G R. C. Ormsby- (Salop

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse

Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.)

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Colomb, Sir John Chas. Ready

Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Aird, Sir John

Colston, Chas. Edw. H. Athole

Goschen, Hon. Geo. Joachim

Allan, William (Gateshead)
Colville, John
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Graham, Henry Robert
Allhusen, Augustus Hy. Eden
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Greene, Sir E W (B'ryS Edm'nds
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Greville, Hon. Ronald
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Craig, Robert Hunter
Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)
Asquith, Rt. Hn Herbert Henry
Cranborne, Viscount
Groves, James Grimble
Atherley-Jones, L.
Cripps, Charles Alfred
Gunter, Sir Robert
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Crombie, John William
Guthrie, Walter Murray
Austin, Sir John
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Hain, Edward
Bagot, Capt. Josceline FitzRoy
Cross, Herb. Shepherd (Bolton)
Haldane, Richard Burdon
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Crossley, Sir Savile
Halsey, Thomas Frederick
Bain, Col. James Robert
Cubitt, Hon. Henry
Hamilton, Rt Hn L d. G. (Midd'x
Baird, John George Alexander
Cust, Henry John C.
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'derry
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J. (Manch'r
Dalkeith, Earl of
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Balfour, Rt Hn. Gerald W (Leeds
Dalrymple, Sir Charles
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
Balfour, Maj. K R (Christchurch

Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Banbury, Frederick George
Davies, M. Vaughan-(Cardigan
Harwood, George
Barry, Sir Francis T. (Windsor)
Denny, Colonel
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Dickson, Charles Scott
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Beckett, Ernest William
Dimsdale, Sir James Cockfield
Hayter, Rt. Hon. Sir A. D.
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Dixon-Hartland, Sir F. Dixon
Heaton, John Henniker
Bhownaggree, Sir M. M.
Dorington, Sir John Edward
Helder, Augustus
Bigwood, James
Doughty, George
Helme, Norval Watson
Bill, Charles
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Black, Alexander William
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Hoare, Edw. B. (Hampstead)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.)
Bond, Edward
Duncan, J. Hastings
Hogg, Lindsay
Boulnois, Edmund
Dunn, Sir William
Holland, William Henry
Bowles, Capt. H. F. (Middlesex)
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin

Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside)
Bowles, T. Gibson (King's Lynn)
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Horniman, Frederick John
Brigg, John
Edwards, Frank
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Broadhurst, Henry
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Hoult, Joseph
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Brookfield, Col. Montagu
Emmott, Alfred
Hozier, Hon. James Henry C.
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.)
Evans, Sir F. H. (Maidstone)
Hudson, George Bickersteth)
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Hughes, Col. Edwin
Bullard, Sir Harry
Fardell, Sir T. George
Hutton, Alfred E. (Morley)
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Farquharson, Dr. Robert
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Burt, Thomas
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Jackson, Rt. Hon. Wm. Lawies
Butcher, John George
Ferguson, R. C. Munro (Leith)
Jacoby, James Alfred
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Fergusson, Rt Hn. Sir J. (Manc'r
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Caine, William Sproston
Finch, George H.
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Caldwell, James
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Johnston, Wm. (Belfast)
Campbell, Rt. Hn. J A (Glasgow
Fisher, William Hayes
Johnstone, Heywood- (Sussex

Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Fison, Frederick William
Joicey, Sir James
Carlile, William Walter
Fitz Gerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Jones, David Brynmor (Swans'a
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh.)
Causton, Richard Knight
Flannery, Sir Fortescue
Kay-Shuttleworth, Rt Hn Sir U.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Kearley, Hudson E.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Flower, Ernest
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Foster, Sir Michael (Lond. Univ
Kenyon, Hn. Geo. T. (Denbigh)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
Kenyon, James (Lancs, Bury)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Fowler, Rt. Hon. Sir Henry
Kenyon-Slaney. Col. W (Salop)
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Fuller, J. M. F.
Keswick, William
Chamberlain, Rt. Hon. J. (Birm
Garfit, William
Kimber, Henry
Chamberlain, J Austen (Worc'r
Gibbs, Hn. A. G. H. (City of Lond
King, Sir Henry Seymour
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Gibbs, Hn. Vicary (St. Albans)
Kinloch, Sir John George S.
Chapman, Edward
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John
Kitson, Sir James
Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Law, Andrew Bonar
Coddington, Sir William

Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Lawrence, W. F. (Liverpool)
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Gordon, Hn. J. E. (Elgin & Nairn)
Lawson, John Grant
Question put.
The House divided.;Ayes, 370; Noes, 60. (Division List No. 258.)
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Murray, Col. Wyndham (Bath)
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Lecky, Rt. Hn. William Edw. H
Myers, William Henry
Stevenson, Francis S.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham
Newdigate, Francis Alex.
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead
Newnes, Sir George
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Nicholson, William Graham
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Nicol, Donald Ninian
Strachey, Edward
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Stroyan, John
Leng, Sir John
Palmer, Sir Charles M. (Durham
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S.
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Levy, Maurice
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Talbot, Rt. Hon. J. G. (Oxf'd U.)
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Paulton, James Mellor
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Lockwood, Lt.-Col. A. R.
Pease, Sir J. W. (Durham)
Tennant, Harold John
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Percy, Earl
Thomas, Abel (Carmarthen, E.)

Long, Col. Charles W (Evesham
Pierpoint, Robert
Thomas, David Alfred (Merthyr
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Pirie, Duncan V.
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Thornton, Percy M.
Lowther, Rt Hn J W (Cum. Penr.
Plummer, Walter R.
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Pretymann, Ernest George
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Pryce Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth)
Purvis, Robert
Valentia, Viscount
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Pym, C. Guy
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Macartney, Rt Hn W. G. Ellison
Quilter, Sir Cuthbert
Wallace, Robert
Macdonald, John Cumming
Randles, John S.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Ratcliffe, R. F.
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Maconochie, A. W.
Reid, James (Greenock)
Wason, E. (Clackmannan)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Remnant, James Farquharson
Wason, John C. (Orkney)
M'Arthur, William (Cornwall)
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Weir, James Galloway
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)

Rentoul, James Alexander
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton)
M'Crae, George
Renwick, (George)
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh W.)
Rickett, J. Compton
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
M'Kenna, Reginald
Ridley, Hn. M. W. (Stalybridge)
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire)
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green)
Whiteley, H. (Ashton-u.-Lyne)
Majendie, James A. H.
Rigg, Richard
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Malcolm, Ian
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. C. Thomson
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Mansfield, Horace Rendall
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Mappin, Sir Frederick Thorpe
Roe, Sir Thomas
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Markham, Arthur Basil
Ropner, Col. Robert
Williams, Rt Hn J Powell- (Birm)
Maxwell, Rt Hn Sir H E (Wigton)
Round, James
Wilson, Chas. Hy. (Hull, W.)
Mellor, Rt. Hon John William
Russell, T. W.
Wilson, Fred. W. (Norfolk, Mid)
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Wilson, Henry J. (York, W. R.)
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Milner, Rt. Hon. Sir Fred. G.
Sassoon, Sir Edward Albert
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Mitchell, William
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. E. J.

Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Simeon, Sir Harrington
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Morley, Charles (Breconshire)
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf'd
Morley, Rt. Hn. J. (Montrose
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Morrell, George Herbert
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Morris, Hon. Martin H. F.
Smith, H C (North'mb., T'neside
Wylie, Alexander
Morrison, James Archibald
Smith, James P. (Lanarks.)
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Soares, Ernest J.
Younger, William
Mount, William Arthur
Spear, John Ward
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Spencer, Rt Hn C R (Northants.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Muntz, Philip A.
Spencer, E. (W. Bromwich)
Sir William Walrond and
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Stanley, Hon. A. (Ormskirk)
Mr. Anstruther.
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Stanley, Edward J. (Somerset)
NOES.
Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Cullinan, J.
Labouchere, Henry
Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Delany, William
Leamy, Edmund
Ambrose, Robert
Doogan, P. C.
Lundon, W.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Duffy, William J.
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Blake, Edward
Ffrench, Peter
M'Dermott, Patrick
Boland, John
Field, William
M'Govern, T.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Flynn, James Christopher
Murnaghan, George
Cameron, Robert
Gilhooly, James
Murphy, J.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Hammond, John
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Clancy, John Joseph
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Cogan, Denis J.
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Jordan, Jeremiah
O' Brien, Kendal (T'pp'r'ry Mid.
Crean, Eugene
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
O'Malley, William
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
O'Connor, James (Wicklow, W.
O' Mara, James
Sullivan, Donal
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
O'Shee, James John

Wilson, John (Durham Mid.)

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)

Power, Patrick Joseph

Young, Samuel (Cavan, E.)

O'Dowd, John

Reddy, M.

TELLERS FOR THE NOES;

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

Redmond, John E. (Waterford)

Sir Thomas Esmonde and

O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N

Redmond, Wm. (Clare)

Captain Donelan.

Bill read the third time, and passed.

FINANCE BILL.

Order read for the House to be put into Committee.

*MR. SPEAKER: There are several Instructions on the Paper in respect to this Bill. The first stands in the name of the senior Member for Merthyr Tydvil, and that Instruction, I think, is not in order. The Finance Bill, as is well known, is the Bill containing all the taxes to meet the expenditure of the year, as far as taxation is necessary: The Instruction proposes that the coal tax should be placed in a separate Bill from the six or seven other taxes embodied in the Finance Bill, and if this Instruction were in order it would be equally in order to move an Instruction as regards each tax in the Bill and propose that it should be put in a separate Bill. The ordinary practice of the House is to treat the Finance Bill as one Bill with one object, and this Instruction is out of order. The next Instruction stands in the name of the hon. Member for North Monmouthshire, and is also out of order. † Its object can be attained by an Amendment moved in Committee on the Bill, and it is therefore unnecessary. The next two Instructions are in the names of the hon. Member for the Eifion Division and the junior Member for Merthyr Tydvil. These are not in order; they propose to substitute for the coal duty other taxes, and to empower the Committee to put taxes in the Bill for which no preliminary resolutions have been passed. Therefore they are not in order.

†This Instruction was as follows:,"That it be an Instruction to the Committee that they have power to provide that the duty to be charged, levied, and paid on coal shall be payable as to one-fourth of the amount of such duty by the coalowner or first vendor of the coal, being the person for the time being in receipt of any royalty or rent in respect of the coal on which the duty is charged." The remaining Instructions are not given, as their purport is explained by Mr. Speaker.

Bill considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

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

Clause 1::

*THE CHAIRMAN: The first Amendment on the Paper, standing in the name of the

hon. Member for Sheffield, is not in the right place.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT (Sheffield, Central): My Amendment applies both to tea and sugar.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I am afraid that would make it more out of order still.

MR. KEARLEY (Devonport) said the object of the Amendment which he had to move was to distribute more evenly a tax which now fell with undue weight upon the poor people who consumed the cheapest tea. He had no doubt that many hon. Members who had not studied this question would consider that a 50 per cent. ad valorem duty was too high. Probably they would be more surprised to hear that the percentage of duty upon the cheapest tea consumed by the poorest people ran as high as from 100 to 150 per cent. The duty on other articles which appeared on the breakfast table, such as coffee and cocoa, the average cost price of which in bond was about the same as that of tea, was much lower. The average price of tea in bond was about 8d. per pound, and the average price of coffee and cocoa in bond was about the same; and yet the disparity in the duty levied upon these commodities was altogether out of proportion. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that it was in the true interests of economy that the labouring classes should bear their share of the cost of the war, but he submitted they were already taxed above their deserts, and they were bearing their share with a vengeance. The Chancellor of the Exchequer pointed out that the money had to be raised, and it was useless to object unless they were prepared to find something else which could be conveniently taxed. He thought it was not the duty of the Opposition to recommend alternative taxes, but he might suggest that if the Government forewent the pleasure of renewing the Agricultural Rating Act they would have the £;2,000,000 which the Chancellor of the Exchequer anticipated from the increased tea duty. In the days of the great French War the tax on tea never exceeded 100 per cent., and only then after it had been raised several times. Prior to the Crimean War the duty on tea was 1s. 6d. per pound, and in the first Budget after the war in 1855 it was raised to 1s. 9d. per pound. The effect, however, upon the consumption of tea was so marked that in 1857 the Chancellor of the Exchequer came down to the House and reduced the tea duty to 1s. 5d. per pound, which was 1d. lower than before the outbreak of the war. He did this because his own purposes were defeated by the higher duty. Although the duty was reduced to 1s. 5d., three years after the war the total product of the tea duty was much larger at the lower figure. Therefore it would be seen that when the duty was raised it had not the effect which the Chancellor of the Exchequer anticipated, but quite the contrary effect. The hon. Member for Flintshire suggested a graduated income tax, and he should have no hesitation in supporting that proposal. He might be asked how he proposed to levy the tax and collect it upon an ad valorem basis. Formerly the tea duties were collected on an ad valorem basis, and he suggested that we should revert to that basis. Probably 95 per cent. of the tea sold in this country was sold by public auction in Mincing Lane. It would be easy to ascertain the cost price of the tea, and on that cost price an ad valorem duty of 50 per cent. might be levied. Taking the average for the last three years, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have realised from ad valorem duties the

same amount as he had been receiving up to the point when the increase in the tea duty took place. When the tea duty was reduced to 4d. about £;1,000,000 was lost to the revenue, but he thought that if it had been continued at that figure the yield would have been as much with the 4d. duty as with the 6d. duty in a few years time. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer increased the duty on tea to 6d., the consumption of tea, which had previously grown under the stimulus of reduced duties, decreased, as was the case after the Crimean War. The consumption of tea last year amounted to 225,000,000 lb., as against 243,000,000 lb. the year before. The tendency must be in that direction, in view of the point which the duty had reached, coupled with other taxation which had been put on the working classes.

Then there was another matter which he wished to mention; the effect of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposals on a great British industry. A large amount of the tea imported into this country now came from India and Ceylon. Forty years ago nearly the whole of our tea came from China. The capital now invested in tea growing in Ceylon and India amounted to £;30,000,000. The total trade amounted to 304,000,000 lb., of which India contributed 157,000,000 lb., Ceylon 115,000,000 lb., and China only 32,000,000 lb. The sudden falling off in the consumption of tea had brought about a most serious financial crisis in the tea industry in those countries. Fifty per cent. of the gardens there at the present time were estimated to be running at a loss. Year by year the tea-growers, anticipating the increased consumption, had put into cultivation larger areas. Suddenly the demand declined, and the extra tea grown had to be disposed of somehow, and, instead of being taken legitimately, it was sent over here and had to be sold at lower rates. The Chancellor of the Exchequer called this over-production, but he did not think it was fair to put the matter in that way, because for thirty, forty, or fifty years the growers had reasonably anticipated the demand on their production, and it was the Chancellor of the Exchequer's duty which had brought about the present serious state of affairs in India and Ceylon. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had received representations from different growers in India and Ceylon, and he was not unacquainted with this aspect of the question. Their property had been depreciated and a great financial crisis had overtaken them, and he submitted that, whatever might be the future value of the new colonies which they were annexing, it seemed to him to be bad statesmanship to get out of tune with their old and loyal colonies which had done them such good service. From that point of view it was bad policy to impose a tax which had brought about such disastrous results to those colonies. He thought he was quite justified in moving this Amendment inasmuch as tea could not be described as a luxury, for it was a necessity of the people, and therefore its consumption should be encouraged, and not discouraged by a high duty. He submitted that whatever the requirements of the war might be, there was nothing to justify the Chancellor of the Exchequer in levying a duty which imposed upon the food of the people a tax of from 100 to 150 per cent. Amendment proposed;

"In page 1, line 20, after the word 'pound,' to insert the words 'fifty per

cent. ad valorem, but not to exceed."";(Mr. Kearley.)

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

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The hon. Member who has just sat down has an intimate knowledge, no doubt, of the trade to which he has alluded; but, in spite of that, I must say that I differ entirely from him in regard to his conclusions.

He has made a proposal which, on the face of it, cannot be accepted, because it would reduce this year's revenue from tea by more than the amount of the extra 2d. which was proposed last year. The hon. Gentleman has made the proposal on grounds which appear to me to be entirely mistaken. His assumption is;and it is often the assumption of hon. Members who deal with this matter;that the poor man has a special inclination to consume the worst class of tea. I do not agree with that assumption, and I do not believe it, I believe that the poor man knows very well what is good tea and what is bad

tea. I know that he is able to purchase good tea, and he does purchase it. But let us assume that it is right that the tax upon tea should be lowered in order to induce people to consume the worst class of tea. I demur to the argument of the hon. Member that this is a question of percentage at all. A great deal has been made of the high percentage of the tax on tea of low quality. But what is the price of that tea, including the tax? That is the real question. The hon.

Member has forgotten in his comparison of the percentage of duty now with that of many years ago that in those days the price of tea, apart from the duty, was very high indeed. Now it has fallen to a point so low that it is unfortunate for the interests on behalf of which the hon. Member spoke in India and Ceylon that by over-production they should have brought it down to that point. The hon.

Member says that in the time of the Crimean War the duty was raised to 1s. 9d., and that the result of that was so disappointing that it was lowered very soon after the war by the Chancellor of the Exchequer. But it was lowered, I suppose, for quite another reason, and I think the hon. Member for Devonport is quite wrong in his comparison of the circumstances of 1856 with those of the present year. He says that the consumption of tea has fallen off on account of the high rate of duty, but that is not a fact. The hon. Member himself told the Committee that whereas the imports of tea for home consumption in the year before last, when the duty was 4d. per pound, were 242,500,000 pounds, last year they were nearly 250,000,000 pounds. I know he attributed that to a great extent to forestalments. But there were forestalments in the year before.

MR. KEARLEY: I said so. The right hon. Gentleman is not quite accurate, because the forestalling took place last year. I know that it has taken place this year, but there are no figures for this year at all.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: It is not a fact that the consumption has fallen off on account of the increase in the tea duty from 4d. to 6d. The imports of tea with a sixpenny duty have been

higher during the past year than they ever were before. The total imports in 1899 were 289 millions of pounds, and in 1900 they rose to 299 millions of pounds, which is higher than has ever been known before, and that in spite of the increase in the duty. The hon. Gentleman has said that the consumption of tea during the past year has decreased to 225 millions of pounds, but he has no

proof whatever of that. You will see how the consumption goes on, and you can judge after a time of the effect of the duty; but there is no ground whatever for saying at the present time that the consumption of tea has been diminished in this country by the increase of duty from 4d. to 6d., because, as a matter of fact, owing to the lower price of tea only a small part of the increased duty has really reached the consumer. The average price of tea last year was nearly 2d. per pound less than it was two years before, and 1d. per lb. less than in the year before. The hon. Member desires to substitute an ad valorem duty in place of the present uniform duty, which has existed since the year 1835, but I cannot think that he will receive any support for that proposal from anyone who has really examined the question. Between 1721 and 1833 there was an ad valorem duty on tea. During that time the tea trade was a monopoly in the hands of the East India Company. The East India Company collected the duty for the Government, and carried out all the sales of tea in this country. All these sales were conducted by public auction, so that the price was easily ascertained. In 1833 that monopoly was repealed, and the tea trade was thrown open, as it is now, to the public at large. Directly that was done the impossibility of an ad valorem duty made itself felt, for there was no certain record of prices, and there arose all those disputes as to values between the Custom House officers and the importers of tea which are certain to occur in the case of an ad valorem duty, and which are as inconvenient for, and as injurious to, the trade itself as they are to the revenue of the country. The hon. Member will suggest, perhaps, that an ad valorem duty should be levied now on the price of tea at the date of import, but he knows very well that tea is retained in bond for months, and during that time it changes hands over and over again at different prices. How are you ever, in these circumstances, to find out, without the greatest risk of fraud, what is the real, bona fide value of the tea? You can only do it by a system which involved such temptation to dishonesty on the part of the Custom House officers, with whom it rested to say what the value of the tea was, that another plan had to be adopted. Under that plan tea was divided into three classes, and the duty was fixed at the rate of 1s. 6d. per pound on the first, 2s. 2d. per pound on the second, and 3s. per pound on the third class; but that, too, was very soon found to be unworkable, because teas of very different values were included in the same class, and so in 1835 the whole system of an ad valorem duty on tea was abolished and a uniform duty instituted. During the interval, though the duty has been raised and lowered over and over again by different Chancellors of the Exchequer, no one has ever proposed to Parliament that an ad valorem duty should be substituted for the uniform duty. I oppose this Amendment on account of the loss of duty which it would cause, and also the impossibility of fairly levying an ad valorem duty. I trust that, whatever view the Committee may take as to whether the duty should be 6d. or a lower figure, it will not, at any rate, support the proposal of the hon. Member that it should be an ad valorem duty.

*MR. LOUGH (Islington, W.) said his hon. friend the Member for Devonport deserved the thanks of the Committee for moving the Amendment, because it served

to bring into prominence the different principles which the Government had introduced into the first clause of the Bill as compared with the second clause. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated his objections to an ad valorem duty, but in the next clause of the Bill it was proposed to put an ad valorem duty on sugar.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said the duty on sugar was not an ad valorem duty at all.

The duty on sugar was precisely the same amount for the same quantity of pure sugar.

*MR. LOUGH said that answer, which they had had before, was the most superficial that could be given. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said that the graduated duty which he proposed in Clause 2 was a duty based upon the sweetening properties of sugar. The price of tea was based on the tea essence; the essential good quality of the tea itself. His hon. friend in making the proposal had submitted a perfectly clear way of arriving at the tea value, which represented the quantity of good tea which each parcel contained, but his plan was resisted by the Government in favour of the system of charging an equal duty regardless of the quality. The right hon. Gentleman's proposal with regard to the tea duty was perfectly inconsistent with the proposal he was going to take with regard to sugar. He was opposed to a graduated duty on sugar, and he was also opposed to an ad valorem duty on tea. It seemed to him that such a duty would expose both the tea trade and sugar trade to very serious risks, which Parliament ought not lightly to put upon them. The great difficulty about an ad valorem duty in this country on tea, or any other article, was that it would put a premium on low quality. The object of the Committee ought to be to pass such laws as would make all producers give to the people the best quality at the lowest possible price. If the Committee adopted the principle of giving a lower tax on a lower quality it would put a premium on the production of a low quality of goods. The Chancellor of the Exchequer said we must not assume that the poor consumed the cheapest quality. His experience confirmed that opinion. The cheapest quality was bought by mean rich people, who gave it to their servants. The poorest people often distinguished themselves by the excellent taste they displayed, so far as tea and, he believed, other articles of consumption were concerned. If they got little, they demanded that it should be good. This was a sound principle to go upon. There was no real economy in bad quality. A smaller quantity of that which was better gave more support to life and went farther. It was this opinion that led him to take a very grave view of the proposal to put a graduated duty on sugar. He thought the Committee should recognise in dealing with these matters that its object ought to be to facilitate business, and particularly the staple businesses of the country. If anyone would think for a moment how the tea trade could be carried on with a graduated tax, it would be enough to make him support the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Such a duty would interfere with the immense trade done in tea in bond, because the seller, the second seller, or the third seller would have to produce the original invoice, so that the duty might be paid upon that. Thus he perceived the price that had been paid by all previous purchasers, it would give a most disastrous blow to the distributors of tea in England, and it would, he

thought, accomplish the ruin of the grower of tea in India and Ceylon. He believed it would be impossible to carry on the trade under the scheme proposed by the Amendment.

MR. CAINE (Cornwall, Camborne) said he hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would see his way to make a reduction in the amount of the duty on the lower kinds of tea. He had given a good deal of attention to the tea trade, and he found that the tax weighed heavily on the poor people of the country, who consumed the low-priced teas. It was quite true that the well-to-do working classes liked good tea, and that they very seldom bought it under 1s. 8d. per pound, but there was a large class who used tea; that was almost the only luxury they possessed; who bought it at 1d. per ounce. They bought the cheapest quality in small quantities. He had been connected with some of the poorest unions in London, and he found from inquiry that paupers sometimes spent 4d. or 6d. a week on tea out of the small pittance they received. That tea would not cost the seller much more than 4d. or 5d. per pound in bond, and the poor people bought it at the rate of 1d. per ounce. It thus appeared that the sellers themselves had a tremendous profit on the article. He thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer might have a small graduation of the tea duties, in order to give relief on the qualities which found their way into the homes of the poor.

Question put, and negatived.

SIR HOWARD VINCENT moved to insert words providing that, "in respect of goods from British possessions, one-fourth part or 25 per cent. shall be remitted."

The ground on which he made this proposal was that there was enormous difficulty in getting finished British goods into foreign markets. Lord Salisbury made a declaration on this subject on November 10th, 1890. He said;

"We know that every bit of the world's surface which is not under the British flag is a country which maybe, and probably will be, closed to us by a hostile tariff. It is to the trade that is carried on within the Empire that we look for the vital force of the commerce of this country."

There could be very little doubt that there was a great deal of truth in the statement made by Lord Salisbury ten years ago, and recent events had given force to it. In recent years a great movement had taken place in favour of a closer union of the Empire. The right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies made a speech on 25th March, 1896, in which he said;

"If the people of this country and of the colonies mean what they say, and intend to approach this question of Imperial unity in a practical spirit, they must approach it from the commercial side."

The commercial side was in favour of giving a preference to colonial trade over foreign trade. Until recently this was impossible, at least with regard to trade from this country to the colonies. There were two treaties, one concluded with Belgium in 1862, and one with Germany in 1865, which contained a clause prohibiting;

"articles, the produce or manufacture of Belgium (alternatively Germany), being subject in British colonies to other or higher duties than those which are, or may be, levied upon similar articles of British origin."

Our colonies, so long as this clause existed, were prevented from putting a

lighter duty on British than on foreign goods, and in order to facilitate trade between all parts of the empire the Government, in 1897, after a considerable movement had taken place on this matter, not alone in this country, but also in the colonies, gave notice of the termination of these treaties. On July 28th, 1897, we wrote to our Ambassador to the German Emperor and to our Envoy Extraordinary to the King of the Belgians as follows;

"I have to request that you will at once give notice of the intention of Her Majesty's Government to terminate the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between Great Britain and the Zollverein (alternatively Belgium). In virtue of the stipulations contained, the Treaty will accordingly terminate upon the expiration of a year, dating from the day upon which you give the notice."

A very short time after these treaties terminated Canada admitted British goods at a reduction of 25 per cent., or one fourth the duty charged upon foreign goods, and it was exactly similar action he was anxious should be established in this country. Since 1898 they had enjoyed this advantage in the Canadian market. There must be a beginning somewhere, and he urged the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make a beginning in the tea duties. Owing to events in China, the production of tea in India and other parts of the British Empire had very considerably increased, and, although the loss to the Exchequer would be considerable; he thought about £1,687,000; he urged that the opportunity should not be missed. Let the Chancellor of the Exchequer put a tax on foreign manufactured goods imported into this country which we could produce ourselves, and which entered into competition with trade and labour here, and remit as far as possible the duties upon goods which were essential to the life of the people, but which our climate absolutely prevented us from producing. And, therefore, they ought to raise our public revenue, or that portion of it derived from Customs' duties, upon goods which entered this country in competition with the product of labour in this country, but which were goods that our climate absolutely prevented us from producing. That being so, we could not have a better article to commence with than tea. It could not be contested that tea was an essential

food with the people of this country, and that it could not be produced in the United Kingdom; and any remission that we could give to tea produced in any portion of the British Empire would be for the benefit of the people in this country, while, although the proportion of tea consumed here from our possessions abroad was very large, such remission could hardly fail to lead to a still further production of tea in India and Ceylon and other parts of the Empire almost equally suitable for the production of tea. There were parts of Australia, the West Indies, and Mauritius which were capable of producing large quantities of tea.

Now the point would arise, "Could we give preferential treatment to our colonies under our present treaties?" The answer to that given by the hon. Baronet the Member for Berwick, who was then Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, on 30th July, 1894, was conclusive. That hon. Member said that "Commercial Treaties"; referring particularly to the Treaty with Germany;

"Did not prevent differential treatment by the United Kingdom in favour of the British Colonies, but that it did prevent preferential treatment by the British Colonies in favour of the United Kingdom."

That answer of the hon. Baronet clearly showed that the course which he suggested to the Committee was not contrary to any existing treaties. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had shown very little sympathy with preferential trade within the Empire. But there was a growing feeling in its favour, not only on both sides of the House but in the country generally. The denunciation of treaties with Belgium and Holland by Lord Salisbury was viewed with absolute favour by all the Chambers of Commerce of this country, and not a single resolution, so far as he knew, antagonistic to it had been passed in any part of the country. If that were so, it was perfectly clear that preferential trade within the Empire was growing in popular favour. Canada had increased her preference to British trade from 25 per cent. to 33½ per cent. He should have preferred to have made his motion 33⅓ per cent., but he had limited it to 25 per cent. because he recognised that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was in urgent need of funds. His constituents were living by their labour and industry, and they echoed to the full the words of Lord Salisbury that foreign nations compelled them to look for trade to the countries over which the British flag flies. If we went on continuing, as for the past three years we had done, to accept favours from Canada and other British colonies without making any effort to reciprocate with them in their markets there would be a great revulsion of colonial feeling. The main subject of discussion on every platform last year in Canada was that the preferential tariff on British goods would not continue long if the old country would not reciprocate. The Prime Minister of Canada was most anxious to give a reasonable preference to British goods, but His Majesty's Government showed an unreasonable obstinacy in the matter and would give no advantage. There could not fail to come a time when the colonies would not give any return if Great Britain and Ireland were so wedded to one-sided free trade. This was a matter of vital importance to the working classes. There were very few working men who had not kith and kin beyond the seas. He firmly believed that the sentiment of the mass of the working men in this country, in view of the attitude of foreign countries, and the increasing difficulties of trade with those countries on account of their increasing Customs restrictions, was to develop trade with our colonies and do what we could by that means to still further weld the Empire together. He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make a sympathetic reply, because his words would be read and reread at every breakfast table on the morrow in every colony and throughout the Empire. If the tone of the reply of the Chancellor of the Exchequer showed him to be out of sympathy with colonial trade and wedded to the old-fashioned notions of trade which were repudiated by so many classes in this country and the colonies, then the feeling of the unity of the Empire, to which we owed so much in the last two years and which was absolutely essential to us, would be abated, and the effect would be disastrous. He appealed to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he was unable to propose a duty on manufactured

goods from foreign countries which came so much into competition with those of our fellow subjects, to at least express sympathy with the development of colonial trade.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND (Clare, E.) asked, on a point of order, whether the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman would exclude the Amendment which stood in his name.

THE CHAIRMAN said that the Amendment of the hon. Member for East Clare had been passed over, because when called upon he was not present.

Amendment proposed;

At end of clause, to insert the words, Always provided that in respect of goods from British possessions one-fourth part, or 25 per cent., shall be remitted."";(Sir Howard Vincent.)

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

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I can assure the hon. Member who has just spoken that I am by no means behind him in my desire to promote closer relations with our colonies, but I do not find in the policy which my hon. friend has more than once put before the House anything that would be really advantageous to either our colonies or the mother country, On the contrary, I believe if his policy were adopted of placing Customs duties on a large number of foreign-manufactured goods and turning our revenue tariff into a protectionist tariff, to be dealt with as some of our colonies which have adopted a protectionist policy were able to deal with protectionist tariffs, by giving preferential rates, under certain circumstances, to the mother country, any such policy would be deeply injurious to this country. I hope my hon. friend will pardon me if I do not follow him into those large questions which he has raised. Even if I could agree with the hon. Gentleman in the principles he advocates I could not agree with him on the present occasion. Let the Committee consider what the proposal of my hon. and gallant friend means. He desires by the policy he advocates to promote larger trade with our colonies. He desires, therefore, that instead of importing certain articles from foreign countries we should import them, to a large extent, from our colonies, and so promote mutual trade between our colonies and ourselves. I sympathise with my hon. friend's object; but what are the facts with regard to tea? The hon. Gentleman's proposal is to reduce the duty on tea by one quarter in favour of tea coming from our colonial possessions. As a matter of fact, at the present time India and Ceylon, under equal duties, have driven foreign producers out of the market. My hon. friend's proposal with the tea trade in that position would deprive the Exchequer, this year of all years, of one-quarter of the revenue from tea in order to do no good. I hope the hon. Member and the Committee will see that it is absolutely impossible for me to accept such a proposal.

Question put, and negatived.

Question proposed. "That Clause I stand part of the Bill."

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said that, having missed the opportunity of moving the Amendment which stood in his name, he would now state what he proposed to say on that matter. It was perfectly obvious that the meaning of the Amendment was to exclude Ireland from the operation of the Act. All along, the Nationalist

Members had protested against the treatment accorded to Ireland in the matter of taxation. They contended that, whatever fresh burdens might be put upon the people of England and Scotland, the Irish people ought to be exempted from these burdens for several reasons. What was at the bottom of the Budget proposals was of course the war in South Africa. But for that war these proposals would not be submitted to the House now. It was monstrously unjust and unfair to ask the taxpayers of Ireland to pay in any shape of new taxation a single farthing towards the cost of the war. The Irish people had protested against the war from the commencement as uncalled for and absolutely unnecessary, and that consequently it was a most

unjust and iniquitous war, but if the people of England and Scotland considered otherwise, if they had come to the conclusion that it was just and necessary, it was natural that they should take steps to provide for the cost of it, but what was most unnatural was that the people of England and Scotland who approved of the war should call upon the unfortunate people of Ireland to pay for that which they regarded as wholly unjust and unnecessary. He knew that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would say at once that it was impossible to make an exception of Ireland in schemes of this kind of general taxation for Imperial purposes, but that would not be an answer which could excuse the Irish Members from taking this and every opportunity of protesting against the fresh imposition of taxation in Ireland. He was reading the other day a very interesting return containing figures compiled by the hon. Member for Islington. In the course of his examination of what had taken place in Ireland he pointed out that while the population of that country had been decreasing to an alarming extent the taxation of the Irish people had been increasing to an equally alarming extent at the same time. He knew that it was hard sometimes for hon. Gentlemen in this House to follow the course of events in Ireland.

*THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. Member was going beyond the question raised in the clause now under discussion.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said if the Chairman had allowed him to do so he was going to point out in support of his argument that Ireland should not be included in the scope of this Bill. He was about to say that tea which was dealt with in the clause was one of those articles the taxation of which fell most heavily upon the Irish people. In the last five or six years the taxation of Ireland had been increased to the extent of a couple of millions a year. When they took into consideration the poverty of the Irish people as compared with the prosperous condition of the British people there was no man in the House with any sense of fairness who could deny that they had at least some case to put forward when they asked the Chancellor of the

Exchequer to make some exception in favour of Ireland. He was not going to discuss the broad question of the financial relations between Great Britain and Ireland, which had been brought about by the Act of Union, but he would say that it was laid down in that Act that the Irish people should get separate treatment and that consideration should be given to the taxable capacity of the Irish people. He objected to the tea tax last year, and he now repeated his objection. No article of consumption could be selected for taxation which would be more

absolutely certain to bring about hardship to the Irish people. The consumption of tea was greater per head of the population in Ireland than in England and Scotland, and the consumption of alcoholic beverages was far greater per head of the population in England and Scotland than in Ireland. He urged that if additional taxation must be put on the Irish people to pay for a war which they hated and loathed, the Chancellor of the Exchequer should consider whether it could not be raised in some other way than upon tea, which was the common article of consumption by the poor people. As far as he was personally concerned, he would infinitely prefer to see the Chancellor of the Exchequer putting additional taxation on alcoholic beverages in Ireland than upon the tea of the poor people. Ireland was sometimes most unjustly taunted with being intemperate, but they were really more temperate than the English or the Scotch, judging by the amount they consumed per head of the population. He would conclude by saying that in his opinion it was a poor, contemptible and pitiable policy on the part of the people of England and Scotland to ask Ireland to pay for the war. Whatever little return might have come to Great Britain out of the war expenditure, Ireland had got absolutely nothing. The millions which had been spent might react in some small way for the benefit of the working people of Great Britain, but, Ireland got nothing at all. Apart altogether from the justice or injustice of the war, he maintained, from a purely material point of view, that the Irish people ought to be exempted, and it was downright mean and dishonourable to ask them to pay anything for the war.

There were very few jingoes in Ireland, thank goodness. The Irish people strongly adhered to the noble policy of conciliation preached by the late Mr. Gladstone. They were told that the English people were jingoes and that they were in favour of the war.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member is not entitled to enter on a discussion on the war.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he was sorry the Chairman had not mentioned that before, as he was afraid he had already said a good deal about the war. He would only say that the Bill was introduced to meet the costs of the war. The Irish people had nothing to do with the war, and it was dishonourable to ask them to pay for it. He would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer to dismiss from his mind, if he could, the trouble which he might consider he was put to from time to time by the Irish members. He would ask him to put himself in, for instance, his position, as representing 12,000 electors in a country district in Ireland, who were hard pressed to make both ends meet. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman to sympathise with the Irish Members to the extent of at least allowing that they were justified in appealing to him that, if Ireland were to be taxed, it should be taxed in some other way than by a duty on tea. He moved the omission of the clause.

MR. POWER (Waterford, E.) said his hon. friend who had just spoken stated that he would prefer that a tax should be imposed on alcohol rather than on tea, and he added that he did not know whether he was speaking on behalf of many of his colleagues. He would tell his hon. friend that, although he would object very much to an extra tax on whiskey, which he thought was already overtaxed, yet if

it came to a choice between an extra tax on whiskey and an extra tax on tea he would prefer the extra tax on whiskey, because tea was a beverage largely used in Ireland, and by the poor more than by any other class. They had been told by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that indirect taxation was the worst system of taxation, and that it pressed more heavily on the poor than did direct taxation, and therefore indirect taxation pressed more heavily on the people of Ireland, because they were poorer than the people of England. It had been stated on very high authority that the people of England did not pay more than 2s. in the £; on the taxable capacity of each individual, whereas Ireland paid 10s. in the £; taxable capacity being of course the surplus which remained over after the necessary deductions had been made for the support of the individual. The appeal of his hon. friend was that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should differentiate. He had to a certain extent differentiated, because he imposed a certain tax on a certain article which did not happen to be produced in Ireland. The war was the Alpha and Omega of the taxation they were considering. Ireland had already paid more than her share in the blood of her own people, which he was ashamed of and regretted extremely, and he thought it was rather hard that she should be now asked to pay in £; s. d. His hon. friend would be perfectly justified in going to a division. He was opposed to the tax because he believed indirect taxation was the worst system that could be adopted. It was decreasing in Great Britain, but increasing in Ireland, which was the poorest part of the United Kingdom.

MR. JORDAN (Fermanagh, S.) said he thought it his duty also to protest against the increased duty on tea. At the same time he sympathised with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had to get the money somewhere. But he would prefer that the money which was required had been made up in some other way than in taxing tea, sugar, or any other article of the breakfast table. He thought that the income tax was bad enough, but he would rather pay an increased income tax than have an increased duty on tea. When the Chancellor of the Exchequer introduced his Budget he ought to have made a clean breast of it and to have simply increased the income tax to 1s. 6d. in the £; and put 1s. a ton on coal, whether it was consumed in England or elsewhere. That would be very much better than taxing the food of the people. He understood the necessity of the case, and was not arguing against the money being raised, but putting taxation on the poorer people was bad. It would have been much better to have put it on men who had comes. They would not want a breakfast or a dinner if they had to pay an income tax of 1s. 6d. They might not be able to go so often to the theatre, or to build a yacht, or to buy a carriage and pair, but those were luxuries which they could do without. A tax on tea and sugar, however, pressed heavily on the very poorest.

MR. FIELD (Dublin, St. Patrick) said he objected to the increased taxation on much broader grounds than his hon. friends. He objected on constitutional grounds to the taxation of Ireland being increased, and he also objected from the Unionist point of view. According to the treaty which was entered into at the time of the Union, Ireland was to be subject to certain exemptions according to the taxable capacity of her people, and it appeared to him that in recent

years Unionists had lost sight of that very important provision. Apparently the basis of taxation in Ireland was that as population decreased taxation should increase. The late Mr. Gladstone, who was in his opinion the greatest financial enemy Ireland ever had, introduced the income tax into Ireland, although Sir Robert Peel had refused to impose it. It was then said that that tax would only last for a short time, but it remained ever since. The tax which was now being imposed would follow exactly the same procedure. When an extra tax was put on whisky the Chancellor of the Exchequer said that it was merely a temporary expedient to raise the revenue which was necessary for the time being, but it had remained ever since. It was very remarkable that since the accession of her late Majesty the population of Ireland had decreased by one half, whereas the taxation had increased threefold. That was an extraordinary state of things. He would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he would not adopt the ethics of taxation that were adopted by statesmen in constitutionally governed countries. His argument was that taxation should be imposed in accordance with the ability of the people to bear it, and the income tax returns supplied the measure of the financial taxable capacity of the Irish people as compared with residents of Great Britain. He was prepared to argue the question on commercial lines, because he had a good case. He wished to direct the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the fact that in Ireland 78 per cent. of the taxation was indirect, whereas in England the indirect taxation was only about 50 per cent. The amalgamation of the Exchequers shortly after the Act of Union was one of the reasons why the Irish people came to be so heavily taxed. They in Ireland had no intense interest in the defence of the Empire, but yet they were charged for it, although they derived no benefit from it. He thought that even Unionist Members would admit that Ireland was bound to get some value for the taxation she paid. What value did she get? The Constitution was suspended, and they got no share of the expenditure on the Navy and Army. He thought a stronger case could not possibly be made out why this tax should not be imposed on Ireland. So far as he was concerned, he was, as a temperance man, entirely opposed to the tax on tea, which was almost one of the necessities of life, particularly among the poor. He ventured seriously to suggest to the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the tax should be put on something else. Hon. Members opposite did not quite realise that taxation which was grinding down the people of Ireland could easily be paid by people in this country. He would not go into the merits of free trade further than to say that the policy of the Government was not really a policy of free trade but a policy of free imports.

*THE CHAIRMAN: I fail to see how free trade comes within the scope of the discussion.

MR. FIELD submitted it arose on the question of the duty on tea. He desired to know as a free trader why a tax was put upon tea, as he understood the principle of free trade was that no food should be taxed. In conclusion, he would say he declined to believe that the Chancellor of the Exchequer wished to press hardly upon the people of Ireland, but he warned the right hon. Gentleman that, if taxation was unduly increased against the spirit and the letter of the Act of Union, a time would come when the people of Ireland would be obliged to fly from

a country where they could no longer live. He was surprised at the attitude taken up by the Irish Conservative Members, because, after all, this taxation fell as heavily upon them as on any other section of the community. They paid an enormous sum of over taxation in this way. He trusted the Chancellor of the Exchequer would consider the points which he had raised.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am very far from feeling any desire to blame the hon. Member for East Clare for bringing the matter forward, but I would remind the Committee that it has already been discussed on the resolution on which the Bill was founded, and therefore I hope I am not unreasonable in asking that the discussion may not be prolonged. The hon. Member who has just sat down touched upon topics which I think he will agree could be more conveniently discussed on another occasion. There could only be but a fragmentary discussion of the financial relations between Ireland and Great Britain on a clause of this Bill, and therefore it would be more convenient to reserve the subject for a later occasion, when we can have a fair discussion upon it. The hon. Member for East Clare takes a primary objection to the duty on tea, because he says he objects entirely to taxation for the purposes of the war. No doubt the hon. Member and his colleagues are right from their point of view in taking that objection; but, as the hon. Member appealed to me to put myself in his place and to express some sympathy for the position in which he finds himself, I will appeal to the hon. Member to put himself in my place.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I only wish you would allow me to.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: For a moment, I would say, and ask him to consider this question from that standpoint. I must get the money from some source, and whatever the source I propose, somebody or other would raise an objection. I do on the other hand feel that the tax on tea is to some extent a greater burden on Ireland than on other parts of the kingdom. I do not think implicit reliance can be placed on the statistics in this matter, but they seem to show a greater consumption of tea per head in Ireland than in Great Britain. That may be so or not. But in any case I am asked on account of the great consumption of tea in Ireland to refrain from imposing this extra taxation. I would remind hon. Members that the fall in price of the article has materially reduced the burden of the extra taxation. I think the hon. Member for Devonport will confirm me when I say that the average price of tea apart from the extra duty is now nearly 2d. a lb. less than it was two years ago, and 1d. a lb. less than it was one year ago, and therefore, although I do not deny that the extra taxation is an additional burden, it is not so great a burden as it was expected to be this time last year. I am glad to have elicited one opinion which seems to be very generally held by hon. Members below the gangway opposite, that they would prefer that taxation on beer and spirits should be raised rather than that on tea. I do not wish to hold out any hopes for the future which I might not be able to realise, but if it might be my happy lot to propose a reduction in taxation I shall certainly be disposed to reduce the duty on tea rather than on beer or spirits. I trust that hon. Members will see that, although I am unable to agree with them, I am not without sympathy for their views.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: I only rise to point out that the right hon. Gentleman is not to understand me to express the view that the increased taxation of spirits in Ireland is justifiable, I am against that also, and shall move against it at a later stage.

SIR THOMAS ESMONDE (Wexford, N.) said that in view of the circumstance that a special day was to be set aside for raising the general question of the financial relations he did not propose to enter into it now, but he would like to make a suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman. The right hon. Gentleman, if he could not do so now, might at some future date allow a rebate of 1d. or 2d. on the lb. to Irish tea merchants in view of the special circumstances of Ireland in regard to taxation. Such a policy was, he believed, carried out in the Isle of Man, and whatever method the authorities had of arriving at the amount to be allowed in rebate of taxation in the Isle of Man could very well be adopted with regard to Ireland. The question of the tea tax was a most important one for Ireland. This tax affected the poor people of Ireland to an enormous degree; to a greater degree, he believed, than any class of people in England or Scotland. Tea was the staple drink of the working classes of Ireland, who in many cases drunk it three times a day. Beer was not consumed in Ireland in the same way as in England. In England beer was the staple drink of the labouring classes, but that was not so in Ireland, and in view of the fact that Ireland was a much poorer country than either England or Scotland, taxation of any kind must fall upon Ireland much more heavily than on Great Britain. It was for that reason he suggested that a rebate should be allowed.

*MR. LOUGH said in the general discussion which had taken place they had only heard one side of the tea tax; the Irish side. The tea tax in Ireland last year produced £;877,000; an increase of £;227,000, which was dragged out of Ireland by indirect taxation. He drew attention to that point because the Chancellor of the Exchequer often said he had a certain kindness for Ireland, but still the right hon. Gentleman at times did much to undermine the great case that had been built up for Ireland. To-night he had said that exact figures of the produce of the tea and other taxes could not be given because there were no means of ascertaining it, but it was unjust that Ireland should be taunted with the fact that she could not give accurate figures; the Government had figures under lock and key which they would not give to the House. There was a charge of £;220,000 a year for collection of taxes in Ireland. That fact alone would show how easy it was for the Government, if it desired, to state the amount of tea brought into

Ireland. He believed this additional taxation would check the consumption of that commodity, and thus press very heavily upon the people. The right hon. Gentleman had said that this was not the time to discuss the financial relations between Great Britain and Ireland, which was perfectly true; but this was certainly the time to point out the effect of this particular tax. The large amount which was derived from taxes in Ireland was taken as a proof of the wealth of the country, but here it could be seen that that was not the case, and this increase of £;227,000 obtained from the additional tax upon tea was ground out of the blood of the Irish people. The system of taxation was breaking the

back of Ireland. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that the indirect taxation of the country was only 50 per cent. of the entire taxation, but in Ireland the indirect taxation amounted to 77 per cent.; therefore an equal tax between Great Britain and Ireland upon such articles as tea and tobacco did not produce an equal result, but an entirely opposite result. Even in Great Britain the result of this tax upon tea had been most unsatisfactory; the consumption of tea had diminished, and the growers had suffered heavily. A burden had been put upon the poorest classes of the population, the consumption of tea had been checked, and the people would now probably drink something worse. The right hon. Gentleman had admitted that on tobacco he had reached the limit of taxation; on spirits he had passed the limit; and that there was nothing more to be obtained upon wine. He believed that this policy was a most unsatisfactory policy, and that the result of the first year of a high tea tax would not encourage further experiments in a similar direction. He had not had an opportunity of moving the Amendment he had intended to move, but he certainly thought that the cost of the war and the amount required to meet the increased expenditure of the country could have been found in some better way than the increase of indirect taxation. An illustration of the mistake the Government was making might be found by comparing the present methods by which money was raised for municipal purposes in our own great cities as compared with the methods of former times which still existed in many Continental cities. The present system was by a direct rate on property. The fact of a large additional sum of money being required did not lead us to abandon that system, say in favour of an octroi, or duty on food coming into the city, which would be more injurious than beneficial. Money required was obtained by increasing the rates upon property, the burden of which fell upon the backs of the rich, but by this system of indirect taxation the burden fell upon the backs of the poor. It would be safer for us to stick to the methods which had produced such a splendid revenue during recent years rather than return to the worn-out expedient of taxes on the necessities of life which had worked so badly in the past.

*MR. CHANNING (Northamptonshire, E.) said that it was his intention to move an Amendment to reduce the amount of the tax upon tea, but he was detained in another part of the House by his duties upon a Committee, and had been unable to do so. He was, therefore, under the necessity of voting against the tea tax as a whole. There would be a disposition among those who strongly dissented from the proposals to meet the gigantic expenditure of this year to recognise that in dealing with this tax the Chancellor of the Exchequer had shown a wise moderation. There was a certain measure of equity and fairness to the poorer classes of this country, in so far as the increase in indirect taxation did not include any further increase in the duty on tea. He should vote against the clause upon two distinct and definite grounds; that all taxation of food was unjust and unfair to the poorest classes of the community, and, further, because all taxes upon food were open to the economic objection that such taxes, increasing as they inevitably did the cost of living, and increasing in the highest proportion the cost of living to the workers, were so much dead weight upon the productive, manufacturing, and the commercial power of the country in

competition with other nations. It might be arguable that almost any kind of tax could rightly be had recourse to in special cases of grave emergency. But for an industrial and a commercial nation any form of tax on food should only be resorted to when other resources were already exhausted. He did not wonder at the protest from Irish Members, but a high rate of indirect taxation was hurtful, not only to Ireland, but to the poorer classes everywhere in the United Kingdom, and upon that ground and the grave injury to trade he should resist the clause.

MR. CREAN (Cork, S.E.) said he could not understand why the Chancellor of the Exchequer should take credit for the reduction in the price of tea, a fact with which he had had nothing whatever to do; the duty remained the same whether the price of tea was high or low, and the people were surely entitled to the benefit of the fluctuations of the market. If anyone was entitled to protest against so iniquitous a tax it was the Irish representatives. There might be some excuse for applying to the colonies, who had supported the policy of the war, but he protested against Ireland being taxed on account of a war for which she was in no way responsible, and against which she had always protested. If it were in the power of the people to defeat the collection of the tax, not one penny of it would be obtained within the four seas of Ireland.

MR. NANNETTI (Dublin, College Green) said he only intervened in the discussion because he represented a number of poor people. The tax was instituted in order to pay for the war in which we were now engaged, but his constituency had one and all protested against that war. And, inasmuch as the people of Dublin and of Ireland generally had protested against the war, they ought not to be called upon to contribute anything towards the cost of it. He protested against the imposition of this tax because it would press more heavily upon the poor people whom he represented than upon the people of this country. Owing to their poverty the Irish people were compelled to adopt tea as their principal beverage, and it formed their staple article of food, whether for break-fast, dinner, tea, or supper. Why was not a tax put upon something in which mainly the rich were interested, such as

carriages, foreign wines, or foreign cigars? There might be something in the argument that those articles were already sufficiently taxed, but, at any rate, it would be fairer to place the burden upon those who could afford to pay rather than upon the unfortunate people who were not in that position. There might be some justice in placing the tax upon the people of England and Scotland, who had approved of the war, but the

AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex F.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Allhusen, Augustus H. Eden
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Firbank, Joseph Thomas

Mitchell, William
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Fisher, William Hayes
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Atkinson, Rt. Hn. John
Fison, Frederick William
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Austin, Sir John
Fitz Gerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Morrell, George Herbert
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Morrison, James Archibald
Bain, Col. James Robert
Flower, Ernest
Morton, A. H. A. (Deptford)
Baird, John G. Alexander
Fowler, Rt. Hn. Sir Henry
Mount, William Arthur
Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Galloway, Wm. Johnson
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Balfour, Rt. Hn. G. W. (Leeds
Garfit, William
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Bathurst, Hon. Allen Benjamin
Gibbs, Hn A G H. (City of Lond.)
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Myers, William Henry
Beach, Rt. Hon. W. W. B (Hants
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John E.
Nicholson, William Graham.
Beckett, Ernest William
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Bhownaggee, Sir M. M.
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Pierpoint, Robert
Bigwood, James
Grenfell, Wm. Henry
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard

Blundell, Colonel Henry
Groves, James Grimble
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Gurdon, Sir W. Brampton
Plummer, Walter R.
Brigg, John
Hain, Edward
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Hall, Edward Marshall
Pretymann, Ernest George
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Hamilton, Rt Hon Lord G (Mid'x)
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edw.
Bull, William James
Hamilton, Marq of (L'donderry
Randles, John S.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. Wm.
Rasch, Major Frederic Carne
Burdett-Coutts, W.
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Reid, James (Greenock)
Batcher, John George
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Remnant, Jas. Farquharson
Carlile, William Walter
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Rentoul, James Alexander
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Renwick, George
Cautley, Henry Strother
Hogg, Lindsay
Rickett, J. Compton
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Hope, J. F (Sheffield, Brightside
Ritchie, Hon Sir Chas. Thomson
Cavendish. V. C. W (Derbyshire
Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Henry
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham)
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich

Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Ropner, Col. Robert
Chamberlain, J Austenc (Worc'r
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Round, James
Chapman, Edward
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Saunderson, Rt Hn. Col. Edw. J.
Cohen, Benjamin Louis
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Sharpe, Wm. Edward T.
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Kennaway, Rt. Hon. Sir John H.
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop.
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Lambton, Hon. Fredk. Wm.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Smith, H. C (North'mb. T'nes'de.
Cox, Irwin Edward Bainbridge
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks.)
Cranborne, Viscount
Lawson, John Grant
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H. (Hants Fareham
Spear, John Ward
Cross, Her b. Shepherd (Bolton)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset),
Crossley, Sir Savile
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Dalkeith, Earl of
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.)

Stock, James Henry
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Dickson, Chas. Scott
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Stroyan, John
Digby, John, K. D. Wingfield-
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Strutt, Hon. Chas. Hedley
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Doughty, George
Macdona, John Cumming
Thomas, David Alfred (M'rthyr
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
M'Iver, Sir Lewis (Edinb'rgh, W
Thornton, Percy M.
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Dyke, Rt. Hn. Sir William Hart
Majendie, James A. H.
Tritton, Chas. Ernest

Irish nation had, by every means in its power, protested against and opposed the policy of the Government in South Africa, and, therefore, as representing a portion of that nation, he should support the Amendment in the division lobby.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 192;. Noes, 108. [Division List No. 259.]

Tufnell, Lt-Col. Edward
Welby, Lt,-Col. A C E (Taunton
Wortley, Rt. Hon. C. B. Stuart-
Valentia, Viscount
Welby, Sir C. G. E. (Notts.)
Wylie. Alexander
Vincent, Col Sir C E H (Sheffield)
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Wilson, A. Stanley (York, E. R.)
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Warde Col. C. E.

Wilson, John (Falkirk)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Warr, Augustus Frederick
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Sir William Walrond and
Webb, Col. Wm. George
Wolff, Gastav Wilhelm
Mr. Anstruther
NOES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)
Hardie, J Keir (Merthyr Tydvil)
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Allan, William (Gateshead)
Harwood, George
O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)
Allen, Charles P (Glouc., Stroud
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Ambrose, Robert
Helme, Norval Watson
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Black, Alexander William
Holland, William Henry
O'Dowd, John
Blake, Edward
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Boland, John
Jones, David B. (Swansea)
O'Kelly, James (Roscommon, N.
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Jones, William (Carnarvonsh'e
O'Malley, William
Broadhurst, Henry
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Mara, James
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Burke, E. Haviland-

Kinloch, Sir John Geo. Smyth
Power, Patrick Joseph
Burt, Thomas
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Price, Robert John
Caldwell, James
Leamy, Edmund
Reddy, M.
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leese, Sir Joseph F (Accrington
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Channing, Francis Allston
Leng, Sir John
Redmond, William (Clare)
Cogan, Denis J.
Levy, Maurice
Rigg, Richard
Condon, Thomas Joseph
Lewis, John Herbert
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Crean, Eugene
Lough, Thomas
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cullinan, J.
Lundon, W.
Sinclair, Capt. John (Forfarsh.
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Delany, William
M'Crae, George
Soares, Ernest J.
Doogan, P. C.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C. R. (North'ts
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
M'Govern, T.
Sullivan, Donal
Duffy, William J.
M'Kenna, Reginald
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Duncan, J. Hastings
M'Laren, Charles Benjamin
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Mooney John J.

Weir, James Galloway
Fenwick, Charles
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
French, Peter
Murnaghan, George
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Field, William
Murphy, John
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Flynn, James Christopher
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Fuller, J. M. F.
Newnes, Sir George
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Gillhooly, James
Nolan, Col. John P (Galway, N.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, E.)
Goddard, Daniel Ford
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Griffith, Ellis J.
O'Brien, James F. X. (Cork)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Hammond, John
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary Mid)
Captain Donelan.

Clause 2::

MR. D. A. THOMAS (Merthyr Tydfil) said the Amendment standing in his name was not an important one, but he desired to move it formally in order to obtain some explanation from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and he had no intention of going to a division if the answer given was satisfactory. What he really wished to know was whether the duty upon sugar was to be paid as from the beginning of the 19th of April or the close, that was to say on the 20th. That was a point he desired to have made quite clear, because it made a difference of £20,000 in the amount to be obtained from the sugar duties. He begged to move;

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 1, to leave out 'from' and insert 'on and after'; and to leave out 'nine-

teenth' and insert 'eighteenth.'";(Mr. D. A. Thomas.)

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: As I understand it, the effect of the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman would be to make the duty leviable a day before it was legally leviable, and that you could not do without a resolution.

MR. D. A. THOMAS said that was the form in which it appeared in the resolution, and it was for that reason he moved it in that way. The Budget resolution

provided that the duty should be leviable on the 19th, but this clause did not carry out the resolution.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: The resolution applied to a future date, and, therefore, the words "on and after" were put in. This Bill authorises the collection of the duty from a past date,

and therefore it is properly set forth as from the 19th.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: It makes a difference of a day.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No, it does not.

MR. D. A. THOMAS: Then do I understand that "as from" means from the beginning of the 19th of April?

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Quite so.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

*MR. CHANNING said that the Amendment which he proposed to move was one which directly challenged the form in which this new tax and the coal tax also were put before Parliament. The sugar duty was proposed not in the form of the tea duty and other indirect taxes, but as a permanent tax. The usual and constitutional form was of a tax to be levied and paid for one year only, and subject to revision and reconsideration in this House in subsequent years. His Amendment should properly be moved after the word "paid," and not after the word "one," and he desired to move it in that form. He dissented entirely from the sugar duty. He did not raise the question of the excessive expenditure to be met by taxation this year, or where the money required should come from; it was sufficient for his purpose to argue that it was open to the Chancellor of the Exchequer to propose other taxation which would give him the amount which he proposed to obtain from the sugar duty. He wished to take the gravest objections to this tax, it was the reversal of the wise policy of a great Conservative Chancellor of the Exchequer. It imposed a burden heaviest in proportion on the poorest classes, and it was open to all the economic objections to taxes upon food. It seemed to him that the form in which it was laid before Parliament which made it a permanent tax added very materially to the objections he had to it. If brought in in the usual way for one year it would be perfectly easy to re-impose it, if necessary, in any subsequent year. But if imposed for ever and ever as a hereditary burden it was harder to get rid of it in future. This tax was a serious burden placed on what was practically the raw material of many growing industries in this country. It was highly objectionable, having regard to the way in which it would press upon the working classes of the country; it was still more objectionable from the manner in which it would interfere with many growing industries; but its most objectionable feature was the fact that it was to be a permanent tax. The most serious objection could be taken to its being made permanent on the specific ground that this or any similar source of taxation should only be drawn upon in case of the gravest emergency. He ventured to say that the objections to this tax were so serious that to deal with it in such a manner as to imply that the tax would be for ever imposed upon the community, was a very dangerous proposal to lay before the House, when regard was had to the fact that this tax came largely out of the pockets of the poor. To permanently earmark an obviously

unjust proportion of the smallest incomes in the country in such a manner as this, was, in his opinion, a very dangerous course to adopt. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of widening the basis of taxation. He had agreed with many of his contentions on financial matters, but in regard to these words he had the greatest suspicion, doubt and dread. There was a section on the opposite side of the House who looked upon the sugar and coal taxes with satisfaction just because they had this element of permanence, and as driving in the wedge of protection into the fiscal system in this country. The form in which the proposals were laid before Parliament amounted to a sort of pledge to that party that the enormous expenditure in the future would be largely charged on indirect taxation. A direct tax was a thing which everyone could understand and measure, but indirect taxation largely escaped criticism. He ventured to say that the form in which these new taxes were proposed was a threat to the financial principles of this country.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 2, after the word 'paid,' to insert the words 'until the first day of August nineteen hundred and two.'";(Mr. Channing.)

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

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I recognise that the view of the hon. Member with regard to this tax is not my own. He objects to additional taxation here, he objects to the war in South Africa, and, if it were necessary for him to give his mind to the levying of additional taxation, he would no doubt raise it by an addition to the income tax rather than by this duty. No doubt we view this matter from entirely different standpoints. My own view as to the sugar duty is that it is a fair tax, having regard to the great expenditure of the country and to the necessity that that expenditure should be evenly divided between direct and indirect taxation. I have not scrupled to add largely to direct taxation in the last two years, and I felt myself bound, in fairness to all the taxpayers, to add also to indirect taxation. The hon. Member says that, whatever the merits of this tax, it ought to be only an annual tax. I never could have excused myself if I had proposed to Parliament a sugar duty as a tax simply for one year. It is impossible to propose any tax of that kind without very considerable trouble, inconvenience, and even disorganisation to the trade and industry of the country, and to undertake any proceeding of the kind merely for the purpose of one year's taxation would be, to my mind, entirely indefensible. I have already explained fully to the House that I have felt it is necessary to increase the articles on which our indirect taxation is at present laid not only in view of the war expenditure of the present year, but also in view of the largely-increasing ordinary expenditure of the country. I have proposed this tax as by no means a tax for one year. I have frankly told the Committee that to my mind this tax ought to continue, so far as I can see, as part of the general fiscal system of the country so long as our expenditure is on anything like the present basis. Whether the day will ever come when that expenditure will be reduced to what it was twenty years ago is a matter, of course, on which hon. Members can form their own opinion, but, having regard to the additional and increasing responsibilities of the country, and to the increasing demands for national

expenditure of every kind, any such expectation as that is, to my mind, absolutely impossible to entertain. Under those circumstances I have proposed this tax, and, as I have said, so far as I can see for the present, as a permanent part of our fiscal system. It may be possible for some future Chancellor of the Exchequer to repeal the tax, but it is not for me to forecast the future in that way. But there is no necessity, so far as I can see, for placing it on the same basis as the tea duty, so that by inclusion in the Finance Bill of every year it should be annually a matter for the consideration of the House of Commons. The tea duty has long occupied that place alone among indirect taxes. I hardly know why it was selected for that position, but it is right, of course, that one among our indirect taxes should occupy the place taken by the tea duty in order to maintain the control of Parliament on indirect taxation, but I do not see that it would be for the convenience of Parliament or any advantage to anyone concerned to place the sugar duty in the same position as the tea duty. If I had made any such proposal my action would have been taken as a suggestion that I had intended this merely as a tax for one year, and I should have been denounced, and rightly denounced, by the hon. Member for Devonport and other Members interested in this matter. It is impossible for me in these circumstances to agree to the proposal of the hon. Member opposite.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON (Tower Hamlets, Poplar) asked whether this ought to be a permanent tax, placed entirely out of the purview of the House of Commons year by year? What they wanted to secure was that this tax should come every year within the purview of the House of Commons, so that they might reduce it if they thought fit, or abolish it altogether. It was obvious that, so long as this Government existed, this tax would exist. The intention of the tea duty was that the House of Commons should have full control over the taxation of the country. He thought it was a serious matter to ask the House to part with such a control over the sugar duty as it had in regard to the tea duty. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that he wanted to keep the same proportions between direct and indirect taxation. He agreed with him in that, but what were they doing now? They were voting direct taxation for one year, and they were voting additional indirect taxation in the shape of the sugar duty as a permanent tax. Surely it was only right, if they were to keep these proportions between direct and indirect taxation, that the House of Commons should have the opportunity of voting whether they desired a reduction of indirect taxation. This sugar tax was not merely a revival of an old tax; it was a new tax, and he thought the attitude of the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to it was rather hard.

MR. MCCRAE (Edinburgh, E.) hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would carefully consider this Amendment. He thought that a year hence the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he occupied his present position, would have to consider very carefully the whole question of taxation. What was the reason for the imposition of this sugar duty? It was not a war tax; it was a tax due to the ordinary expenditure of the country. Apart from those taxes imposed for the war, there would have been a deficit this year on ordinary expenditure and revenue of something like £9,250,000. There was no question that this increased taxation which had been imposed this year had not been imposed for war expenditure, but

for the ordinary expenditure of the country. If that was the case, he thought there was all the more reason to consider the application of the principles of taxation. He held that the House should be given an opportunity twelve months hence to consider whether or not the tax should be continued. He held that the proposal to make the sugar duty a permanent one would not commend itself to the House.

MR. KEARLEY: said it was a new experience for him to find the Chancellor of the Exchequer solicitous to avoid the disorganisation of business. Two years ago, in spite of the good advice which he and others tendered to him, the right hon. Gentleman took off the tobacco duty. He arranged it so that the tobacco duty would go into the pockets of his Bristol friends and others. He found that he was wrong, and next year he put the duty back again. The Chancellor of the Exchequer was not infallible, and he was a dangerous man to be entrusted with the levying of the taxation of the country. He was disorganising the sugar trade by the irregular way the duty was to be levied. It was quite fair on that ground alone that this tax should come up year by year, as other taxes did, for review. This was the first time in the history of the country that any Chancellor of the Exchequer levying a war tax announced simultaneously that it was to be permanent. He thought the Amendment of his hon. friend should be strongly supported.

MR. ARTHUR ELLIOT (Durham) said the appeal that the tax should be confined to one year was one that would not be responded to. Surely it was fair to the House and the country that it should know that it would be necessary, in all probability, to maintain this tax for several years to come. That was the honourable course to pursue. He knew that there were some hon. Members who would take very strong measures for the reduction of taxation if the country or the House were to allow them, but they must deal with affairs as they found them. They saw that the expenditure must be very high indeed; and he confessed that he found some difficulty in quite understanding the position of those who were constantly arguing that the expenditure of the Government was right and were yet coming forward prepared to refuse permission to the Government to revise the taxation by which alone the policy could be carried out. They should not support the policy and cut down the means of carrying it out. Having listened to the remarks of speakers on the front Opposition bench, he could see that the expenditure was likely to last even if a change of Government took place.

COLONEL NOLAN (Galway, N.) supported the Amendment because he fancied if they accepted the duty in the form in which it was now proposed they would require a special Bill to repeal it.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH said that the House of Commons had always reserved to itself sufficient power to secure its privileges against any possible action by the House of Lords.

MR. M'KENNA (Monmouthshire, N.) said he could not follow the argument of the hon. Member for Durham. If this were merely a war tax it must be obvious that it would be only necessary for one or two years; but it was brought forward in order to meet the increased ordinary expenditure of the Government. The normal expenditure of the country had increased under the present Government by twenty-

eight millions a year, and there was no reasonable prospect of that expenditure decreasing so long as this Government remained in power. They, on that side of the House, were convinced that if the Liberals got into office there would be such economies as to permit of the sugar duty being done away with. Under those circumstances they did not look forward to the sugar duty as being necessarily permanent. There was another reason why he begged the Chancellor of the Exchequer to impose the duty for one year only. It was not wise in the House of Commons to make it possible for the Government to raise money readily. He would give the Chancellor of the Exchequer full credit for his desire to reduce expenditure, but if they made this tax permanent they would be putting an extra weapon into the hands of those Members of the Cabinet who were, to say the least, not exponents of economy. The House ought to retain its power over taxation, and if the present Government wanted the sugar duty continued next year let them come and ask for it.

MR. JOHN WILSON (Falkirk Burghs) said that the right hon. the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been perfectly frank and straightforward in his statement. He thought this was the proper time to refer to the coal duty.

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must confine himself to the question of sugar.

MR. JOHN WILSON said he was afraid he must vote against the clause, because otherwise it would carry approval to other parts of the Bill.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: No.

*MR. TAYLOR (Lancashire, Radcliffe) said there was another reason why the tax should only be made for one year. The changes which the Chancellor of the Exchequer had already made in the tax showed that the information that he had received had not been sufficiently considered, and that was a very potent reason why they should not put the tax upon a permanent form. As a believer in the control of the House of Commons over the national purse, he did not approve of making any duty permanent, but if any were to be made permanent it should be that on tea rather than that on sugar. They could not forecast the effect of the duty on the fruit and jam industries, and he was afraid that before a year was over even the Chancellor of the Exchequer would regret putting it on an article which would affect the very poorest in the land. Some hon. Members maintained that there should be a proportion preserved between direct and indirect taxation. For himself he did not hold any such proposition; he was in favour of direct taxation which would compel people to realise what the nation was really spending. In thinking over this question he wondered what the effect would be if a procession were to pass the Speaker's chair of the agricultural labourers and their families whose wages were only 12 s. to 14s. per week, and of those similar classes in our large towns whose high rents practically reduced the family income to a similar figure. He believed no Member of the House would be so hard-hearted as to vote for a tax which was to diminish an important article of food of these poor people. The fruit industry in this country had been steadily growing, and often large quantities of fruit had to be destroyed because the price of sugar was more than the jam makers could afford. If they taxed the sugar the jam makers would be compelled to give a less price for the fruit, and they knew that that was no means of encouraging an important

industry.

MR. FIELD said he would not have intervened in the discussion but for the fact that he had received communications from constituents in regard to the duty on imported molasses. He had forwarded these communications to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had received them very courteously, and said he would give their contents his consideration. The imposition of this tax ought to be subject to certain changes and modifications proved necessary by experience by working. He believed in the doctrine of direct taxation, and thought that they should substitute for the sugar duties a tax on land values, which would be felt, not by the poor, but by the rich. He protested against a system of putting into the hands of the Chancellor of the Exchequer the dangerous power of perpetuating taxation. At present the House of Commons was not a legislative machine, but merely an instrument to provide taxation for abnormal expenditure, of which the Irish people had to pay more than their fair share. The effect of granting a perpetual tax would be to encourage expenditure and discourage economy. He entirely agreed that the House of Commons should retain the control of taxation, more particularly indirect taxation, which was the most dangerous form of taxation of all.

*MR. HEMPHILL (Tyrone, N.) said he had from the beginning most strongly opposed the imposition of the duty on sugar, and, a fortiori, he objected to its being made a permanent tax. He was very sorry to hear from the hon. Member for Durham that the country was threatened with an accumulation of taxation, increasing from year to year. He could not agree with the hon. Member that if the reins of Government were transferred from that to this side of the House there would not be a considerable improvement in that respect. He could not believe that the great Liberal party of this country would give up the cry of "peace, retrenchment, and reform." If he was not much mistaken, the time was not far distant when the constituencies would see the evils into which they had been led, and the expense which had been and was being accumulated on the country. The object of making this tax permanent was, he believed, to prevent the discussion of it from year to year, because if this Amendment was defeated it could not be got rid of without repealing an Act of Parliament. This tax would press most heavily on the poorest classes of the community, and upon the most helpless of those classes, women and children, to whom sugar afforded nourishment and comfort. At one time there was great hope of the free breakfast table, but the present Government were destroying all hope of that being realised.

*THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The question is not the imposition of the tax, but whether it is to be imposed for a year or permanently.

*MR. HEMPHILL said that if the tax were perfectly innocuous, of course no one would object to its being made permanent. He meant by his argument that a tax of this kind, which was so harmful and so very obnoxious, ought not to be made perpetual.

SIR JOHN BRUNNER (Cheshire, Northwich) said he wished to put forward another consideration why the tax should not be made permanent. If they increased the

taxes on wine, spirits, beer, and tobacco, they would reduce the consumption of these articles, and decrease the working power of the people. But in this case they were imposing a tax upon an article which was in large consumption, and which increased the earning power of the people. That was a reason to his mind of the last importance to consider. He desired with all the earnestness he could put into words to induce Members of the House to study this matter for themselves, and if they did so he believed that at the end of twelve months they would repeal the tax.

MR. CREAN objected to the tax being made permanent, because it would press more heavily on the Irish taxpayers than on the English. The Chancellor of the Exchequer himself had no knowledge to what extent the ramifications of the sugar tax would go, and the fact that he had to change it so often proved that he was not sure of the ground on which he stood. That was one reason why the tax should only be imposed for twelve months, when they would be able to review the work of the year, and see whether the tax had not gone a great deal beyond what the Chancellor of the Exchequer himself intended. At any rate this was a tax which, of all taxes, ought not to be made perpetual. He

thought that the arguments were very strong in favour of not making the tax permanent, especially in a poor country. If it were a direct tax, the arguments of his hon. friends might not be as sound as they were, but people scarcely knew what they were paying on an indirect tax. If a direct tax were imposed people would know what they were paying, and that would be a curb on extravagant expenditure. He thought the Committee should be very slow to make an indirect tax permanent, whatever might be the case as regarded a direct tax.

MR. FLYNN (Cork, N.) said it was obvious that the tax was experimental, because it was impossible to estimate what its result would be. It might be disappointing to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and in that event the clause would be repealed. How much more difficult that would be if another Government were in power. They would be very much handicapped and it would be very difficult for them to put back the tax in accordance with the wishes the people. If the tax affected the confectionery and other trades, and if there were great outcry against it another Government might desire to reduce it. But they could not do it in the ordinary way if the tax were made permanent. That would be making it very difficult for any future Chancellor of the Exchequer to reduce the tax, and he could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman would not accept the Amendment. If the tax were required again next year it could be reimposed in a small clause in the Finance Bill. He could not understand why the Chancellor of the Exchequer desired to make the tax permanent unless it were to burke discussion. It was obvious to the intelligence of the Committee that if the tax were found to be intolerable there would be a general desire to repeal it, and if it were found to be tolerable there would be no objection to putting in a clause in the next Finance Bill reimposing it. He thought the Amendment a very reasonable one.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: If the tax is found to be intolerable or if it is found not to be satisfactory the Chancellor of the Exchequer of the day can propose an alteration, and I therefore cannot see why this tax cannot now be made

permanent. I see great reason for not accepting the Amendment of the hon. Member, but after all the point is a narrow one, and I hope the Committee will now take a division on it, and then proceed with the discussion.

MR. BROADHURST (Leicester) said that if the tax were imposed for one year only it could then be seen whether or not the Chancellor of the Exchequer was right. His hon. friend stated that the tax was a tax in favour of protection but the Chancellor of the Exchequer said it was not. The Chancellor of the Exchequer now said that if at the end of a year certain experiences were obtained the tax might be altered, but it could not be altered without legislation if it were a permanent tax. If the Amendment were accepted it could be altered without legislation.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: Legislation would be necessary in either case.

MR. BROADHURST said he failed to understand how legislation would be necessary for a tax which was not permanent. All the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have to do would be to drop it out of the Finance Bill. He hoped the Chancellor of the Exchequer would accept the Amendment. It was laid down as a sound doctrine that the taxation of the food of the people was unconstitutional, and he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer was very ill-advised in resisting the Amendment, as there was a great principle at stake. The explanation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was no by means clear to the Committee, however clear it might have been to himself. He would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to tear himself away from the meshes of the Protectionist party behind him. If the right hon. Gentleman listened to the speeches and cheers and interruptions of his friends behind him he would surely be led into a course of legislation which he himself had again and again denounced and repudiated, and which would work great injury to the workers of the country. He hoped that even yet the right hon. Gentleman might accept the principle of the Amendment.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I am obliged once more to appeal to the Committee to take a division. The hon. Member has charged me with Protectionist principles, but I can assure him they have nothing whatever to do with the Amendment before the Committee. I am absolutely following precedent. I find that in 1864 when, to the best of my recollection, a gentleman who was certainly not a Protectionist, was Chancellor of the Exchequer, the sugar duties were revised, and an Amendment was moved that words should be
AYES.

Abraham, Wm. (Cork, N. E.)

Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herb. John

O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)

Abraham, William (Rhondda)

Goddard, Daniel Ford

O'Dowd, John

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Grey, Sir Edward (Berwick)

O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)

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

Griffith, Ellis J.

O'Kelly, J. (Roscommon, N.)
Ambrose, Robert
Haldane, Richard Burdon
O'Malley, William
Asquith, Rt. Hon. Herbt. H.
Hammond, John
O'Mara, James
Austin, Sir John
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir William
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Harmsworth, R. Leicester
Palmer, George Wm. (Reading)
Bayley, Thomas (Derbyshire)
Harwood, George
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Bell, Richard
Hayden, John Patrick
Pirie, Duncan V.
Black, Alexander William
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Power, Patrick Joseph
Blake, Edward
Helme, Norval Watson
Price, Robert John
Boland, John
Hemphill, Rt. Hon. Chas. H.
Priestley, Arthur
Bolton, Thomas Dolling
Hobhouse, C. E. H. (Bristol, E.)
Reddy, M.
Brigg, John
Holland, Wm. Henry
Redmond, J. E. (Waterford)
Broadhurst, Henry
Horniman, Frederick John
Redmond, William (Clare)
Brunner, Sir John Tomlinson
Joicey, Sir James
Rickett, J. Compton
Bryce, Rt. Hon. James
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
Rigg, Richard
Burke, E. Haviland-
Jordan, Jeremiah
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)

Burns, John
Kennedy; Patrick James
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Burt, Thomas
Kinloch, Sir John George Smyth
Roe, Sir Thomas
Buxton, Sydney Charles
Layland-Barratt, Francis
Scott, Chas. Prestwich (Leigh)
Caine, William Sproston
Leamy, Edmund
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Caldwell, James
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Shipman, Dr. John G.
Cameron, Robert
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Sinclair, Capt. J. (Forfarshire)
Campbell, John (Armagh, S.)
Leng, Sir John
Soames, Arthur Wellesley
Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H.
Levy, Maurice
Soares, Ernest J.
Causton, Richard Knight
Lewis, John Herbert
Spence, Rt Hn C. R. (Northants)
Cawley, Frederick
Lough, Thomas
Stevenson, Francis S.
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Sullivan, Donal
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Craig, Robert Hunter
Macnamara, Dr. Thomas J.
Thomas, David Alfr'd (Merthyr
Crean, Eugene
M'Crae, George
Thomas, F. Freeman- (Hastings
Cullinan, J.
M'Dermott, Patrick
Thomas, J A (Glamorg'n, Gower
Davies, Alfred (Carmarthen)

M'Govern, T.
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Davies, M. Vaughan- (Cardigan
M'Kenna, Reginald
Walker, Col. William Hall
Delany, William
Mooney, John J.
Wason, Eugene (Clackmannan
Dewar, John A. (Inverness-sh.)
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Weir, James Galloway
Donelan, Capt. A.
Moulton, John Pletcher
White, George (Norfolk)
Doogan, P. C.
Murnaghan, George
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Douglas, Charles M. (Lanark)
Murphy, John
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Dully, William J.
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Whiteley, George (York, W. R.)
Duncan, J. Hastings
Newnes, Sir George
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Esmonde, Sir Thomas
Nolan, Col. J. P. (Galway, N.)
Whittaker, Thomas Palmer
Evans, S. T. (Glamorgan)
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, South)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Fenwick, Charles
Norman, Henry
Wilson, F. W. Norfolk, Mid.
Ffrench, Peter
Nussey, Thomas Willans
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Field, William
O'Brien, Kendal (Tipper'ry Mid
Woodhouse, Sir J. T. (Huddersf, d
Fitzmaurice, Lord Edmond
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, East)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary. N.)

Yoxall, James Henry
Foster, Sir Walter (Derby Co.)
O'Connor, J. (Wicklow, W.)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Fuller, J. M. F.
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
Mr. Channing and Mr.
Gilhooly, James
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Kearley.

NOES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.
Archdale, Edward Mervyn
Bailey, James (Walworth)
Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel
Arkwright, John Stanhope
Bain, Colonel James Robert
Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.
Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John
Baird, John Geo. Alexander

inserted limiting the duties to one year only. That Amendment was rejected and the duties were made permanent. In 1870 the duties were again revised, but were not made annual. I am absolutely following precedent in this matter, and I would ask the Committee to take a division.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 155; Noes, 222. (Division List No. 260.)

Balfour, Rt. Hn. A. J. (Manch'r
Greene, Sir E W (B'ry S Edm'nds
Pilkington, Lieut.-Col Richard
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Groves, James Grimble
Platt-Higgms, Frederick
Balfour, Maj. K. R. (Christchch
Hall, Edward Marshall
Plummer, Walter R.
Banbury, Frederick George
Hamilton, Rt Hn Ld. G. (Midd'x
Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Bathurst, Hn. Allen Benjamin
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'ry
Pretymen, Ernest George
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H (Bristol)
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robert Wm.
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edw.
Beckett, Ernest William
Harris, Fredk. Leverton

Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Randles, John S.
Bigwood, James
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Rasch, Maj. Frederic Carne
Bill, Charles
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Reid, James (Greenock)
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Helder, Augustus
Remnant, James Farquharson
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Henderson, Alexander
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Brassey, Albert
Hermon-Hodge, Robt. Trotter
Renwick, George
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Hickman, Sir Alfred
Ridley, Hn. M. W (Stalybridge
Brookfield, Colonel Montagu
Hobhouse, Henry (Somerset, E.
Ritchie, Rt. Hn. Chas. Thomson
Brown, Alex. H. (Shropshire)
Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside
Rolleston, Sir John F. L.
Brymer, William Ernest
Houldsworth, Sir William H.
Ropner, Col. Robert
Bull, William James
Hoult, Joseph
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel W.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Howard, J. (Midd., Tottenham
Round, James
Butcher, John George
Hozier, Hon. James Henry Cecil
Hudson, George Bickersteth
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Carson, Rt. Hon. Sir Edward H.
Hutton, John (Yorks, N. R.)
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Cautley, Henry Strother
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col. Edw J.
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)

Jebb, Sir Richard Claverhouse
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Cavendish, V. C. W (Derbyshire)
Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick
Sharpe, William Edw. T.
Cayzer, Sir Charles William
Jessel, Captain Herbert Merton
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Johnston, William (Belfast)
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Chamberlain, J. Austen (Worc.
Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)
Skewes-Cox, Thomas
Chaplin, Rt. Hon. Henry
Kennaway, Rt. Hn. Sir John H.
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, E.)
Chapman, Edward
Kenyon, Hon. Geo. T. (Denbigh
Smith, H C (Northmb, Tyneside
Clare, Octavius Leigh
Kenyon, James (Lancs., Bury)
Smith, James Parker (Lanarks
Coghill, Douglas Harry
Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W (Salop)
Smith, Hn. W. F. D. (Strand)
Collings, Rt. Hn. Jesse
Keswick, William
Spear, John Ward
Colomb, Sir John Charles R.
Knowles, Lees
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Cook, Sir Frederick Lucas
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Corbett, A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Lambton, Hon. Frederick W.
Stewart, Sir M. J. M'Taggart
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Law, Andrew Bonar
Stock, James Henry
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool)
Stone, Sir Benjamin
Cranborne, Viscount
Lawson, John Grant
Stroyan, John

Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Lee, Arthur H (Hants., Fareh'm
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Cross, Herbert S. (Bolton)
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Crossley, Sir Savile
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
Leveson-Gower, Frederick N. S
Thorburn, Sir Walter
Dalkeith, Earl of
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Thornton, Percy M.
Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Denny, Colonel
Long, Rt. Hn. W. (Bristol, S.)
Tritton, Charles Ernest
Dickson, Charles Scott
Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Tufnell, Lieut.-Col. Edward
Digby, John K. D. Wingfield-
Loyd, Archie Kirkman
Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield
Lucas, Col. Francis (Lowestoft)
Valentia, Viscount
Doughty, George
Lucas, Reginald J (Portsmouth
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield.
Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Doxford, Sir William Theodore
Durning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison
Warde, Col. C. E.
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. Hart
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Warr, Augustus Frederick
M'Calmont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.)
Webb, Colonel William George
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
M'Killop, James (Stirlingshire
Welby, Lt.-Col. ACE (Taunton
Malcolm, Ian

Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. W. F
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Finch, George H.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Williams, Colonel R. (Dorset)
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Meysey-Thompson, Sir H. M.
Willoughby de Eresby, Lord
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Fisher, William Hayes
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Wilson, A. Stanley (Yorks, E. R
Fison, Frederick William
Moon, Edward Robert Pacy
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Fitz Gerald, Sir Robert Penrose-
Morrell, George Herbert
Wilson, John (Glasgow)
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh. N.
Flower, Ernest
Morrison, James Archibald
Wilson-Todd, Wm. H. (Yorks.
Morton, Arthur H. A (Deptford)
Wodehouse, Rt. Hn. E. R. (Bath
Gibbs, Hn A. C. H. (Cityo'Lond.
Mount, William Arthur
Wolff, Gustav Wilhelm
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn
Muntz, Philip A.
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Gore, Hn G R. C. Ormsby-(Salop
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Wylie, Alexander
Gore, Hon. S. F. Ormsby-(Linc.
Myers, William Henry
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon

Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Nicholson, William Graham
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Graham, Henry Robert
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Sir William Walrond and
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
Parkes, Ebenezer
Mr. Anstruther.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said he begged to move the Amendment standing in his name to exempt Ireland from the sugar duties. He did not know how the bulk of the English Members regarded the sugar tax, but as far as Ireland was concerned there was absolutely no doubt whatever as to the injustice of the tax and as to the heavy way in which it would fall on the very poorest of the population, and he would say that he was greatly surprised that a more vigorous protest had not been made against the tax by the great majority of the Liberal party. In these matters they seemed to be going from bad to worse. It was a disgrace to raise money to be squandered upon war by imposing taxation upon the ordinary articles of food, and this was a proposal which ought to be resisted by the Liberal party. They had taxed tea, and now they were taxing sugar. With regard to the tax on sugar;

*THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member as mistaken in thinking that the whole question of the sugar duty is open for discussion. The only question before the Committee is whether there should be a differentiation between Great Britain and Ireland in regard to this duty.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND, who was frequently interrupted from the Ministerial side, said that if hon. Members opposite would allow him to take his own course in this matter it would be found in the long run to be the shortest. If the people of this country would tolerate the breakfast table articles of food being taxed, then they deserved to be taxed. Irish Members, however, would always protest against this tax being extended to their country. It was a tax which would fall upon the very poorest of the people, and one which would be felt at once by every woman who went at the end of the week to buy supplies for her family. The vast mass of the Irish people were strongly opposed to the causes which had necessitated the Chancellor of the Exchequer's present proposals, and they had a right to ask that they should be exempted from this tax. There was a strong feeling amongst the masses of the people in Ireland that articles should be selected for taxation which would not place a burden upon the very poorest of the population. He should have preferred some form of direct taxation which would have made people enjoying large incomes pay in proportion for the expenses of the war. [Ministerial interruptions.] Hon. Gentlemen opposite by their demeanour seemed to think that the object of Irish Members was simply to obstruct the passage of the Finance

Bill;[Ministerial cries of "Hear hear."];and they gave them credit for doing nothing but obstruct the business of the House. [Renewed cries of "Hear, hear!" from the Ministerial side.] That confirmed his statement that they were simply credited by hon. Members opposite with a desire to obstruct. That was not a reasonable or a chivalrous view to take of the position of men who were voicing the opinions of their constituents just as much as hon. Members who supported the Government. It was one of the cruellest things in connection with the position of Ireland that, when Irish Members simply rose to voice the views of those they represented, they got no better reception than an intimation from hon. Gentlemen opposite that they were wantonly obstructing the business of the House and that their objections were not valid or real. If hon. Gentlemen opposite would visit Irish constituencies they would find that the objections to which Irishmen gave utterance in the House of Commons were felt throughout the length and breadth of Ireland. In protesting against this fresh taxation they were truly representing the views of their constituents. They had nothing to do with bringing about the war, and Ireland ought not to be charged with it. This tax would fall upon the poorest of the people; and whether the English Members protested or not, the Irish party would oppose it strenuously. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not accept his Amendment he would, if he had the power, organise a strike in Ireland against this tax, but he had not that power. The taxation of Ireland had increased by £2,000,000, while at the same time the population had gone down by a quarter of a million, and that was an intolerable state of affairs. If the Chancellor of the Exchequer did not give some attention to the voice of Ireland upon this matter that voice would be raised a great deal more strongly by other Irish Members. He hoped his Amendment would receive at least some support from a considerable section of the Liberal party. If this kind of taxation could not be avoided in England he appealed to those hon. Members who held by the old doctrines of Liberalism to support the Irish Members and himself when they endeavoured to protect this country from fresh taxation imposed by the Tory party.

Amendment proposed;

"In page 2, line 3, to leave out the words 'or Ireland.'";(Mr. William, Redmond.)

Question proposed, "That the words 'or Ireland' stand part of the clause."

SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I can assure the hon. Member that I am far from attributing to hon. Members from Ireland who are opposed to the taxation of Ireland a mere desire to obstruct. I am quite aware that they voice not only their own opinions, but those of their constituents, although I sometimes wish that they would do so with a less flow of eloquence;an eloquence to which I myself, unfortunately, am entirely unable to aspire.

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND: We were born that way; we cannot help it.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: As to the terrible threat of the hon. Member that he would organise a strike in Ireland against the consumption of sugar, I believe that is beyond even his powers. The hon. Member could not succeed in persuading the Irish woman or child to deprive themselves of the luxury of sugar in their tea

any more than he could persuade the Irishman to deprive himself of the luxury of sugar in his whisky. The hon. Member has suggested to hon. Members from England and Scotland who are opposed to this tax that they should support his Amendment in the lobby. I can quite understand that there are hon. Members representing constituencies in Great Britain who are opposed to the sugar duty, and who would vote against it in connection with the whole clause; but I cannot quite understand anyone who opposes the sugar duty in Great Britain voting that it should not be applicable to Ireland, but that it should be applicable to Great Britain. The hon. Member in this and other proposals which he has from time to time made in this House always seemed to forget that it was practically impossible to make any distinctions between Ireland and Great Britain in the application of the Customs duty without establishing a Customs tariff as between the two countries. I venture to say that if we were to attempt, for the sake of this sugar duty, to make such a change in the fiscal relations of Ireland and Great Britain we should be doing something which would cause infinitely greater suffering to the Irish people than anything that could be caused by the sugar duty. The hon. Member complained that the sugar duty of 4s. 2d. in the cwt. would impose a great burden on the people of Ireland. In the year 1893 the price of sugar was as high without duty as it would be now with duty. Was the position of the Irish labourer, his wife, or child, with regard to the consumption of sugar, so very dreadful in 1893 as the hon. Member seemed to anticipate it would be in the present circumstances?

MR. WILLIAM REDMOND said it was only fair to bear in mind that since 1893 taxation had gone up in Ireland by over two millions a year.

*SIR M. HICKS BEACH: I might meet that by saying that the taxation of Great Britain has gone up considerably more, but I do not want to enter upon that question, which, as I have already said, can hardly be debated on an Amendment of this kind. It is quite natural that hon. Members representing Irish constituencies should be opposed to the imposition of this duty in Ireland, and that they should believe that they ought not to bear increased taxation for any purpose, and perhaps more particularly for a war, or preparation for war, of which they may not approve. I venture to say, however, that they ought not to exaggerate the effects of the burden of this tax upon their constituents. I am afraid it is quite impossible for me to accept the suggestion of the hon. Member, and I hope he will pardon me if I do not enter at any greater length upon this subject, for I feel that I should only be wasting the time of the Committee and repeating arguments which I have already put before the House.

COLONEL NOLAN said that the rate of wages was lower in Ireland than in England, and that the duty would therefore press more heavily on the population in the former country. The war had brought a good deal of increased employment in England, but Ireland merely contributed to its cost. A very large proportion of the war expenditure was spent in England, and trade in this country benefited by it, whereas Ireland scarcely got any benefit at all from this expenditure. That was one reason why the working classes in this country did not object to increased taxation. Taxes on food were always a great burden, and they were not

only a form of taxation which was most objectionable, but they weighed very heavily upon the poor people of Ireland. He hoped if the Chancellor of the Exchequer could not see his way to remitting the tax on sugar he would make it up to the poor people of Ireland in some other way.

MR. O'MARA (Kilkenny, S.) said that, so far as he was able to gather, the only argument the Chancellor of the Exchequer put forward against exempting Ireland from this tax was that the people did not suffer anything by its imposition, because four or five years ago the prices of tea and sugar were higher than at present. That was a very ingenious argument, but it was unsound. A logical case had been made out against the imposition of this tax in Ireland. The Irish people had had neither part nor lot in the war, and therefore should not be called upon to pay for it. Moreover, they were not in a position to bear additional taxation, as would be seen from the fact that in Ireland there were now, in proportion to the population, more aged people over sixty years of age and more young people under fifteen years of age than in any country in Europe. The fact that the tax was to be permanent made it even more objectionable. Of late years the manufacture of condensed milk had been increasing in Ireland, but the tax on sugar would deal the industry a very heavy blow.

MR. POWER did not agree with the Chancellor of the Exchequer that a separate system of Customs for Ireland could not be devised without great difficulty. He instanced the case of the Isle of Man, where he contended such a system was in force, and he had never heard that it caused any difficulty or upset the arrangements of the United Kingdom. As to the statement that the people would be no worse off as regarded this tax than they were in 1893, he asserted, having some knowledge of the question, that the Irish people, whether landlords, labourers, or artisans, were less able to bear taxation now than even as recently as 1893. That statement could be proved by statistics, and it was well known that while the taxation had increased the population had decreased. The Nationalist members spoke for the poorest of the people; they were proud of their position, and they would be false to their trust if they did not by every means in their power endeavour to safeguard the interests of the people whose cause had been confided to their hands.

*MR. COGAN (Wicklow, E.) supported the Amendment for three reasons; first, that Ireland was on the verge of ruin and unable to bear this additional taxation; secondly, that the cause of the imposition of this tax was one which Ireland had opposed with no uncertain voice; and thirdly, that it was a tax on the food of the working man. The manner in which the tax had been introduced was of a piece with the whole system of Tory finance, especially in relation to Ireland. Under the Local Government Act taxation was imposed upon the working man which he had never had to bear before, and now taxation was imposed indirectly which if imposed directly would be seen by him to be much heavier than in its present form it appeared to be. The Chancellor of the Exchequer used the absurd argument that because, with the addition of the duty, the price of sugar would not be greater than it was in 1893. The advance in the price of sugar in 1893 was due to the fact that the Bounties

Commission was about to sit, and the dealers and merchants were afraid that the bounty system on the Continent would be abolished; but before 1893 sugar was cheaper than at the present time. The argument of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on that point, therefore, fell to the ground. It was true that there had been no outcry against the tax from the sugar importers and merchants; the reason of that was that these gentlemen had forestalled the announcement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The imports of refined sugar alone from the 1st January to the 17th April this year were 5,209,220 cwts. in excess, or nearly
AYES.

Acland-Hood, Capt. Sir Alex. F.

Crossley, Sir Savile

Hobhouse, Hy. (Somerset, E.)

Agg-Gardner, James Tynte

Dalkeith, Earl of

Hope, J. F. (Sheffield Brightside

Agnew, Sir Andrew Noel

Dalrymple, Sir Charles

Houldsworth, Sir Wm. Hy.

Allan, William (Gateshead)

Davies, Sir Horatio D (Chatham

Hoult, Joseph

Allen, Chas. P. (Glouc., Stroud

Dewar, John A (Inverness-shire

Jeffreys, Arthur Frederick

Allhusen, Augustus Henry E.

Dickson, Charles Scott

Jessel, Capt. Herb. Merton

Archdale, Edward Mervyn

Digby, John K. D, Wingfield-

Johnston, William (Belfast)

Arkwright, John Stanhope

Dimsdale, Sir Joseph Cockfield

Johnstone, Heywood (Sussex)

Ashton, Thomas Gair

Doughty, George

Joicey, Sir James

Atkinson, Rt. Hon. John

Douglas, Rt. Hon. A. Akers-

Kenyon, Hon. G. T. (Denbigh

Bailey, James (Walworth)

Douglas, Chas. M. (Lanark)

Kenyon, J, (Lancs., Bury)

Bain, Colonel James Robert

Doxford, Sir William Theodore

Kenyon-Slaney, Col. W. (Salop.

Baird, John George Alex.

Darning-Lawrence, Sir Edwin
Keswick, William
Balfour, Rt. Hon. A. J (Manch'r.
Dyke, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm. H.
Knowles, Lees
Balfour, Rt Hn Gerald W (Leeds
Egerton, Hon. A. de Tatton
Lambton, Hon. Frederick Wm.
Balfour, Maj. K R (Christchurch
Elliot, Hon. A. Ralph Douglas
Law, Andrew Bonar
Banbury, Frederick George
Evans, Samuel T. (Glamorgan)
Lawrence, Wm. F. (Liverpool
Bathurst, Hon. Allen B.
Fellowes, Hon. Ailwyn Edward
Lawson, John Grant
Beach, Rt. Hn. Sir M. H. (Bristol
Finch, George H.
Lee, A. H. (Hants., Fareham)
Beaumont, Wentworth C. B.
Finlay, Sir Robert Bannatyne
Lees, Sir Elliott (Birkenhead)
Beckett, Ernest William
Firbank, Joseph Thomas
Legge, Col. Hon. Heneage
Bentinck, Lord Henry C.
Fisher, William Hayes
Leigh-Bennett, Henry Currie
Black, Alexander William
Fison, Frederick William
Leveson-Gower, Fredk. N. S.
Blundell, Colonel Henry
Fletcher, Sir Henry
Llewellyn, Evan Henry
Bond, Edward
Flower, Ernest
Loder, Gerald Walter Erskine
Boscawen, Arthur Griffith-
Fuller, J. M. P.
Long, Col. C. W. (Evesham)
Brassey, Albert
Galloway, William Johnson
Long, Rt. Hn. Walter (Bristol, S
Brigg, John
Godson, Sir Augustus Frederick

Lonsdale, John Brownlee
Brodrick, Rt. Hon. St. John
Gordon, Hn. J. E (Elgin & Nairn)
Lowther, C. (Cumb., Eskdale)
Brown, Alexander H. (Shropsh.
Gore, Hn G R C. Ormsby- (Salop)
Lucas Col. F. (Lowestoft)
Brymer, William Ernest
Gore, Hn. S. F. Ormsby- (Linc)
Lucas, Reginald J. (Portsmouth
Bull, William James
Gorst, Rt. Hon. Sir John Eldon
Lyttelton, Hon. Alfred.
Bullard, Sir Harry
Goschen, Hon. George Joachim
Macartney, Rt. Hn. W G Ellison
Butcher, John George
Goulding, Edward Alfred
Macdona, John Gumming
Caldwell, James
Gray, Ernest (West Ham)
M'Arthur, Charles (Liverpool)
Carson, Rt Hon. Sir Edw. H.
Greene, Sir E W (B'y S Edm'nds)
M'C'almont, Col. J. (Antrim, E.
Cautley, Henry Strother
Gretton, John
M'Crae, George
Cavendish, R. F. (N. Lancs.)
Greville, Hon. Ronald
M'Kenna, Reginald
Cavendish, V. C. W. (Derbysh.)
Griffith, Ellis J.
M'Killop, Jas. (Stirlingshire)
Cecil, Evelyn (Aston Manor)
Groves, James Grimble
Malcolm, Ian
Cecil, Lord Hugh (Greenwich)
Hamilton, Rt Hn Lord G. (Midd.
Martin, Richard Biddulph
Chamberlain, J. A. (Worc'r.)
Hamilton, Marq. of (L'nd'nd'rry
Massey-Mainwaring, Hn. WF.
Chapman, Edward
Hanbury, Rt. Hon. Robt. W.
Maxwell, Rn. Hn Sir H. E Wigt'n

Cochrane, Hon. Thos. H. A. E.
Harcourt, Rt. Hon. Sir Wm.
Melville, Beresford Valentine
Collings, Rt. Hon. Jesse
Harris, Frederick Leverton
Mildmay, Francis Bingham
Colomb, Sir John Charles Ready
Haslam, Sir Alfred S.
Molesworth, Sir Lewis
Corbett. A. Cameron (Glasgow)
Haslett, Sir James Horner
Montagu, G. (Huntingdon)
Corbett, T. L. (Down, North)
Hay, Hon. Claude George
Moon, Edw. Robert Pacy
Cox, Irwin Edw. Bainbridge
Hayne, Rt. Hon. Charles Seale-
Morgan, Hn. Fred (Monmths.
Craig, Robert Hunter
Helder, Augustus
Morrell, George Herbert
Cranborne, Viscount
Helme, Norval Watson
Morrison, James Archibald
Cross, Alexander (Glasgow)
Henderson, Alexander
Morton, Arthur H A. (Deptford)

double what they were for the corresponding period of last year. This quantity at 4s. 2d. per cwt. would produce £;1,085,000. Hence the patriotic silence of one interest affected. The public had not participated at all in this huge gain, because immediately the new duty was announced the price to the consumer had been advanced a halfpenny a pound. It was the bounden duty of Irish Members to resist to the utmost this unjust and intolerable tax.

Question put.

The Committee divided:;Ayes, 217; Noes, 88. (Division List No. 261.)

Moulton, John Fletcher
Ritchie, Rt. Hon. Chas. T.
Thornton, Percy M.
Mount, William Arthur
Roberts, John H. (Denbighs.)
Tomlinson, Wm. Edw. Murray
Mowbray, Sir Robert Gray C.
Robertson, Herbert (Hackney)
Trevelyan, Charles Philips
Muntz, Philip A.
Rothschild, Hon. Lionel Walter

Tufnell, Lt.-Col. Edward
Murray, Rt. Hn. A. G. (Bute)
Round, James
Valentia, Viscount
Murray, Charles J. (Coventry)
Sackville, Col. S. G. Stopford-
Vincent, Col. Sir C E H (Sheffield
Newdigate, Francis Alexander
Sadler, Col. Samuel Alexander
Vincent, Sir Edgar (Exeter)
Nicholson, William Graham
Samuel, S. M. (Whitechapel)
Walker, Col. William Hall
Nichol, Donald Ninian
Saunderson, Rt. Hn. Col, Edw J.
Warde, Colonel C. E.
Norman, Henry
Seely, Chas. Hilton (Lincoln)
Warner, Thomas Courtenay T.
Orr-Ewing, Charles Lindsay
Sharpe, William Edward T.
Welby, Lt.-Col. A C E (Taunton)
Palmer, Geo. Wm. (Reading)
Simeon, Sir Barrington
Welby, Sir Charles G. E. (Notts.
Palmer, Walter (Salisbury)
Sinclair, Capt John (Forfarshire)
Whiteley, George (Yorks, W. R)
Partington, Oswald
Sinclair, Louis (Romford)
Whitmore, Charles Algernon
Penn, John
Smith, Abel H. (Hertford, East)
Williams, Osmond (Merioneth)
Pilkington, Lt.-Col. Richard
Smith, H C (North'mb. Tynesie
Willox, Sir John Archibald
Pirie, Duncan V.
Smith, Jas. Parker (Lanarks)
Wilson, A Stanley (Yorks, E. R.)
Platt-Higgins, Frederick
Smith, Hon. W. F. D. (Strand)
Wilson, John (Falkirk)
Plummer, Walter R.
Soares, Ernest J.
Wilson, John (Glasgow)

Powell, Sir Francis Sharp
Spear, John Ward
Wilson, J. W. (Worcestersh., N.
Pretymann, Ernest George
Stanley, Edw. Jas. (Somerset)
Wodehouse, Rt Hn. E. R. (Bath)
Price, Robert John
Stanley, Lord (Lancs.)
Wortley, Rt. Hn. C. B. Stuart-
Pryce-Jones, Lt.-Col. Edward
Stewart. Sir Mark J. M'Taggart
Wrightson, Sir Thomas
Purvis, Robert
Stirling-Maxwell, Sir John M.
Wylie, Alexander
Randles, John S.
Stock, James Henry
Wyndham, Rt. Hon. George
Rasch, Major Frederick Carne
Strachey, Edward
Young, Commander (Berks, E.)
Reid, James (Greenock)
Stroyan, John
Younger, William
Remnant, James Farquharson
Strutt, Hon. Charles Hedley
Renshaw, Charles Bine
Talbot, Lord E. (Chichester)
TELLERS FOR THE AYES;
Rentoul, James Alexander
Tennant, Harold John
Sir William Walrond and
Ridley, Hon M. W. (Stalybr'dge
Thomas, David Alfred (Merth'r
Mr. Anstruther.
Ridley, S. Forde (Bethnal Green
Thomas, F. Freeman-(Hastings
NOES.
Abraham, William (Cork, N. E.
Jones, Wm. (Carnarvonshire)
O'Kelly, Conor (Mayo, N.)
Abraham, William (Rhondda)
Jordan, Jeremiah
O'Kelly, Jas. (Roscommon, N.)
Ambrose, Robert
Kearley, Hudson E.

O'Malley, William
Barry, E. (Cork, S.)
Kennedy, Patrick James
O'Mara, James
Boland, John
Layland-Barratt, Francis
O'Shaughnessy, P. J.
Broadhurst, Henry
Leamy, Edmund
Pearson, Sir Weetman D.
Burke, E. Haviland-
Leese, Sir Joseph F. (Accrington
Power, Patrick Joseph
Campbell, John (Armagh S.)
Leigh, Sir Joseph
Priestley, Arthur
Causton, Richard Knight
Leng, Sir John
Reddy, M.
Cawley, Frederick
Levy, Maurice
Redmond, John E. (Waterford)
Channing, Francis Allston
Lough, Thomas
Redmond, William (Clare)
Cogan, Denis J.
Lundon, W.
Rigg, Richard
Condon, Thomas Joseph
MacDonnell, Dr. Mark A.
Roberts, John Bryn (Eifion)
Crean, Eugene
M'Dermott, Patrick
Robson, William Snowdon
Cullinan, J.
M'Govern, T.
Roe, Sir Thomas
Delany, William
Mooney, John J.
Sheehan, Daniel Daniel
Doogan, P. C.
Morris, Hon. Martin Henry F.
Spencer, Rt. Hn. C R (Northants
Duffy, William J.
Morton, Edw. J. C. (Devonport)
Stevenson, Francis S.

Duncan, J. Hastings
Murnaghan, George
Sullivan, Donal
Elibank, Master of
Murphy, John
Taylor, Theodore Cooke
Emmott, Alfred
Nannetti, Joseph P.
Tomkinson, James
Ffrench, Peter
Nolan, Col. John P. (Galway, N.
White, Luke (York, E. R.)
Field, William
Nolan, Joseph (Louth, S.)
White, Patrick (Meath, N.)
Flynn, James Christopher
O'Brien, K. (Tipperary, Mid)
Whitley, J. H. (Halifax)
Gilhooly, James
O'Brien, Patrick (Kilkenny)
Wilson, John (Durham, Mid.)
Gladstone, Rt. Hn. Herbert J.
O'Brien, P. J. (Tipperary, N.)
Young, Samuel (Cavan, E.
Goddard, Daniel Ford
O'Connor, Jas. (Wicklow, W.)
Hammond, John
O'Connor, T. P. (Liverpool)
TELLERS FOR THE NOES;
Hayden, John Patrick
O'Donnell, John (Mayo, S.)
Sir Thomas Esmonde and
Holland, William Henry
O'Donnell, T. (Kerry, W.)
Captain Donelan.
Horniman, Frederick John
O'Dowd, John

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress; and ask leave to sit again."; (Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.) Put, and agreed to.

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon Thursday.

Adjourned at a quarter after Twelve of the clock.